

SENATE—Monday, October 18, 1993*(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 13, 1993)*

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable HARLAN MATHEWS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Father in Heaven, we want to thank You for the return of Michael Durant and remember him especially as he undergoes surgery this morning. And we cover with prayer those families of the ones who did not return from Somalia.

Almighty God, as a new week begins, we express our gratitude for Your loving watch care. We thank Thee for the Senators who had to travel and have returned safely. We thank Thee for those who had time with family and rest. We pray for those who were kept busy this weekend and ask that they will be especially energized for the work that lies ahead.

Gracious Father, as the Senators are confronted inescapably from the problems of the Nation and the world, grant special wisdom and insight that they may fulfill their responsibilities. Guide their considerations, their debate, and their decisions and let Thy will be done in the Senate as it is in heaven.

In the name of Him who promised rest for those who labor and are heavy laden if they come to Him.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1993.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HARLAN MATHEWS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MATHEWS thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 hour in speaking out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, [Mr. INOUE] and the distinguished Senator from Alaska, [Mr. STEVENS] and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, [Mr. NICKLES] for their courtesies in indulging my taking this time.

LINE-ITEM VETO XIV

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the 14th in my series of speeches on the line-item veto, with particular reference to the Roman Republic and the Roman Senate. When I began this series of 1-hour speeches on May 5, I spoke of Montesquieu, the eminent French philosopher and author who had greatly influenced the Founding Fathers with his political theory of checks and balances and separation of powers.

What influenced Montesquieu in his espousal of this political system? Montesquieu was greatly influenced by the history of the development of the English constitution and by the history of the people of Rome. So impressed was Montesquieu with the Romans that he, in fact, developed and published a work of his own on the subject. Almost midway between the "Persian Letters" in 1721 and the "Spirit of the Laws" in 1748, Montesquieu published, in 1734, his "Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and their Decline," which is the least well-known of the three.

I have also stated a number of times that if we are to have a better appreciation and understanding of the U.S. Constitution—its separation of powers, and checks and balances, and the power over the purse—then we should follow in Montesquieu's tracks and study Roman history as he did, and that is what we have been doing together during these past several months.

What have we acquired to pay us for our pains? What have we learned that can be applicable to our own time, our own country, and to the political questions of today concerning checks and balances and the control over the purse? Let us see.

Mr. President, I hold that human nature is like a molecule of water. It has never changed. That which was H₂O at the beginning of creation, when "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" is still H₂O today, two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen. And that which was human nature when Adam and Eve fell from grace, is still human nature today. It has never changed. And as human nature has not changed from the beginning, but is still motivated by the same emotions and instincts and needs and drives—love and hate and fear and greed and hunger, and so on—the history of man's actions will always have a way of repeating itself.

So, as we who live today contribute to the flow of history's unceasing stream, we will find it worth our while to examine the events of past ages, their causes and their consequences, in order that we might better understand the causes and possible consequences of the phenomena, the happenings, the events, and the actions of our own life and times.

Napoleon said, "Let my son often read and reflect on history. This is the only true philosophy." We have elected, therefore as did Montesquieu, to look to Roman history for guidance.

Roman power derived from Roman virtue, basically; in other words, from great moral qualities. The average Roman, as we have noted, was simple, steadfast, honest, courageous, law-abiding, patriotic, and reverent, and his leaders were men of uncommon dedication and acumen.

From the earliest times, the Romans possessed a profound reverence for national tradition, a firm conviction of being the special object and instrument of destiny, and a strong sense of individual responsibility and obligation to that tradition and to the fulfillment of that destiny.

There spring to mind several parallels between the history of the Romans and the history of our own Republic, one such parallel being that the same old virtues which lent sturdiness and integrity to the early Romans, also gave stability and substance and strength and character to our own national life in the early years of its formation and development.

The Roman family was the cornerstone of the Roman social structure, and the family setting instilled in its members the self-discipline, the respect for authority, the veneration of ancestors, and the reverence for the

gods that lent stability to Roman society and iron discipline to the Roman legions.

The Roman family unit was, indeed, a religious organization, a community of worship centered around the cult of the hearth and the cult of the dead. Each morning and evening, the entire family, including the slaves, offered prayers and sacrifices to the departed ancestors at the family hearth, the ever-burning flame of which symbolized both the unity and the continuity of the Roman family.

Because of their pastoral tradition, the Romans, like the Jews of the Old Testament, sacrificed animals to their gods. Reverence and the idea of obligation—inherent in the Roman conception of the relation between gods and men—inevitably developed among the Romans a strong sense of duty, a moral factor of inestimable worth.

Mr. President, we have seen that same strong tradition of family and religious values prevalent in the formation and development of our own country, from colonial times down to the mid-20th century. The erosion of these values in America over the last 30 to 40 years has signified a decline in the moral and spiritual strength of this nation, as it did in the Roman state.

We have seen in both the Roman and American psyches a sense of Manifest Destiny, and the same urge to extend territorial frontiers. We saw in the territorial expansion of the Roman city state what amounted to an overexpansion. We saw the drain that was placed upon Roman manpower, and the burden that was imposed upon the administration of the far-flung provinces. While, in our own case, territorial expansion has long since ceased, in recent years we have spent billions of dollars in space exploration, and we stand in danger of overextending our international commitments and our financial capability to sustain and underwrite them. We have been talking about that a good bit lately.

We have also drawn Roman and American parallels in the vanishing peasantry from the land and the decline in small family farms, the consequences of which have been increasing unemployment and crime and poverty in the cities, and a growing welfare dependence upon the State.

During the centuries of the early and middle Republic, public office in Rome could be obtained only through virtue, and brought with it no pay, no salary, no benefit other than honor, and the opportunity to prove one's self worthy of being preferred for further toils on behalf of the State.

In the last century of the Republic, the old citizen soldiery and the old moral structure of integrity and dedication to the cause of country gave way to greed, graft, corruption, venality, and political demagoguery, much of which we see in our own time and in

our own country. The self-serving ambitions of Roman generals and politicians led to violence, civil wars, and military domination by standing armies made up of professional soldiers. In our own Republic today, the military-industrial complex, against which President Eisenhower warned, can pose a threat to the system.

Thus, Mr. President, there are sundry similarities between our own history and the history of the Romans.

Now, let us turn to the consideration of the Roman political system. In the Roman Republic, the political organization was complex, and it was also experimental, unlike that of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver of the ninth century B.C.

Lycurgus united in his constitution all of the good and distinctive features of the best governments, so that none of the principal parts should unduly grow and predominate. But inasmuch as the force of each part would be neutralized by that of the others, neither of them should prevail and outbalance another. Therefore, the constitution should remain in a state of equilibrium.

Lycurgus, foreseeing by a process of reasoning whence and how events would naturally happen, constructed his constitution untaught by adversity. But, while the Romans would achieve the same final result, according to Polybius, they did not reach it by any process of reasoning but by the discipline of many trials and struggles. And, by always choosing the best, in the light of the experience gained, they reached the same result as Lycurgus.

Let us consider the Roman system as it was seen by Polybius, the Greek historian, who lived in Rome from 168 B.C., following the Battle of Pydna, until after 150 B.C., at a time when the Roman Republic was at a pinnacle of majesty that excited his admiration and comment.

Polybius viewed the Roman constitution as having three elements: the Executive, the Senate, and the people, with their respective share of power in the state regulated by a scrupulous regard to equality and equilibrium.

Let us examine the separation of powers in the Roman Republic as explained by Polybius. The consuls—representing the Executive—were the supreme masters of the administration of the government when remaining in Rome. All of the other magistrates, except the tribunes, were under the consuls and took their orders from the consuls. The consuls brought matters before the Senate that required its deliberation, and they saw to the execution of the Senate's decrees. In matters requiring the authorization of the people, the consuls summoned the popular meetings, presented the proposals for their decision, and carried out the decrees of the majority.

In matters of war, the consuls imposed such levies upon the allies as the

consuls deemed appropriate, and made up the roll for soldiers and selected those who were suitable. Consuls had absolute power to inflict punishment upon all who were under their command, and had all but absolute power in the conduct of military campaigns.

As to the Senate—we are talking about the separation of powers—as to the Senate, it had complete control over the treasury and regulated receipts and disbursements alike. The quaestors could not issue any public money to the various departments of the state without a decree of the Senate. The Senate controlled the money for the repair and construction of public works and public buildings throughout Italy, but this money could not be obtained by the censors, who oversaw the contracts for public works and public buildings, except by the grant of the Senate.

The Senate also had jurisdiction over all crimes in Italy requiring a public investigation, such as treason, conspiracy, poisoning, or willful murder, as well as controversies between and among allied states. Receptions for ambassadors and matters affecting foreign states were the business of the Senate.

What part of the constitution was left to the people? The people participated in the ratification of treaties and alliances, and decided questions of war and peace. The people passed and repealed laws—subject to the Senate's veto—and bestowed public offices on the deserving, which, according to Polybius, "are the most honorable rewards for virtue."

Polybius, having described the separation of powers under the Roman constitution, how did the three parts of state check and balance each other?

Mr. President, during the past several months, I have often referred to the various checks that the consuls, the tribunes, the Senate and the assemblies exercised against each other. And I have paid particular attention to the veto power of the Roman Senate and the tribunes.

Incidentally, Henry Clay, who believed that the veto power of American Presidents was "despotic" and ought to be circumscribed, stated in a Senate floor speech that the veto "originated in the institution of the tribunician power in ancient Rome," and had "been introduced from the practice under the empire into the monarchies of Europe."

Polybius explains the checks and balances of the Roman constitution, as he had observed them firsthand. Remember, he was living in Rome at the time.

What were the checks upon the consuls, the executive? The consul—whose power over the administration of the government when in the city, and over the military when in the field, appeared absolute—still had need of the support of the Senate and the people.

The consul needed supplies for his legions, but without a decree of the Senate, his soldiers could be supplied with neither corn nor clothes nor pay. Moreover, all of his plans would be futile if the Senate shrank from danger, or if the Senate opposed his plans or sought to hamper them. Therefore, whether the consul could bring any undertaking to a successful conclusion depended upon the Senate, which had the absolute power, at the end of the consul's one-year term, to replace him with another consul or to extend his command.

Even to the successes of the consuls on the field of battle, the Senate had the power to add distinction and glory, or to obscure their merits, for unless the Senate concurred in recognizing the achievements of the consuls and in voting the money, there could be no celebration or public triumph.

The consuls were also obliged to court the favor of the people, so here is the check of the people against the consul, for it was the people who would ratify, or refuse to ratify, the terms of peace. But most of all, the consuls, when laying down their office at the conclusion of their 1-year term, would have to give an accounting of their administration, both to the Senate and to the people. So, it was necessary that the consuls maintain the good will of both the Senate and the people.

What were the checks against the Senate? The Senate was obliged to take the multitude into account and respect the wishes of the people, for in matters directly affecting the Senators—for instance, in the case of a law diminishing the Senate's traditional authority, or depriving Senators of certain dignities, or even actually reducing the property of Senators—in such cases, the people had the power to pass or reject the law in their assembly.

In addition, according to Polybius, if the tribunes imposed their veto, the Senate would not only be unable to pass a decree, but could not even hold a meeting. And because the tribunes must always have a regard for the people's wishes, the Senate stood in awe of the multitude and could not neglect the feelings of the people.

But as a counterbalance, what check was there against the people? We have seen the checks against the consuls; we have described the checks against the Senate. What about the people? According to Polybius, the people were far from being independent of the Senate, and were bound to take its wishes into account, both collectively and individually.

For example, contracts were given out in all parts of Italy by the censors for the repair and construction of public works and public buildings. Then there was the matter of the collection of revenues from rivers and harbors and mines and lands—everything, in a word, that came under the control of the Roman government. In all of these

things, the people were engaged, either as contractors or as pledging their property as security for the contractors, or in selling supplies, or making loans to the contractors, or as engaging in the work and in the employ of the contractors.

"Over all these transactions," says Polybius, "the Senate has complete control." For example, it could extend the time on a contract and thus assist the contractors; or in the case of unforeseen accident, it could relieve the contractors of a portion of their obligation, or it could even release them altogether if they were absolutely unable to fulfill the contract.

So, there were many ways in which the Senate could inflict great hardships upon the contractors, or, on the other hand, grant great indulgences to the contractors. But in every case, the appeal was to the Senate.

The Senate's ace card lay in its control over the purse strings. Also, the judges were selected from the Senate, at the time of Polybius, for the majority of trials in which the charges were heavy. Consequently, the people were cautious about resisting or actively opposing the will of the Senate, because they were uncertain as to when they might need the Senate's aid. For a similar reason, the people did not rashly resist the will of the consuls, because one and all might, in one way or another, become subject to the absolute power of the consuls at some point in time.

Polybius sums it up in this way: "When any one of the three classes becomes puffed up, and manifests an inclination to be contentious and unduly encroaching, the mutual interdependency of all the three, and the possibility of the pretensions of any one being checked and thwarted by the others, must plainly check this tendency. And so the proper equilibrium is maintained by the impulsiveness of the one part being checked by its fear of the other."

Polybius' account may not have been an exact representation of the true state of the Roman system, but he was on the scene, and he was writing to tell us what he saw with his own eyes—not through the eyes of someone else. What better witness could we have?

The theory of a mixed constitution—that is what ours is, a mixed constitution with checks and balances, and separation of powers—the theory of a mixed constitution had had its great measure of success in the Roman Republic. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Founding Fathers of the United States should have been familiar with the works of Polybius, or that Montesquieu should have been influenced by the checks and balances and separation of powers in the Roman constitutional system, a clear element of which was the control over the purse, vested solely in the Senate in the heyday of the Republic.

Mr. President, in my presentations today and heretofore on this subject, I have drawn many parallels between our own Republic and the historical meanderings of that ancient Republic that rose and declined along the banks of the Tiber River, a parallel which induced someone in an earlier American generation to name the tiny stream that once flowed across the present-day Mall, "Tiber Creek." It is my own sincere prayer, however, that the United States will not follow a course parallel to the Roman Republic into an inexorable decline and decadence.

Mr. President, worthy scholars and thoughtful authors have exhausted rivers of ink in attempting to analyze the decline and fall of the Roman Republic and the subsequent empire. Among the foremost of these author-historians is Edward Gibbon. Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" is an incontestable historical classic, and no competent grasp of Roman historiography can be achieved without taking Gibbon into consideration. If Senators have not read his volumes, they should read them.

Whereas Polybius wrote about the rise of the Roman Republic and its greatness, Gibbon wrote about the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, which followed on after the Republic collapsed.

However, Gibbon outlines a case for Rome's decline and fall with which few, if any, subsequent historians will agree. Gibbon asserts that Christianity was the cause of Rome's decline and ultimate fall.

Gibbon's assertion is not an atheist's diatribe against Christianity, as some people might assume. Gibbon's position is that Christianity's "other-worldly" orientation, its exclusivistic monotheism, its withdrawal from the larger society, its condemnation of Mediterranean culture, its fostering of monasticism, and its contemplative emphasis, when taken together, refocused the people's attention on spiritual values to the detriment of the practicality, the civic activism, and the aggressiveness that characterized and gave rise to the Roman attitude toward life.

Conversely, while Gibbon is acquainted with and recounts most of the evidences of Rome's decline that have nothing to do with Christianity—moral decadence, tyrannical emperors, barbarian incursions, the decline of the small family farms, the vanishing peasantry, the depletion of soils and accessible mineral resources, and the collapse of faith in the old gods—Gibbon treats these as being merely coincidental to Rome's decline—minor distractions and sideshows around the center ring's main event, namely, Christianity's gnawing away at the empire's superstructure.

Certainly, no informed student of Roman history can ignore Gibbon's achievement, both as a historian and as an interpreter of ancient Roman civilization. But though the "Decline and

Fall of the Roman Empire" is an undeniable classic, Gibbon has not written the last word on ancient Rome. Indeed, during the roughly two centuries since Gibbon wrote his masterpiece, we have witnessed a revolution in historical methodology and a reformation in our comprehension of the causes of Rome's failure. For example, Will Durant, who made his political and cultural influence felt earlier in this century, broadly represents a 20th-century perspective on the causes of Rome's decline and decay. In "The Story of Civilization," Will Durant asserts that Rome was already in decline before Christianity emerged on the scene.

An eroding faith in the old Greco-Roman pantheon of deities, a decline in family life, rotting public and individual morality; the corrosion of discipline, patriotism, and the military esprit; abandonment of the land by the peasant classes, agricultural decline, deforestation; civil wars, class struggle, international warfare, praetorian intrigues and conspiracies, assassinations, violence, and civil disorders; bureaucratic despotism, economic depression, stifling taxes, and corruption in government; mad emperors, pestilences, and plague; games and circuses, free bread, and the welfare mob—all of these wore away the moral and spiritual and social underpinnings of the Roman state, and accelerated its plunge into hopeless impotence and eventual obscurity as a military power and territorial empire.

Against such a backdrop of crises, fecklessness, and drift, Christianity served, not as a cause of decay and collapse, but as a lifeboat for a despairing populace. Rome was already a cracked shell when Christianity ascended the stage.

But, perhaps most tellingly, Durant declares:

The political causes of decay were rooted in one fact—increasing despotism destroyed the citizens' civic sense and dried up statesmanship at its source. * * * The Senate, losing ever more of its power and prestige, * * * relapsed into indolence, subservience, or venality; and the last barrier fell that might have saved the state from militarism and anarchy.

In short, Rome's fate was sealed by the one-by-one donations of power and prerogative that the Roman Senate plucked from its own quiver and voluntarily delivered into the hands, first, of Julius Caesar and then Octavian, and subsequently into the trust of the succession of Caligulas, Neros, Commoduses, and Elagabaluses who followed, until at last, the ancient and noble ideals of the Roman Republic had been dissolved into the stinking brew of imperial debauchery, tyranny, megalomania, and rubble into which the Roman Empire eventually sank.

At the height of the Republic, the Roman Senate had been the one agency with the authority, the perspective, and the popular aura to debate, inves-

tigate, commission, and correct the problems that confronted the Roman state and its citizens. But the Senate's loss of will, and its eagerness to hand its responsibilities over to a one-man government—a man on a "white horse"—a dictator, and later an emperor, doomed Rome and predestined Rome's decline and ultimate fall.

Mr. President, those "political midwives" attendant on the birth of our own Republic—George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, James Wilson, Elbridge Gerry, Oliver Ellsworth, and others—were some of the wisest men alive at that time, in this or any other country. Many had served in the Continental and Confederation Congresses and in State legislatures. All of them were experienced and reflective men.

Many of those constitutional framers were well acquainted with Cicero, Polybius, Livius, Tacitus, and Plutarch, and the glories of the classical Roman Republic. Those brilliant men borrowed freely from the best of ancient Rome, and purposefully and deliberately christened the upper Chamber of the Congress "the Senate."

Just as carefully, they set in place a system of checks and balances and separation of powers, and lodged the control of the purse in the "people's branch", to prevent the rise of a new coinage of imperial executives in the federation that they created.

Mr. President, in our own times we see the same problems, the same kinds of dilemmas that the hand of history wrote large upon Rome's slate, being written upon America's slate. In difficult times or in crises, many people grow impatient, as they grew impatient during the French revolution and elevated Napoleon to the emperors; as they grew impatient during the Russian revolution and elevated Lenin to head of state; as they grew impatient in depression-era Germany and elevated Adolf Hitler to the presidency and the chancellorship; as they grew impatient in Cuba and elevated Fidel Castro to the dictatorship.

We, too, have reached a stage where we seem to remain in a state of crisis, semicrisis, or pseudocrisis and the American people have grown impatient and are demanding solutions to serious problems—problems that do not lend themselves to easy and quick solutions. The solutions to these problems will be painful and will take time, perhaps years, to succeed.

This is not a truth that some people want to hear. Many would rather believe that quack remedies such as line-item vetoes and enhanced rescissions powers in the hands of Presidents will somehow miraculously solve our current fiscal situation and eliminate our monstrous budget deficits.

Of course, some people would, perhaps, prefer to abolish the Congress altogether and institute one-man govern-

ment from now on. Some people have no patience with constitutions, for that matter.

Mr. President, let us learn from the pages of Rome's history. The basic lesson that we should remember for our purposes here is, that when the Roman Senate gave away its control of the purse strings, it gave away its power to check the Executive. From that point on, the Senate declined and, as we have seen, it was only a matter of time. Once the mainstay was weakened, the structure crumbled and the Roman Republic fell.

This lesson is as true today as it was 2,000 years ago. Does anyone really imagine that the splendors of our capital city stand or fall with mansions, monuments, buildings, and piles of masonry? These are but bricks and mortar, lifeless things, and their collapse or restoration means little or nothing when measured on the great clock-tower of time.

But the survival of the American constitutional system, the foundation upon which the superstructure of the Republic rests, finds its firmest support in the continued preservation of the delicate mechanism of checks and balances, separation of powers, and control of the purse, solemnly instituted by the Founding Fathers. For over 200 years, from the beginning of the Republic to this very hour, it has survived in unbroken continuity. We received it from our fathers. Let us as surely hand it on to our sons and daughters.

Mr. President, I close my series of reflections on the ancient Roman Republic with the words of Daniel Webster from his speech in 1832 on the centennial anniversary of George Washington's birthday:

Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it. If it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it. If it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No. If these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art. For they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw: the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank all Senators. I thank the two leaders for their accommodations and their courtesies, and the floor staffs

Abby Saffold, Lula Davis, Martin Paone, Elizabeth Green—and all the others who have been so helpful over these more than 5 months during which I have developed this series of 1-hour speeches on the history of the Romans, with particular reference to their political system of checks and balances and divided powers.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will note under the previous order the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3116, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now pending before the Senate is the committee amendment, which begins on page 42, line 4.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending two committee amendments be temporarily set aside.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1051 TO THE EXCEPTED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON PAGE 154, LINES 7 THROUGH 22

(Purpose: To review the consequences of the use of United States Armed Forces personnel in certain international operations)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. BURNS, proposes an amendment numbered 1051 to the excepted committee amendment on page 154, lines 7 through 22.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the committee amendment on page 154, line 22, strike "stockpile." and insert the following: "stockpile;"

SEC. 8137A. RESTRICTION ON USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to support United States Armed Forces personnel, other than those engaged in medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian, training, temporary observer or liaison activities, after March 1, 1994, when such forces are:

(1) under United Nations operational or tactical control if such forces would be under the command, operational control, or tactical control of foreign officers, unless prior to that date (A) the President has submitted a report to Congress which specifies the role and mission of such forces, the estimated cost of supporting such forces for such mission, the probable maximum size of such force, and the probable duration of the commitment of such forces, to the appropriate congressional committees; (B) such committees have had 30 days thereafter to review the consequences of such a commitment of United States Armed Forces; (C) and a joint resolution authorizing the placing of such forces under foreign command has been enacted; or (2) a part of any prospective standing United Nations international armed force.

(b) The prohibition described in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the President determines that (1) national security interests justify a waiver of such prohibition; (2) the President declares that an emergency exists and immediately informs the Congress of his action and the reasons therefor; and (3) within 30 days of such declaration there is enacted a joint resolution authorizing such actions and declaring them to be in the national security interests of the United States.

(c) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should notify the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate when there is pending in the United Nations Security Council any resolution that might entail the commitment of United States military personnel, and should seek the advice of the chairman and ranking members of the appropriate congressional committees prior to instructing the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations regarding such a pending resolution.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—(1) For purposes of this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) For purposes of this section, "any prospective standing United Nations international armed force" means any armed military unit or units under United Nations operational control, not in existence as of the effective date of this Act, established for a permanent or indefinite duration, and without a mission defined by country or region. It is specifically recognized that all forces currently in existence with a country-specific or region-specific mission, such as those forces under the control of the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea, do not meet this definition.

(3) For purposes of this section, "United Nations operational or tactical control" means the exercise by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Secretary General, or any other non-United States entity designated by the United Nations Security Council, or the United Nations Secretary General, with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct the mission-related activities of the units comprising such force. It is specifically recognized that overall statement of policy or mission authorization in resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, such as those relating to Korea beginning in 1950 or to Iraq beginning in 1990, do not meet this definition.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank my colleagues, both Senator INOUE and Senator STEVENS, for their accommodation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be recorded in the RECORD that besides myself and Senator COCHRAN, Senator GORTON, Senator D'AMATO, Senator KEMPTHORNE, Senator FAIRCLOTH, Senator BROWN, Senator HELMS, Senator HATCH, Senator ROTH and Senator BURNS be added as cosponsors to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank the managers of the bill for their accommodation in this amendment. As I have stated in the past, it was my intention to offer this amendment on the defense appropriations bill, both in subcommittee and full committee. I basically complied with the request of the managers of the bill to wait and postpone it for the floor.

I might tell my friend and colleague from Virginia, originally I intended to offer this amendment to the Foreign Operations bill because, in the past, that is where we funded U.N. peace-keeping forces. But under the legislation this year, it is to be funded under the Department of Defense.

I might also tell my colleagues, this bill was not drafted in response to the tragedy that happened recently in Somalia. Actually, this amendment was drafted well before the Somali incidents of the last couple of weeks.

I would like to offer just a brief explanation of what this amendment that Senator COCHRAN and I and others have been working on and hopefully explain it. It is not a complicated amendment, but it is an important amendment.

This amendment would deny funds for U.S. combat forces under foreign command in United Nations operations unless authorized by Congress. It will also disallow the participation of U.S. combat forces of any part of any prospective standing U.N. international army. Lastly, this amendment includes a sense-of-the-Congress provision stating that the President should notify the Congress when there is a resolution pending in the U.N. Security Council

which might result in commitment of U.S. personnel. Again, that is a sense-of-the-Congress resolution.

Let me share with you what has prompted me to address this issue. Several disturbing articles began appearing in the Washington Post and other places over the past several months which indicate that the United Nations and this administration are contemplating, if not planning, to place men and women of our Armed Forces at the will and direction of the United Nations.

Let me quote from just a few of those articles and administration officials as well. I will begin with candidate Bill Clinton in December of 1991. He said that he would "call for a U.N. rapid deployment force that could be used for purposes beyond traditional peacekeeping."

A year later, the President's book, "Putting People First," stated that he would "support the recent more active role of the United Nations in trouble spots around the world and would pursue the establishment of a voluntary United Nations rapid deployment force."

These statements grew into a White House policy document known as Presidential Decision Directive 13 or PDD-13. On June 13, the Washington Post stated, and I will just read a couple of the sections and then I will insert this entire article into the RECORD. It says:

The Clinton administration is drafting a new set of criteria for U.S. involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations that would provide for a much wider role of U.S. military personnel, according to senior defense and diplomatic officials.

Under the proposed criteria, the officials said, U.S. forces could help plan, train and participate in U.N. peacekeeping activities when justified by general U.S. interests, not just when the United States could make a unique military contribution.

The administration's plan also calls for substantial beefing up of the peacekeeping staff at the U.N. headquarters in New York. U.S. forces in turn would be inclined to accept greater U.N. authority over peacekeeping operations that involve them, the official said.

The aim of the plan is partly to demonstrate a U.S. commitment to using military force in concert with other nations rather than unilaterally, an approach dubbed "assertive multilateralism" by Madeleine K. Albright, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. It also is meant to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to conduct military operations successfully in strife-torn areas, the officials said.

Mr. President, I will highlight a couple other paragraphs in this rather lengthy article:

Albright outlined some of the proposed new features in a speech last Friday to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, saying that the administration had decided "the time has come to commit the political, intellectual and financial capital that the U.N. peacekeeping and our security deserve."

The plan would constitute an official U.S. endorsement of many of the ambitious ideas suggested last year by U.N. Secretary Gen-

eral Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his report on the U.N.'s role on the post-cold war era, entitled "Agenda for Peace."

I will mention a couple other quotes:

By the end of this month, the United Nations will have about 90,000 troops in 13 operations around the world. Yet the entire force depends upon a staff of 35 military advisers and about 40 civilians in New York.

Mr. President, I have some trouble with those ambitious plans. I will just quote another part of this article:

These and other problems made U.S. military leaders reluctant to commit U.S. forces to peacekeeping operations, particularly under U.N. command, officials said:

The former head of U.N. forces in Sarajevo, Canadian Major General Lewis MacKenzie, vividly described the insufficient staff problem last year. "Do not get into trouble as a commander in the field after 5 p.m. New York time, or Saturday and Sunday," he said. "There is no one to answer the phone."

Just to continue a couple other highlights:

U.S. military leaders have dropped their traditional insistence that U.S. forces be kept under U.S. command. The Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to take a case-by-case approach and place U.S. troops under U.N. or allied command whenever they find the particular arrangements acceptable, officials said.

This article is dated June 18.

Recent models for the policy shift, the officials said, include the deployment of roughly 25,000 U.S. troops to Somalia and the planned deployment of 300 U.S. infantry to Macedonia to prevent the Balkans conflict from spreading there.

Mr. President, in a later article dated August 5 in the Washington Post, its headlines said, "Wider U.N. Police Role Supported, Foreigners Could Lead U.S. Troops."

I will just read a couple of paragraphs from this article:

President Clinton's top national security advisers have agreed to support the "rapid expansion" of United Nations peace enforcement operations around the world, but the new policy falls far short of U.N. hopes and the aggressive proposals of some members of the administration.

The initiative, outlined in the classified final draft of Presidential Decision Directive 13, endorses United Nations as ersatz world policeman and commits Washington to support multinational peacekeeping and peacekeeping operations "politically, militarily and financially." Its major emphasis is boosting the size and professionalism of the U.N. headquarters staff, where fewer than 80 full-time employees now attempt to control 80,000 troops around the world in 14 separate operations.

If signed by Clinton this month as expected, the directive would formalize the President's acceptance of U.N. command over U.S. troops, a significant milestone. But the document rejects any open-ended U.S. commitments and directs American commanders to disobey U.N. orders they judge to be illegal or "militarily imprudent."

I will skip a paragraph or two:

In 1990, according to the briefing charts prepared by the Pentagon's joint staff, the United Nations had about 10,000 peacekeepers deployed at an annual cost of \$819 million. By this year, there were more than 80,000 U.N. peacekeepers deployed with annual bills exceeding \$3.6 billion.

I might repeat those figures. According to this report, in 1990, United Nations had peacekeepers of 10,000. In 1993, we are looking at over 80,000. We are looking at expenses rising from \$819 million to \$3.6 billion in a period of just 3 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1993]

UNITED STATES PLANS WIDER ROLE IN U.N. PEACE KEEPING

(By R. Jeffrey Smith and Julia Preston)

The Clinton administration is drafting a new set of criteria for U.S. involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations that would provide for a much wider role for U.S. military personnel, according to senior defense and diplomatic officials.

Under the proposed criteria, the officials said, U.S. forces could help plan, train and participate in U.N. peace-keeping activities when justified by general U.S. interests, not just when the United States could make a unique military contribution.

The administration's plan also calls for a substantial beefing up of the peace-keeping staff at U.N. headquarters in New York. U.S. forces, in turn, would be more inclined to accept greater U.N. authority over the peace-keeping operations that involve them, the officials said.

The aim of the plan is partly to demonstrate a U.S. commitment to using military force in concert with other nations rather than unilaterally, an approach dubbed "assertive multilateralism" by Madeleine K. Albright, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. It is also meant to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to conduct military operations successfully in strife-torn areas, the officials said.

The plan represents what one official termed an "evolutionary rather than revolutionary" shift from existing policy. Officials said one factor that has helped block a significant U.S. military role in such U.N. peace-keeping operations as Cambodia, Lebanon, Kashmir and Cyprus is a requirement that U.S. forces be able to make a unique military contribution.

Under the proposed criteria, articulated in classified drafts of a White House policy review document known as PDD-13, the United States could take part if such action would catalyze involvement by other nations or more generally advance U.S. interests, the officials said. The degree of involvement would be determined by such factors as the intensity of public support and the risk of any U.S. commitment becoming open-ended.

Officials said PRD-13 has not yet been presented to President Clinton, but general agreement has been reached on these points among senior officials at the State Department, Defense Department and Joint Chiefs of Staff. Albright outlined some of the proposed new features in a speech last Friday to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, saying that the administration had decided "the time has come to commit the political, intellectual and financial capital that U.N. peace keeping and our security deserve."

The plan would constitute an official U.S. endorsement of many of the ambitious ideas suggested last year by U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his report on

the U.N.'s role in the post-Cold War era, entitled "Agenda or Peace." Although the U.S. plan has not yet been presented in detail to the U.N. leadership, top U.N. peace-keeping officials aware of the plan's general outline said in interviews they welcomed Washington's shift.

"There is a definite change of mood and [a] willingness from the United States to be partners," said Kofi Annan, U.N. undersecretary general for peace-keeping operations. "As U.N. operations become ever more complex and cumbersome to manage, U.S. participation becomes ever more important."

U.N. officials acknowledged they sorely need the kind of political and logistical boost the United States is offering. U.N. peace-keeping operations are growing exponentially, straining the infrastructure, experience and planning capabilities at U.N. headquarters. By the end of this month, the United Nations will have about 90,000 troops in 13 operations around the world. Yet the entire force depends upon a staff of 35 military advisers and about 40 civilians in New York.

"If I had to choose a single word to evoke the problems of U.N. peace keeping, it would be 'improvisation,'" Albright said. "A kind of programmed amateurism shows up across the board," including what she described as "the near total absence" of contingency planning, "hastily recruited, ill-equipped and often unprepared troops and civilian staff," the absence of centralized military command and control and "the lack of a durable financial basis for starting and sustaining peacekeeping operations."

These and other problems have made U.S. military leaders reluctant to commit U.S. forces to peace-keeping operations, particularly under U.N. command, officials said.

The former head of U.N. forces in Sarajevo, Canadian Maj. Gen. Lewis MacKenzie, vividly described the insufficient staff problem last year. "Do not get into trouble as a commander in the field after 5 p.m. New York time, or Saturday and Sunday," he said. "There is no one to answer the phone."

Currently, only the three biggest operations—in Somalia, Cambodia and the former Yugoslav republics—have officers stationed in the U.N. situation room around the clock. The U.S. plan calls for a reorganization of the U.N. peace-keeping staff, including the creation with U.S. help of a military operations headquarters modeled after the Pentagon's 24-hour command center.

Administration officials also have agreed to work out arrangements for sharing some U.S. intelligence information with the staff of such a center, substantially bolstering its ability to run distant, complex military operations. Later this month, for example, the United States is to help install a joint defense intelligence information system (JDIIS) in the U.N. situation room to enhance its ability to handle such information.

"This is a very tricky business," said Canadian Brig. Gen. Maurice Baril, the top U.N. military adviser for peace keeping. "You can't expect an organization that is already overworked to come up all of a sudden with a perfect new system. But at the same time we have to develop from within the heart of the United Nations."

Officials said that in the course of the administration's review of its policy toward U.N. peace-keeping, U.S. military leaders have dropped their traditional insistence that U.S. forces be kept under U.S. command. The Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to take a case-by-case approach and place U.S. troops under U.N. or allied command when-

ever they find the particular arrangements acceptable, officials said.

Recent models for the policy shift, the officials said, included the deployment of roughly 25,000 U.S. troops to Somalia and the planned deployment of 300 U.S. infantrymen to Macedonia to prevent the Balkans conflict from spreading there.

Part of the proposed policy directive also stipulates some of the conditions under which the United States would endorse, though not necessarily participate in, U.N. peace-keeping operations. These include: humanitarian needs such as those caused by civil strife or natural disasters; threats to democratically elected governments; a high risk that local strife could expand into regional conflict; and threats to international security.

Albright said that the United States intends to support U.N. efforts to create a central peacekeeping budget to pay for such operations, including an enlarged contingency fund and a ready pool of military equipment. She also said the administration favors the "creation of a cadre of highly qualified budget experts" to audit peacekeeping expenditures.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 5, 1993]

WIDER U.N. POLICE ROLE SUPPORTED (By Barton Gellman)

President Clinton's top national security advisers have agreed to support the "rapid expansion" of United Nations peace enforcement operations around the world, but the new policy falls far short of U.N. hopes and the aggressive proposals of some members of the administration.

The initiative, outlined in the classified final draft of Presidential Decision Directive 13, endorses the United Nations as ersatz world policeman and commits Washington to support multinational peacemaking and peacekeeping operations "politically, militarily and financially." Its major emphasis is boosting the size and professionalism of the U.N. headquarters staff, where fewer than 80 fulltime employees now attempt to control 80,000 troops around the world in 14 separate operations.

If signed by Clinton this month as expected, the directive would formalize the president's acceptance of U.N. command over U.S. troops, a significant milestone. But the document rejects any open-ended U.S. commitments and directs American commanders to disobey U.N. orders they judge to be illegal or "militarily imprudent."

The presidential directive and accompanying review paper, known respectively as PDD-13 and PRD-13, distill five months of contentious interagency debate over the best response to a world full of post-Cold War ethnic and subnational conflict. The new policy comes at a time of unprecedented growth in demands for U.N. intervention, and amid serious problems with major operations in Somalia and the Balkans.

In 1990, according to briefing charts prepared by the Pentagon's Joint Staff, the United Nations had about 10,000 peacekeepers deployed for an annual cost of \$819 million. By this year, there were more than 80,000 U.N. peacekeepers deployed with annual bills exceeding \$3.6 billion.

The final draft of PDD-13, approved in a July 14 interagency meeting of senior officials and obtained by The Washington Post, rejects Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's ambitious call last year for a standing U.N. "rapid deployment force" for intervention in world trouble spots, an idea Clinton endorsed in his presidential campaign.

The Pentagon, in the words of one officer, threw "a major dose of cold reason" on more ambitious proposals from the State Department and National Security Council staff.

The presidential directive is in the form of a memorandum to Clinton's senior national security advisers. It says the United States will neither "earmark" U.S. military units for U.N. peace operations nor even promise in advance to supply generic capabilities, such as combat engineering or air cover. Instead, Washington will list a set of capabilities that it may be willing to contribute "on a case-by-case basis."

The effect of that restraint, according to one disappointed administration advocate of greater commitment, leaves the world body in the position of "rounding up a posse" every time it considers a new intervention. At the same time, the presidential directive endorses a broad new definition of what constitutes a "threat to international peace and security," setting the stage for forcible U.N. intervention when a country undergoes "sudden and unexpected interruption of established democracy or gross violation of human rights."

The policy allows for U.S. troops to be placed under the "operational control" of a U.N. commander, which ratifies an experiment underway in Somalia. When the American-led humanitarian intervention there gave way to U.N. command in May, Clinton became the first president since the Korean War to place American troops under the world body's control.

But in a controversial hedge, the directive orders U.S. commanders in such operations to maintain separate reporting channels to higher U.S. military authorities and disobey U.N. orders which they judge to be illegal, outside the agreed U.N. mandate or "militarily imprudent and unsound." The United States will also reserve "the right to terminate the participation of the U.S. unit. . . and to take whatever actions it deems necessary to protect them if they are endangered," the directive says.

Although Pentagon officials insisted on these conditions, they acknowledge that they make for what one called "a double-edged sword."

"If we're in charge, do we want the Turks to say, 'I don't like that order?'" asked one officer who has closely followed the debate. "It's going to cause us some problems as we try to sell this to other nations in the U.N."

Madeleine K. Albright, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, acknowledged in a closed-door talk to Army officers last Thursday that the reservation of national decision-making power makes for "serious command and control problems" in a U.N. force, according to a tape recording of her remarks.

Those problems are already manifest in Somalia. Italian forces in Mogadishu have conducted military operations and negotiations there without notifying Turkish Lt. Gen. Cevik Bir, the operation's overall commander, and they have refused direct orders to attack Somali militias. Small contingents from Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have likewise rebuffed Bir's commands, and a 1,174-man American quick reaction force was never placed under Bir.

"If this is the wave of the future, the future looks pretty ugly," said another Army officer.

But a senior administration official who has played a central role in drafting the new policy initiative insisted that the hedge against "imprudent" orders would not justify the behavior of the Italians. He said it is intended only to stop reckless tactical

moves, not disagreements over a mission's larger strategy.

A central aim of PDD-13 is to boost the prestige, staff and resources of the U.N. military headquarters staff, long hobbled by the U.S.-Soviet deadlock and unaccustomed to operational responsibility. The initiative seeks to more than double the peacekeeping headquarters with 100 new staff members, 20 of whom would be supplied by the State and Defense departments.

A revamped U.N. staff, the directive says, should have a "research division," a euphemism for military intelligence; an operations division with a 24-hour staff and encrypted command, control and communications facilities; a "rapidly deployable headquarters team" to control new operations in the field, and a "standing airlift capability" using commercial and possibly leased Russian military transports.

Unwilling to pay for most of this, the Clinton administration is directing Albright to begin recruiting donors, "focusing on Japan and Germany," to expand the peacekeeping office.

Within the administration, the State and Defense departments have been battling for months to control the newly important budgets and policy decisions on peace operations. The dispute flared Tuesday at a closed meeting of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations committees attended by senior Pentagon, State and National Security Council staff officials. "It was abruptly ended after the administration embarrassed itself by not speaking with one voice," said one government official.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I cite those two articles and I will cite a couple of other quotations that concern me because we are talking about a massive expansion of U.S. forces committed to United Nations and, in many cases, to U.N. commanders that are not from the United States.

On June 11, Madeleine Albright stated,

I think a strong United Nations is critical to U.S. security, so we in the United States must work energetically to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations and other multilateral organizations to conduct peacekeeping, preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace enforcement, and so on.

These statements cause me great concern. I believe some supporters of the United Nations are placing too much faith in its hands. In the United Nations, we have seen a shift from traditional peacekeeping to peacemaking and peace enforcing, and in Somalia we have, unfortunately, seen how well-intentioned U.N. resolutions can result in tragic consequences.

We have also seen a rapid rise in U.N. operations. There were 13 U.N. peacekeeping operations between the years 1945 and 1985. Since 1985, there have been 14. So we have had more U.N. peacekeeping operations in the last 8 years than we did in the first 40 years. The number of troops has increased from 10,000 troops in peacekeeping operations 3 years ago to over 80,000 today. That is a dramatic increase. And there are less than 90 U.N. military and civilian officers to oversee those operations.

So let me address what will and will not be affected by this amendment which Senator COCHRAN and others and myself are offering today. I might mention, too, I have made some minor modifications to accommodate some of the concerns that were raised by the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator INOUE, and Senator STEVENS.

This amendment does not apply to NATO and its integrated command structure because it is not under U.N. operational control. Likewise, such NATO standing elements as the Multi-national Standing Naval Force Atlantic would not be affected. It also would not affect the current United States-Korea arrangement. It would not preclude any future situation structured like the gulf war. Since it only applies to U.S. combat forces under foreign command, it would not affect U.S. participation in traditional U.N. peacekeeping. It would not affect our ability to enter into multilateral U.N. agreements. It just addresses the operational command of American combat forces.

It also retains Presidential flexibility in an emergency and need not result in the abrupt removal of U.S. combat personnel participating in U.N. operations. Again, it just disallows U.N. operational control or foreign command over our combat men and women unless authorized by Congress. If anything, this amendment assures that the President, unless it is clearly in the national security interests of the United States, retains his constitutionally guaranteed role as Commander in Chief. Should he seek to delegate that responsibility to a foreigner, it is only common sense that relinquishing command responsibility be done with the utmost care and caution. We did not elect the U.N. Secretary General as Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, this is an important amendment. Lives of dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces are at stake. At a time when U.N. missions are increasing rapidly in number and in size, sprawling in their scope, and the world is full of ethnic and regional conflicts, it is our responsibility to ensure that those who are willing to sacrifice their lives for America are never jeopardized for anything other than what is clearly in our national security interests.

Mr. President, I believe that is the minimum that we owe the service men and women of our country.

Mr. President, I have several editorials I would like to enter into the RECORD. Actually, I have four or five. One is by Jeane Kirkpatrick: "Where Is Our Foreign Policy?" And I will just read or highlight a couple of paragraphs from this editorial.

The Secretary General does not explain why the United States should commit hundreds of millions of dollars and risk thousands of lives to nation-building in one Afri-

can State. That is not his responsibility. Explaining to the American taxpayers why these activities are in U.S. national interests is the responsibility of President Clinton and his administration.

I will just insert this entire statement, but needless to say—let me just conclude with one final statement. It said:

The Clinton administration offers us a vision of foreign policy from which national self-interest is purged. And it proposes to forgo U.S. control over important decisions and rely instead on the judgment of international bodies and officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Jeane Kirkpatrick, one in the Sunday Oklahoman, an article from the National Review, as well as an op-ed piece by Samuel Francis and one by Trudy Rubin, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1993]

WHERE IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

"What is our purpose?" Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole asked of the latest U.S. commitment of troops to Somalia. "What is the cost? How long will they stay?"

U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali addresses these questions in his most recent report to the Security Council on Somalia. But his answers would not please Dole or a growing number of senators and representatives concerned about the increasing U.S. commitment to the U.N. operation in Somalia.

Boutros-Ghali explains that what began as an effort to prevent mass starvation has become a campaign "to reconstruct [Somalia's] political, social and material infrastructure on a lasting basis," to disarm warring factions, apprehend "criminal elements," establish a national police force, a prison system and a judicial system.

The secretary general does not explain why the United States should commit hundreds of millions of dollars and risk thousands of lives to nation-building in one African state. That is not his responsibility. Explaining to American taxpayers why these activities are in the U.S. national interest is the responsibility of President Clinton and his administration.

We know why the Bush administration committed 20,000 troops to Somalia: It was to stave off imminent starvation of tens of thousands. But President Clinton and his top advisers have not explained why Americans should become militarily involved in the internal politics of Somalia—a distant country to which we have no special ties. Nor have they explained why the conflict in Somalia should have greater claim to U.S. resources than, say, the bitter war of aggression against Bosnia. The president's silence on these questions has given rise to the complaint, heard with increasing frequency, that the Clinton administration has failed to define a foreign policy. I believe that complaint is not justified.

In fact, the Clinton administration's foreign policy has been repeatedly described and illustrated by top administration officials. But what they say and what they do are so unfamiliar and unexpected that they are barely heard and even less understood.

For the Clinton team, implementing the decisions of the U.N. Security Council and

the secretary general in Somalia, Bosnia, Cambodia or wherever is our foreign policy. Doing what the United Nations calls on us to do is our foreign policy. That is why Secretary of State Warren Christopher listed among the administration's foreign policy accomplishments "taking the lead in passing the responsibility to multilateral bodies." It is presumably why the administration accepted Boutros-Ghali's claim of authority to decide when and where NATO air strikes could take place in Bosnia and why the U.S. dispatched crack troops to Somalia without raising serious questions about whether it is prudent, justifiable or in the U.S. interest.

The Clinton administration has made acting through the United Nations the centerpiece of U.S. foreign policy. "There is a political will in the new administration to use the United Nations in solving international disputes," Boutros-Ghali told David Frost soon after Clinton's inauguration. And he was right. But even he must be surprised at the extent of the Clinton administration's commitment to global multilateralism.

The clearest statement yet of the Clinton doctrine of "assertive multilateralism" was offered in U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright's June speech to the Council on Foreign Relations. But Christopher and other policy-making members of the Clinton team have emphasized and illustrated the administration's belief that a strong United Nations is critical to U.S. national security, that a conflict anywhere is a threat to U.S. national security and that they have a commitment to promote peace and development everywhere through the United Nations.

In Bosnia, Somalia, Cambodia and in its sweeping plans to upgrade U.N. peacekeeping capacities, the administration has demonstrated a will to make the U.N. secretary general's priorities its own.

In its support of Boutros-Ghali's boundless agenda and unprecedented claims of authority, in its willingness to defer to U.N. decisions (as, for example, on air strikes in Bosnia), in its decision to place U.S. troops under U.N. command, the Clinton administration defines its foreign policy and dissolves the national interest as traditionally conceived. It eliminates from the calculation of interests and priorities factors like geography, history and culture, which have traditionally shaped the foreign policy of nations. The Clinton administration offers us a vision of foreign policy from which national self-interest is purged. And it proposes to forgo U.S. control over important decisions and rely instead on the judgment of international bodies and officials.

The reason the Clinton administration's foreign policy seems indecisive is that multilateral decision-making is characteristically complicated and inconclusive. The reason Clinton policy seems ineffective is that U.N. operations—in Bosnia or Somalia or wherever—are characteristically ineffective. The reason Dole demands an explanation of our purposes in Somalia, now that starvation no longer looms, is that it is difficult to relate Somalia's internal political struggles to any U.S. goals except the goal of honoring the priorities of the U.N. secretary general.

This is not the first time an American-administration has brought to U.S. foreign policy-making a global perspective and tendency to prefer universal needs to national interests. Many of the same people now making foreign policy for the Clinton administration tried these ideas first when they served in the Carter administration. But the Cold War and the reality of Soviet expansion in the late '70s imposed limits on the utopian

quest for a global community. Now, only Congress can prevent the progressive loss of control by Americans of our resources and our future.

[From the Sunday Oklahoman, Aug. 22, 1993]

CLINTON AND THE UNITED NATIONS

If President Clinton thinks he stirred up a hornet's nest with his plan to permit homosexuals to serve openly in the military, he should hear the buzz of opposition against another one of his off-the-wall ideas.

Some high-ranking senators have their stingers out for Clinton if he goes through with an executive order clearing the way for U.S. combat forces to serve under foreign commanders. Sen. Malcolm Wallop, a Republican on the Armed Services Committee, called it a "nutty idea." Sen. Richard Lugar, a senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, criticized the lack of consultation with Congress. Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, said "such military endeavors could be disastrous" and called for a thorough debate.

The controversial order is an outgrowth of the Clinton administration's embrace of an expanded role for the United Nations in places like Somalia and Bosnia and other explosive regions around the world. This kind of multinational approach to peacekeeping has some backing on Capitol Hill.

Sen. Joseph Biden, a Democrat, has endorsed the concept of a standing army controlled by the U.N. in which American troops would serve. Biden may not mind U.S. soldiers taking orders from foreigners but plenty of his colleagues would find that unacceptable. The joint chiefs of staff traditionally have resisted subordinating their services to international command.

Furthermore, the U.N.'s botched operations in Somalia and Bosnia, along with chronic mismanagement and fraud, should rule out expanding its power and influence. Says Thomas Sheehy of The Heritage Foundation, "this is a time to be skeptical about U.N. effectiveness in settling conflicts around the globe."

Clinton has far too much confidence in the U.N. and its secretary general Boutros Boutros-Ghali of Egypt. As Sen. Bob Dole said at the national governors conference, the U.N. is a flawed institution that "does not stand for the same values and principles" as the United States. Warning Clinton not to abdicate his responsibilities, Dole said "the American people did not elect Boutros-Ghali to run U.S. foreign policy."

Rather than get stung by angry senators, Clinton should drop any plans to assign U.S. soldiers to an international police force run by a multinational organization with a shoddy success record. It's time he started acting like the leader of a superpower. He is spending presidential capital on unwise and ill-advised policies.

[From the National Review, Oct. 4, 1993]

C'MON, BABY—DO THE MULTILATERAL (By Lawrence T. Di Rita)

Bill Clinton came to Washington determined to end "12 years of gridlock." This message resonated with the approximately one in four Americans who provided Mr. Clinton his mandate. For the remaining 75 percent of us, it remains to be shown why "gridlock" is a Bad Thing. After all—with apologies to Senator Goldwater—gridlock in the pursuit of common sense is no vice.

No gridlock during the past 12 years was more sensible than that which obtained be-

tween civilians and the military regarding overseas adventurism. The Joint Chiefs of Staff learned one very important lesson from America's failure in Vietnam: beware civilians who would launch crusades abroad.

During the Reagan-Bush years the chiefs were able to convince the secretaries of defense to pay attention to their views on this matter. As a result, a curious role reversal took place, in which hair-shirted civilians in the State Department and at the National Security Council frequently criticized the apparent pacification of the Department of Defense when it resisted their calls for "a mix of diplomacy and military force" to achieve their objectives. The breakdown of the international force that led to the tragic deaths of 241 U.S. Marines in Beirut in October 1983 only strengthened the case for defense gridlock regarding multilateral military "presences."

The prudent approach to the use of U.S. forces was codified by our longest-serving Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger. Paraphrased from his excellent memoirs, his recipe for gridlock, since named the "Weinberger Doctrine," includes these precepts:

1. Do not commit combat forces overseas unless the engagement is deemed vital to our national interest.

2. If combat troops are committed, do so wholeheartedly, with the clear intention of winning, and with clearly defined political and military objectives.

3. The commitment of combat forces abroad should be a last resort.

Fortunately, the Beirut episode was an isolated instance. More representative of the period were the liberation of Grenada, the invasion of Panama, and, of course, Operation Desert Storm. Clear and achievable objectives, an overwhelming preponderance of force, and the willingness to act independently if necessary characterized these operations, which, not coincidentally, were remarkable for the minimal loss of life on either side.

A PROMISE TO BE KEPT

Ending gridlock (or at least the kind produced by disciplined adherence to the Weinberger Doctrine) appears to be one area in which President Clinton intends to keep his word. He has entrusted the Pentagon to a team of Great Strategic Thinkers that seems bent on seeing how quickly it can violate every one of Mr. Weinberger's principles. President Clinton seems ready to permit—indeed, encourage—the use of American military forces around the world as a snap-in, snapout replacement for diplomacy. Worse yet, he seems prepared to use unaccountable United Nations bureaucrats—who wouldn't recognize a "vital national interest" or "clearly defined military objective" if it were printed on their inflated paychecks—to "legitimize" his use of force.

The centerpiece of Mr. Clinton's effort is his administration's review of multilateral operations being undertaken as part of its systematic assessment of Bush Administration policies. Dubbed Presidential Decision Directive (PDD)-13, the review is considering all manner of one-worldisms, including a UN military-operations headquarters. PDD-13 would also investigate the feasibility of intelligence sharing. Imagine the People's Republic of China having access to U.S. satellite photo-imagery data and you get the idea.

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin is going to great lengths to burnish whiz-kid credentials tarnished by his lackluster first eight months in office. In his Pentagon reorganization, Mr. Aspin has created a new position,

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping. Reporting to this official are the newly created Deputy Assistant Secretaries for (1) Drug Policy, (2) Democracy & Human Rights, (3) Peacekeeping & Peace Enforcement, and (4) Humanitarian & Refugee Affairs.

One must give Mr. Aspin credit. With the country fixated on gay soldiers, married Marines, and lewd and lascivious sailors, he quietly reinvented government, or at least his small piece of it. It remains to be seen how effective his new organization will be, but it should suffice to note that it depends heavily on cooperation with the UN.

THE UN NIGHTMARE

One need look no further than the UN Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM) to learn how ill-suited the United Nations is to realizing the Clinton dream. What began as "humanitarian relief" soon developed into "peacekeeping" and—with the deaths of four U.S. soldiers when they drove across a land mine—"peacemaking." Four thousand American troops—hamstrung by their larger and far less competent coalition partners—have been given an open-ended assignment to end the hostilities there. The "command structure" in Mogadishu is such that national-contingent commanders seek approval from authorities in their capitals before carrying out the orders of their nominal superiors in the field. Moreover, the troops under their command are suffering from an identity crisis. Are they part of a police force or a military force? The confusion is justified. The returned U.S. admiral who is the UN representative in Somalia has issued an arrest warrant for the head of one of the factions involved in the long-standing civil war there.

But the Clinton Administration knows that the success of UNOSOM is critical to proving that its kinder, gentler Pentagon will work. This explains why Mr. Aspin has placed such a high priority on keeping the coalition from collapsing and burying the new world order in the debris. Not directly relevant, but shows how unworkable this UN Armed Force idea really is—what's in our national interest?

Pursuant to this agreement, the Pentagon has transferred to the United Nations weaponized armored personnel carriers (APCs), riot-control agents (including tear gas), and small-arms ammunition. Much of this equipment has been requested by the UN on behalf of the Pakistani contingent. Were the government of Pakistan to request such equipment from the U.S. directly, the Defense Department would have no choice but to say no. Because of the so-called Pressler Amendment imposed on President Reagan in 1985, "no military equipment . . . shall be sold or transferred to Pakistan" unless the President is able to certify that Pakistan does not have a nuclear capability. Since everyone believes it has such a capability, Pakistan has had to look elsewhere for security assistance.

Fully cognizant of Pressler Amendment restrictions, Pentagon officials are quick to mention two things: (1) These items are not for use within Pakistan, so it's okay; and (2) it doesn't matter anyway, because the UN actually owns the equipment. When queried about what will happen if the UNOSOM coalition is ever disbanded (sadly, a more remote possibility each day) these officials reply with child-like faith that the equipment will "go back to the UN." Presumably, there is a parking garage in midtown Manhattan housing tanks, APCs, and all manner of retrograde from similar operations in the past.

The attempted masculinization of the United Nations via an injection of American military hormones goes beyond Somalia. President Clinton has twisted arms at NATO to provide for air strikes in Bosnia to help end the siege of Sarajevo. He has deferred, though, to UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali to approve the targets and order the strikes, evidently believing the latter is rather less a Secretary than a General. Will the President also ask Mr. Boutros-Ghali to travel to distant Iowa or Alabama to explain to the parents of the first American pilot downed by Serbian missiles why their son won't be coming home?

We may hope that President Clinton's message of condolence to the parents of the soldiers fallen in Somalia offered insight that he has thus far failed to share with the nation at large. It seems obvious, though, that the policy is animated by the notion that multilateral military operations are somehow more "noble" than raw expressions of national interest (an unintended but entirely logical extension of President Bush's desire to get the UN imprimatur before protecting the United States' well-recognized right to access to Middle East oil fields).

Not to be outdone, the crusaders of Capitol Hill have joined this ennobling quest. Joseph Biden has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 112, which would provide the jewel in the Secretary-General's crown: a UN standing army. For its part, the majority staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has issued a study lamenting that "[t]he French have in many ways seized the mantle of world leadership in UN peace operations." To correct this, these Democratic do-gooders would: "negotiate . . . special agreements with the UN to facilitate rapid American assistance to peace operations; provided assistance to the UN in modernizing its peacekeeping operations; deploy U.S. combat troops under UN command."

The Administration has avoided broad public discussion of these ideas, and for good reason. The opinion of the United Nations held by most Americans is as low as that of their armed forces is high. Moreover, the Defense Department has soft-pedaled its reorganization because Secretary Aspin's Assistant Secretary-Designate for Democracy and Peacekeeping is one Morton Halperin, who has made a career of being on the wrong side of history.

Mr. Halperin was until recently the director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, and he was a prominent defender of those who released classified national-security documents to the media. He has himself established a paper trail (uncovered by Frank Gaffney, the director of the Center for Security Policy) that puts him far to the left of the "misunderstood civil libertarian" he claims to be. For example, as a leading advocate of a nuclear-weapons freeze during the Cold War, he wrote in *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* in March 1983: "If the freeze is seen to be losing support in Congress, then no arms control will be possible under this Administration" (Emphasis added.) In one of history's more satisfying ironies, that article went to press about the time President Reagan announced SDI, the catalyst for the series of arms-control agreements he began signing four years later with the Soviets.

The nomination hearings for Mr. Halperin will begin soon. Those hearings should develop into a referendum on the Administration's decision to hand over the keys of the American military machine to the UN. If the debate is properly crafted, defeating Mr.

Halperin will go a long way toward defeating the policy. Should he be confirmed—General Shalikhavili, the Secretary-General would like to see you.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 1, 1993]

NATIONAL INTERESTS? HOW QUIANT (By Samuel Francis)

Meetings of the U.N. General Assembly are not yet quite as alarming as sessions of the U.S. Supreme Court, but they still ought to cause honest citizens to lose sleep. When the munchkins of the New World Order convene from Islamabad and Lusaka to decide which countries American troops should invade next, it's almost as worrisome as the Nameless Nme's periodic excursions into theology and social science.

This past Monday, the U.N. conclave got to hear an oration from President Clinton himself on the contours of his foreign policy, and Americans were permitted to listen too. Indeed, for the preceding week, President Clintonians were dispatched throughout the land to prepare the peasants for their chief's coming revelations.

Mr. Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, warned about "neo-know-nothings" who insist on caution about American participation in U.N. peacekeeping missions, and U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright expounded the administration's caution about American participation in U.N. peacekeeping missions. By the time the president spoke to the munchkins, neither munchkin nor American knew much more about his foreign policy than his own administration.

Nevertheless, Mr. Clinton's speech was at least as well received as Jane Fonda's a few days before, and he retreated from more of the foolish promises of his campaign. That, you know, is the bright side of the Age of Clinton: Every time the leader speaks, he backs away from what he said the last time.

This time Mr. Clinton trod Amb. Albright's path of caution. He stated bluntly that "the United Nations cannot become engaged in every one of the world's conflicts. If the American people are to say yes to U.N. peacekeeping, the United Nations must know when to say no."

It's about time someone said it. Ever since the Persian Gulf War, pretty much all we've heard has been bloated utopianism about bloated U.S. warmaking under the cant of "peacekeeping." U.N. "peacekeepers" have swollen from a mere 9,800 in 1987 to more than 80,000 today. They quadrupled just last year, and the costs rose to more than \$3 billion, of which we the peasants are supposed to pick up some 30 percent. Mr. Clinton says we (he means you). Mr. Clinton says we (he means you) will pay, but he also insisted that others pay more as well.

At a later news conference, he outlined the preconditions of U.S. participation in "peacekeeping," at least for Bosnia, and these two were properly cautious. He wants "clear understanding" about command and control, the command or a NATO general, a "clear timetable" for review, the "right to terminate American involvement," a "clear political strategy" and "clear expression of support" from Congress. All of which is swell, but there's one thing Mr. Clinton didn't mention.

What he didn't mention as a precondition for committing American troops to meddle and fight in other people's wars is a clear understanding of what the American national interest might be. There's a reason he didn't mention it. The national interest doesn't figure in the new mathematics of U.N. peacekeeping.

This brings us back to Mr. Lake's "neo-know-nothings," a species that has the unpopular habit of demanding to know what American national interests are in any projected foreign involvement and keeps insisting on the existence and expression of some national interest as the major precondition of any involvement. Why there is anything "neo" about these habits is beyond me, and I for one am content to abide with the label of "paleo-know-nothing."

But in the happy land of the New World Order, anyone who asks such questions is some kind of know-nothing, for in that undiscovered country "national interests" no longer exist. There is only the interest of universalist abstractions such as "human-kind," the "global village," the "first universal nation," "the global economy," etc.

Mr. Clinton, for all his well-advised caution, never challenged these windy premises of the New World Order, and he never distinguished the national interest of the sovereign American nation from those abstractions.

Instead, he used his rhetorical caution to drag us into the U.N. quagmire even deeper than we already are, and the rest of his speech about the need for global enforcement of human rights, the global environment ("our obligations as custodians of this planet") and transnational control of nuclear weapons and materials stank of commitments no American has ever agreed to shoulder and few have even thought about.

If Mr. Clinton ever bothers to talk to his own countrymen about his foreign policy, the know-nothings amongst us ought to use the occasion to tell him a bit about our interests and rights as a sovereign people that he and his posse of know-somethings have forgotten to mention.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 20, 1993]

IT'S TOO SOON TO PUT U.S. TROOPS UNDER FOREIGN U.N. COMMANDERS

(By Trudy Rubin)

President Clinton is reportedly on the verge of signing a directive to permit U.S. troops to serve under foreign commanders in U.N. peace-keeping operations.

It's easy to understand why the idea appeals. If it were possible to shift the burden of policing an increasingly messy world, America wouldn't have to play globocop and U.S. officials could focus on problems at home.

But Clinton should think again, and not just because many members of Congress are furious that he made this decision without much consultation. The questionable U.N. performances in Somalia and Bosnia have shown that the organization is many years away from being ready to play world policeman. ***

The United Nations has never played the role of international peace enforcer the way its founders anticipated. When the body was founded, provision was made for member states to make armed forces available on a permanent basis. The Cold War got in the way, and these provisions never came into force.

The U.N. operation in Korea only got started because the Soviet Union boycotted a crucial Security Council meeting (China wasn't yet a U.N. member). U.S. forces in Korea, though part of a U.N. mission, fought under American command.

After the Cold War ended, many observers thought the United Nations would finally come into its own.

The number of global U.N. peace-keeping operations mounted. The Gulf War seemed to

set a precedent for Security Council cooperation. Member nations, were eager to dump messy ethnic and civil wars into the U.N.'s arms.

They were much too hasty.

For one thing, the Gulf War wasn't much of a precedent. It was mainly a U.S. show under a U.N. umbrella, with American troops under U.S. command.

For another, as the United Nations started to experiment with peace enforcement (as opposed to peacekeeping where all sides to a conflict have agreed to stop fighting), the fallacies in the concept of a global supercop became apparent.

The first big problem was logistics. The United Nations isn't set up to run fighting operations. It's tall glass building on the East River is full of well-paid bureaucrats but has practically no military advisers, no war room, no intelligence or communications centers, and no financial resources.

The world body is now trying to set up a command center. But it will depend heavily on intelligence from member nations, notably Washington. And it is doubtful whether such a center will be sufficient for serious military operations.

That doesn't even address problems of how to raise and train troops from nations with totally different skill levels, weaponry and language. Or how to pay for them. Or decide where they should fight.

Which leads to the second and more serious problem: the relations between guns and politics.

U.N. involvement in fighting demands political decisions about where and how force should be used. Those decisions have to be made by the Security Council, and the U.N. Secretary General and accepted by nations who dispatch peace-enforcement troops. Political disagreements on whether or how to fight put U.N. troops in risky positions.

The consequences of such squabbles have been on full display in Mogadishu and in Sarajevo.

In Somalia, the United Nations took over the operation from the United States in May. U.S. troops—only logistical units—were put directly under U.N. command for the first time, with one minor exception. But the 1,300 U.S. combat troops left in Mogadishu still serve under American officers.

But in Somalia, top U.N. officials and nations serving in the U.N. operation have been unable to agree on their mission.

The U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali wants to reestablish stability and rebuild the structure of the nation. That means Somali warlords must be disarmed.

The Italian contingent, however, opposed U.N. efforts to disarm and punish warlord Mohammed Aided after he shot up Pakistani peacekeepers. The Italian commander insisted on taking orders from Rome, not the Turkish U.N. commander. When he was reprimanded, the Italian government decided to pull its troops out of Madadishu.

Down that path lies chaos. But one can envision any number of situations where historic frictions, or disdain or distrust would make it dicey for troops of one country to serve under a U.N. commander from another. That's why the Clinton proposal to let U.S. troops serve under U.N. commanders apparently contains provisions that would allow U.S. military officers to disregard orders they consider to be illegal or militarily questionable. But this makes a mockery of a unified military command.

In Bosnia, political disagreement between U.N. members has undercut the entire mis-

sion. U.N. peace-keeping forces were supposedly dispatched to deliver humanitarian supplies to besieged civilians. They were given the mandate to use force if they were blocked.

But when Serb militias blocked aid and besieged Sarajevo, political displacements among the members prevented the United Nations from acting. The French and British opposed U.S. proposals to threaten air strikes against the Serbs because they feared retaliation against their peacekeepers on the ground.

Political squabbles over potential U.N. missions are likely to multiply, especially if the Security Council expands to include Germany, Japan, India or Brazil. The end of the Cold War doesn't ensure Security Council agreement on what causes are worth fighting for. More likely the opposite.

And without such agreement, hopes for a U.N. globocop are vastly overrated.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for a question or two?

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to study the revised amendment for a brief period of time. I had been working on possibly an alternative with some other Senators, and we are not sure exactly the final draft of that because this has sort of been a moving target. But I understand how the Senator has every right to work on this, and the Senator has made some changes.

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to respond, Mr. President. I appreciate the Senator's concern. The Senator and his staff did bring to our attention and wanted to make absolutely sure that we would not undermine the current cooperative effort that we now have between the United States and Korea. I do not think that was covered under our initial draft.

We made absolutely clear that we would not affect that in any adverse way. We made absolutely clear that we would not have any negative impact whatsoever in NATO.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. Indeed, we did bring that to the attention of the Senator, and I think both of those corrections will be made.

I should like the draw the Senator's attention to the first page, numeral 1, which reads:

Under United Nations operational or tactical control, if such forces would be under the command, operational control, or tactical control of foreign officers.

This is a subject on which the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, on which I serve as the ranking member, has been working. Senator LEVIN is the chairman.

As drafted here, I am not clear. Suppose, for example, as in the gulf operation, General Schwarzkopf was the designated supreme commander of that operation. Nevertheless, there were units of our Armed Forces, which for

periods of time during the gulf operation served under, say, a regimental commander, who was a foreign officer, who in turn reported to General Schwarzkopf.

Now, this is a technical question, but as drawn here, it seemed to me to preclude even that type of operation.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will be happy to respond to the Senator's question. We put in a definition, actually on page 3 of this amendment:

For the purpose of this section, "United Nations operational or tactical control" means the exercise by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Secretary General, or any other non-U.S. entity designated by the United Nations Security Council, or the United Nations Secretary General, with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force such as the authority to coordinate and direct the mission-related activities of the units comprising such force.

So clearly in the Persian Gulf example, as the Senator outlined, the United States had operational control, and it was under the control of General Schwarzkopf. We went to great lengths to try to accommodate the—

Mr. WARNER. So if there were an intervening foreign officer in the chain of command, this amendment would not apply?

Mr. NICKLES. No.

Mr. WARNER. So long as the top military officer is a U.S. officer.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WARNER. My next question would be, given the United States is a leader in military matters throughout the world, suppose each nation adopts a similar type piece of legislation. How then does the U.N. put together an armed force?

Mr. NICKLES. I will respond to my colleague and friend, Mr. President. I wanted to be very clear and very careful that we did not in any way basically transfer the constitutional responsibility of the Commander in Chief to the Secretary General, nor would we abrogate or violate the constitutional responsibility of Congress.

So our amendment says the President has this authority as Commander in Chief. He would not delegate it. If he so determined that it was in our country's national interest to do so, he could request from Congress, and receive, authorization. If he felt it was in the best interests to put U.S. combat forces under the U.N. flag or under a foreign commander, he could do so, but he would have to receive congressional authorization. He could declare an emergency, he could do it, would not have to pull our troops out. He could do so but would have to declare an emergency and receive authorization from Congress.

So this would basically protect the President's right as Commander in Chief. It would keep his authority as Commander in Chief so it will not be

delegated to the U.N. Secretary General or other operations.

Other countries, frankly, if you look at the history of the United Nations, have in many cases, I think when it was well run and made successful exercises, they were following the lead of the United States. Certainly, that was the case in the operation of the Persian Gulf war. That was a U.S.-led effort with a significant coalition. Those other countries, if they elected not to participate or if they passed a similar resolution, then they would be saying, "We don't want our forces to serve under combat with the United States-led forces," then they will not be part of the coalition.

Mr. WARNER. In point of fact, if other nations do adopt comparable legislation, it preempts their participation unless they have a similar exculpatory clause whereby their head of state or head of government can come in and have a comparable way. Would that be the case?

Mr. NICKLES. I think it would be the case. I do not see those countries leaning—I have not seen other countries wanting to take the lead in U.N. combat forces. They would have to make that decision if they wished to participate. If they wished to only have their commanders or something, then I doubt they would be participating.

They did not make that request, I might mention, under the Persian Gulf war. That was not made under the Korean operation, Korean war. So I do not know that it would be another problem. But certainly they would have to decide whether they wanted to participate or not.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a further explanation of that particular point?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, of course.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me just say that this amendment seeks to define the relationship between the Congress and the President in the decisionmaking process on the deployment of troops under U.N. command. Any other country in a parliamentary system would be free to have a similar understanding as between the parliament and the chief executive. In many countries, like Great Britain, of course, they are, in effect, one and the same because the ministers and prime ministers are Members of Parliament.

But in our system it is important for us to have that understanding and spell it out in the statute that makes clear that Congress is going to share in this decisionmaking responsibility in our Government. It does not attempt to dictate to any other government, an ally anywhere, how they will work out their intracountry situation. This amendment is how we propose that it should be done in the United States.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished colleague. Indeed, I

am trying to get a better grasp and am proceeding in that direction.

But let me also direct your attention to section A under I. The President has submitted a report to Congress which specifies the role and mission of such forces, the estimated cost of such operation, of such mission, the probable maximum size of such force, and the probable duration of the commitment of such forces to the appropriate congressional committees.

I do not see in this a reporting requirement, which, as I understand the amendment, goes to the heart of the amendment. The heart of the amendment is perhaps twofold as I understand it. One, we, the Congress, should have a partnership relationship with a President, our President, as he proceeds to engage our troops in a situation, men in danger, much like the War Powers Act. Indeed, I think this amendment is tailored in many respects like the War Powers Act, without the concurrence of the Congress.

Now, I presume that is done because the Senator believes that we at this moment do not wish to impose the welfare or the safety of our troops on a foreign commander, whoever that individual might be. But this does not, in the reporting requirements, ask the President to give us his appraisal of such a foreign commander he proposes to put the troops under. Does the Senator follow me on that?

Mr. NICKLES. Not totally. But, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMON). The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. I just want to respond to my colleague. I did not totally understand where he is coming from.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me try to restate it. Part of the amendment is the concern that American service personnel should not serve under the command of a foreign commander because, presumably, he might not be as well qualified militarily as some of our—say most, not all—of our commanders. Is that the point of the amendment?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is missing a big part of it. There are two pieces to the amendment.

Mr. WARNER. I know. This is a second part. You want to make sure that this particular operation comports with the will of the Congress. It seems to me it is twofold.

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct. Yes; you should have congressional approval before you commit U.S. combat troops into foreign operations or combat situations, or the President has to declare an emergency and say we need to do this and come to Congress and get some authority to do so. Or, two, we do not want to be part of an international standing army. Many have proposed and I was reading some quotes where they are talking about

establishing—the U.N. Secretary General has proposed a United Nations standing army, which we would be able to commit, or the United Nations would be able to commit, very rapidly. I think the United States should have some control.

So where I have come from, we will not be part of a U.N. standing army, one, looking for another cause to put out and another place where we could engage our troops, and, two, that if the President decides to do that, if he decides to put U.S. forces under a foreign commander, he is going to have to get approval from Congress. We have not done that in the past, but they are talking about doing it. My guess is that events in the last couple of weeks have taken away that appetite. I hope that is the case. But it has been proposed by the U.N. Secretary General to establish a U.N. standing army comprised of a multinational force to be able to rapidly respond to many of the problems that are evident in the world. I thought, wait, I do not want, one, to think we should have U.S. forces committed to a U.N. standing army, and, two, if they are going to be involved there with a foreign commander as such, then Congress should say so. The President can get around that.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand that. Let me sharpen the question. It seems to me that the Senator enumerates several things that the President has to report to the Congress, but there is nothing in here that designates what will be the command and control and who is likely to be the officers in that chain of command. In other words, there is not a reporting requirement for that specific.

Mr. NICKLES. In the first place, if the Senator will yield, the President does not have to report anything to the Congress if he keeps it under U.S. command. If he is putting our troops under foreign command, he would have to go to the Armed Services Committee, he would have to go to the Intelligence Committee, and he would have to report. Here is what we are looking at doing. I am sure that report would include—we did not specify it as such—would include the military qualifications of the foreign commander. But the President is going to have to say we are in the process of putting U.S. combat troops under foreign command, and he would have to seek congressional approval. Then they would rely on the wisdom of the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Intelligence Committee to receive a joint resolution authorizing such action.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand all of that. I come back to the simple question. You do not have any requirement in here—you ask for the cost, the mission, the time, but there is nothing in here asking about what is the chain of command and what are the

various foreign commanders that are likely to be in that chain of command. It seems to me that is pertinent information.

Mr. NICKLES. I do not disagree with my colleague. That may be something that the committees would certainly be interested in before they would be signing off on a joint resolution. I am sure we could expand it, but I do not know that it is necessary.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I shall not further question the distinguished colleague at this time. I will have further questions at a later point in time. I thank the Senator for his indulgence.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, we state that if the President declares that an emergency exists and immediately informs Congress of his actions and the reasons therefor, the "reasons therefor" may well mean here is the justification of why he wants to have it under foreign command, here is the justification. Again, those committees would have to inquire into the details and try to make the decision of where we want to go, is this the kind of approach that we would want to take where we put U.S. forces under a foreign command? If the President is making that request, evidently he feels that would be the right thing to do, and Congress would have the opportunity from the appropriate committees to pass a joint resolution or not.

I thank my friend and colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me, first of all, commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue, and also compliment him on the very hard work and thoughtful effort that has gone into the preparation of this amendment.

I am happy to join him as an original cosponsor of the amendment, because I think this is a very timely issue to resolve. We had a very valuable debate on the subject of our commitment and the mission of United States troops in Somalia last week. In Somalia, our objective, as everyone knows, was to make possible the delivery of humanitarian and food aid to the starving people of Somalia, and to help protect those who were in the country trying to provide assistance to those destitute and starving people.

Then the objective was broadened by a resolution of the U.N. Security Council, with the support and vote of our U.N. delegate and representative on that Security Council.

The broadening of the mission included the aim to commit combat forces and elements of U.S. troops who were deployed to the area in an effort to attack militarily certain named persons and forces in Somalia. The question that that incident illustrates and makes relevant to this debate is: To what extent should Congress have been involved in that decision to broaden the activity and to actually commit

U.S. troops to a combat role in that country, and to also make them subject to, in certain circumstances, command and direction and at least influence by commanders other than U.S. commanding officers?

Under the guise of peacekeeping, or stabilizing influences, or humanitarian aid, we slowly moved in the direction of having United States combat troops engaged in warlike activities in Somalia, without having Congress participate in that decisionmaking process. That is a deeply disturbing event, and it is regrettable in many respects. But it illustrates why it is important for Congress today, for the Senate today, to make a statement, through the adoption of this amendment on this bill, that in the future any deployment of U.S. troops and Armed Forces to a U.N. force under U.N. command or foreign officer command will have to be done only with the consent and authorization of the Congress.

That is the strength of this amendment. It also reinforces and reaffirms the commanding officer's allegiance to the Commander in Chief of the United States. It reinforces the President's authority over U.S. forces as well.

The amendment does not seek to limit the President's ability to commit United States forces to traditional peacekeeping activities, such as the beginning of the operation in Somalia. If the situation were to arise again that confronted President Bush when he was President, no future President would be restricted in any way different from the restrictions in the current law that applied when President Bush decided to become involved in helping to relieve the problems in Somalia as he did.

What it would prevent, without consultation and approval of Congress, would be the changing of the role, the broadening of the role into a combat and military activity, such as described in this amendment. The amendment disallows the inclusion of U.S. combat forces as part of any standing U.N. international armed force.

The Senator from Oklahoma identified many statements that have been attributed to administration officials and the President himself, prior to and after becoming President, that this, in their view, was a good idea. Well, we are suggesting that that may not be such a good idea and that the Congress ought to take a very careful look at whether we would want to stand idly by, without being consulted, without being involved in the decision, and see U.S. forces become a part of some international standing army that would be directed by the Secretary General of the United Nations. To me, this goes against tradition and against longstanding established policy of the United States. It is not a change in policy that ought to be permitted without the most careful and thorough consultation with this Congress and the prior authorization of this Congress.

So this amendment, for the time being, if adopted, would say "no" to the inclusion of U.S. forces in any U.N. standing rapid-response force or international armed force that could be directed by the U.N. Security Council or the U.N. Secretary General.

Congress has acted in the past, as the Senate knows, to more clearly define the powers and the responsibilities of the Chief Executive in connection with the deployment of U.S. troops in dangerous situations.

The adoption in 1973 of the War Powers Resolution, for example, sought to define and impose some restraints on the Chief Executive's authority to deploy combat forces. The War Powers Resolution, which the distinguished Senator from Virginia referred to in his remarks and which we discussed in the colloquy just now, acknowledges that the President has the authority to deploy troops, but stipulates that he must consult with Congress in every possible way before introducing U.S. Armed Forces, and to continue to consult while Armed Forces remain deployed. It requires that the President report to Congress within 48 hours of introduction of such forces in a combat situation, and it requires the President to withdraw Armed Forces after 60 days, or after 90 days if he explains and justifies the continued deployment for an additional 30 days—

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be pleased to in a moment. He does so unless Congress declares war, or authorizes the action, has extended the action, or could not meet that deadline because of an armed attack against U.S. forces.

I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. WARNER. If I understand it, this amendment says that if the President so desires to put our troops under—and you use the phrase here "command, operational control, or tactical control of a foreign officer," he must have the concurrence of the Congress; that is the essence of it, correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. My question to the Senator is, Can a President at any time under the U.S. Constitution delegate his authority as Commander in Chief to a foreign commander even with the concurrence of the Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly he cannot delegate his duties as President to anyone. He has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution. We can impeach him if he violates the laws.

Mr. WARNER. Back up a minute and just talk slowly. This amendment says that a President may put our troops under the command operation or tactically of a foreign officer if Congress concurs after a certain procedure, is that not correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. My question to the Senator is, Can a President do that ir-

respective of the concurrence of the Congress under this amendment? I question the fundamental right of a President, as Commander in Chief, to ever put our troops under another commander in chief.

Mr. COCHRAN. It seems to me that we have the responsibility of spelling out that restraint on his powers since he has said in a campaign for President and since he has been President, that he thinks that is a good idea from time to time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I do not wish to get into the politics of this thing and partisanship. I am just talking about a straight constitutional question whether or not a President of the United States can ever delegate his authority under the Constitution as Commander in Chief and put our troops under the command of a foreign officer?

Mr. COCHRAN. He is not authorized by law to do that. That is what the Senator's question is, neither the law nor the Constitution authorizes him to do that.

Mr. WARNER. This infers that you will not give him any money unless he gets concurrence of Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. If he gets concurrence of Congress he can put them under a commander.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, one, the Constitution says the President is Commander in Chief. It does not state he can delegate that authority.

This President has indicated a willingness in the past to do this very thing. That is really what prompted this amendment—whoa, we do not want you to do that but if you do you are going to have to sell Congress on the idea. You are going to have some public support before you make some type of open-end commitment of 20,000 or X number of thousands of troops in a combat situation.

We do not think, one, that should be debated; two, if it is he is going to have to sell Congress on the idea.

We have stated that as an integral part of the amendment. So my friend and colleague will understand we also say the United States will not be part of a standing international army looking for a fire to put out.

So we really are in sympathy with the Senator from Virginia in saying we do not know that the Commander in Chief should do this; if he does do it, we are saying no funds unless he comes back to Congress to convince us of its wisdom.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I understand very clearly the mechanics of the amendment, but I point out a threshold question of whether or not this amendment is worth the paper it is written on because the President simply does not have the power to do

what the Senator is prohibiting him from doing, albeit he says he does and made certain protestation to that effect. It is all for naught. I do not think he has the power at any time under the Constitution to delegate his responsibility as Commander in Chief over the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I tell my friend and colleague—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield further.

Mr. NICKLES. So my friend from Virginia will be aware of the statement that the administration made, this is in the Washington Post, which I know my friend from Virginia might read on occasion:

The Clinton administration is drafting a new set of criteria for U.S. involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations that would provide for a much wider role for U.S. military personnel, according to senior defense and diplomatic officials.

It goes on to basically say we could participate in that kind of capacity.

If I remember, too, I think the President's statement before the United Nations as recently as September 27 is if parties to the conflict—talking about Bosnia—take the hard steps needed to make real peace, the international community, including the United States, must be ready to help in effective implementation.

He goes on: U.S. peacekeepers hold promise for many in this area's conflict. The reason he supported such a mission, not as critics in the United States charge, under contract for American foreign policy, strengthen security, protect interest, and share among the nations the cost and effort of pursuing peace and, finally, anyway these are several quotes that are very recent. September 27 where the President is talking about expanded U.S. role in the U.N. peacekeeping efforts that have at least made me and I think many other people, Jeane Kirkpatrick, who I know the Senator respects a great deal, and others saying before we make a commitment of U.S. combat forces wait a minute; we should not be delegating the power and authority of the Commander in Chief.

And certainly Congress has the role, as Senator BYRD has stated several times, Congress does have something to say. Congress under the Constitution has the power and the right to declare war, and so Congress should be involved. We are saying before we get these troops involved in international combat under U.N. auspices under foreign control that Congress should have a say-so.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I will conclude simply saying—

Mr. WARNER. I am happy to yield further to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. COCHRAN. This will be my last observation. I appreciate the indulgence of my friend and colleague. We

should be having an amendment saying it is the sense of the Congress under the Constitution of the United States the President cannot do these things. As the amendment is drawn there is inference that if he gets the concurrence of the Congress he can do it. That is what this amendment infers.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. The President has already done it. I say to my friend and colleague, we already have U.S. troops under foreign command, and so if the Senator from Virginia is correct then those would not be allowed. We have U.S. troops participating in several U.N. operations. My amendment or our amendment is drafted to limit U.S. combat troops. But we do now have it.

The Senator raises a constitutional point where the President has put United States troops—mostly logistics I might mention—under foreign command, and that is the case in Somalia. He has retained and said combat troops, and the few thousand combat troops he just now is sending to Somalia, would be under United States command but a lot of logistics and others are under foreign command.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi continues to have the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I recall as a Member of the other body when we had before us the resolution of war powers that was passed in 1973. There were many concerns expressed at that time, especially by the administration that the resolution was an infringement upon Executive powers and the powers of the President as Commander in Chief.

I do not think this amendment seeks to go nearly as far in restraining the powers of the President as the war powers resolution did. There are similarities, that is true, but it is not as broad in scope. It is specifically directed, as the Senator from Oklahoma describes it, to combat troops only in situations where they would be subject to control and operational control command by foreign forces. This includes, of course, U.N. peacekeeping forces that are engaged in combat activity.

We have seen, and we have learned from the Somalia situation that what appears to be a peacekeeping role, or appears to be a role to simply provide humanitarian assistance, can change into a military confrontation where United States combat troops are controlled, directed, and so involved with the U.N. force that it is hard to tell who is in charge. It is hard to know who is accountable and who is responsible for the U.S. troops that are in this situation.

It is dangerous for us to sit idly by. As a legislative body, we simply observe the decisions made by our U.N.

representative in voting on the current U.N. Council resolution changing the nature of the deployment of U.S. troops without being consulted or granting congressional authority. This amendment seeks to address that problem and make it very clear that the Congress insists upon consultation in certain circumstances prior authorization before U.S. troops can be deployed. I suggest that this is a good amendment. It is a timely amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in favor of this amendment to require congressional authorization for placing U.S. forces under foreign officers as part of a U.N. military command and to prohibit U.S. forces from serving in any standing U.N. Armed Forces.

This is a measured and proper response to a new issue. During the cold war, the tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union made it very unlikely that United Nations-sanctioned or United Nations-commanded military operations would take place. Today, in light of United States-Russian cooperation, the possibility exists for United Nations actions in a wide variety of hotspots.

Our attention has been focused on this issue by the tragic events in Somalia, where 28 Americans have been killed on a mission that was initiated with the purest humanitarian motives. This tragedy has transpired partly because the Clinton administration shifted the mission of our limited deployments without changing the size and configuration of those forces. More important, it resulted from the fact that the administration allowed United Nations officials to define the mission and give the orders to American units.

Those changes took place without debate and without formal notice of Congress, almost by sleight of hand. It has led to a tragic outcome, and Congress must act never to allow those events to be repeated. That is why I support this amendment.

This amendment would not affect our ability to participate in alliances such as NATO. It would not affect our ability to participate in U.S.-led coalitions acting pursuant to U.N. Security Council resolutions, as was the case in the Persian Gulf war. It would not even affect our ability to subordinate U.S. forces to a U.N. command established in a particular crisis, provided that Congress acts affirmatively to authorize such involvement.

It does, however, prohibit the subordination of United States forces to any standing United Nations armed forces that might be created. Pundits and policy analysts have breezily recommended creating such a force to handle post-war crises. In light of the United Nations' abysmal record in Somalia, I hope that members of this body will pass an absolute prohibition

against any American involvement in such an irresponsible idea.

Under the Constitution, the American people place in the President's hands the lives of our sons and daughters who serve in the Armed Forces. It is a sacred trust. The President, and Congress, have a moral responsibility not to cavalierly transfer this authority to U.N. officials who are not in any way accountable to the American people.

This authority was transferred with insufficient forethought in Somalia, and the pending amendment would ensure that this profound mistake would not be repeated.

Mr. President, I urge that this amendment be adopted. We owe it to our sons and daughters who have volunteered to serve in our Nation's Armed Forces. Never again should we transfer to foreign officers under a U.N. command the authority to place them in harm's way without considered deliberation and congressional approval.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma which proposes to deny funding for U.S. combat forces participating in U.N. operations under foreign command unless and until previous authorization from Congress has been obtained.

The Constitution provides that the Congress is empowered to "make war". It is very clear that the responsibility for the potentially momentous consequences for initiating armed hostilities should only be called upon by the concurrence of the President and both Houses of Congress. This provision cuts through the murky haze of issues revolving around this grand new era of peacekeeping—or is it peace-making—no one can even figure out what to call it, much less how to define its objectives. The Clinton administration wants to call all U.N. forays peace operations. By using this new term "peace operation", the administration avoids the debate over the terms and conditions under which U.S. troops are deployed. Tragically, when this administration agreed to UNOSOM II, vastly expanding the scope of the Somalia peace operation, the policymakers did not recognize the distinction between United States participation in a purely humanitarian mission or United States participation in a hostile, combat-like mission. In essence, this administration forfeited the U.S. Government's right and responsibility to deploy U.S. troops, and bestowed this right upon the Secretary General of the United Nations.

I addressed this issue with our U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine Albright during her confirmation hearing before our committee in late January. At that very hearing, I quoted former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney's opinion on this subject and I must say I couldn't agree with him

more. He said we do not want that most solemn of sovereign responsibilities of the Government or the most significant responsibility of the President to be delegated to any international organization. That's a pretty concise statement. One which the Clinton administration should memorize.

Let's be clear about this. This amendment does not deny funds for the deployment of U.S. troops under foreign command, as agreed to in a signed and ratified treaty—as in the case of NATO. It does, however, send a loud and clear signal to the administration that the U.S. Congress will not tolerate U.S. troops operating under foreign command, especially when they have been committed to an ill-defined, unfocused and poorly conceived U.N. operation.

This amendment may be too generous to this administration since the Senator's amendment provides for a national security interest waiver. However, I support the concept behind this resolution and hope that my fellow Senators will do the same.

I want Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to have access to the thoughts of retired Brig. Gen. Theo T. Mataxis of my home State of North Carolina. Ted Mataxis wrote an op-ed piece on this issue which was published in the September 12 edition of the Fayetteville Observer. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

DOES U.S. OR U.N. CONTROL U.S. COMBAT FORCES?

(By Theo C. Mataxis)

A recent news article headlined "Rangers Change the Game" noted that the Clinton administration had allowed the change by the U.N. of the mission of the U.S. military in Somalia from peacekeeping to the more active role of peacemaking.

This raises the key question: When a decision is made to change the role of U.S. troops from peacekeeping to peacemaking—a euphemism for prolonged combat involving casualties—who makes the final decision: the president with the approval of Congress, or the secretary-general of the United Nations?

Since the collapse of the Communist empire it appears as if the U.N. has become by default the "policeman of the world"—with the United States military being called on to become the "enforcers," in effect an international SWAT team. Both missions are being carried out by the U.N. and both have "peace" in their name—and are frequently used interchangeably by the media, so what's the problem?

Well, as noted there is a big problem—as distinct as a choice between black and white or peace and war. Peacekeeping is clearly defined in the current U.N. text "The Blue Helmets." It states peacekeeping involves the deployment of military personnel, but not to fight or threaten anyone—and it is clear that force can only be used in self defense.

Also as noted in "The Blue Helmets," those engaged in a United Nations peacekeeping operation cannot take sides without becoming involved and a part of the conflict

the operation has been set up to supervise. The attack by U.S. gunships on Mohamed Farrah Aidid's home and principal command centers on July 12 resulted in many Somali civilian casualties. According to the International Red Cross, there were 54 killed and 174 wounded. In retaliation, a Somali mob attacked reporters covering the story, killing four.

This attack on Aidid drove him underground and was followed by a series of guerrilla attacks against the U.N. forces, hampering their operations. This attack was criticized not only by civilian humanitarian organizations in Somalia but also by critics overseas and in the U.S. who felt that the U.N. was forsaking its humanitarian role which brought it to Somalia. Whatever the validity of these complaints, there is no doubt that these attacks have violated the U.N.'s own peacekeeping dictum of not taking sides or you'll become part of the problem.

Fortunately, according to a newspaper account on Aug. 24, the U.N. announced it would "open talks with the leaders of Aidid's group, the Somali National Alliance-United Somali Congress." It is encouraging that in the middle of the U.N.'s new "Fight-Fight" stance they are endeavoring to reestablish the peacekeeper's "Talk-Talk" strategy of negotiations seeking a "Common Ground." This is a realistic approach which understands that the establishment of a lasting viable government depends on the Somalis—not on the U.N.!

A recent statement by Ambassador David Shin, U.S. coordinator for Somalia, noted that Gen. Aidid "should be removed" and that "it was possible that specially trained U.S. troops might be sent to Mogadishu to help find and arrest Gen. Aidid." This was validated by the recent arrival of the Ranger and Delta units and the news in the media of launching of helicopter combat assault operations against Aidid by the Rangers. With this operation the U.S. forces have now gone far beyond their original peacekeeping role.

The next step after peacekeeping is peacemaking and peace enforcement. Here, the main objective is to enforce the orders of the U.N. Security Council, even if the Somalis disagree with the orders! Peacemaking-enforcement authorizes the Security Council under the authority of the U.N. Charter to take "such action by air, sea and land forces as may be necessary to restore the situation." In other words it is combat action that has resulted in Somalia, as described by Columnist Carl Rowan, becoming "another killing field where the strong clobber the weak."

A recent article in the August issue of the Reserve Officer's "National Security Report" titled "The End of the Cold War Opens a New Future for NATO" by General John M. Shalikashvili, who has been selected by President Clinton as the next chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, helps clear this current semantic jungle. Unfortunately, today many feel that if an operation has "peace" in its name, it is considered peaceful and should be approved. This is wrong, as Gen. Shalikashvili points out *** "a far cry from yesterday's pristine Blue Helmet operations *** and that the line between peacekeeping and peacemaking has become blurred." He warned that humanitarian assistance or other peacekeeping operations can turn to peacemaking or peace enforcement *** which can be "most demanding and turn warlike as we turn the next bend in the road."

This, as has been explained, is the key to understanding U.N. operations. Peacekeep-

ing is an operation in which both sides invite the U.N. forces into their country as a buffer or "umpire" while they attempt to resolve their disagreements peacefully. Peacemaking-enforcement, on the other hand, is a decision to move from the minor risk of peacekeeping to imposing the U.N.'s decisions by force—it is going from peace to war. A move from peace to war in Somalia, instead of being made by the president in consultation with Congress as required under the War Powers Act, has been left to the U.N. Security Council. The War Powers Act clearly states that "the long term deployment of American armed forces into an area of imminent hostilities must have Congressional approval." To hold that Somalia is not an area of imminent hostilities would require a sophist on the order of "but I didn't inhale."

Here we have a case where our troops are committed to combat operations—i.e., Army Rangers conducting air assault raids, with possible heavy casualties if the operations go sour—without even a public pronouncement being made by the commander in chief. Its clearly mandated responsibilities of debating whether it is in our national interests to involve our forces in a prolonged guerrilla war situation where there already have been casualties.

As noted, the dispatch of the tough combat Ranger unit does not come under the heading of peacekeeping. It is a clear signal that our role has passed by default through inaction of our leaders from peacekeeping into peacemaking—forcing the locals to obey the U.N.'s directives whether they agree or not. Another indicator of the need of peacekeeping was the announcement last month that U.S. troops serving in Somalia would be authorized to "wear a combat patch." What will we see next, combat infantry badges and their inevitable accompaniment, body bags?

The question that comes to mind is, "Who's minding the store in Washington?" The scenario in which the U.N. authorizes U.S. military forces to conduct combat operations without the president informing the American people that their sons and daughters are going to war boggles the mind. The next question is where is Congress, the watchdogs who have the final say under the War Powers Act? Unfortunately, the public and evidently Congress also, have been befuddled by the semantics.

This is too important an issue to let us slide down the slippery slope into another prolonged guerrilla war without debating whether it is in our national interest. What is needed now is for the public to jump-start this issue. The best way to do this in a pre-election year is to call or write your representatives in Congress!

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Nickles-Cochran amendment which would prohibit the President from putting United States combat troops under the command of the United Nations unless specifically authorized by the Congress.

Like most Americans, I was outraged by the killing of American soldiers in Somalia and I was appalled by the treatment of our dead soldiers in the streets of Mogadishu, by the very people that we sought to help in a humanitarian relief effort. I believe that we must pull our troops out of Somalia, and we must turn our foreign policy away from the peace-enforcement and

nation-building agenda of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Boutros-Ghali.

In "An Agenda for Peace" Secretary Boutros-Ghali outlines a greatly expanded United Nations role in peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace-enforcement. I believe Secretary Boutros-Ghali has expanded the traditional concept of U.N. peacekeeping in a dangerous way that could cost Americans more money and more lives without a clearly defined U.S. interest.

The United Nations' traditional role of peacekeeping makes sense as long as two conditions are met: The warring parties have essentially ceased fighting; and all of the parties have agreed to the presence of peacekeepers.

I believe the recent events in Somalia demonstrate what happens when peacekeeping operations turn into peace making and peace enforcement operations.

Article II of the U.S. Constitution states, "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States * * *." I support strong executive authority when it comes to the military affairs of this Nation. I do not, however, support abrogating the Commander in Chief's responsibilities to the control of the United Nations.

The Constitution also provides, in article I, section 8, that the Congress is empowered to "provide for the common Defense" of the United States and to "raise and support armies." In light of these two provisions of the U.S. Constitution, I believe the Nickles amendment makes good sense.

The Nickles amendment would cut off funding for U.S. combat forces that are placed under foreign command in U.N. operations, unless authorized by Congress. The Nickles amendment does not prohibit U.S. military personnel from engaging in medical, humanitarian, logistics, communications, and related activities where the role is clearly noncombatant. However, it does provide flexibility to the President if and when U.S. national security interests are threatened.

The Nickles-Cochran amendment seeks to return U.S. participation in the United Nations back to the traditional role of peacekeeping envisioned by the founders of the United Nations. This amendment is not designed to stop U.S. participation in multilateral military missions. But multilateral military missions must be U.S. missions, or they must be authorized by the Congress. We cannot ask the taxpayers of this great Nation to continue to foot the bill for U.N. missions that do not have a clear U.S. interest.

Passage of this amendment will, I believe, curb U.S. involvement in the types of mismanaged U.N. operations, like Somalia, which the United Nations is not presently capable of handling.

I supported President Bush's decision to send humanitarian relief to the So-

mali people. The Nickles amendment would have allowed for President Bush's humanitarian efforts. But the amendment would have prevented the placing of American combat troops under U.N. command, as was the case until recently in Somalia. We might have avoided the loss of American lives in Somalia, had the provisions of the Nickles amendment been the law of the land.

As the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick cogently noted in a recent article in the Washington Post:

Not all the tasks [the U.N.] undertakes are even remotely relevant to American interests. Some are not prudent. Some simply cannot be accomplished. While it was possible for the United States forces to deliver food to the Somalis, it is not possible for foreign forces to provide political reconciliation and stable democratic government to Somalia because these depend on the desires and behavior of the Somalis.

As we saw in Somalia, if people don't want peace, or they don't want our nation building, asking United States troops to impose this solution is asking too much of our men and women in uniform.

I am also concerned that there may be a potential, new U.N. mission in Haiti that has all the look of another disaster in the making. Once again, the United Nations proposes to play its new role of nation building. Once again American troops are asked to play a leading role when the mission of our troops, and the U.S. national security interests at stake, are uncertain.

Since 1948, the United Nations has undertaken about 29 peacekeeping operations and there are currently around 14 ongoing peacekeeping operations. In calendar year 1992, peacekeeping expenditures to the United Nations cost the American taxpayers over half a billion dollars, \$544.5 million. In addition, our \$500 million peacekeeping bill to the United Nations does not include the operations and maintenance funds our military has spent participating in peacekeeping operations. With a national debt totaling over \$4 trillion, I do not think we can ask the American people to continue to fund peace-enforcement/nation-building operations where there is clearly no defined goal or U.S. interest.

On December 12, 1991, then Governor Clinton announced to an audience at Georgetown University that the United States should help establish "United Nations rapid deployment force that could be used for purposes beyond traditional peacekeeping * * *." The United States cannot afford to have a foreign policy that is globalist and multilateralist in nature and centered around the peace-enforcement and nation building efforts of the United Nations. We should not cede control of our armed forces to the bureaucrats at the United Nations.

Before I will support sending American men and women into harms way

there must be a clear determination, by the President, that vital U.S. national security interests are at risk; there must be a strong, bipartisan, national consensus that supports the use of U.S. military forces; and there must be a clear statement from the administration of what are our objectives; what constitutes a winning situation; and what are the conditions for the termination of the mission.

Mr. President, the United States of America cannot serve as the globocop around the world. And I support multilateral military missions such as Operation Desert Storm. In operation Desert Storm, U.S. interests were clearly defined and American soldiers were properly armed and commanded by U.S. officers with unclouded goals. However, I do not support the new nation-building missions of the United Nations, and neither do the people of this Nation. In order to preserve our sovereignty over our military forces, I urge my colleagues to support the Nickles amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further discussion?

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, thank you. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma what his intentions are now with regard to this amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. I would like to ask for the yeas and nays. I understand that votes are going to be held to 7 o'clock, is that correct?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, if I may respond, there is no order directing the Senate to vote at 7. It was just an announcement made by the leader, and so it is understood by one and all that all votes will be stacked up until that moment which would mean even if we close the debate at this point colleagues can come here before 7 o'clock to reopen the debate.

Mr. NICKLES. Sure. That is certainly fine with this Senator, and I am happy to accommodate the leader's request for postponing the vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

NAFTA

Mr. DOLE. President, one slogan we are hearing from the opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is "not this NAFTA." They seem to be saying "we support the idea of a trade agreement, but not this one. Go back and get a better deal." They argue that in NAFTA, our negotiators somehow were taken by the wily Mexicans, and we are now being asked to pass a bad deal.

Mr. President, this argument is a delusion. It is simply disingenuous to claim that the United States can reject this NAFTA and negotiate a better one next year. I have met with Mexican President Carlos Salinas. Anyone with even a passing familiarity with the two centuries of United States-Mexican history knows that President Salinas has offered a historic opening to the United States. It has taken extraordinary political courage for him to break with his country's statist economic policies and traditional distrust of the United States by proposing NAFTA and implementing sweeping free-market economic and political reforms. This opportunity will not come again in this century, in my view, if we reject the North American Free-Trade Agreement, which is now pending in the House and the Senate.

Every negotiation requires giving something up in order to get something in return. NAFTA is not a bad deal for the United States and by no means is it a bad deal for Mexico. But the fact is that Mexico gives up far more under NAFTA than the United States. NAFTA is not unfair to Mexico, but it is one-sided in the sense that Mexico must undertake many more reforms than the United States.

The reason for this is that Mexico is starting from a much higher level of protection than is the United States. So, for example, where the United States tariff on automobile imports is only 2.5 percent, the Mexican tariff is 20 percent. The Mexican tariff will come down by one-half, to 10 percent, immediately upon implementation of NAFTA, and then phase out over 10 years. This will mean tremendous opportunities for United States automakers who, until now, have effectively been shut out of the Mexican vehicle market.

In fact, we have been told in the first year of the agreement, if it is passed, we will sell a billion dollars of automobiles in Mexico. That is 12,000 to 15,000 jobs right there.

If you look up the definition of "good deal" in the dictionary, you will find the example of the deal our negotiators got on automobiles from Mexico. And this example is repeated over and over throughout the agreement, across thousands of tariff classifications, and across numerous sectors.

Critics say the NAFTA document is too long. That is simply because our tariff schedules are thousands of pages long, and other barriers to trade are numerous, too. NAFTA eliminates these tariffs and barriers with respect to our largest and third-largest trading partners. A long trade agreement is an acceptable price to pay for a very good deal.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1052

(Purpose: To restrict available funds to aid the former Soviet Union)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be laid aside and that I be permitted to send this amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside, and the committee amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 1052.

On page 22 of the bill, at line 18, before the period, add the following new proviso: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be expended or transferred to an eligible recipient state until fifteen days after the President certifies to the Congress that the proposed eligible recipient is not currently engaged in the fabrication and construction of new road mobile or fixed-site land based intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with multiple nuclear reentry vehicles".

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the amendment that I have proposed, I think, is very simple in content and intent.

It states that none of the \$400 million provided in this bill to assist the States of the former Soviet Union to dispose of their nuclear arsenals should be expended until the President certifies that no recipient State is currently engaged in the production of new MIRV'd intercontinental missiles.

For the fiscal years 1992 and 1993, I supported the transfer of funds from the Department of Defense activities for this purpose—\$800 million have been available to date. For 1994, in this bill, I have joined Senator INOUE, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, in recommending the direct appropriation of another \$400 million to continue this effort.

But I believe that before additional funds are directed to this initiative, we must take stock of the progress to date and whether the goals of the program have been realized.

Through the Senate arms control observer group, a number of Senators have closely monitored our progress on reaching meaningful arms limitation treaties. I was the original chairman of that group and have participated in that group since its inception.

The initiative addressed by this amendment is the product of two members of the observer group, Senators NUNN and LUGAR.

I recall on several occasions bringing members of Russian groups that came to Washington to meetings, particularly in the Senate Armed Services Committee room, where I presented

those people to both Senators NUNN and LUGAR and other Members of the Senate. The initiative that they have presented I think has been a very good one.

I know how strongly these two Senators believe in the need for the United States to assist those forces in the former Soviet Union who seek to turn away from the excessive militarism of the past.

It has been my privilege to travel with those two Senators on arms control missions in the past. We have gone to arms talks in Geneva and Vienna and we have met with leaders of the former Soviet Union. Earlier this year, a number of us traveled to Moscow to evaluate the status of the START ratification process. And I applaud them for their leadership on the issue.

But, as a member not only of that arms control observer group but as the former chairman of this subcommittee and now privileged to work with my good friend from Hawaii on it as ranking member and a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have become increasingly troubled by indications that nuclear weapons production in the former Soviet Union continues unabated.

Let me explain to the Senate what this amendment does not do.

This amendment does not reduce the \$400 million provided in the Nunn-Lugar amendment for 1994.

The amendment does not impact assistance for Belarus, Ukraine, or Kazakhstan, as they do not produce nuclear missiles.

The amendment does not impact funds provided after 1994. It is not a permanent statute. It applies to these moneys in this bill only. It is a limitation. It is not legislation on an appropriations bill.

This amendment does not impact the \$1.8 billion in the foreign aid appropriations bill that was for Russia and States of the former Soviet Union.

The amendment does not impose any new burden on the intelligence community. They are, as I will point out, already monitoring these issues.

The amendment does not discourage Russia from working with the United States on arms disposal efforts. It should add momentum to those seeking to reduce Russian military spending.

The amendment does not tie funding to the rate of Russian nuclear dismantling or treaty compliance. This is only linked to new ICBM production of vehicles capable of carrying MIRV'd warheads.

It does not apply, for instance, to the single warhead that we know they are building as they build down in terms of their missile force.

The amendment does not conflict in any way with the START treaties. Those have not been ratified on either side anyway, but we are complying with them. I do not believe that it conflicts with them.

Despite the massive economic depression facing Russia, and the curtailment of Warsaw Pact military activities, numerous reports continue to reach us in the West indicating that production of new, modern nuclear systems in Russia continues.

These weapons serve only one effective purpose, and that is to continue to threaten the United States.

I ask the Senate, simply as many Senators have asked us as managers of this bill, what is the threat? I will point out to the Senate what we have done to reduce our threat against the Soviet Union. They continue to build theirs against us now. And I think it is time that that stops.

That is the rationale for this amendment, Mr. President—for the Congress and the administration to take a breath and evaluate the progress made by Russia in Russia and the choices made by Russian leaders in the employment of their scarce resources.

The Senate has voted \$1.8 billion in aid to be provided to Russia in the 1994 foreign operations bill, as I said.

And this Senator, I have reluctantly agreed to the diversion of \$979 million of funds that should be spent for defense for this country in funds that will be allocated to the President's Russian aid initiative.

Now, I do not come to this question here on the floor today as a longstanding critic of foreign aid. I have not been. I have attempted to facilitate assistance to serve American national interests abroad and have supported foreign aid where it would do that.

The concern that has brought me to the floor today with this amendment is a concern that United States assistance for the destruction of existing weapons may be making available the very resources employed by the Russians to construct new systems to continue the threat against us.

I believe the authorizing legislation that established the Nunn-Lugar initiative attempted to ensure that all U.S. assistance would be used only for the destruction of arms. And we all supported that. I continue to support Nunn-Lugar.

I know various reports have come to the Congress identifying how those funds have been expended.

The issue I ask the Senate to address is whether the military leaders in Russia are taking advantage of our assistance to destroy weapons consistent with the START ceilings to redirect their own funds to construct more capable, new nuclear weapons that have MIRV'd capability.

Mr. President, at this time, I want to present to the Senate a series of excerpts from both American and Russian journals addressing indicators that Russian nuclear weapons production continues at a robust rate.

I want to thank Dr. William Van Cleave for bringing these matters to

the attention of several of us at a meeting the Republican leader held.

I wanted to satisfy myself as to the authenticity of the remarks that were made at that meeting, and I requested the Central Intelligence Agency to comment on the accuracy of these excerpts that I will read to you.

There are 10 major points raised by these excerpts and I want to read from them and then I will present to the Senate the unclassified comments of the CIA on the excerpts that I will read.

Mr. President, it is going to take much time and effort for our intelligence services to continue to evaluate the exact status of Russian nuclear weapons development. Despite the end of the cold war, I know these matters remain a key focus of our intelligence resources and I have the utmost confidence in the Director of Central Intelligence, Jim Woolsey. I point out to the Senate, during the period of time when we were at the height of our negotiations with the Russians in Geneva, Mr. Woolsey, as an adviser on arms control, accompanied the Senate delegation on many occasions. We have confidence in Jim Woolsey because we know and have worked with him on this issue of arms control.

I am for arms control. I am for these agreements. And I am for continued assistance. I am just not for our providing money to the Russian system that turns around and releases more of their money to start new systems when we are decreasing and have canceled many of the systems that we had on the screens and the boards before that time, the time of the change that we perceived in our relationship with the Russian Republic.

Some may argue I am asking the Russians to forgo weapons improvements that are allowable under START. I point out again, that is not correct. The world has changed substantially since the details of the most recent round of negotiations. Again, I point out those agreements have not been ratified yet.

There was no expectation that the American taxpayers would be asked to provide \$2.2 billion in combined foreign aid and defense transfers to the Russians for 1994. With this bill, that is what that adds up to, 2.2 billion American dollars going to Russia for their assistance. There was no expectation that international lending bodies would be providing hundreds of millions of dollars to support economic development in Russia.

I, again, agree with that. We have all supported these initiatives to direct the energies and capabilities of the Russian people on a different course—toward democracy and toward free markets. But I do not believe the Senate or the Congress can or should countenance the notion that the United States multilateral aid will make pos-

sible the continued operation of the foreign Soviet arms industry within Russia. It is within Russia now. The combined foreign and defense assistance approach related to the Soviet Union for 1994 makes that country the third largest recipient of United States foreign assistance this next year, 1994.

A case can be and has been made for those commitments. The Senator from Hawaii and I have asked the Senate to support them, and I continue to support them. But I ask the Senate not to dodge the question of whether the Russians are following through on the spirit of the agreements and the spirit of our cooperation with them.

In my opinion, the continued production of any new nuclear MIRV'd system that threatens this country violates the spirit of our efforts to assist in the transition, and I urge the Senate to join me in asking the President to use the resources of the defense intelligence community to evaluate the status of such weapons development and production.

These are not very long; there are a few more than 10. They are excerpts of journals of both the United States and Russia that I believe support my contention.

(1) In response to Dr. Van Cleave's and Dr. Churba's questions about the state of the Russian military, he [Mr. Felgenhauer] stated that the Strategic Rocket Forces (SRF) continue to receive preferential treatment in terms of resources. 80% of their ranks are filled, and their combat readiness is the highest in the Russian military. The SRF continues to have priority. The SS-25 road mobile ICBM is still being deployed; there is a new multi-warhead silo-based ICBM under development; serious modernization of the SSBN fleet is underway; and the new TU-160 Blackjack-type bombers are under construction.

The Politics of Reform in Russia, Report of Conference, April 15-16, 1993, International Security Council, Washington, D.C. (Reprinted in Global Affairs, Summer 1993.)

NOTE.—Pavel Felgenhauer, editor of *Segodnya* (Today) is the number one defense writer in Russia. No member of the Russian Delegation, which included three senior Generals and the Deputy Chairman of the Russian State Committee on Defense, challenged his statement.

When I asked the CIA, they stated this:

Gen. Sergeyev, CINC SRF, has stated there are manning shortfalls in the SRF. We believe there are three ballistic missiles under development—two small single-RV ICBMs and a modified SLBM. A new SSBN is being designed for deployment after turn of the century. We believe that Blackjack production has ceased.

In other words, the CIA partially agrees with the statement in *Global Affairs*, but it does not disagree with the concept that a new SS-25 MIRV'd is being manufactured.

Second, a statement, again from *Global Affairs*, this for the winter of 1993. This is a quote:

[Major General Ghely Batenin, Chief of the Personnel Staff of Vice President Rutskoi and Counsellor to the Foreign Minister]: "we

are still producing mobile ICBMs and are upgrading them.' They have a simplified launch system and can be based either in the silos vacated by missiles destroyed under START or in complexes for mobile missiles. There are now 380 mobile ICBM launchers, which under the Framework Agreement can be increased to 500, he said. Russia will continue submarine force modernization. Bombers at strategic air bases outside Russia, in Ukraine or Kazakhstan, raise questions. While there are no new bombers under development, Stealth technology has been successfully developed," he said.

Dr. [Lowell] Wood asked if he was correct in his understanding of General Batenin's comments that Russia's force modernization has slowed significantly but has not stopped as comprehensively in either platforms or weapons as has the United States. He asked if Russia was continuing the developing of a follow-on ICBM to the type known as SS-25s. Dr. Wood asked specifically about the so-called 'Fat Boy,' a larger new type mobile ICBM.

General Batenin responded that reduced and modest upgrading necessary to maintain a modernized strategic force will continue. It is not necessary to replace the SS-25 as yet. We plan to continue producing about ten per month, he said, but may have to reduce that. The missile that we call universal is not a new missile but only an upgrade. We are changing some characteristics of the SS-25—its ballistic trajectory and angle of flight. It will be given a low-flying capability. It will have a maneuverable warhead. More throw weight. We had planned to give it some capability against SDI, but now we do not need to do that with GPALS.

C.I.S. and Nuclear Weapons: Liabilities and Risks; Proliferation and Strategic Defense, Report of Working Meeting, July 19-20, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C. (Reprinted in Global Affairs, Winter 1993.)

SBI says:

True, except that the rate of SS-25 production is overstated.

A third quote, which comes from the Seminar Report of the Center for Naval Analysis, July 1993:

Russia's nuclear doctrine and forces are undergoing a thorough revision * * * the importance of land mobile systems will increase; and a 'second strike' capability will be developed. * * * To avoid being forced to preempt or to fire on warning of attack, the Russians will increase the survivability of strategic rocket forces by increasing the proportion of land mobile systems from about 5 percent of the land based force to about 60 percent. A major feature of this plan will be the deployment of SS-25 missiles and a modernized successor.

Comments of Vladimir Dworkin, Head of the Main Institute of the Armed Forces and Dr. Alexei Arbatov, Head of the Center for Geopolitical and Military Forecasting as reported in: Seminar Report; Center for Naval Analysis, Jonathan D. Geithner and Scott R. Atkinson, Rapporteurs, July 1993.

The CIA, when I asked, said the answer is:

True. START II requires them to eliminate all MIRV'd ICBMs. Therefore, SS-25 mobile ICBMs become a larger percentage of the residual ICBM force.

Fourth:

Krasnaya zvezda was the first of the central newspapers to report the successful launch of the "Start-1" Russian transport booster rocket from the missile test range at Mirnyy. The March 25 [1993] demonstration

launch was conducted for commercial purposes. . . . "Start-1" is in all respects an unusual project. It has no equal in the world. And mainly because for the first time, technologies employed in a combat missile system on active duty are being used for peaceful purposes. In this case it is the RS-12M, known in the West as the SS-25 and in our country as the "Topol." With an added fourth stage and other technical refinements made in strict compliance with the START I Treaty, this system became the one that we now know as the "Start-1." It also lofted a prototype communications satellite into orbit from the Plesetsk space facility. On the whole, all the main objectives of the "Start-1's" first demonstration flight were accomplished successfully. The results of the launch allow the mobile system's designers to pronounce it ready to launch commercial payloads. . . . more than 250 accident-free launches have been carried out using similar combat systems. The "Start-1" is simple in design and can be launched from any region.

Dolinin, Aleksandr, Lieutenant Colonel "Success, Prospects of 'Start-1' Commercial Missile Launch" Krasnaya Zvezda, May 25, 1993. #116, p. 2, cols. 6-8.

I read that quote, Mr. President, to point out—and the CIA says it is true—that Russia is now combining the use of their new highly mobile rockets for military purposes and for commercial purposes. They are the only ones in the world that are doing this now. But I hope the Senate gets the point.

Again, through the use of commercial funds coming into the Soviet Union, they continue to upgrade their military system. We are not doing that.

Again, I have no problem with modernization that leads to build-down, to reducing the number of warheads involved in their system. That is there as a balance for nuclear deterrence. I want the Senate to get the point that Russia is shifting the mass of its forces into their strategic force that deals with missiles.

Again, in Global Affairs—and let me point out again that the CIA said all of that is true—in the Global Affairs edition for the summer of 1993 is this quote:

[Dr. Vitaly Shlykov, Deputy Chairman, State Committee on Defense, Russian Federation]: Reforms have not hit the military-industrial sector. Prices there are still state subsidized, and the true expense of military production is hidden by the 'perverted nature' of the former Soviet economy. During the communist days very few people had access to information about the military economy. Gaidar came in and thought that all he had to do was cut budgets and military orders and that would halt production. It did not. The military-industrial sector continued producing, drawing from vast state reserves of material and financial support from central bank institutions. Thus Minister of Defense Grachev has been saying that the more the state cuts military orders, the poorer we get; the more military orders, the better the economy. There has been no demilitarization of the economy. 'This is the historic crime of the democratic leadership of Russia.'

The Politics of Reform in Russia, Report of Conference, April 15-16, 1993, International Security Council, Washington, D.C. (Reprinted in Global Affairs, Summer 1993.)

On this one, I have read it because I want to point out the CIA says it is not true. They believe the reform shave started to hit their defense sector and military orders have declined and some of the enterprises have been privatized. But we are not making the point of those who have opposed President Yeltsin that there has not been any change in military. My point is the shift has been from conventional and from their normal type of defense spending to the area that is most threatening to the United States, and that is to the modernization and improvement of their ICBM force.

Sixth is this statement that comes from Izvestiya in June of this year, 1993. It was a statement by Mr. Litovkin concerning the current conditions of the complex that produces the majority of the air defense missiles, including the SA-10 and the SA-12. He said this:

Even in these times of sharply reduced defense spending, state orders keep "Fakel" operating at a level of almost 100%.

Litovkin, Viktor, "Products of Current Conditions at 'Fakel' Machinery Design Bureau." Izvestiya, June 4, 1993. #104, p. 6, cols. 1-3.

One hundred percent.

We have none of our systems operating at 100 percent of the former level of appropriations, Mr. President.

Incidentally, the CIA said that they doubt that the Fakel is producing almost 100 percent but cannot disprove Litovkin's claim that they are.

In May of 1993, in Aviation Week and Space Technology is this statement:

Since January 1, Russia has launched three military navigation spacecraft, two military communications spacecraft, two imaging reconnaissance satellites, two missile warning spacecraft, two new electronic intelligence (elint) satellites and the new ocean surveillance spacecraft.

Covault, Craig "Russian Military Space Maintains Aggressive Pace" Aviation Week & Space Technology, May 3, 1993, p. 61.

Mr. President, why does Russia need more of those systems than the former Soviet Union needed? Why is it that, as we are assisting them to destroy the weapons they agreed to destroy under START, that they are modernizing? But they are not only modernizing, they are sending up the most modern communications satellite that the world knows. They are sending up three military navigation spacecraft. They are sending up two imaging reconnaissance satellites. They are sending up two missile warning satellites and two new electronic intelligence satellites.

When I asked the CIA, what did they say? True, true, and they add that during that period, there were additional launches of five spacecraft which were for dual military-civilian use. In other words, the launching facilities of Russia have been hyperactive compared to that of the West, particularly of the United States.

Eighth, let me read from a bulletin of the International Security Council. It

is in the report. I have it here if anyone wishes to examine it. This statement is from Dr. Shlykov, a Russian, who participated in a conference in November of last year. He said:

I am convinced that the failure to consider the military economy was a cardinal error. The magnitude of the resources allocated to the military sector has been, and continues to be so large that economic reforms would be hard put to offset the structural imbalance between military and civilian production. (Dr. Shlykov)

Economic Reform and Defense in Russia: The Interplay, Report of Conference, November, 15-16, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C.

The CIA's response was simply they agree with that statement.

Again, from this International Security Council. Another statement of Dr. Shlykov:

But in 1992, after prices were decontrolled, the situation was reversed. Government orders for civilian consumer goods evaporated, while the rampant expansion of state bank credit for weapons caused armament prices and profit margins of military-industrial items to skyrocket. (Dr. Shlykov)

Economic Reform and Defense in Russia: The Interplay, Report of Conference, November 15-16, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C.

The CIA says they doubt this was true. The market for military goods, in their opinion, in Russia has declined dramatically.

Again, that is a Russian saying that there has been an expansion.

That same gentleman continued later in the same report to make this statement:

As for any relief on the budgetary issue, the 20 billion ruble savings ascribed to the so-called radical cuts in the military industrial operations were overwhelmingly washed away when the Central Bank opened a line of credit for 3.5 trillion rubles requested by the arms industry to settle their liabilities.

That is a conference in November of 1992. The CIA said this: It is possibly true. They have a report of a line of credit. They are unsure how large it was and whether it was all used for military purposes.

Let me point out to the Senate that 3.5 trillion rubles in 1992 equated to \$23 billion. It was an extension of a new line of credit for development of new arms in Russia. Again, the CIA says it is possible it is true. They cannot confirm it was.

The tenth item I would like to read is again from that same conference in November of 1992:

Dr. Shlykov said that in the last days of the Soviet Union, it had reserves for four months availability in the European region for peak, wartime production, which is much larger from peacetime production levels. In the Asian sector, there was up to six months availability of such reserves. "Now, after some deletion of the reserves and the independence of some republics, the plan is to maintain reserves of war-time production at the plant level for one-to-three months. But this is only one part of the reserve system. In reality the stockpiles are much more extensive."

Economic Reform and Defense in Russia: The Interplay, Report of Conference, November 15-16, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C.

The CIA says that might be true. The former Soviet Union stockpiled goods for wartime use.

As for any relief on the budgetary issue, the 20 billion ruble "savings" ascribed to the so-called radical cuts in military-industrial operations were overwhelmingly washed away when the central bank opened a line of credit for 3.5 trillion rubles requested by the arms industry * * * to settle their liabilities. (Dr. Shlykov)

Economic Reform and Defense in Russia: The Interplay, Report of Conference, November 15-16, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C.

NOTE.—In July of 1992, 3.5 trillion rubles equated to 23 Billion U.S. dollars.

The CIA says that is possibly true. We saw a report of a line of credit, but we are unsure how large it was and whether it was all for military use.

Turning to the issue of mobilization stockpiles, he [Dr. Shlykov] noted that Yeltsin had even ordered an increase in the stockpiles held by the military industries.

Economic Reform and Defense in Russia: The Interplay, Report of Conference, November 15-16, 1992, International Security Council, Washington D.C.

The CIA says they are not aware of such an order.

Mr. President, the question is, Why? Why is Russia increasing wartime stockpiles when we are decreasing ours and we thought we had a period of relative stability as far as the military was concerned in dealing with Russia.

The Americans then probed again the real levels of Russia's military effort. (Dr. Yuri) Yaremenko responded by stating that there is no reliable data in the archives, but that in his view as much as 50% of the former Soviet economy supported the military (22% arms + 25-28% investment = -50% real burden in late 1980s). If research and development, the KGB, etc. are added, it could be even higher. It was an enormous burden, and since Russian GNP is much lower than USSR's GNP at the end of the 1980s, the burden is still enormous.

The Politics of Reform in Russia, Report of Conference, April 15-16, 1993 International Security Council, Washington, D.C. (Reprinted in Global Affairs, Summer 1993.)

NOTE.—Dr. Yuri V. Yaremenko is Director of the Institute of Economic Forecasting of the Russian Academy of Sciences; is one of Russia's foremost economists.

The CIA says that is credible. The defense burden was enormous.

Mr. President, my point is it still is too high.

Does the Senator seek the floor?

Mr. INOUE. I just wanted to congratulate the Senator, if I may.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator very much.

I have one other thing to say, if I may, Mr. President, just to emphasize to the Senate why I, a Senator from Alaska, take such an interest in this.

I ask unanimous consent that this overview I have had my staff make of former Soviet force modernization from the DOD publication Soviet Military Power appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STEVENS. Let me point out that the Japanese Defense Agency's white paper in 1992 has told us that the Soviet Union has steadily built up its military strength in the Russian Far East since the late 1960's. In qualitative terms, Japan states those forces continue to grow.

Mr. President, I can see that land from my State. A lot of people forget that our nearest neighbor is Russia. And we see this constant growth.

Japan points out that pursuant to the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, the CFE Treaty, the former Soviet Union was required to reduce tanks, armored fighting vehicles, artillery, tactical aircraft, and attack helicopters. But what did they do? They did not destroy them. They sent them west of the Urals.

The Japanese report that rather than destroy those weapons, 60,000 pieces of equipment have now been transferred to the Russian Far East—over 7,000 new tanks. That is more tanks than we produce in 10 years. The former Soviet forces in the Far East possess one quarter to one third of the total former Soviet strategic missiles, 36 of approximately 160 army divisions, about 90 of some 270 submarines, around 1,860 of 7,820 tactical aircraft.

In terms of today, the Far East is really the military stockpile. It is their resource base. It is their area of operations now.

The agreements that we entered into cover west of the Urals basically, particularly in terms of the CFE and other such conventional agreements.

In terms of the strategic forces, that reach across from my State, according to the Japanese study, the region contains modernized ICBM's and SLBM's, the new TU-95 Bear H bomber. We see those quite often still. They are capable of carrying the AS-15 air-launched cruise missile with nuclear warheads. There are also approximately 130 TU-22M Backfire bombers with a radius of 4,000 kilometers. That takes you about to Denver. I thought that might get the attention of the Chair.

The forces from Russia in the Far East have a greater capability of presenting a threat to the United States in the West than the ICBM period did to the eastern part of the United States.

In terms of ground forces, the ground forces of the Russian Far East are continuing to build as they have been building even under the Soviets since 1965. As I said, there are 36 army divisions now in the Russian Far East. There is one division which will be reduced to a brigade in Alaska—one. And there is one division in Hawaii.

Now, I think the Senate should understand that those of us from Alaska in particular, but for the West in general, are, or at least should be, watching what is happening in the Pacific.

In terms of naval power, the Pacific Fleet based in Vladivostok is the largest of the naval units. The Pacific Fleet now includes 780 ships, 60 of them nuclear submarines. The Pacific Fleet alone—I am not saying it has the same capability, but in numbers it is larger than the fleet of the United States worldwide. They have the new Akula-class nuclear-powered attack submarine, which carries, by the way, the SSN-21 sea-launched cruise missile.

The insertions I have made demonstrate, I think, what the interest of this Senator is and what I think Western Senators should be and nationally all Senators should be. That is what my amendment aims at.

The moneys that we are pouring into Russia to help Russia make the transition have now freed up additional moneys to modernize their nuclear force in ways that we have not permitted our force to be modernized. As a matter of fact, to the contrary. We have canceled a whole series of systems.

Let me close by reminding the Senate of this. We canceled the small ICBM in 1992. We canceled the Peacekeeper, the rail garrison version in 1992. We canceled the Minuteman in silos, the Peacekeeper in 1992; we canceled Minuteman II. We are currently eliminating all of those missiles. Minuteman III we are de-MIRV'ing all launchers in agreement with START. The B-52 D, G and H, 675 of them, will be eliminated by the end of 1993. The FB-111, 66 of them will also be eliminated. The B-1, we will have eliminated 99 by the end of fiscal 1993.

I do not mean to be misunderstood. We have not eliminated the B-1 entirely but 99 of them will be retired this year. On the B-2, the production of the B-2, as the Senate knows, has been reduced from 130 to 20.

Now, I think we ought to send a message. It is a plain and simple message. It just says, do not let them have this additional \$400 million if they are continuing to build MIRV'd ICBM's at the time we are decreasing our threat to Russia.

EXHIBIT 1

FORMER-SOVIET FORCE MODERNIZATION (Source: DOD Publication, *Soviet Military Power*)

OVERVIEW

The overview Soviet defense burden increased from 12-14% of GNP in 1970, to 15-17% of GNP by the mid-1980s. That figure continued to rise during the Gorbachev years.

1993 military orders are expected to be significantly higher than 1992. And since overall GNP has dropped significantly in the last few years, the overall military burden since 1991 has actually increased.

In contrast, the overall US defense burden increased from 5% of GNP in 1977, to 6.2% in 1985, to 4.5% in 1993. Significantly lower than Soviet spending during the same period.

The former Soviet Union has more strategic nuclear weapons than the US in terms of the number of launchers for ICBMs and submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

It continues to increase the survivability and operational flexibility of its forces, by increasing road-mobile SS-25s, rail-mobile SS-24s and other types of ICBMs, by deploying ballistic missile-equipped nuclear submarines equipped with long-range SLBMs and high target-hitting accuracy, and by improving the capabilities of strategic bombers—including construction of a new TU-160 Blackjack-type bomber.

Non-strategic nuclear weapons also pose a continuing threat on short-range surface-to-surface missiles, medium-range bombers, air-launched cruise missiles, sea-launched cruise missiles, and nuclear shells. Some estimate that the number of non-strategic nuclear weapons may be as high as 30,000.

Ground forces remain large, consisting of about 160 divisions of approximately 1,500,000 personnel and 52,000 tanks; naval forces consist of about 2,460 ships—including about 270 submarines; and air forces include about 7,820 tactical aircraft.

While some former-Soviet forces have decreased in number, qualitative improvements continue to be made across the spectrum. Recent deployments include: new T-80 tanks; Kirov-class nuclear-powered guided missile cruisers; Akula-class nuclear-powered submarines; and state-of-the-art fourth-generation fighters.

STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES

Since the mid-1960s, the Soviets had engaged in a brisk program of strategic modernization while US spending on strategic forces for the most part stayed flat, and even declined at times.

From 1960 to 1990, the Soviets deployed 57 new varieties of strategic systems—including 41 new types of missiles and 11 new classes of submarines. During the same period, the US introduced less than half that number of new systems (26).

From 1979 to 1990 alone, the Soviets added 15 new missile types, including the: SSN-18-M2, SSN-18-M3, SS-16, SS-17-M3, SS-18-M4, SS-19-M3, SSN-17, SSN-20, AS-15, SS-25, SSN-23, SSN-21, SS-24 Mod1, SS-24, Mod2, and the SS-18-M5.

During that same period, the US added only 5 new missiles: the C-4, the Minuteman III, the ALCM, the Peacekeeper, and the D-5.

Contrary to what some may think, production did not decrease with Gorbachev's ascent to power. In 1989, at the height of the Gorbachev regime, the Soviets deployed over 100 new ICBMs, several Bear H and Blackjack bombers, and two new SSBNs.

During the same year, the US added to ICBMs, no bombers, and only one SSBN.

Over the entire decade of the 1980s, the US deployed fewer than 100 new ICBMs. Over the same decade, the Soviets deployed over 900.

From 1981 to 1990, the Soviets maintained a force of over 6,000 ICBM launchers and re-entry vehicles. During that same period, the US maintained only 2,000. Soviet ICBM production actually increased once Gorbachev came to power.

Last winter it was reported that the Russians are now testing four new ICBMs.

From 1981 to 1990, Soviet deployment of sea-launched ballistic missile launchers and re-entry vehicles nearly doubled, with an additional 1,500 being added by 1990. During that same period, US deployments actually dropped by several hundred.

Last winter it was reported that the Russians are now testing two new SLBMs.

In sea-launched ballistic missiles, and in submarines, the Soviets outproduced the US during the 1980s by more than 2 to 1.

Since Gorbachev came to power, the production of long-range cruise missiles rose by a factor of three.

AIRCRAFT

From 1981 to 1989, the Soviets nearly doubled their inventory of inter-continental capable aircraft (such as the Bear, Bison, Backfire and Blackjack). By 1989, they had 100 more such aircraft than the US. During that same period, the US inventory remained constant.

Once Gorbachev came to power, the number of fourth-generation, look-down/shoot-down capable aircraft—such as the MiG-31 and Su-27 Flanker—increased by nearly 40%.

Further modernization continues. In the last two years: flight testing has been proceeding on the MiG-33 and other new fighter aircraft types; an improved version of the Su-27 is undergoing development trials; and development has continued on the Russian equivalent of the advanced tactical fighter, the first Russian plane to incorporate stealth technology.

Throughout the 1980s, Soviet weapon production far outnumbered US production in a number of significant systems. The following chart shows the total number of each weapon produced by the US and by the Soviets during the period from 1979 through 1988:

TOTAL WEAPONS PRODUCED, UNITED STATES VERSUS SOVIET, FROM 1979 TO 1988

	United States	Soviet
Tanks	7,400	25,000
Other armored vehicles	8,900	50,000
Artillery, mortars, MRL's	3,600	19,000
Long and intermediate range bombers	103	400
Fighters/attack aircraft	3,600	6,200
Military helicopters	2,200	4,200
Submarines	40	75
ICBMS, SLBMS	600	2,700
Surface-to-air missiles	19,700	112,000

If you compare the Pre-Gorbachev early 1980s with the Gorbachev-era of the late 1980s, you see no decrease—and actually some significant increases—in the annual production of certain key weapon systems. The following chart shows the average annual weapons production in a number of key systems during the early 1980s and the late 1980s:

ANNUAL SOVIET WEAPONS PRODUCTION: PRE-GORBACHEV VERSUS GORBACHEV

	Pre-Gorb (1982-84)	Gorbachev (1988-89)
Tanks	2,800	3,400
Other armored vehicles	5,400	5,700
Self-propelled field artillery	900	900
Submarines	9	9
Major surface warships	9	12
Bombers	40	40
ASW fixed wing aircraft	5	5
AWACS	2	5
ICBM's	116	140
SRBM's	580	700
Long-range SLCM's	35	200
Short-range SLCM's	980	1100
Surface-to-air missiles	15,000	16,000

Soviet annual production of all of the above weapons systems actually increased or remained constant once Gorbachev assumed power.

During that same period—from 1982 to 1989—US production of the following weapon systems decreased or was zero: Tanks, other armored fighting vehicles, major surface warships, bombers, AWACS, ICBMS, SRBMS, and short-range SLCMs.

While the Soviets/Russians have continually expanded and modernized their forces, the US over the last 15 years has made significant cutbacks in its defense expenditures. The following US Air Force strategic systems have either been dismantled, terminated or canceled since 1977:

US AIR FORCE STRATEGIC SYSTEMS DISMAN-
TLED, TERMINATED OR CANCELED SINCE 1977

Small ICBM: canceled in 1992.

Peacekeeper, rail garrison: canceled in 1992
Peacekeeper, in Minuteman silos: canceled
in 1992.

Minuteman II: currently eliminating all
missiles.

Minuteman III: currently de-mirving all
launchers in agreement with START.

B-52 D, G, and H: eliminated 675 by end of
1993.

FB-111: eliminated 66.

B-1: eliminated 99 by end of 1993.

B-2: production reduced from 132 to 20.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOR-
GAN). The Chair recognizes the Senator
from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise to
commend my colleague from Alaska
for bringing to the attention of the
Senate the continued and robust in-
volvement of the Russian people in the
research and development and produc-
tion of intercontinental ballistic mis-
siles.

As the Senator from Alaska pointed
out, we have tried our best not only by
the START II Treaty but to maintain
the spirit of the START II Treaty. And
keeping with that spirit as he has
pointed out, we have terminated the
MX Missile Program, just cut it out.
We have cut out and terminated the
small ICBM Program, a mobile ICBM.
There are no more Pershing II missiles.
We have reduced the Submarine
Launched Ballistic Missile Program.
As the Senator pointed out, we had in-
tended to produce and procure 130
stealth B-2 bombers. We have decided
to stop at 20. We have stopped the de-
velopment of the advanced cruise mis-
sile.

I believe that we have maintained
our good faith. Even to the recent trag-
edy in Moscow the Government of the
United States painfully supported the
activities of Mr. Yeltsin. And I concur
with the Senator from Alaska. This
measure has \$1.8 billion in aid plus the
\$400 million, a total of \$2.2 billion. This
amendment affects \$400 million of that.

This report is the most troubling
one. It should be a matter of grave con-
cern to all of us. And I would hope that
we would by this means send a message
to Mr. Yeltsin and tell him that we
know that his ICBM forces are intact.
We know that they are very active. We
know that he is still producing, and
that we are not happy about this. I
think the time has come for the United
States to stop being the good boy and
tell our Russian comrades that we will
not go for this nonsense.

If the cold war is to be ended, as all
have suggested, then I think it should
be ended by all parties, not just the
United States.

So if I may, I would like to join my
colleague from Alaska as a cosponsor
of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent.

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

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON].

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I want to
take 3 minutes to comment on an ear-
lier amendment offered by our col-
league, Senator NICKLES, from Okla-
homa. It has an initial appeal. But let
me tell you. It would paralyze the
United States and our ability to work
with the community of nations.

This has a lot of visceral appeal, say-
ing we should not have foreigners com-
manding or in charge of American
troops.

First of all, the amendment goes
back and says that it takes effect
March 1. We just Thursday night or
early Friday morning said we are going
to have our troops out by March 31.
This reverses that by one month, which
does not show a great deal of stability.

But second, Mr. President, the much
more pernicious part is to say without
the direct approval of Congress we can-
not have American forces under the op-
eration of the United Nations or other
countries.

I happen to believe we have way too
many troops in Western Europe half a
century after the war is over. We do
not need that many troops.

What is wrong with having a French,
German, British, Italian, or some other
country NATO commander? Does it
have to be an American? I think if we
want to pull back some in terms of
military efforts we have to recognize
we will have to let other people have
some responsibility. And we cannot
have it both ways.

How many times have we heard on
the floor of the United States Senate
we cannot be the world's policeman? If
we are unwilling to work with other
countries, we take on that burden be-
cause we are the only power that has
that kind of potential. And if we think
that we are going to do this just on our
own and no other nation is going to fol-
low this example, we are fooling our-
selves. Cambodia would not have been
possible. Our action in Somalia, which
I think was great on the part of Presi-
dent Bush, would not have been pos-
sible under this amendment. Cambodia
would not have been possible.

Yes. We do have some problems. Yes.
We are going to have to reexamine.

I have talked with Senator BOREN
and Senator BIDEN about the possibil-
ity of having a small group that would
be authorized, maybe 5,000 or 10,000
troops of volunteers who would be au-
thorized under the direction of the
President to work with the United Na-
tions. But to say that we are not going
to permit unless Congress authorizes it
U.S. troops to work under U.N. oper-
ations is a major step backward. That
legislation should not pass. I hope the
amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Chair recognizes Senator LUGAR.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I speak
in reference to the amendment offered
by the distinguished senior Senator
from Alaska, [Mr. STEVENS]. I speak in
an attempt to really explore the issue
that is involved here.

Senator STEVENS, as the Chair will
recall, has offered this amendment pro-
vided further that none of the funds ap-
propriated under this heading may be
expended or transferred to an eligible
recipient state until 15 days after the
President certifies to the Congress that
the proposed eligible recipient is not
currently engaged in the fabrication
and construction of new road-mobile or
fixed-site land-based intercontinental
ballistic missiles armed with multiple
nuclear reentry vehicles, in essence
MIRV.

Mr. President, the distinguished Sen-
ator from Alaska had reference on sev-
eral occasions during his presentation
of this amendment to the Nunn-Lugar
amendment. I cite, Mr. President, the
national legislative language the law
of the land that was a part of the
Nunn-Lugar legislation. It says:

Assistance authorized by subsection (a)"—
that is the Nunn-Lugar amendment—"may
not be provided for in a year to any country
which is an independent state of the former
Soviet Union unless the President certifies
to Congress for that year that the proposed
recipient country is committed to each of
the following:

Specifically two under that—

Each of the following:

The language says:

Forgoing any military modernization pro-
gram that exceeds legitimate defense re-
quirements and forgoing the replacement of
destroyed weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, it appears to me that
clear on the face of that language de-
velopment of a MIRV'd SS-25 by Russia
would lead to restrictions by the Presi-
dent of any Nunn-Lugar moneys being
disbursed.

I cite all of this, Mr. President, for
purposes of clarification and for pur-
poses of both Senators and staff trying
to work out if we are talking about the
same thing or if in fact this is dif-
ferent, and perhaps during the course
of this debate that exploration will
lead to a conclusion.

I just simply want to say, Mr. Presi-
dent, the senior Senator from Alaska
has indeed not been only a strong sup-
porter of the START I treaty, under
the so-called Nunn-Lugar legislation
which is designed to assist the states of
the former Soviet Union in implement-
ing and indeed accelerating the dis-
mantling and destruction of nuclear
weapons covered by the START treaty,
but he has been a cochairman from the
start of the Arms Control Observer
Group, extraordinarily knowledgeable
about these questions.

Therefore, I want to explore with him
and with others whether the target of
the amendment is a system, real or po-
tential, or whether the target of the
amendment is all Russian strategic

modernization programs. While Russia is developing modifications to existing ICBM's such as the so-called silo-based version of the SS-25—that is an ICBM with one warhead—I have seen no concrete evidence that it is developing any new multiple warhead MIRV'd land-based system. That is the critical distinction, Mr. President.

I am aware that a few Russian publicists have speculated on the possibility of such a development. But an equally well-informed group of Russian publicists have categorically denied it. Officials within the administration also cite the lack of any hard evidence to support such speculation that a MIRV'd SS-25 is being developed.

Although it is not impossible, it is also highly unlikely that Russia would initiate development of MIRV'd ICBM's, because the START II treaty will ban either side from deploying land-based MIRV's. There is no hard evidence that the other recipient states—Ukraine, Kazakhstan, or Belarus—have ongoing ICBM programs. In all likelihood, they lack the capability to pursue such programs. It is my understanding that there may be three ballistic missiles under development—two small single RV ICBM's, and a modified SLBM. The new SSBN may be in the design stage for possible deployment after the turn of the century. It also appears as if Blackjack production has ceased.

If part of the intent in this amendment is to stop Russia from developing the modified single warhead systems, such as the silo-based version of the SS-25, then the amendment could be counterproductive. The START I and START II treaties allow signatory states to modernize their forces, to increase their survivability and strategic stability. The Russians, for example, are allowed to deploy increased numbers of single warhead SS-25 ICBM's because they have limited hard target kill capability and, therefore, are stabilizing. This is particularly true of the road-mobile version of the SS-25.

The Russians have indicated they need to develop such systems to round out their force structure at the deeply reduced levels required by START II, and that SS-25 were important to their strategic requirements. Indeed precisely because START II requires them to eliminate all MIRV'd ICBM's, SS-25 mobile ICBM's become a larger percentage of the residual ICBM force. This issue was discussed at length during the negotiations of START II, and all sides agreed on revisions which limited modernization to stabilizing systems, such as single warhead SS-25's and SLBM's.

If the United States were to attempt to use the Nunn-Lugar assistance as leverage to not only limit Russian strategic modernization, but to exclude it specifically *in a war, toward which we encourage Russia to move, many in the

Russian military industrial complex would likely view this as an attempt by the United States to manipulate Moscow into reducing its forces below its legitimate and arms control substantial requirements. This would be particularly true if the United States were to attempt to pressure Russia to limit its SS-25 force, which is the most stabilizing component from almost any perspective. Such attempts to undermine chances for START II to be ratified and end the force in the near term could also undermine our ability to rapidly conclude and implement additional Nunn-Lugar assistance agreements with Russia that accelerate the pace of dismantlement.

What are some of the more recent steps in the Nunn-Lugar assistance program? In late August and early September, the United States signed three agreements with Russia providing additional assistance under the Nunn-Lugar programs to help Moscow dismantle nuclear weapons and demilitarize its industries.

On August 26, the United States signed an implementing agreement in Moscow with the Russian state committee or defense industry. It commits the United States to provide up to \$130 million to assist Russia in dismantling strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Much of that money will likely go to the United States defense contractors. The equipment the United States plans to provide for this dismantlement includes mobile cranes, cutters, bulldozers for ICBM elimination, shears to cut up submarine ballistic missile tubes, guillotines, forklifts, and tractors for heavy bomber dismantlement.

I make the point that this is not money readily transferable by the Russians to any other program. It is money largely spent with the U.S. defense contractors on very specific equipment that wrecks strategic systems.

In addition, the U.S. assistance will ensure the supply of special railroad cars to transport liquid fuel from retired ballistic missiles, as well as incinerators to burn the fuel.

On September 2, the U.S. and Russia signed implementing agreements committing the United States to provide up to 75 million dollars' worth of assistance in building and operating a fissile material storage facility in Russia. Under the agreement, the United States will also provide up to 10 million dollars' worth of assistance to improve the control, physical protection, and accountability of civilian nuclear material in Russia.

The Nunn-Lugar funding for the facility, which will store plutonium derived from dismantled warheads, will help to pay for such items as light resistors, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, the electric power generation, a physical security system, fire alarm, and suppression systems. Once again, it

is moneys that are not fungible or transferable to the building of any other system. The assistance for the control of Russian civilian nuclear materials is expected to include training and provision by the United States of computer software and hardware.

In summary, it would be very difficult, if not counterproductive, to seek to accomplish, through the Nunn-Lugar program, an objective such as prohibition on SS-25 modernization, that the United States did not seek, though indeed specifically exempted from the arms control negotiating process. Neither President Reagan nor President Bush sought to prohibit SS-25 modernization in the START I or START II treaties. Both saw the SS-25 as a more stabilizing force and sought to encourage single warhead ICBM's in lieu of destabilizing MIRV'd ICBM's.

START II prohibits MIRV'd ICBM's as the most threatening systems, leaving both sides with more stabilizing forces consisting of the SLBM's, heavy bombers and single warhead ICBM's.

Mr. President, the Nunn-Lugar legislation permits Russia to undertake modernization to meet its legitimate defense needs.

It will be cutting off our nose to spite our face if the United States were prevented from assisting the Russians in dismantling destabilizing systems like the SS-18's because they are modernizing the single-shot SS-25's.

The Nunn-Lugar program will accelerate the Russian rate of dismantling the old strategic systems and also provide assistance for the secure storage of fissile material from dismantled nuclear warheads.

Are we really willing to trade off the benefits of slowing or even preventing nuclear proliferation for the safer and secure storage of nuclear material in return for a dubious legislative effort to force the Russians to stop modernizing the SS-25?

The portion of Nunn-Lugar assistance allocated to Russia is unlikely to provide us with sufficient leverage to block a military program that is not limited by any arms control agreement and is deemed essential by the Russian military in meeting legitimate defense requirements.

The Senate needs to think long and hard about this kind of amendment. Russia and the Ukraine are beginning to make substantial progress on the disposition of nuclear weapons currently on Ukraine soil. The United States is poised to conclude Nunn-Lugar assistance agreements with the Ukraine and has started to help in destruction of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles on their soil and the disposition of liquid propellants.

In testimony before the Russian Parliament, the Russian military was supportive of START I and provisionally of START II, partly because the negotiated elimination of their SS-18's was

compensated for in part by the ability to modernize the single warhead SS-25; and its desire during the end game of START II negotiations to preserve some of the SS-18's silos from destruction was motivated, in part, by the need to save money in housing the modernized single-shot SS-25's.

It is of no small importance that in acceding to the Russian desire to modify some SS-18 silos so they might house the single warhead SS-25, the United States secured the right to inspect and to verify silo modification processes.

In short, Mr. President, the difficulty with an all-or-nothing approach is the answer might just as easily be nothing. The object of the START negotiations was not the total denuclearization of the Soviet Union or the United States at that time. Had that been the case, I doubt whether the Senate would have consented to the START I treaty. Rather, the objective was to secure a greater degree of strategic stability at a lower level of armaments and risk.

In addition, the negotiations were designed to push the remaining systems not covered by START in a more stabilizing direction; that is, away from heavy MIRV systems and toward single warhead ICBM's. A degree of modification and modernization was not only permitted, it was to be encouraged in the interest of greater strategic stability.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we are moving ever closer to the formal implementation of the START I treaty. The Nunn-Lugar assistance programs have reached a new plateau with the conclusion of agreements on destruction of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and the safe disposition of the propellants.

The Russian military gained newfound influence and power as a result of the support of President Yeltsin in the recent confrontation with the Parliament.

There is nothing to suggest that if United States assistance in dismantling Russian systems covered by START is restricted or abolished, the Russians will divert resources from their strategic modernization programs in order to compensate for the cutoff of United States assistance in dismantling nuclear systems they agreed to eliminate under START. Indeed, a cutoff or a significant reduction of Nunn-Lugar assistance could well result in a lessening Russian disposition to ratify START II, or even to fully implement START I.

The Russians have demonstrated a propensity to commence the dismantlement of treaty-covered items prior to the actual entry into force and implementation of START. I doubt that this propensity will survive a cutoff or a substantial cutback in the Nunn-Lugar assistance.

Mr. President, the bottom line is that Nunn-Lugar assistance is being of-

fered to Russia and other States of the former Soviet Union not as a favor, but because it is in our own national interest to reduce sooner, rather than later, the nuclear threat facing the United States by the prompt and even accelerated safe and secure dismantlement of nuclear systems covered by the START treaties. That interest exists independent of any Russian modernization program, as long as that program is consistent with the arms control commitments and obligations of the Russian Federation.

Having said all this, I, too, would be concerned for Russia to initiate the deployment of any new MIRV'd ICBM's. The START II treaty will ban either side from deploying land-based MIRV's, although it is important to remind ourselves that the Senate has yet to complete action on the START II treaty.

My difficulty with the specific language of the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Alaska is that it asks the President to certify a negative: That Russia is not doing something. Nevertheless, as an expression of an American interest in proceeding with the mutual de-MIRVing commitments contained in the START II treaty, I am prepared to discuss the amendment with the sponsor, if he is prepared to insert into the proviso some clarifying language with respect to activities of eligible recipients and their arms control commitments.

It is time to get on with the dismantlement of those systems covered by the START treaties, in part with Nunn-Lugar assistance rather than legislatively, to pressure the Russian military serving a major part of the strategic modernization program that has been permitted by the recent Russian-American arms control agreements and encouraged by us.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUGAR. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. I am delighted to have the comment of the Senator from Indiana. I await the words of my good friend from Georgia.

The draft of the language that was suggested by the Senator's staff to our staff was the insertion of language which would make this into a new type of road mobile or fixed ICBM, contrary to the recent contribution under the relevant arms control agreements.

My question is this, and I believe the Senator will agree with me: There is no restriction in any existing agreement against the research, the development, and the production of any new MIRV'd ICBM, is there?

Mr. LUGAR. I am unaware of any.

Mr. STEVENS. There is no such restriction. In other words, the language the Senator's staff suggested makes my amendment just worthless.

Has the Senator some suggestion? I do not like the feeling of having the Senator from Indiana and the Senator

from Georgia, with whom I worked on arms control matters so long, react to this amendment. I will be happy to discuss this.

The Senator has indicated he is willing to make a change that would eliminate the problem he suggests.

As I walked out of here—I had a call to my office—the Senator was speaking; I apologize for that. But another Senator said to me: "You know, this is a matter of employment. The Russians are just keeping people employed."

It is not just keeping people employed, to this Senator, if they are making a new ICBM, modernized, as the Russian general indicated, with highly mobile maneuverability, lower trajectory, and already a more awesome weapon. And he said it was MIRV'd. I understand what the Senator says.

I do not like to put the President in the position of certifying a negative, either. I ask the Senator: How does he do it? I think the spirit of the relationship that I thought we had with the Russians was that neither one of us was going to increase the threat.

If that general is right, they are increasing the threat, as far as this Senator is concerned, and Westerners are concerned, because they are doing it over in eastern Russia. They are not doing it in western Russia. That is my point.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, if I may respond to the Senator's question, I expressed agreement in my statement that if, in fact, production or development of MIRV'd SS-25's was enforced, not only would the Senator from Alaska be concerned, but certainly the Senator from Indiana would be; we all would be. In fact, I quoted from the Nunn-Lugar amendment language which is the law of the land now that simply says that under those circumstances, no moneys can go to Russia, or any of them.

In other words, what I suppose I am attempting to divine is the importance of the amendment of the Senator from Alaska as to how it differs from current law, because we have no disagreement over development of MIRV's.

My point is that if, in fact, the Senator's amendment may somehow restrict Nunn-Lugar funds to dismantle current SS-18's which are MIRV'd, then that is not a very good objective. At least, this Senator has not seen evidence that the Russian are developing MIRV'd SS-25's, despite the report the Senator has cited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Senator NUNN], is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, first, let me say that I agree with the analysis of the Senator from Indiana. But I also would like to add that the Senator from Alaska certainly has raised a question that all of us need to be concerned with.

I agree with the Senator from Indiana that we need to be very careful before we send a message to Russia, particularly the Russian military, we are trying to use Nunn-Lugar funding to achieve something we never have ever achieved in arms control negotiation, because there are already deep suspicions in some elements of the Russian military about our motives in assisting them in getting rid of their weapons.

Well, obviously, we think it is in our interest to help them get rid of their weapons in a safe way. In fact, I happen to believe this may be one of the most important national security issues our country faces now and will face for the next 5 to 10 years.

But the specific amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Alaska, as I understand it, if I have the right copy of it, would require:

That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be expended or transferred to an eligible recipient state until fifteen days after the President certifies to the Congress that the proposed eligible recipient is not currently engaged in the fabrication and construction of new road mobile or fixed-site land based intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with multiple nuclear re-entry vehicles.

Mr. President, first, I would say that, based on the information I now have, the President could make this certification. But I do believe it would be in the interest of all of us to work carefully with the Senator from Alaska to see if we can construct language here that would reflect concern but not come to conclusions about what the Russians may or may not be doing.

The Senator from Alaska was kind enough to give me a summary of a seminar that was held, I believe, in Washington in the spring. As I read this summary, the statement about MIRV'd SS-25 missiles was not made by a Russian general but was, rather, made by a Russian journalist. The journalist was a defense writer and editor of the Russian newspaper "Today."

Nevertheless, I felt it was of sufficient concern to check with the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe the Senator from Alaska has a copy of the letter, dated October 18, I received from the Director of Congressional Affairs for the CIA. I would like to read that into the RECORD.

I am not sure whether the Senator from Indiana has seen a copy. I will send a copy to him so he can view it, too. I believe the Senator from Alaska has a copy.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NUNN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEVENS. I want to say to my friend from Georgia that the Senator from Georgia is correct concerning the one statement which was from Felgenhauer. It was pointed out in the note that there were three senior generals and the deputy chairman of the

Russian State Committee on Defense who were there at the time that Felgenhauer made his specific comment concerning a new multiwarhead, silo-based ICBM under development.

It was General Batenin, a Russian major general, who made the statement that there was a new ICBM, that:

It is not necessary to replace the SS-25 as yet. We plan to continue producing about ten per month, he said, but may have to reduce that. The missile that we call universal is not a new missile but only an upgrade. We are changing some characteristics of the SS-25—its ballistic trajectory and angle of flight. It will be given a low-flying capability. It will have a maneuverable warhead. More throw weight.

Now, that is the confirmation of the military that there is an upgrade of SS-25 being made. We are talking about the development of a MIRV'd weapon, in my mind, and I mention that to make sure we are not talking about the single warhead, which I am sure the Senator from Georgia and this Senator both support the concept of a build-down.

But what bothers me is the feeling throughout the conference that I have referred to with the summaries I put in the RECORD that you have seen. I say to the Senator from Georgia that indicates that there is constant modernization going on in the strategic missile force of the Soviet Union. And while the START agreements do not prohibit the development and production of a new weapon of that type, I believe that our assistance to them is based upon their compliance with the spirit of START, which is a build-down, not a buildup, as far as the maneuverability, the capability of their missile system.

I would call the attention of the Senator to the comment that was made concerning the allocation of resources, for instance, in terms of the Russian system with regard to the level of support that that system is receiving now, which is greater than the Soviets provided, the missile system that they now have, a higher level of support.

And I am looking for that one quote, if you will give me just a moment.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator allow me just to read into the RECORD this letter from the CIA, and I will come right back and yield to him again.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I will. I have not found it yet. I will be back with my quote.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, this letter from the CIA goes directly to the question of MIRV'd missiles, with the multiple warheads being put on the SS-25, as alleged by a journalist at this seminar, not the general. The general, as the Senator from Alaska just mentioned, has stated they were upgrading the SS-25.

But I have to say, Mr. President, that would be the best deal we ever got if they upgrade the SS-25 to keep it a single warhead and get rid of the MIRV'd missiles. I do not think we are asking

the Russians to give up all their missiles. We are saying we want you to get rid of the multiple-warhead missiles. And if we say to them, in addition to that, they are not going to be permitted by the Congress to have an SS-25 upgrade, that is still a single-warhead missile, then I am afraid their response will be, OK, if you do not want us to have a single-warhead missile, we will go back to the MIRV's; we will not get rid of them. Yet that has been our goal for the last 10 or 15 years.

I would prefer the Russians not build any more missiles, but I do not believe we can use Nunn-Lugar money to leverage something that has not been achievable in arms control.

This letter goes directly to the MIRV'd missiles. It is dated October 18, 1993. This was a reply to my inquiry of the CIA. It says:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your questions concerning the allegations by a Russian journalist that Russia is developing a new multi-warhead silo-based ICBM, our information indicates that the Russians are in the process of developing a modified version of the single-RV, road mobile SS-25 class ICBM that will be deployed in both a silo-based and a mobile-version. The Russians have provided the United States with information on both the missile and drawings of the silo modifications. Prior to START, the Russians may have been developing a MIRVed version of the missile. All our recent information points to the fact that both the silo-based and mobile versions of this modified S-25 class missile will be armed with a single RV.

This letter is signed by Stanley M. Moskowitz, who is the CIA's Director of Congressional Affairs.

Mr. President, this does not mean that we should not continue to follow these matters with great interest and with concern and make sure that all of our monitoring is such that we know if there are efforts to put on MIRV'd warheads, because, as the Senator from Alaska said, this would violate the spirit of the START II agreement, even though that agreement has not yet entered into force.

But I do think we have to be very careful about having amendments that seem to assert something is going on in this regard when really all the information we have in our Government is that that is not the case.

I hope we can work with the Senator from Alaska in, perhaps, modifying his amendment to some extent so it would reflect this legitimate concern about the SS-25 and the modernization overall and get some kind of report from the President on this subject. I do not believe we ought to agree to the amendment as it is now constructed, but I would be pleased to work with the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Indiana to that end.

I also would like to reaffirm something the Senator from Indiana said. The Nunn-Lugar legislation, at the very beginning to the present, requires an annual certification by the President that each recipient—and this

would include Russia—is not modernizing strategic weapons beyond legitimate defensive requirements and is adhering to its arms control commitments.

While the Senator from Alaska is correct that the START II agreement has not yet entered into force, I would think any President would certainly note with alarm any development in Russia that would, basically, contravene the basic element of START II, even though it has not been ratified. And that would certainly include if any information came to our intelligence community or otherwise came to the attention of the President that there was a MIRV'ing effort underway on the SS-25. I think that would certainly contradict the spirit of START II and I would think it would preclude the President, if he came to that conclusion, from certifying to us that they are only developing things that meet their legitimate defensive requirements and are adhering to their arms-control commitments.

I might also say that this question of the Russians continuing to spend money on their defense needs as they view them is of concern to all of us. It is a concern to all of us who want Russia to succeed in converting to a market economy and a democracy and participating in the family of nations. This pertains not simply to Nunn-Lugar money, it pertains to all economic aid.

The problem, as we all know, is the Russians are addicted to military production. They have cut back dramatically. They have cut back about 75 percent of all their military production. But they are continuing to emphasize some of their nuclear developments, without any doubt. That is about all that they have left, in terms of being a superpower. It also is a source of employment in Russia, given the bad shape of the Russian economy.

I think we ought to emphasize for the record here that the Nunn-Lugar money has certain restrictions beyond what I have already related.

No. 1, this legislation, which was sponsored by Senator LUGAR, Senator WARNER, Senator DOMENICI, myself, Senator BOREN and others in 1991, had in mind the kind of concern expressed by the senior Senator from Alaska. We required that a recipient of the Nunn-Lugar assistance must facilitate U.S. monitoring of all Nunn-Lugar-funded programs. We required a recipient must not use fissile material and other weapons components from dismantled weapons in new weapons. We also required that to the extent feasible, Nunn-Lugar funding should go to U.S. firms and U.S. technology.

That, in fact, has happened to date. Nunn-Lugar funding has been used primarily to provide Russia with Kevlar blankets manufactured in the United States, with fissile-material-monitor-

ing technology produced in the United States, with high-technology containers for fissile material produced in the United States, with specialized equipment for destroying missile launchers that is produced in the United States.

These are priorities that make sense from Russia's point of view and from our point of view. If the Russians engage in a large military buildup at any time in the future, we certainly would have to reexamine the basic premise, not only of this program but also of the entire economic assistance program.

However, to date, there is really no indication that this has happened, although there is indication they are continuing to give high priority to their nuclear program and particularly giving high priority to those programs that are going to replace the MIRV'd missiles that they are getting rid of or plan to get rid of under the START II agreement.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. President, that for a long time this country had the goal of getting the Russians to give up their multiple warhead missiles and to go to a single warhead missile for a lot of reasons, but mainly because those multiple warhead missiles are much more of an offensive threat. They particularly lend themselves to a surprise attack. And they make our own retaliatory capability much more vulnerable.

The theory has always been and still is that a single warhead missile, when targeted against other single warhead missiles in this country, would not provide the country firing first with a significant advantage. However, MIRV'd missiles are much more dangerous offensively and also much more tempting targets for preemptive attack because they have tremendous offensive power.

I hope the Senator from Indiana and I would be able to discuss this with the Senator from Alaska and determine if we can express his legitimate concern in an amendment that is somewhat modified from the present pending amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I obviously would be pleased to work with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Georgia. I want to point out, though, in the CIA letter, as I understand it, they have expressed the situation as I understand it, that prior to START the Russians may have been developing a MIRV'd version of the missile. That was the statement.

I understand the authorization legislation is, as the Senators from Georgia and Indiana have both indicated, designed to try to make certain that what I believe is happening should not happen; that is that the Russians are modernizing their strategic force while we are decreasing our spending on our strategic force. At the meeting I at-

tended, that I previously discussed, when the subject came up I was very surprised. I found at least two of the gentlemen there had spent several months this past year in Russia and came away with a feeling that everybody knows that Russia is building a new MIRV'd ICBM.

It is a fact that the last information we have about the Russian strategic nuclear force is that in 1989—those are the last figures I have, the authorization committee may have later figures—during the Gorbachev regime, at the height of the Gorbachev regime, there was a deployment of 100 new ICBM's.

They had a robust development period going on. We added no ICBM's during that period and we added no new bombers. They had several new bombers and 100 new ICBM's. In the period of just last winter it was reported the Russians are now testing four new ICBM's.

I would only reiterate what I have said, and I think the Senator from Georgia said it: If in fact the CIA has the capability of producing the information, the President could very easily certify, if it is so, that they are not. However, the group that I was with, all of whom are very distinguished students of the Soviet and Russian system, indicated a strong belief that there was in fact a modernization going on over there in their strategic force that we did not know about.

My objective here is twofold. One is to raise the issue and get the Senate, particularly our arms control group, to think about what is happening if, as a result of our making this money available to Russia to meet some of their costs of complying with the START agreements, Russia is able to free up money to increase the status of their strategic force, while we have to cut the moneys—and this bill does cut the money for our strategic force. Then I think we are shooting ourselves in the foot.

Again, I point out—this is what I was looking for—again, it was a reporter and editor of Today, "Segodnya," a Russian publication. He is their No. 1 defense writer, acknowledged by the CIA and others as being their No. 1 defense writer.

He says the strategic rocket force has preferential treatment. Eighty percent of their ranks are filled. Their combat readiness is the highest of the Russian military. And he is the one who reported that there is a new, multiple warhead silo-based ICBM under development.

That violates the existing law. That violates Nunn-Lugar, I believe.

I ask my friends from Georgia and Indiana, if what the editor of the Russian Today magazine says, that the Russians are in fact developing a new multiple warhead silo-based ICBM, that violates the Nunn-Lugar provisions now? Does it not?

Mr. NUNN. I believe it does in two different ways. One is, when you sign an arms control agreement, even though it has not been ratified, it carries with it certain international obligations to comply. So it is beyond simply the spirit. There are international obligations that flow.

Also, under the Nunn-Lugar legislation, I will say to my friend from Alaska, I do not remember the exact words—I quoted them a moment ago—where the President has to say not only are they complying with arms control agreements, but they are not spending their money on things that go far beyond for what they need for defensive purposes.

I think under either one of those he would have to alert us to this. I would think the President himself and the administration would be very alarmed if this allegation proves to be accurate.

Mr. STEVENS. I join the Senator. My purpose is to raise that alarm, to see if these people who reported to us are correct. The problem is, as I understand the Nunn-Lugar legislation, there is no triggering device in there. There is nothing that says cut off this money if you find A, B, C, D or E.

If the Senator wants to turn this around and, instead of dealing with a negative, say that if the President finds that the CIA should make a report and based on that report the President finds any of these conditions exist, then the moneys cannot be spent, I am willing to go that way. I do not want to put the President in a position of certifying a negative. Obviously, the CIA cannot prove a negative. But the CIA can have a report to show the President whether or not the conditions that the Nunn-Lugar legislation presumed, and I think the spirit of the START agreements presumed, and I think the Senate believes are no longer prevailing, then I do not think we should give them the money.

It does seem to me someone ought to raise the question and get it to the level of some sort of review that says: What are they doing in terms of this money?

This one report about the extension of a line of credit for 3.5 trillion rubles to the military. I am told that was some \$35 billion at the time that line of credit was opened. That is a substantial amount of money to flow to the military at the time when the three of us were in Russia and we had reports of starving, of real unemployment, of lines being formed and seeking assistance.

I do not think we ought to drive their economy, but we certainly ought not to allow our moneys to be used to pay for bills in a manner that frees up more money to go into modernization at a time we have to cut our modernization in order to provide that money.

Mr. LUGAR. If the Senator will yield for a moment, the Senator makes a

constructive suggestion in terms of the President alerting us. It appears to me that under the Nunn-Lugar legislation, every year there has to be a certification. So there is a triggering, in essence, of an annual examination. Beyond that, the Senator makes a good point. If the President of the United States finds they are producing MIRV's, SS-25 MIRV's, then that ought to trigger instantly the prohibitions of the Nunn-Lugar amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. I will be happy to work with the two Senators on that basis. My feeling is this: This group of distinguished people came to us. And I see the distinguished minority leader is on the floor now, Senator Dole. We listened, and I might say, with some great surprise at their conclusions based upon their personal examination. I asked at that time, and Senator Dole subsequently received a further series of quotes and backup information that led them to their conclusions.

If the Senator wishes to have our staffs work up an amendment which is positive rather than certifying a negative, I am entirely in accord with that. I just think somehow someone ought to be telling the CIA and the Department of Defense: "You ought to listen to some people." If these people have been over there 6 months and come back and tell us the Russians are producing a MIRV'd ICBM, someone ought to be listening to them.

That is my purpose here is to see to it and, by the way, I have with me three of the publications that come from this group that we listened to. It is the Global Affairs publication. I found the one, in particular, that dealt with the printing of the report of the International Security Council conference, from which I have quoted, to be very, very illuminating as far as the attitude of some of these people concerned about the extent of the modernization of the Soviet rocket force.

Mr. LUGAR. I will just indicate for the distinguished Senator, Senator Nunn and I will be happy through our staffs to work with the distinguished Senator's staff. I think we can fashion something that brings this alert and achieves the Senator's purpose.

Mr. NUNN. I share that, and I will be glad to work with the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask that the pending amendments, that is, the committee amendment and then the two other amendments, be set aside for the purpose of Senator BROWN pre-

senting four amendments. I believe that some of them may be capable of being accepted without a vote, and unless there is objection from the manager of the bill, Senator BROWN would like to present his four all in one sequence. There is no objection to that as far as I am concerned.

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

The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1053

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that Somalia should be treated as a combat zone for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to offer an amendment. I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1053.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section—

"SEC. . (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the President should declare that service in Somalia during the period described in subsection (b) should be treated as service in a combat zone.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is the period beginning on December 10, 1992, and ending on the date on which withdrawal from Somalia of all forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in Somalia has been completed, as declared in a proclamation issued by the President.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, the amendment is a sense of the Senate. It is not an attempt to change statutes. But the concern lies with the designation of Somalia as a combat zone.

As I think Senators are well aware, there is a provision in our Tax Code that offers special tax treatment for those military personnel who serve in a combat zone, specifically section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. This provides assistance primarily for enlisted personnel, although it does apply in some areas to commissioned officers. And it provides some tax relief for those who serve in that area.

Currently, we have 30 who have died in Somalia with 170 wounded. While those numbers are not huge in terms of our conflicts, they are significant in terms of proportion of personnel that have been deployed there. At the height of deployment, over 26,000 Americans were overseas in that combat zone. By November 7, the Pentagon now estimates that 20,715 Americans will be on their way to or in Somalia. We have had one POW, who, thankfully, has been returned.

Madam President, I offer this amendment because I think the combat zone application in my mind does apply to this area. It is a way not only of providing assistance that exists in our tax law for those who have served our country so nobly but also recognizes those people. The tax-exempt status applies to the first \$500 of gross income, so it is not major. But psychologically, I think it is very important to recognize the men and women who served our country in this troubled part of the world.

This, as I have said, is a sense of the Senate. It is not an attempt to legislate. It does leave the decision in the executive, but I think the Senate by going on record lays a foundation for the executive to recognize these young men and women who serve us so well.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I am pleased to speak in behalf of Senator STEVENS and myself, and we are prepared to accept this sense-of-the-Senate amendment. We think it is quite overdue.

If the Senator from Colorado will yield, is it not true that we provided the same treatment, IRS treatment, to those men and women who served in Desert Storm?

Mr. BROWN. I believe that is correct. It did apply to those who served in Desert Storm, and as the Senator knows, some have served in Somalia a greater period of time than those in Desert Storm.

Mr. INOUE. If those men and women in Desert Storm had this treatment, then the men and women in Somalia should get the same thing.

So we have no further discussion, Madam President. We are ready to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1053) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BROWN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1054

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress an annual report on the cost to the United States of transporting supplies for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by sea on vessels of the United States or belonging to the United States pursuant to section 2631 of title 10, United States Code)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1054.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report containing information on the cost of the United States of transporting supplies for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by sea on vessels of the United States or belonging to the United States pursuant to section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, including the amount of the cost savings that could have been realized if such supplies had been transported at competitive international shipping rates available from non-cargo-preference vessels. The annual report shall cover a cargo preference year which shall be a 12-month period defined by the Secretary.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, the subject of cargo preference is one that this Chamber has debated on a number of occasions. I think the Chamber has made its feelings clear on it.

While I would prefer not to have cargo preference, it is clear that the majority of Members do wish some sort of cargo preference. I know that the administration is at this point studying alternative ways to effect assistance to our merchant marine and ensure that we have adequate sea transportation in times of crisis, which has been the basic reason for cargo preference.

We found in researching the issue that the Defense Department simply was unable to come up with the cost of cargo preference. They did not keep accounts in a way that allowed them to identify the cost that was involved in this particular program. As strange as it sounds, we literally have a program that has a significant impact on the taxpayers where the books simply do not reveal how much is involved in it. Whether you like cargo preference or have concerns about it, as I do, it seems to me it is in our interests to know what is involved here.

It appears that it is a multimillion dollar program each year of enormous significance. My belief is that the administration will find alternatives to cargo preference, or at least modifications that will allow them to improve the effectiveness of the program.

As all Members are aware, cargo preference, while it has been in existence, has seen a rapid drop in the number of American-flag vessels, thus the stated purpose of cargo preference has not been achieved, that is, of preserving a viable merchant marine for times of emergency. All that is a way of saying whether you like cargo preference or do not like it, there may well be efficient, effective ways to improve the program and modern size it.

Yet the foundation of that, the basis of that, is knowing how much the program costs. This amendment is quite straightforward. It simply requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an an-

nual report on the cost. It will give us the information that I think is needed to modify or improve the program. It is simply calling for a report on the cost of this program on an annual basis.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, the managers of the bill would appreciate it if we could have some time to prepare a modification of this measure if that is OK with the Senator. May we set this aside temporarily?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1055

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning hearings on the commitment of U.S. troops in Somalia)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1055.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section—

“SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON THE COMMITMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS IN SOMALIA AND HAITI.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) Public hearings are essential in ensuring broad-based understanding of and support for United States policies;

(2) Since United States troops were committed in Somalia, the original humanitarian mission has been significantly expanded to include nation-building, as evidenced in United Nations Security Council Resolution 814;

(3) Since the commitment of United States troops in Somalia, the Senate of the United States has received only update briefings or has held closed hearings on United States actions there and has held only one public hearing;

(4) To date, thirty United States troops have lost their lives since United States troops were committed in Somalia;

(5) Since the most recent disaster where 18 Americans lost their lives, 76 were wounded and 1 was captured, the President has announced his intention to commit several thousand additional United States troops;

(6) Six American warships sit off the coast of Haiti and six hundred Americans wait to be deployed as part of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) the appropriate committees of the Senate should hold public hearings at the earliest practical date with the Secretaries of State and Defense as witnesses on the commitment of United States troops in Somalia and Haiti as members of the United Nations peacekeeping force; and

(2) the appropriate committees should promptly hold investigative, public hearings on the October 3, 1993, incident in Mogadishu, Somalia in which 17 American soldiers were killed and at least 76 were wounded as part of the United Nations peacekeeping operation.

MR. BROWN. Madam President, the amendment is a sense of the Senate that hearings should be held on Somalia. There are two provisions in the resolve clause; one that asks for hearings, and a second provision that specifically urges an inquiry into the events of October 3 where 17 Americans lost their lives.

This amendment is offered out of my concern that we have not had the proper inquiry from the Senate's point of view into the events in Somalia. This is a concern that existed for 9 to 10 months, starting with the Bush administration.

Early, when President Bush asked for or announced his plans to send troops to Somalia, I asked for hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. One such request was turned down, but another was honored. Hearings were scheduled. And the Bush administration, the day before the hearings were scheduled, sent up a request that they be canceled, that they were not available. Thus, we went ahead with this major deployment without hearings, and most important, I think, without getting a clear handle on what it was the U.S. plan would be and what we would be doing there.

Unfortunately, this has proceeded on. We have had very great difficulty in having the Secretary of State come to the Foreign Relations Committee. It is my understanding that the Armed Services Committee has not yet had an open hearing on this subject. This amendment before us would not mandate their appearance, would not force the committees to have hearings. But it would at least have us on record with a sense of the Senate that those hearings ought to be done.

I see them as fulfilling our primarily constitutional requirement in this area. That is to make sure we know and understand what the plans are and, most importantly, I hope, help us ensure that we will not go ahead with deployment of U.S. troops in combat areas without a clear, discernible mission.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters pertaining to this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, December 1, 1992.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, DC.

HON. JESSE HELMS,
Ranking Member, Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND SENATOR HELMS: The situation in Somalia is tragic. The country is filled with thousands of armed bandits and dozens of Somali warlords. There is no civil authority and no government. Many have described it as a country in utter chaos. The result is extreme suffering by the Somali people.

The great tragedy unfolding in Somalia is one that the American people strongly empathize with. The U.S. must continue its humanitarian efforts there. However, it would be a mistake to send U.S. combat forces to Somalia without a clearly defined military mission or without the strong support of the American people. Any decision to commit America's brave servicemen and women must have the full and complete backing of our nation.

In other conflicts in our country's modern history, our troops were committed without the full support of the American people. I am convinced that one of the reasons for the great success of Operation Desert Storm was the large volume of national support.

Consequently, it is imperative that our Committee convene hearings at the earliest opportunity to understand current plans for U.S. forces in Somalia and to explore other possible alternatives. Congress must not abdicate its responsibility to be intimately involved in the commitment of American troops to conflict situations.

Please feel free to contact me if I can be any assistance in ensuring our Committee's earliest action.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1993.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, DC.

HON. JESSE HELMS,
Ranking Member, Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND SENATOR HELMS: The great tragedy in Somalia is one with which the American people strongly empathize. Our humanitarian efforts have greatly helped these starving men, women and children. Yet, our troops still remain in Somalia without the benefit of a clear American policy propounded by the Administration or a Congress that has carefully reviewed that policy.

The recent reports of riots in Somalia directed against the American troops there underscore the need for the active support of the American people for our military men and women who are in Somalia. In addition, their willingness to sacrifice their lives demands that we provide a set of clear goals that outline when our troops have accomplished their mission.

It is us, the Nation's legislators together with the country's policymakers, who must take the lead in defining our mission in Somalia. To date, our Committee has held no hearings nor marked up any legislation on this vital issue.

With events there deteriorating, it is imperative that our Committee convene hearings at the earliest opportunity. The goal of these hearings must be a clear exposition of current plans for U.S. forces in Somalia. As mentioned in my December 1, 1992 request for hearings on this same subject, we in Congress must not abrogate our responsibility to be intimately involved in the commitment of American troops.

Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any assistance in ensuring our Committee's earliest action.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 9, 1993.

HON. HANK BROWN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR HANK: Thank you for your letter concerning the situation in Somalia.

The Senate, as you know, has acted on a resolution authorizing the U.S. military presence in Somalia, and it is my understanding that the goal is to turn over ongoing responsibilities to a U.N. force by May 1. Unless something goes awry between now and May 1, I am satisfied that the U.S. role has been satisfactorily defined and limited.

I am, however, concerned that the Somalia operation may serve as a precedent for other interventions. Consequently, I am giving thought to holding a hearing on Somalia as a case study for intervention in disintegrating nation states. I would welcome any thoughts you may have on that subject.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 6, 1993.

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: More than nine months ago, I wrote asking that our committee hold extensive hearings before U.S. combat troops were committed to Somalia. Instead, we were provided numerous closed-door briefings.

A few months later, I again wrote asking that we hold extensive hearings. Nonetheless, not until July, 1993 did our committee hold a public hearing on the commitment of U.S. troops to Somalia. Only an Undersecretary of State and the Director of Operations for the Joint Staff testified. Neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Secretary of State has appeared before the Senate to specifically discuss the commitment of American troops in Somalia.

Today, some of America's finest young men and women are risking their lives for our Nation in Somalia. Without a full, public vetting of the many complex issues concerned with the commitment of U.S. troops and without clear authorization by the Congress, the early euphoria for a humanitarian commitment in Somalia has evaporated.

We owe these young men and women and their families a full, public debate of our commitment in Somalia. Such a debate rightly should begin in our Committee with a hearing attended by the Secretaries of State and Defense.

Please let me know what I can do to assist in scheduling extensive hearings on Somalia at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, the managers have studied the amendment and we find no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1055) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BROWN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the debate in the Senate today on the fiscal year 1994 Defense appropriations bill takes place at a time of crisis in many areas of the world.

The debate in the Senate today is not about just another defense bill. The importance of this bill increases in the context of post-cold war global instability, as seen in Somalia, the Balkans, and Haiti, and the potential threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The decisions the Congress makes today will determine the ability of this Nation in the future to play an effective role in world affairs and to protect our own security and that of our friends and allies.

Of particular importance, then, are the decisions of this body as we attempt to reconcile our local and special interests with our legitimate national security needs—all within the limited dollars of a declining defense budget. We have entered a time when every special request, every special interest item, every bit of pork, can only come at the expense of direct national security requirements of the United States.

Even in this time of uncertainty, we continue to cut the defense budget and the military forces of this Nation. Real defense spending has been cut steadily every year since fiscal year 1985. According to a recent estimate by the Congressional Research Service, we have cut defense spending, in constant 1994 dollars, from \$388 billion, in fiscal year 1985 to \$278 billion in fiscal year 1993. We plan to cut the defense budget to \$263 billion this year.

During last year's Presidential campaign, then-candidate Clinton pledged to cut the defense budget by \$60 billion over 5 years. Now, the defense plan sub-

mitted to Congress earlier this year projects cuts which are nearly double that amount. The Clinton administration plans to cut spending to \$234.1 billion by fiscal 1998. This is a total cut in real defense spending of roughly 43 percent—in only slightly more than a decade.

Because of these huge funding cuts, we are forcing hundreds of thousands of men and women out of the military. Our defense industrial base is being cut to the bone. We are accepting compromise after compromise in our military capabilities. The United States has eliminated all programs to modernize our strategic deterrent forces, even though a great degree of uncertainty exists as to the status of such programs in the former Soviet Union. We are cutting readiness, and some aspects of our forces are rapidly becoming hollow. We have already taken our peace dividend. There are no spoils left for the Congress to divide.

The new strategy and force posture just announced by the Clinton administration represents the first try in an attempt to deal with some of these problems.

Yet there is a very serious problem in the Bottom-Up Review—namely, dollars. Even if the Congress never spent one dime of the defense budget on pork and special interests, we could not afford to pay for the force posture called for in the Bottom-Up Review with the funds that the Clinton administration has allocated in its future years defense plan [FYDP].

Secretary Aspin himself has already admitted that his program is underfunded by \$13 billion in the Clinton future years defense plan. But this shortfall increases to \$38 billion as soon as we consider the fact that the Congress has already reversed President Clinton's pay freeze and money will have to be found to pay for the congressionally mandated pay raise. The shortfall grows to \$78 billion when we add in the cost of unrealistic savings assumed from procurement and management reform.

This funding shortfall, however, is only the tip of the iceberg.

I have a very strong suspicion that, if the experts in the Office of Management and Budget or in the DOD Comptroller's Office were free to speak, they would agree that the force structure in the Bottom-Up Review, if properly costed, would require at least \$100 billion more outlays over the future years defense plan than are currently programmed. I urge President Clinton to seek the advice of these experts in his administration and plan ahead to set aside sufficient funding to ensure our Nation's security.

Yet, consider the appropriations bill we are now debating. Money that is vitally needed for defense programs goes to special interests, foreign aid, and programs that have nothing to do with

defense at all. This is not a new problem. Nor is it solely the fault of the Congress; the President's budget requested funding for foreign aid and peacekeeping programs in the defense budget. And I should also note that this is not a problem exclusive to the defense budget. Madam President, I trust that my colleagues have seen an article carried in the Washington Post on Sunday, October 10, 1993, which criticized the practice of congressional earmarks of Federal tax dollars for special interest projects. The article provides additional background for the points I am making today. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1993]

FUNDS FROM FRIENDS IN HIGH PLACES

(By Mary Jordan)

ANCHORAGE.—Near neat rows of colorful single-engine planes here is a small beige aviation building that is angering scientists, federal agencies, even Vice President Gore.

The Federal Aviation Administration—despite begging not to have to spend government money this way—must pay \$6.8 million to remodel it. Scientists rant that this shows how American scientific research increasingly depends not on what you know, but which member of Congress you know. Gore railed against the expenditure in his report on government waste. His recommendation: "Terminate it."

Nonetheless, a taxpayer-funded Airway Science Program for University of Alaska students will soon be taught inside the building, thanks to the growing practice of "earmarking" academic grants by a group of powerful members of Congress.

"It's robbery. I don't know what else to call it," said Joe B. Wyatt, chancellor of Vanderbilt University and chairman of the Association of American Universities. "There is a new recognition among scientists that this is not free money going to these midnight, earmarked projects. . . . It's money coming right out of competitive science funding."

Earmarked projects win approval not by a public evaluation of their merits but by an influential member of Congress adding a sentence or two to the fine print of a spending bill. Often, only the sponsor knows the funding is in the bill when Congress approve it, that is, until it is time for the groundbreaking ceremony back home. A cabal of House and Senate members on the Appropriations committees who have the best access to changing the fine print of spending bills are responsible for most of the money that is spent this way.

Federal academic grants are intended to advance scholarly research, but when they are approved through earmarkings, they can fund such parochial projects as a new college program in Alaska, a food marketing center in Pennsylvania and a planetarium for a small town in Michigan.

While Congress long has used earmarkings, or "pork politics," to secure highways, bridges and other pet projects, earmarking is a 1980s and '90s phenomenon when it comes to scientific and academic research. One of the reasons the United States excels in academic research, scholars say, is because the money for it is awarded in a peer review process.

Under peer review, the agency spending the money selects a panel of independent experts to evaluate a proposal. The panel looks at the proposal's scientific merits and the qualifications of those proposing it.

This never occurs in earmarking. Rather, as in this case, Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) simply makes certain that \$6.8 million is set aside for the Alaska Airway Science program in an FAA appropriations bill. That then diminishes FAA's pool of available money for projects that won approval on their merits.

"It's a good use of money for the nation," Stevens said of the \$6.8 million to get a new Airway Science Program off the ground in his state.

AUDITORS DISAGREE

But outside auditors conclude it is not. In May, the Department of Transportation's inspector general said the program, already located at 37 schools, has "not achieved its objective." It was started in 1982, in the wake of the air traffic controllers strike, to bring well-trained young people to the field.

The inspector general's office found that between 1983 and 1989, the FAA hired more than 8,000 people, yet only 41 of them were Airway Science graduates.

That means that the government—which has so far spend more than \$100 million on this program nationally—paid more than \$2 million to train each person it hired, said Raymond J. DeCarli, assistant inspector general for auditing. Gore's report also concluded that the government did not need to be subsidizing the private aviation industry.

BROWN FIGHTS BACK

Ten days ago, Rep. George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.), chairman of the Committee on Science, Space and Technology, threatened a showdown on the House floor unless 25 earmarked projects—ranging in cost from \$75,000 to \$60 million—were forced to undergo peer review.

"The members of the Committee on Appropriations, having seen that they can get away with \$10 million, go for \$50 million the next year, and \$150 million the following year," said Brown, who long has warned that pork-barrel projects are destroying the future of American science.

In a signal that he means to make colleges that take the projects uncomfortable, too, Brown last month called officials to Washington from two prestigious universities: Tufts and Columbia. Both Tufts and Columbia pay the lobbying firm Cassidy and Associates to help them get earmarks, making it more difficult to pinpoint which congressional member worked behind the scenes for the schools. The use of lobbyists, some of whom formerly were staff members on Appropriation committees, also adds to the frustration of those who oppose earmarks.

Brown estimated that about 170 of the nation's more than 4,000 two- and four-year colleges have received earmarked funds. "What do they have in common?" he asked. "They all have friends in high places."

On principle, some schools, including Vanderbilt, Cornell and Harvard, reject projects funded by earmarking. Some members of Congress do not go near them either. But others, such as Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Sen. Mark O. Hatfield (Ore.), the committee's ranking Republican, seem to vie for who can add more. Byrd recently secured \$41 million for Wheeling Jesuit College, a small school in his home state that has an annual operating budget of \$14 million. Hatfield has sent so many earmarks over the years to Oregon Health Sciences University

that the current tally is around \$100 million for that school alone.

Stevens, the most senior Republican on the Appropriations subcommittee that oversees defense spending, is not far behind. He, too, makes no apologies for helping make his state, which has about the same number of residents as the District, rank at or near the top when it comes to getting academic earmarks.

FAA PAYS A PRICE

Along with the taxpayers, the FAA also pays a price. "For every \$1 million we sent to Airway Science, we have a little bit less of every thing we do," said FAA spokesman Herb McLure.

Even though earmarks are widely disdained by federal officials, many said in interviews that they are reluctant to talk about them, because the project's sponsor sits on the Appropriations committee and has direct control over their budgets.

Brown's investigation also found that some agencies increasingly have been forced to spend money on projects far afield from their mission. For instance, more than \$100 million has been taken out of the Department of Energy's budget to build hospitals.

One particularly curious earmark in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget is \$8.75 million for Delta College to build a planetarium in Bay City, Mich.

Many people, including NASA officials, question the federal use of such a facility. Beyond that, they ask why it would be placed in a two-year community college that does not offer a major in astronomy or even in general science. Bay City is the home of former representative Bob Traxler (D-Mich.), a longstanding member of the House Appropriations Committee.

When agencies complain, it seems to make no difference. The FAA asked the House and Senate Appropriations committees not to support any more Airway Science grants in fiscal 1993. In response, the committees directed \$30 million more to the program.

"It frightens me to think we might continue this trend," Wyatt said of the non-scientific process for awarding science grants. "It undermines the process that has made American science great." He said that nearly \$600 million of the estimated \$760 million earmarked for scientific projects last year was "stolen" from merit projects.

McLure and other aviation officials said this does not mean that the Airway Science Program and other earmarked programs are necessarily bad. Many said the University of Alaska program, for instance, has a very good reputation.

But that is not the point, according to the scientific community, federal agencies, Brown and Gore. The big question is why the government—especially now, when it is so strapped for cash and considering new taxes—is funding them.

IN DEFENSE OF EARMARKS

Vern C. Oremus, dean of the University of Alaska's college of vocational education, insists it does make sense for the government to give aviation training a boost. His reasoning, he said, is that Ford Motor Co. and other companies donate new model cars for training automotive students, but airplanes and flight simulators are far more expensive and harder to come by for aviation students.

Oremus said he has a good program in dire need of cash, and he knows other colleges are getting government help. "We identified an opportunity and went for it," he said. "That's the American way, isn't it?"

The federal grant will allow the school to double in size to 1,000 students and transform

the small, beige building at the edge of a landing strip. In the spring, construction is to begin on classrooms and an instructional control tower. Flight simulators, radar screens and massive maps for the tracking of incoming planes will be installed. The state is putting up matching money.

Stevens said earmarking is one of the only ways less-established colleges such as the University of Alaska have a chance of snaring funds against centuries-old places like Harvard.

But other members of Congress say that is an unacceptable excuse. What earmarking is doing, they say, is turning money meant for the national good into a local jobs program.

In the 1992 defense spending bill, Stevens added \$25 million for a "supercomputer for arctic research" that will mean new jobs for Fairbanks. In discussing possible strategic and environmental uses of the expensive computer, Stevens described it as a wonderful new tool that might even "harness the power of the aurora borealis." Skeptics call it "Porkpie in the sky."

Mr. McCAIN. The article is entitled "Funds From Friends in High Places, Schools' Congressional Earmarks' Leave Less for Other Science Efforts."

I have chosen today to focus my comments on the problem as it has consistently arisen in the defense budget review process.

Mr. President, in the Congress, we have a process. The system gives the authorizers the responsibility of reviewing the overall defense budget and determining the priorities and maximum funding levels for the programs requested by the President. The appropriators are charged with the responsibility of financing those priorities within the available funding. But the system is no longer working as it should. The Congress has allowed the appropriators to essentially usurp the role of the authorizers and add funding above authorized levels and even create new programs and provide funding for them. The system is broken.

As I have said, this is not a new problem. Consider our recent history. At my request, the Congressional Research Service looked at the past 4 years of congressional action on defense budgets, comparing the programs requested in the President's budget with the authorized and appropriated levels. What this report shows is that in many cases the administration did not request funding for a project, neither the House nor Senate Armed Services Committee approved funding for the project, neither the House nor Senate Appropriations Committee acted to fund a project—yet remarkably the Department of Defense appropriations conference report was returned to the Congress with funding for the project.

I will admit that pork is in the eye of the beholder and I admit some congressional add-ons are less onerous than others. These distinctions may be useful to some, but my own view is more simple and clear cut. Any funding that is not authorized and is an add-on should be subject to the same scrutiny given all other programs in the authorization review. That is the process that

the Congress is supposed to follow. Let us look at a couple of the most egregious examples included in the Congressional Research Service report on last year's congressional action on the defense budget.

There were \$25 million of defense dollars appropriated to purchase C-20 aircraft for the Coast Guard. This non-defense program emerged out of the conference meetings on the Department of Defense appropriations bill. Again, I want to emphasize, not authorized, not appropriated. It comes out of a conference of a few members of the Appropriations Committees getting together. It was never vetted through either House of Congress in any bill that was returned for a final vote.

Here \$10 million was set aside for natural gas vehicle technology, a civilian program with dubious connection with defense needs. Again, this emerged from the appropriations conference with the legislative earmark specifying the demonstration sites for this new technology were to be established in California and Hawaii.

There was \$80.7 million added in the appropriations conference to procure the multiple launch rocket system for the Army National Guard. I am sure this may be a meritorious defense program. It was not in the administration's request or the authorization. It was in neither of the appropriations bills going into the conference. I question whether the Guard's requirement for the MLRS should be given priority over the needs of active Army units.

There was \$5 million set aside for the purchase by the Department of Defense of 1,502 acres of land owned by the Coast Oyster Co. in Washington State. Was this decision based on a valid military requirement for these tidelands? I wonder.

Here \$40 million was earmarked and the Navy was required to pay for cost overruns on two TAGS ships. I might add on the two TAGS ships, the issue was in court, under litigation between the Navy and the contractor, and the Congress decided to pay \$40 million in cost overruns for these two ships without letting the process continue.

These are just a few of, in my view, what are the most outrageous examples of dark-of-the-night, wink-and-a-nod deals to set aside scarce defense dollars for Members' special interest programs. The fact is there is no such thing as free pork. Every add-on requires an offset from some other program. Often these tradeoffs are difficult to identify readily but if and when American troops are required to put their lives on the line in defense of this Nation's interests, the dangerous effect of pork barrel politics will become very obvious. We cannot afford it anymore.

Let me point out another thing, Madam President. At the same time we can spend \$5 million to purchase 1,500

acres of land from the Coast Oyster Co. in Washington State, we tell thousands of young men and women who joined the military for a career that they have to leave the military because we cannot afford to keep them. We cannot afford to keep people who volunteer for the military for a career but we can pay these kinds of money, of which this is a very small example, for projects that are unrequested by the administration, unauthorized by either committee, unappropriated by either committee, and inserted in the appropriations conference.

Over 4 years, the Congressional Research Service calculations show, the Congress added \$28.7 billion for unauthorized and often unrequested defense programs: \$28.7 billion in 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993. In short, as our national defense budget dropped steadily during those 4 years the Congress spent nearly \$30 billion on unauthorized activities and programs, on pork barrel projects, and on other special interests.

I want to repeat, I am sure that \$30 billion had very much needed and worthwhile projects. I can also assure the critics of my presentation here that for every single program that they find was necessary, I can find two that were totally unnecessary and cannot be justified.

Again, I am not attacking specific projects. I am attacking a system that is not working because when these appropriations are added in a conference from which emerges a report which is unamendable, which can only have an up-or-down vote from the Members of both bodies of Congress, then we do not play a role in the decisionmaking process. All we do is ratify or reject.

Madam President, I came here with some defense experience and I deserve to have more of an input in the process than what we are getting from this process. As part of the same study discussed above, the Congressional Research Service compiled a list of legislative earmarks in Department of Defense appropriations bills over the past 4 years. For example, in fiscal year 1993 the appropriators included the following language in the Department of Defense appropriations bill:

\$7 million shall be made available only for the environmental cleanup of the National Presto Industries' Eau Claire facility.

I do not know what the environmental cleanup of National Presto Industries has to do with national defense, and it may have a great deal to do with it. But none of us knew about it until it appeared in the bill.

\$100,000 shall be made available only to connect Lowry Grove Mobile Home Park to the St. Anthony, Minnesota Municipal Water Supply System.

Someone will have to explain to me what the Lowry Grove Mobile Home Park has to do with this Nation's defense needs. There are numerous other examples. These may, indeed, as I said,

be very meritorious projects and deserve Federal funding, but not defense dollars.

When the Congress micromanages to this extreme, specifically earmarking millions of defense dollars to improve a mobile home park in Minnesota, something is terribly wrong. Every time we act with this kind of specificity some other project that may have been requested and authorized—and most important is essential to national security—goes unfunded. We do not have an unlimited number of defense dollars. It is wrong, whether the project is in Minnesota or California or Arizona. Defense dollars are intended to enhance national security, not domestic comfort. The congressional budget review process is designed to prevent this kind of abuse. Let us abide by our own process.

When will this cycle end? When will this body have the courage and integrity to exercise fiscal discipline and stop making appropriations for unauthorized items?

I have proposed a number of solutions to these problems. I support a line-item veto to prevent the abusive and unwarranted spending of taxpayer dollars to support the political careers of Members of Congress. I support an amendment to the Senate's rules to establish a point of order against bills which include appropriations for programs which are not authorized. I support any measure which would prohibit earmarking of Federal funds for a particular district, institution, or special interest project. And I support opening to the public all meetings of conferees on appropriations bills, since this is the forum in which many of these special interests projects are agreed upon.

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN assumed the chair.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, this year's Department of Defense appropriations bill, passed by the House, certainly does nothing to limit the earmarking of scarce defense dollars for home district projects. Indeed, that bill rises to new heights or sinks to new depths of earmarking.

Madam President, the House set aside \$6.5 billion of defense dollars for special-interest, noncompetitive projects at bases, universities, and other institutions in Members' home districts. In other words, the House of Representatives, in this bill, gave its Members \$6.5 billion in unnecessary and unneeded projects.

Let me briefly tell you about a few of those earmarked projects in the House, in the other body's appropriations bill for next year. The other body earmarked every dime—every single dime—of the \$236.5 million in funds intended to assist in transitioning our defense industries and personnel to commercially viable endeavors. These dollars are allocated to specific

projects at designated sites: universities, institutions, and other earmarked recipients. While many of these projects may be worthy of such an investment, their merit should be weighed against all other applicants for these scarce dollars.

I wanted to point out again, all of us support this terrible transition that companies and corporations and States, such as the Presiding Officers, are having to go through. Earmarking all of the funds is not the way to do it. We should give the money to the Department of Defense. Let the Department of Defense on a competitive basis decide where these moneys go.

There is \$2.3 million set aside for cell adhesion molecule research. For the benefit of my colleagues who did not get that: \$2.3 million set aside for cell adhesion molecule research. Aside from the obvious question of the defense-related requirement for such a medical research program, I suspect that the specific language included in the House bill matches only one institution in this entire Nation, although I do not yet know which institution that might be.

Let me read that language to my colleagues. This is from the bill:

The research is to be done at a nonprofit foundation in the Northeast by an integrated team of scientists with extensive experience in the molecular analysis of the immune system. The scientific team must have extensive experience in the identification and analysis of cell adhesion, signal transduction pathways, cytokine production, and gene regulation.

Madam President, I am willing to bet my next month's paycheck that there is only one institution in America that will meet that criteria.

Up to \$50 million is directed by the House to be spent for environmental cleanup of an abandoned mine at the Penn Mine site in Calaveras County, CA. Why are defense dollars being used to clean up old mining operations?

I ask unanimous consent that approximately 150 pages of data be printed in the RECORD listing all of the earmarks in the House Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF HOUSE EARMARKS
(In billions of dollars)

Title	In HAC bill	Earmarked
I-Mil pers	71.3	NEG
II-O&M	73.8	.3
III-Procurement	45.7	3.1
IV-R&D	36.5	3.1
V-Revolving	1.6	NEG
Other	11.2	NEG
Total	240.1	6.5

SASC AMENDMENT PROHIBITS THE FOLLOWING

1. Defense conversion R&D earmarks, \$236.5M.
2. Defense conversion O&M earmarks, \$239.9M.

3. Unknown amount of university earmarks.

4. SERDP earmarks, \$61.0M.

5. Environmental restoration earmarks, \$7.4.
Known earmarks: \$1,614,669,000.
Possible earmarks: \$1,463,792,000.
Total earmarks: \$3,078,461,000.

Reserve Personnel, Navy (HA Report p. 55)

Total appropriated: \$11,653,200,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: 0
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$16,100,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$16,100,000.

Description of known earmarks: NA.
Description of possible earmarks:
Craft of Opportunity Program \$3,200,000 (O&M includes an additional \$2,000,000 to support this.)

Four P-3 squadrons \$12,900,000 (O&M includes an additional \$20,400,000 to support this.)

Reserve Personnel, Air Force (HA Report pp. 55, 56)

Total appropriated: \$729,019,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: 0
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$723,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$723,000

Description of known earmarks: NA.
Description of possible earmarks:
WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance Squadron \$723,000 (O&M includes an additional \$1,884,000 to support this.)

Four P-3 squadrons \$12,900,000 (O&M includes and additional \$20,400,000 to support this.)

O&M REMARKS—HAC FY 1994 DOD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

National Task Force on Counterterrorism (HA Report p. 25-26)

Total appropriated: \$5.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: \$5.0 million is provided only to "establish a national task force to review federal programs on fighting terrorism."

Environmental Restoration, Defense (HA Report p. 31-34)

Total appropriated: \$1,716,800,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$7,400,000.
Description of known earmarks:
"\$2,800,000 to be used only for the cleanup of two abandoned missile sites (Titan 1 Missile Complex No. 1B and Titan 1-C) located at Beale Air Force Base in Northern California; \$4,600,000 to be used only for surface decontamination of Castner Range at Fort Bliss, Texas."

Olmstead Air Force Base Restoration Project (HA Report p. 33; bill p. 10)

Total appropriated: \$5.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: "... the Committee has recommended that \$5,000,000 be made available in Title II, Operation and Maintenance, Air Force appropriation, for any necessary action on Phase II remediation projects, Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Formerly used Defense Sites (FUDS) eligible projects, or any matter related to past Air Force use that will result in expedited remediation and subsequent deleting by EPA of Olmsted as a superfund site."

Penn Mine site, California Cleanup (HA Report p. 31)

Total appropriated: Not clear where earmarked funds come from.
Subtotal of known earmark: Directs DOD to spend up to \$50 million for cleanup of this site.

Description of known earmarks: "The Committee notes that a number of mine sites exist that since the late 1800s supported the Nation's war efforts by supplying strategic minerals and which were operated under directives from the federal government. Many of these sites are abandoned. It has been demonstrated that these sites generate acid mine drainage that pose threats to the environment. The Committee directs the secretary to undertake a cleanup program at the Penn Mine site located in Calaveras County, California. . . . The Committee directs that up to \$50 million be used for this cleanup."

Defense Conversion (HAC Report p. 40-41)

Total appropriated: \$239.9 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$153.9 million.

Description of known earmarks:
Southeastern PA Consortium for Information Technology and Training (\$3.5 million).
Western Michigan University School of Aviation Sciences/Fort Custer Industrial Park (\$6.0 million).
Illinois Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program (\$.125 million).

Monterey Institute Center for International Trade at Fort Ord (\$9.0 million).
California State University system at Fort Ord (\$25.0 million).

Renovation of the State Pier at New London, CN (\$14.9 million).

Conversion of Homestead AFB (\$10.5 million).

Miami Dade Community College at Homestead AFB (\$15.4 million).

California Statewide Economic Development Network (\$12.5 million).

San Diego State University Center on Defense Conversion (\$7.0 million).

San Francisco State University California Economic Recovery and Environmental Restoration Project (\$3.0 million).

Hampton University/Hughes Aircraft Aerospace Institute (\$15.0 million).

Mare Island and Charleston Shipyard Conversion/Reuse Studies (\$2.0 million).

Worker Retraining for Environmental Restoration at Mare Island, CA (\$10.0 million).

Displaced personnel retraining in gerontology (\$10.0 million).

Demolition and environmental cleanup of Century Brass Products' dormant factory in Waterbury, CN (\$20.0 million).

National Guard Youth Programs (HAC Report p. 65; Bill p. 14)

Total appropriated: \$10.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$500,000.

Description of known earmarks: "\$500,000 shall be available for the Youth Education Town Center, a multilingual, multimedia video-based health education program which would be accessed through the Los Angeles education network. The National Guard shall serve as administrator of the funds, which shall be allocated to the Los Angeles Unified School District's magnet, academies and other programs."

Presidio of San Francisco (HAC Report p. 70)

Total appropriated: \$300,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$300,000.

Description of known earmarks: "\$300,000 to utilize the San Francisco Conservation Corps to conduct natural resource protection activities at the Presidio of San Francisco."

Automatic Building Machine Shelters (HAC Report P. 70-71)

Total appropriated: \$7.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2.0 million.

Description of known earmarks: "\$2 million to construct equipment maintenance facilities using the automatic building machine technology."

Voice Maintenance Instruction Device (VMID)
(HAC Report p. 71)

Total appropriated: \$950,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$950,000.
Description of known earmarks: "The VMID is a voice synthesis system that provides safety and basic maintenance instructions for both combat and combat support vehicles. The Army is requested to test this device by conducting an operational evaluation on vehicles such as the HMMV, M-109A3, FASSV, and 2.5- and 5-ton trucks."

Supplemental Fuel Carrying Capability (SFCC)
(HAC Report P. 71)

Total appropriated: \$10.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: "The (SFCC) is a concept for a proposed requirement for an additional organic on board refuel capability on Abrams tanks to increase their operation/range and lessen the burden on the fuel resupply system. The concept envisions a portable fuel container and also applies to other vehicles . . ." The Committee recommends an additional \$10 million to purchase portable fuel containers."

Conversion of the USNS Chauvenet (HAC Report p. 75)

Total appropriated: \$8.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: "The Navy, in consultation with the Maritime Administration shall continue the conversion of the ship, USNS CHAUVENET, to a training ship for the Texas Maritime Academy's Training Program. Of the funds appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, \$8 million shall be used to complete this conversion."

Women in Military Service for America Memorial (HAC Report p. 80)

Total appropriated: \$9,538,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$9,538,000.
Description of known earmarks: "\$9,538,000 to make the necessary repairs, restoration and preservation of the entrance structure and adjoining areas of the Arlington National Cemetery in conjunction with the construction of the Women in Military Service for America Memorial."

Civil Air Patrol Operations (HAC Report p. 81; Bill section)

Total appropriated: \$11,679,000 (\$1,750,000 above the budget request.)
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$11,679,000.
Description of known earmarks: "\$11,679,000. . . funds to operate the CAP."

Special Operations Forces (HAC Report p. 83)

Total appropriated: \$22.9.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$22.9.
Description of known earmarks: "The Committee has provided an additional \$22.9 million to support the RC SOF units restored in SOF force structure."

Natural Gas Demonstration (HAC Report p. 83)

Total appropriated: \$1.5 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1.5 million.
Description of known earmarks: "The Committee recommends an additional \$1,500,000 for the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense, Acquisition, for natural gas vehicle refueling infrastructure planning for military bases."

Defense Logistics Agency (HAC Report p. 83)

Total appropriated: \$1,380,825,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$20.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: "The Committee recommends an additional \$20,000,000 only for an Automated Document Conversion System for the Defense Logistics Agency."

Defense Personnel Support Command (HAC Report p. 83)

"The Committee directs the Defense Procurement Agency to increase its purchases of Jumbo, Colossal, and Super Colossal ripe olives in future solicitations for ripe olive purchases."

Schools on Military Installations (HAC Report p. 84)

Total appropriated: \$10.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10.0 million.
Description of known earmarks: "The Committee directs that not less than \$10,000,000 provided for Operation and maintenance accounts be utilized to bring federally owned education facilities on military installations up to acceptable health and safety standards."

Admiral Nimitz Museum (HAC Report p. 85)

"The Committee requests the Department to provide assistance in the expansion of the Admiral Nimitz Museum to honor those men and women who fought in the Pacific during World War II."

Army Reserve Facility, Marcus Hook, PA (HAC Report p. 86)

Total appropriated: \$1,750,000.
Subtotal of known earmark: \$1,750,000.
Description of known earmark: "[Army Reserve] Units assigned at Marcus Hook [PA] should be relocated within a one-hundred mile radius of Marcus Hook or incorporated with the parent reserve or active unit, as soon as it is feasible. The Committee has provided \$1,750,000 for this move."

C-130H Operations (HAC Report p. 91)

Total appropriated: \$3.0 million.
Subtotal of known earmark: \$3.0 million.
Description of known earmark: "The Committee has provided \$3,000,000 above the request for the Air National Guard operations and maintenance account. The Committee directs that these funds be used only for the operations and maintenance for the C-130H operational support aircraft located in South Carolina and Louisiana. The Committee directs the National Guard not to transfer these aircraft from their assignments during fiscal year 1994 and beyond."

Naval Air Warfare Center, Warminster (HAC Bill, p. 8)

Total appropriated: \$350,000.
Subtotal of known earmark: \$350,000.
Description of known earmark: "Provided, That \$350,000 shall be available only to connect residences located in the vicinity of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Warminster, to the Warminster municipal water supply system."

Tactical Interim CAMS and REMIS Reporting System (TICARRS-92) (HAC Bill, p. 9)

Total appropriated: \$15.5.
Subtotal of known earmark: \$15.5 million.
Description of known earmark: "Provided, That \$15,500,000 shall only be used to operate, maintain and enhance the Tactical Interim CAMS and REMIS Reporting System (TICARRS-92)."

Defense Conversion (HAC Report P. 41)

Total appropriated: \$236,491,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$236,491,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$236,491,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends that the following conversion projects be funded in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide appropriation in the Dual Use Technologies program element. DD Form 1414 shall show them as items of special congres-

sional interest, a funding decrease to which requires prior congressional approval:

CFC Free Refrigeration Technology Project, \$800,000.

Demonstration of Shipboard Material Handling Systems at port Arthur, Texas, \$2,000,000.

American Center for Education in Plastics and Rubber Technologies, \$12,500,000.

Drew Medicine and Science Health Occupations Retraining Demonstration Project, \$2,000,000.

Midwest Regional Centers for Advanced Technology Development, \$20,000,000.

Far West Regional Office Technology Transfer Project, \$316,000.

Renewable Electric and Renewable Thermal Utility Demonstration Projects, \$25,000,000.

Ocean Thermal Power Plantships Technology Project, \$8,000,000.

St. Louis Manufacturing Extension Program, \$1,000,000.

Center for Photochemical Sciences Stereolithography Technology Program at Bolling Green University, \$5,000,000.

Center for Advanced Control Systems Technology Project, \$10,000,000.

Queens Hall of Science's "Discovery Lab" Project, \$10,000,000.

Lahey Clinic Ambulatory Surgical Research Project, \$3,000,000.

New York Regional Manufacturing and Engineering Center, \$5,000,000.

Miami Health Technologies Science Center Defense Reinvestment Project, \$3,000,000.

Tucson Defense Conversion Project, \$900,000.

Joint Arizona Center for Manufacturing and Training (JACMET), \$1,500,000.

Curved Plat Technology Project in Norfolk, Virginia, \$60,000,000.

Joint Army Ammunition Plant Transfer Project, \$75,000.

Southeast Health Professional Training Center at Mt. Sinai Medical Center of Miami, Florida, \$3,000,000.

High Technology Center of Rochester, New York, \$6,000,000.

Magnetically Levitated Transportation prototype test track, \$22,000,000.

USF/DOE Pinellas Technology Deployment Center, \$20,000,000.

Devise Independent Multi-Media Universal Interface System for Medical Information Management, \$1,400,000.

Ben Franklin partnership and Industrial Resource Center, \$14,000,000.

Total R&D, \$236,491,000.

Defense Conversion (HAC Report P. 42)

Total appropriated: \$8,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends that the following conversion project be funded in the Procurement, Defense-wide appropriation. DD Form 1414 shall show it as an item of special congressional interest, a funding decrease to which requires prior congressional approval. Pinellas DOE plant equipment, \$8,000,000.

Environmental Medical Unit (HAC Report P. 192)

Total appropriated: \$1,200,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,200,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,200,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$1,200,000 for an environmental medical unit research project at the

University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio, Texas, aimed at researching Persian Gulf War veterans experiencing a disabling syndrome possibly related to low level chemical sensitivities.

Post Polio Syndrome Research (HAC Report P. 193)

Total appropriated: \$1,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$1,000,000 for a research study project on the orthopaedic effects of post polio syndrome to serve as a model to investigate the overuse of muscles, ligaments, bones, and joints for the purpose of curtailing military training and work place injuries. Requirements for conducting this study project should include a facility or institution which has a well established orthopaedic post polio program with a patient base of at least 200 patients; researchers experienced in orthopaedic rehabilitation; a gait and motion analysis laboratory with multichannel dynamic electromyography capabilities; isokinetic muscle testing facilities; and an on-site orthotocis department.

Breast Cancer Research (HAC Report P. 193)

Total appropriated: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$10,000,000 is included for a demonstration and measurement program to evaluate the significance of both the ultrasound and full breast digital imaging technologies.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee also directs the Department of the Army to award, on a competitive basis, grants of \$5,000,000 each to three geographically dispersed medical institutions which offer new advances in applied research and model systems of health care delivery for breast cancer, including early detection, prevention, treatment, education, and community outreach.

Hypoglycemia Research (HAC Report P. 194)

Total appropriated: \$1,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends an additional \$1,000,000 only for a joint venture project involving a Western Pennsylvania educational institution to develop and test a new form of insulin which will prevent hypoglycemia in dependents of active military members.

Medical Development (Navy) (HAC Report P. 194)

Total appropriated: \$37,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$37,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$37,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee has added \$37,000,000 only to the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program, a special interest program within the Navy Medical Research and Development account, to continue national donor recruitment programs, expand formal international agreements with foreign donor registries, and advance research that will continue to improve the tissue typing procedures for matching patients and donors. Of

this amount: \$12,400,000 is to be made available to the Navy Medical Research and Development Command's C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program for continuing its department-wide donor recruitment effort and to maintain its research program for the development of state-of-the-art DNA tissue typing technology; and

The remaining \$24,600,000 will be provided by the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program to the NMDP, through its continued grant from the Navy Medical Research Development Command, for donor recruitment and education activities.

Center of Excellence in Breast Cancer (HAC Report P. 196)

Total appropriated: \$5,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 to establish a Center of Excellence in Breast Cancer at the National Naval Medical Center.

Cell Adhesion Molecule Research (HAC Report P. 196)

Total appropriated: \$2,300,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2,300,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,300,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends an increase of \$2,300,000 to defense-wide research and development only for cell adhesion research. This research, which is non-university related, is important to the Department of Defense for readiness of military personnel. Specifically, the goal of this research is for the Department to work with a nonprofit foundation in the northeast to understand the role of cell surface adhesion molecules in inflammatory reactions such as allergic rhinitis and atopic allergic conditions. The overall hypothesis is that the expression or activity of specific cell surface adhesion molecules contributes to certain inflammatory reactions. This immunological research should be performed by an integrated team of scientists with extensive experience in the molecular analysis of the immune system. In particular, the scientific team must have extensive experience in the identification and analysis of cell adhesion, signal transduction pathways, cytokine production, and gene regulation.

Health Care and Biomedical Engineering Technology (HAC Report P. 196)

Total appropriated: \$4,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$4,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee has provided \$4,000,000 above the President's budget request in Medical Advanced Technology (PE0603002D) and directs the Department to provide this funding only to Sandia National Laboratories to develop a plan to systematically identify and apply those defense related technologies and support technology transfers that can contribute to reduction of health care costs and improvements in health care for our citizens and the services. The Committee directs that this initiative be jointly managed by Sandia and appropriate medical research centers.

Laser Weapons Technology (0602307A) (HAC Report P. 200)

Total appropriated: 5,510,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2,500,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends: \$2,500,000 only for solid-state dye laser program; and \$2,500,000 only for the high powered diode laser program.

Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology (0602601A) (HAC Report P. 200)

Total appropriated: 54,494,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$15,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$15,000,000 is only for future land vehicle technology as proposed by the House Armed Services Committee.

Weapons and Munitions Technology (0602624A) (HAC Report P. 200)

Total appropriated: 38,794,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$4,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$38,794,000, an increase of \$4,000,000 only for two projects at the Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant as proposed by the House Armed Services Committee.

Electronics and Electronic Devices (0602705A) (HAC Report P. 200)

Total appropriated: 27,400,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$27,400,000, an increase of \$8,000,000 to the request. This includes: \$3,000,000 for battery research as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee; and \$5,000,000 only to initiate an effort for preliminary fuel cell systems design and to advance component technologies involving weight reduction, improving thermal management and the use of liquid fuels. This effort supports lightweight power to increase the survivability and lethality of the individual dismounted soldiers.

Environmental Quality Technology (0602720A) (HAC Report P. 201)

Total appropriated: \$68,729,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$43,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$43,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$68,729,000, an increase of \$47,500,000 to the request. This includes the increases of \$43,000,000 as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee, as follows: \$24,000,000 for industrial product development, of which \$20,000,000 is only to continue a joint Defense/Agriculture project, \$2,000,000 is only for bioremediation technologies, and \$2,000,000 is only for acceleration of environmental activities at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL); \$10,000,000 only for Unexploded Ordnance remediation at Jefferson Proving Ground; \$5,000,000 only for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence; and \$4,000,000 only for the Bioremediation Education, Science and Technology Centers (BEST).

Environmental Quality Technology (0602720A) (HAC Report P. 201)

National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE):
Total appropriated: \$68,729,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends an increase of \$5,000,000 only for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE) bringing its effort to not less than \$10,000,000.

Environmental Quality Technology (0602720A) (HAC Report P. 201)

Facility Environmental Management and Monitoring System (FEMMS):

Total appropriated: \$68,729,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$4,500,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee also recommends \$4,500,000 only for an initial phase of the development of a Facility Environmental Management and Monitoring System (FEMMS) demonstration testbed program at Tobyhanna Army Depot for the integrated and comprehensive management and control of Environmental issues at Army facilities. The program will be performed in conjunction with the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE).

Logistics Technology (0602786A) (HAC Report P. 202)

Cold Pasteurization/Sterilization Techniques for Meals-Ready-to-Eat:

Total appropriated: \$32,953,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 only for the Army to continue its research on the establishment of cold pasteurization/sterilization techniques for meals-ready-to-eat. This research should be continued by the institutions that are currently working with these technologies as a result of last year's Defense Appropriations Act.

Logistics Technology (0602786A) (HAC Report P. 202)

Quality Quantification and Enhancement of Combat Rations:

Total appropriated: \$32,953,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 only to continue the Quality Quantification and Enhancement of Combat Rations program started last year.

Logistics Technology (0602786A) (HAC Report P. 202)

Water Chiller/Heater Kits:

Total appropriated: \$32,953,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$500,000 only for the Army to develop diesel powered potable water chiller/heater kits for M149A2 Tank Trailers and XM1098 Water Tank semitrailers. This project will fulfill a need identified by United States forces during the Gulf War, and in Somalia, for a reliable chilled water delivery system. It will also improve support for troops deployed in cold climates as well as provide a means for heating Meals, Ready to Eat (MREs).

Logistics Advanced Technology (0603001A) (HAC Report P. 202)

Munitions Packaging:
 Total appropriated: \$14,913,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 only to continue the program started last year to investigate future ammunition packaging technologies for all Services. The Committee expects the Army to develop a long term funded program to exploit more efficient ammunition packaging technologies. In addition, the Committee directs that \$300,000 of the funds provided for this effort be used to pursue the Army's effort with industry providing government furnished equipment and raw materials to pursue injection-molded plastic technology development.

Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology (0603004A) (HAC Report P. 203)

Total appropriated: \$30,790,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$13,500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$13,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$30,790,000, an increase of \$13,500,000 as follows: \$7,500,000 only to continue the Army's lethality technology programs, such as KE precursor technology to defeat the future explosive reactive armor threat, Electro-Thermal-Chemical (ETC) cannon caliber high energy density compact power supply development efforts; \$5,000,000 only to continue the development of the XM-982 155mm Extended Range Artillery Projectile; and \$1,000,000 only for the Army's Cannon Caliber Electro-Magnetic Launcher program for a total program of \$2,500,000.

Electronic Warfare Technology (0603270A) (HAC Report P. 203)

Total appropriated: \$32,833,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$4,300,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,300,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$32,833,000, an increase of \$4,300,000 only for the Stringray Advanced Technology Demonstration program and associated simulation efforts.

Line-of-Sight, Antitank (LOSAT) (0603654A) (HAC Report P. 203)

Total appropriated: \$25,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for LOSAT in fiscal year 1994 and encourages the Army to aggressively pursue LOSAT technology effort in order to reach EMD in fiscal year 1996.

Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Technology (0603772A) (HAC Report P. 203)

Total appropriated: \$33,746,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,800,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,800,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$33,746,000, an increase of \$2,800,000 only for the development and evaluation of Common Ground Station concepts, technologies, and prototypes for use with the JSTARS program.

Armament Enhancement Initiative (0603639A) (HAC Report p. 204)

Total appropriated: \$.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$21,400,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$21,400,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends an additional \$21,400,000 only to continue concept exploration of the X-ROD program. Since X-ROD is an autonomous, guide-to-hit, horizontal attack munition used against maneuvering, exposed targets, the Committee believes that the Army should continue to pursue the technologies involved in both the guide-to-hit and propulsion systems.

52 Caliber, M109 Self-Propelled Howitzer System (HAC Report P. 204)

Total appropriated: \$.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$18,700,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$18,700,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends an additional \$18,700,000 only to initiate the development and operational testing required to type classify a XM 282 variant 52 caliber, 155mm unicharge cannon fitted with a semi-automatic loading system.

Army Data Distribution System (0603713A) (HAC Report P. 205)

Total appropriated: \$19,757,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee has included an increase of \$8,000,000 in research and development costs associated with upgrades to the Army Enhanced Position Location Reporting System.

Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (0603746A) (HAC Report P. 205)

Total appropriated: \$10,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee believes that the Army should continue the effort begun in fiscal year 1993 and has provided \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1994.

Aviation—Advanced Development (0603801A) (MAC Report P. 205)

Total appropriated: \$16,259,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,446,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,446,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$16,259,000, an increase of \$5,500,000 over the request. Of the amount recommended, not less than \$10,446,000 shall be available only for Project DB45, Aviation Life Support Equipment, with the increased funding to be applied to the aircrew integrated ensemble (\$3,700,000) and the aviation integrated common helmet (\$1,800,000).

Logistics and Engineer Equipment—Advanced Development (0603804A) (HAC Report P. 205)

Laser Vibration Sensing System:
 Total appropriated: \$19,695,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 only for research on bridge, overpass, and highway structural integrity assessments using laser vibration sensing technology. The research is to be conducted under the aegis of the

Army's Belvoir RDT&E Center, Bridge Division, in addition to and complementing its ongoing work on the structural integrity of bridges, overpasses, and highways.

Aircraft Avionics (0604201A) (HAC Report P. 205)

Total appropriated: \$15,061,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recognizes the need to digitize the avionic systems of the Army's scout and attack helicopter fleet in order to horizontally integrate ground and aviation assets. Accordingly, the Committee recommends \$10,000,000 to begin these upgrades. The Committee requests the Army to prioritize its requirements and to include its plan to utilize the \$10,000,000 in the report on Horizontal Battlefield Integration. Out-year funding data should also be included.

Electronic Warfare Development 90604270A) (HAC Report P. 206)

Total appropriated: \$84,953,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$24,500,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$24,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 only for the performance of the testing necessary for use of the Graphite/PEI composite heatsinks in the Advanced Tactical Radar Jammer (ATRJ) and other advanced electronics programs.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$22,500,000 for the development of the countermeasures transmitter (ECM) subsystem for TACJAM-A.

All Source Analysis System (ASAS) (0604321A) (HAC Report P. 206)

Total appropriated: \$15,971,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: Of the additional funds provided by the Committee, \$6,000,000 is only for continuing the upgrade of the communications and intelligence capabilities of the Army's existing Single Source Processor—SIGINT (SSP-S) and continuing the development of a light-weight, portable equivalent for support of contingency operations and low intensity conflict activities.

Heavy Tactical Vehicles (0604622A) (HAC Report P. 206)

Total appropriated: \$2,476,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$2,476,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 only to expand the effort started last year to develop, fabricate, and test a series of Palletized Loan System (PLS) flat racks necessary for engineering equipment and a Heavy Repair Vehicle which makes use of the PLS chassis.

Advanced Command and Control Vehicle (AC2V) (0604640A) (HAC Report P. 206)

Total appropriated: \$28,654,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$28,654,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 above the budget request. Within the additional \$20,000,000 fund-

ing provided, \$2,000,000 shall be available only for integration of the vehicle intercom systems and mission module.

Engineering Mobility Equipment (0604649A) (HAC Report P. 207)

Total appropriated: \$16,404,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,100,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,100,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$16,404,000, an increase of \$3,100,000 only for Heavy Assault Bridge Program.

Automatic Test Equipment Development (0604746A) (HA Report p. 207)

Total appropriated: \$23,472,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$23,472,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 above the budget. The Committee directs that the additional funding provided for this program only be used to develop test program sets for the Apache Longbow and Kiowa Warrior.

Aviation—Engineering Development (0604801A) (HA Report p. 208)

Total appropriated: \$11,033,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,300,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,300,000.

Description of known earmarks: *Army Aircraft Concurrent Engineering Test and Evaluation Center:* The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 only for a study to establish the requirements for an Army Aircraft Concurrent Engineering, Test and Evaluation Center.

Description of possible earmarks: *Aviation Life Support System:* The Committee recommends \$9,033,000, an increase of \$3,300,000 over the request which shall be applied only to the aircrew integrated helmet system P31 and microclimatic cooling system projects within Project DC45.

Weapons and Munitions—Engineering Development (0604802A) (HA Report p. 208)

Total appropriated: \$30,365,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks:

Advanced Rocket System: The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 only for the Army's portion of the joint Advanced Rocket System (ARS) program.

120mm Mortar: The Committee recommends an addition of \$5,000,000 only for development of a 120mm mortar training round.

The Committee recommends \$6,303,000, the fiscal year 1994 budget request, only for the Bunker Defeat Munition.

Combat Vehicle Improvement Program (0203735A) (HAC Report P. 209)

Bradley Fighting Vehicle Upgrade:

Total appropriated: \$137,572,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$33,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$33,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Army requested \$45,964,000 to initiate the development of the A3 model Bradley and phase 1 of the core electronics and intervehicular information system. The Committee supports this effort which will make Bradley modernization compatible with the M1A2 upgrade program and recommends an

additional \$33,000,000 only to accelerate this effort.

Combat Vehicle Improvement Program (0203735A) (HAC Report P. 209)

M1 Abrams Tank Upgrade:

Total appropriated: \$34,600,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$34,600,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$34,600,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends an additional \$34,600,000, as follows: \$14,600,000 to further support the Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (TO&E) efforts and an accelerated Milestone III decision; and \$20,000,000 to upgrade the electronic data processing, storage, and retrieval system of the M1A2 to take advantage of the investment by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in new technology providing increased digital processing which simultaneously accommodates multilingual displays.

Missile/Air Defense Product Improvement Program (0203801A) (HAC Report P. 210)

Total appropriated: \$68,782,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$68,782,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 only for the Army to conduct live fire tests utilizing the AH-64 Apache as the test platform to evaluate near term, low cost, off-the-shelf, high velocity missiles for air-to-air requirements.

Other Missile Product Improvement Program (0203802A) (HAC Report P. 210)

Total appropriated: \$72,438,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends:

Insensitive Rocket Motors: \$4,000,000 only for the Army to evaluate insensitive rocket motors currently in the munitions industrial base to see if any can be brought into production in the near term. These funds are to qualify an insensitive rocket motor for the current Hellfire missile as opposed to a more expensive development program for an insensitive motor.

Hellfire Training Round: \$2,000,000 only for the Army to continue its ongoing demonstration/proof of concept program to develop a low-cost Hellfire laser-guided training round.

DOD High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (0605605A) (HAC Report P. 211)

Total appropriated: \$26,608,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$21,800,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$21,800,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$26,608,000, an increase of \$21,800,000 above the budget request. These funds are to be used only for the continued operation of HELSTF, including \$10,000,000 only for the Sea Lite Beam Director. These funds are not to be used for any studies to curtail the operation and maintenance of HELSTF.

Programwide Activities (0605801A) (HAC Report P. 211)

Total appropriated: \$103,011,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$7,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$7,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$103,011,000, an increase of \$7,000,000 only for the Medical Diagnostic Imaging Support (MDIS) System tele-imaging project in the Puget Sound Area. Under this initiative, Madigan Army Medical Center will provide MDIS tele-imaging support for DOD and other federal medical treatment facilities in the Puget Sound area.

Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety (0605805A) (HAC Report P. 211)

Total appropriated: \$23,991,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$4,228,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,228,000.

Description of known earmarks: *Plasma Centrifugal Furnace*: The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 only to continue development of the plasma centrifugal furnace for the future utilization of plasma arc technology in large scale demilitarization and hazardous material destruction.

Description of possible earmarks: *Ammunition Demilitarization*: The budget includes \$712,000 for research on the demilitarization of conventional ammunition. The Committee recommends an increase of \$4,228,000 for a total program of demilitarization research of \$5,000,000.

Manufacturing Technology Development (0708011A) (HAC Report P. 212)

Total appropriated: \$75,000,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$75,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$75,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$75,000,000 for Manufacturing Technology Development. These funds include: \$20,000,000 only for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE); \$10,000,000 only to investigate composite manufacturing technologies; \$8,500,000 only for the Instrumented Factory for Gears (INFAC) program; \$2,000,000 only to continue the effort to introduce advanced powder metallurgy disks into the growth T800 engine of the Comanche development program; \$2,000,000 only to link Army Centers of Excellence with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) manufacturing technology programs; and the balance of the funding shall be used for Army programs which were included in the RDT&E Defense-wide appropriation request for fiscal year 1994 budget request.

Surface/Aerospace Surveillance and Weapons Technology (0602111N) (HAC Report P. 220)

Total appropriated: \$92,305,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee has included a reduction of \$5,000,000 specifically to the Wide Area Surveillance Subprogram. No portion of this reduction is to be allocated to any other subproject of this program element. The Committee also recommends increases of \$25,000,000 only for the free electron laser and \$5,000,000 only for the Polar Ozone Aerosol Monitor.

Surface Ship Technology (0602121N) (HAC Report P. 220)

Total appropriated: \$38,795,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$21,300,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$21,300,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$38,795,000, an increase of \$21,300,000. This includes:

\$3,300,000 only for the design of standardized shockhardened air circuit breakers;

\$3,000,000 only for interactive electronic technical manual development at the Navy Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) at St. Inigoes, Maryland; and

\$15,000,000 only for the use of composite technology in ship applications.

Surface Ship Technology (0602121N) (HAC Report P. 220)

Total appropriated: \$38,795,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends the following initiatives at St. Inigoes to continue the Demonstration of the Interactive Electronic Technical Manual (IETM) technology for achieving improved capability and reducing weight and cost:

\$1,000,000 only for the creation of standardized procedures for the acquisition of IETM, which will serve as guidelines for systems acquisition managers;

\$1,000,000 only for application of multimedia technology to storage, presentation, and maintenance of C4I architecture information, particularly as it relates to large, diverse commands; and

\$1,000,000 only for application of IETM technology to training materials for the Marine Corps Communication Electronics School.

Mission Support Technology (0602233N) (HAC Report P. 221)

Total appropriated: \$48,224,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5,601,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,600,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,201,000.

Description of possible earmarks: Concerning aircrew protection: \$3,666,000 is only for project M331330; and \$1,935,000 is only for project RM33B31.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$48,224,000, an increase of \$13,800,000. Within the amount provided: \$5,600,000 is only for projects associated with aircrew protection; and an additional \$1,000,000 is only for development and physiological testing or microencapsulated phase change materials for use in extreme temperature protective clothing.

Materials Electronics, and Computer Technology (0602234N) (HAC Report P. 221)

Total appropriated: \$72,563,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,500,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$72,563,000, an increase of \$1,500,000 which is only to continue development and operation of the Distributed Manufacturing Demonstration Project.

Undersea Surveillance Weapon Technology (0602314N) (HAC Report P. 221)

Total appropriated: \$108,960,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$108,960,000, an increase of \$1,000,000 for battery research as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill. The Committee directs that the traditional leadership rules and level of participation by universities and industry in this program element should be maintained.

Mine Countermeasures, Mining, and Special Warfare Technology (0602315N) (HAC Report P. 221)

Total appropriated: \$23,944,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$23,944,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 only for the Rapid Airborne Mine Clearance System.

Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology (0602435N) (HAC Report P. 221)

Total appropriated: \$47,511,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,800,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,800,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$47,511,000, an increase of \$9,800,000 only for the development and application of a cost-effective remote semi-autonomous underwater oceanographic and environmental measurement capability.

Naval Biodynamics Laboratory (HAC Report P. 222)

Total appropriated: \$3,000,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee has provided an additional \$3,000,000 only for the Naval Biodynamics Laboratory (NBDL) and related collaborative research between NBDL and the Advanced Marine Technology Center. Of this additional amount: \$2,000,000 is in the aviation survivability program (0603216N); and \$1,000,000 is in the Medical development program (0603706N).

The Committee directs the Navy to add \$2,500,000 of the increase to the Navy's budget request for operations and research at the NBDL.

Air Systems Advanced Technology Development (0603217N) (HAC Report P. 222)

Total appropriated: \$80,005,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$50,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$50,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$80,005,000, an increase of \$50,000,000. Within that amount:

\$12,500,000 is only for continued development of the advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile;

\$15,500,000 is only for a new project in Shared Aperture/Common Radio Frequency Modular Systems;

\$13,000,000 is only for open architecture efforts in project W0446; and

\$9,000,000 is only for development of integrated avionics racks using microencapsulated phase change materials.

Medical Development (0603706N) (HAC Report P. 224)

Total appropriated: \$60,148,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$43,192,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$43,192,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$60,148,000, an increase of \$43,192,000 as explained in the Medical section of this report.

Generic Logistics Research and Development Technology Demonstration (0603712N) (HAC Report p. 224)

Total appropriated: \$38,520,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$24,800,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$24,800,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$38,520,000, an increase of \$24,800,000 only for the following activities of Logistics Engineering Advanced Development: enhance printed circuit board digital data packages through improved character handling and recognition techniques; automate the creation of "intelligent" printed wiring board CALS files; enhance printed wiring board digital data packages through automated bill of materials entry; integrate printed circuit board functional testing data into a CALS-complaint reverse engineering program; develop a system to automate the quality assurance and digital technical data packages; provide CALS enhancement of the virtual business and manufacturing environment; and for the Aviation Supply Office, reduce system/subsystem repair and acquisition cost analysis.

Advanced Anti-Submarine Warfare Technology 90603747N (HAC Report p. 224)

Total appropriated: \$68,172,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$19,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$19,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$68,172,000, an increase of \$19,000,000 as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill, of which: \$4,000,000 is only for extended echo ranging; and \$15,000,000 is only for low-frequency active technology.

Within the latter amount, \$5,000,000 is only for acoustic projectors.

Fiber Optic Acoustic Sensor Systems (HAC Report p. 225)

Total appropriated: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 only to continue technology efforts in this area with the objective of further reducing the cost of wideaperture arrays; developing common optical towed arrays for surface ships and submarines and undertaking a manufacturing technology program for efficient transition of fiber optic acoustic sensor systems from development into production.

Aviation Survivability (0603216N) (HAC Report P. 225)

Total appropriated: \$23,072,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$11,518,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,400,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$20,918,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee directs that the Navy fund all activities as budgeted, and that a total of \$11,518,000 is available only for Project W0584, Aircrew Systems Technology.

Description of possible earmarks: Of this amount: \$2,000,000 is only for the Naval Biodynamics Laboratory as previously discussed in this section; and \$7,400,000 is only for aircrew systems technology.

The \$7,400,000 increase is only for the following purposes: aircrew integrated life support system (+\$4,700,000); aircrew integrated ensemble (+\$1,200,000); and the advanced helmet vision system (+\$1,500,000).

Advanced Submarine Combat Systems Development (0603504N) (HAC Report P. 226)

Total appropriated: \$23,341,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$4,000,000.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$23,341,000, an increase of \$3,000,000. \$4,000,000 is only for fiber optic acoustic sensor systems as described earlier in this report.

Advanced Submarine System Development (0603561N) (HAC Report P. 226)

Total appropriated: \$142,068,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$17,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$17,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: \$17,000,000 is only for development of dry deck shelters for the SSN-688 class submarines.

Advanced Surface Machinery System (0603573N) (HAC Report P. 226)

Total appropriated: \$92,328,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$7,500,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$7,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$7,500,000 is only for development of a permanent magnet motor.

Marine Corps Assault Vehicles (0603611M) (HAC Report P. 226)

Total appropriated: \$28,554,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$28,554,000, an increase of \$8,000,000, as proposed in House authorization legislation to continue work on the Stratified Charge Rotary Engine.

Ship Self Defense (0603755N) (HAC Report P. 227)

Total appropriated: \$341,904,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$12,800,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$96,900,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$109,700,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$341,904,000, an increase of \$104,700,000. Within the increase: an additional \$6,000,000 only for cooperative engagement multi-function self aligned gate technology; \$3,000,000 is only for continued development and qualification of the Enhanced Lethality Cartridge 20mm CIWS ammunition; and \$3,800,000 only for the Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) at St. Inigo, Maryland to continue developing a multi-sensor data fusion capability for the Ship Self Defense System (SSDS).

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$341,904,000, an increase of \$104,700,000. Within the increase: \$20,000,000 is only for demonstration of an airship which the House Armed Services Committee authorized in the RDT&E, Defense-wide appropriation; \$25,000,000 is only for E-2/E-3 aircraft integration of cooperative engagement capability as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill; an additional \$20,000,000 is only to cover shortfalls in cooperative engagement capability as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill; a net reduction of \$1,000,000 is explained in a classified letter accompanying this report; \$3,000,000 is only to test excess B-52G aircraft ECM systems on a Navy minesweeper; \$11,000,000 is only for Quick Reaction Combat Capability; \$3,800,000 is only for

the Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity multi-sensor data fusion program; \$8,900,000 is only for sealift/tanker ship protection; and \$5,000,000 is only for a prompt test and evaluation of a 25mm or 30mm stabilized, rapid fire gun mount with associated for control system, aboard a front line combatant.

Gun Weapon System Technology (0603795N) (HAC Report P. 228)

Total appropriated: \$38,247,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,500,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,500,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$21,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$38,247,000, an increase of \$21,000,000 of which: \$10,500,000 is only for the advance gun weapons systems project at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$38,247,000, an increase of \$21,000,000 of which: \$2,000,000 is only for electric gun technology; and \$8,500,000 is only for electro-thermal gun development.

AV-8B Engineering Development (0604214N) (HAC Report P. 228)

Total appropriated: \$19,784,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$1,500,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$19,784,000, an increase of \$1,500,000 only for the adaptation and integration of the launcher rail chaff dispenser on the aircraft.

P-3 Modernization (0604221N) (HAC Report P. 228)

Total appropriated: \$21,634,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,500,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$21,634,000, an increase of \$6,500,000 only for a detailed engineering, manufacturing, and cost analysis study to determine the feasibility of initiating a P-3 airframe conversion program.

Air Crew Systems Development (0604264N) (HAC Report P. 228)

Total appropriated: \$14,976,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,850,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,850,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$14,976,000, an increase of \$3,850,000 only for the following items: \$3,100,000 for AILSS/Navy Combat Edge; and \$750,000 for the advanced helmet vision system.

Aegis Combat System Engineering (0604307N) (HAC Report P. 229)

Total appropriated: \$103,995,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$23,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$23,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Within the amount provided: \$5,000,000 is only for the LM-2500R turbine engine as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill; and \$18,000,000 is only for development of the aeroderivative gas turbine engine for naval applications such as destroyers.

Submarine Tactical Warfare System (0604562N) (HAC Report P. 229)

Total appropriated: \$34,427,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$34,427,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 only to initiate a competition for a common ring laser gyro navigation system for submarines and surface ships.

Navy Tactical Computer Resources (0604574N) (HAC Report P. 230)

Total appropriated: \$22,572,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$22,572,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 only for the AN/UYH-16 optical device.

Ship Self Defense (0604755N) (HAC Report P. 230)

Total appropriated: \$118,860,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$12,200,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,200,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$118,860,000, an increase of \$2,100,000. An increase of \$9,200,000 is recommended to accelerate development of the SPQ-9I radar; and an additional \$3,000,000 is for the Thermal Imaging Sensor. A reduction of \$10,100,000 for upgrades to SLQ-32 is also recommended.

Navigation/ID System (0604777N) (HAC Report P. 230)

Total appropriated: \$83,047,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$83,047,000, an increase of \$3,000,000 for non-cooperative target recognition.

Consolidated Training Systems Development (0204571N) (HAC Report P. 231)

Total appropriated: \$46,200,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$9,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$46,200,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 only for the OUTBOARD trainer.

F-14 Upgrade (0205667N) (HAC Report P. 231)

Total appropriated: \$149,995,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$78,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$78,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$149,995,000, an increase of \$78,000,000 as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill. Within this amount: \$25,000,000 is for the pre-deployment upgrade; and \$53,000,000 is only for the F/A-14 configuration of the aircraft.

Marine Corps Command/Control/Communications (0206626M) (HAC Report P. 232)

Total appropriated: \$46,735,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$46,735,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 for the TPS-59 low radar cross section capability program.

Technical Information Services (HAC Report P. 232)

Total appropriated: \$14,773,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$4,500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$14,773,000, an increase of \$4,500,000 only for the Advanced Technical Information Support project.

Test and Evaluation Support (0605864N) (HAC Report P. 233)

Total appropriated: \$293,422,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$1,000,000 is only to continue the ongoing HIDDENSEE project in support of test and evaluation programs and fleet training exercises to provide technical knowledge of advanced communications and control systems.

Manufacturer Technology Development (HAC Report P. 233)

Total appropriated: \$205,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$.
 Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$205,000,000 for manufacturing technology. Within that amount:

\$10,000,000 is only for the National Shipbuilding Initiative as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill;

\$40,000,000 is only for the National Center for Excellence in Metalworking Technology; \$8,000,000 is only for the Life Cycle Improvements through Networking Critical (LINC) manufacturing technologies program; \$11,000,000 is only for the National Center for Advanced Gear Manufacturing Technologies;

\$13,500,000 is only for the Surface Engineering and Material Characterization Facility managed by the Navy's Laser Joining Center;

\$8,000,000 is only for the Center of Excellence in Ship Hull Designs and Electrical Systems; \$5,000,000 is only to link Navy Centers of Excellence with the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

\$3,000,000 is only for fiberoptic acoustic sensor systems;

\$12,000,000 is only for the Electronic Manufacturing Productivity Facility;

\$5,000,000 is only for a manufacturing productivity center at the Louisville, Kentucky site of the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division;

\$4,000,000 is only for the Center of Excellence for Best Manufacturing Practices; \$3,000,000 is only to continue operation of the Joining Center;

\$3,000,000 is only for the Center of Excellence for Energetic Material Manufacturing at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head, Maryland;

The Committee directs that the 1994 level of effort for the National Center for Excellence in Metalworking Technology be continued in the fiscal year 1995 budget request to Congress; and

The Navy is directed to use \$18,000,000 of this appropriation to fund the continued R&D and transition to production of all of the ongoing ductile cast iron 5 inch 54 (i.e., HE, Hi Frag and Cargo) and 76mm projectile programs.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$205,000,000 for manufacturing technology. Within that amount:

\$7,000,000 is only for multifunction self-aligned gate technology;

\$2,000,000 is only for laser assisted manufacturing;

\$2,500,000 is only for spray forming research;

\$8,200,000 is only for the EA-6B Prowler upgrade;

\$18,000,000 is only for the cast ductile iron program;

\$27,900,000 is only for the Great Lakes Composites Consortium;

\$500,000 is only for taconite process technology;

\$9,500,000 is only for Joint Logistics Systems Command Rapid Acquisition of Manufactured Parts migrations;

\$2,000,000 is only for the Navy fleet-of-the-future program; and

\$750,000 is only for electro-optics manufacturing.

Seismic Research (HAC Report P. 238)

Total appropriated: \$27,409,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$27,409,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$27,409,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee strongly supports the basic seismic research program established by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, and therefore: approves Defense Research Sciences (PE0601102F, project 2309) funding of \$7,000,000 only for the Joint Seismic Program; \$14,000,000 only for capitalization of the Global Seismic Network, both administered by the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology; \$4,409,000 for university-based seismic research; and \$2,000,000 to the Geophysics program (PE0602101F, project 7600), only for contractual research to be managed by the Phillips Laboratory Geophysics Directorate.

Geophysics (0602101F) (HAC Report P. 239)

Total appropriated: \$37,252,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$7,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$7,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$37,252,000, an increase of \$7,000,000 to the budget request. Within these funds: \$2,000,000 shall be available only as addressed under the heading "Seismic Research" above, and \$5,000,000 only to upgrade computational resources to detect the detonation of low-yield nuclear devices.

Materials (0602120F) (HAC Report P. 239)

Total appropriated: \$71,305,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$71,305,000, an increase of \$500,000 only for Remote Aircraft Fatigue Sensing.

Aerospace Propulsion (0602203F) (HAC Report P. 239)

Total appropriated: \$81,100,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$81,100,000, an increase of \$3,000,000 only to support the ongoing research project on endothermic jet fuels including coal-based fuels.

Rocket Propulsion and Astronautics Technology (0602302F) (HAC Report P. 239)

Total appropriated: \$51,137,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$11,106,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$11,106,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee believes these programs to be a high priority and recommends \$51,137,000, a total increase of \$11,106,000, with the increase allocated as follows: \$10,000,000 for Thermionics Space Power Program; \$854,000 for Space Systems Propulsion Technology; and \$252,000 for Missile System Propulsion Technology.

Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems (0603112F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$25,825,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$25,825,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 only for the operation of the National Center for Industrial Competitiveness (NCIC), near Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology (0603232F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$12,960,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$12,960,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 above the request. *Advanced Life Support*: The Air Force requested \$1,038,000 for Advanced Life Support. The Committee recommends \$3,538,000, an increase of \$2,500,000 only for Project 2830.

National Aero Space Plane Technology Program (0603269F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$80,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$36,741,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$36,741,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$80,000,000, an increase of \$36,741,000 above the request. These funds support the joint Department of Defense/National Aeronautics and Space Administration restructured National Aero Space Plane (NASP) technology program for fiscal year 1994. This funding is provided contingent upon compliance with section 242 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993.

Space and Missile Rocket Propulsion (0603302F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$11,430,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$1,403,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,403,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$11,430,000, an increase of: \$937,000 for Space Systems Propulsion Technology; and \$466,000 for Missile Systems Propulsion Technology.

Space Subsystems Technology (0603428F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$8,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of know earmarks: No funds were requested for this program. The Committee recommends \$8,000,000 solely to continue the HAVE GAZE program.

Advanced Radiation Technology (0603605F) (HAC Report P. 240)

Total appropriated: \$78,315,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$900,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$22,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$22,900,000.

Description of known earmarks: *High Power Microwave (HPM) Technology*: To ensure stable and continued High Power Microwave (HPM) development, the Committee recommends an additional \$900,000, providing \$11,600,000 only for project 3152.

Description of possible earmarks: *Excimer Laser*: The Committee recommends \$22,000,000 only for the Excimer Laser Technology Development Program.

Civil and Environmental Engineering Technology (0603723F) (HAC Report P. 241)

Total appropriated: \$13,435,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$5,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: *Spray Casting*: The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 only to continue development of production scale spray casting equipment.

B-1B (0604226F) (HAC Report P. 241)

Total appropriated: \$126,543,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$33,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$33,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: *Electronic Countermeasure (ECM) systems*: The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 and directs that the ECM risk reduction effort involve no less than three candidate systems.

Relative Targeting System/GPS-Aided Munition (RTS/GAM): The Committee recommends \$8,000,000 only for a Relative Targeting System demonstration to determine if upgrading the B-1's radar will provide the capability to employ interim precision weapons.

B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber (0604240F) (HAC Report P. 242)

Total appropriated: \$838,497,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$48,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$48,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: *GPS-Aided Targeting System/GPS-aided Munition (GATS/GAM)*: The Committee recommends an additional \$48,000,000 for GATS/GAM development effort.

B-52 Squadrons (0101113F) (HAC Report P. 242)

Total appropriated: \$6,300,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$6,300,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,300,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$6,300,000 only to complete Have Lite technology development efforts, which will further reduce the unit cost of subsequent Have Nap missile procurement.

KC-135S (0401218F) (HAC Report P. 243)

Total appropriated: \$3,441,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,441,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,441,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$3,441,000 only to continue the Improved Air Refueling System (IARS).

Computer Resources Management Technology (0604740F) (HAC Report P. 246)

Total appropriated: \$16,137,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$9,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$16,137,000, an increase of \$9,000,000 only for the Computer Resource Development Program (CARDS).

Threat Simulator Development (0604256F) (HAC Report P. 247)

Total appropriated: \$46,962,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$12,600,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,600,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$46,962,000, an increase of \$12,600,000 only for the Real-Time Electromagnetic Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor (REDCAP) as proposed by the House Armed Services Committee.

Threat Simulator Development (0604256F) (HAC Report P. 247)

Total appropriated: \$10,670,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,670,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,670,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee also recommends \$10,670,000, the budget request, only for the Electronic Combat Integration Test (ECIT) facility at Edwards Air Force Base.

Navigation/Radar/Sled Tract Test Support (0605708F) (HAC Report P. 248)

Total appropriated: \$31,813,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,500,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$31,813,000, an increase of \$3,500,000 only to initiate Phase II, magnetic levitation prototyping and initial electromagnetic propulsion design, for the High Velocity Sled Tract at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico.

Medium Launch Vehicles (0305119F) (HAC Report P. 248)

Total appropriated: \$41,336,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$41,336,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$41,336,000.

Description of known earmarks: As discussed elsewhere in this report under Space and Related Activities, the Committee has added a total of \$37,000,000 for improvements to the space launch ground infrastructure. In order to ensure that this modernization keeps pace with deployment of the medium lift Spacelifter launch vehicle, it is directed that \$15,000,000 be allocated to the Western Space Launch Facility and \$22,000,000 to the Eastern Space Launch Facility. The Committee stipulates that these funds are to be used solely to begin a long term ground infrastructure modernization program at these two locations. As also discussed elsewhere in this report, the Committee has transferred a total of \$16,336,000 to this program from the Reentry System Launch Program (0101213F). Finally, the Committee has included a reduction, without prejudice, of \$12,000,000 to reflect the probable delay in the requirement for the medium Launch Vehicle III program due to slippage in the availability of the Global Positioning System Block IIR payload.

Titan Space Launch Vehicles (0305144F) (HAC Report P. 248)

Total appropriated: \$6,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: No funds are requested in the Titan Space Launch Vehicles program for the Centaur Processing Facility. The Committee recommends an increase of \$6,000,000 solely for this required new facility.

Manufacturing Technology Development (0708011F) (HAC Report P. 249)

Total appropriated: \$130,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$70,400,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$70,400,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$130,000,000 for Manufacturing Technology Development. This includes: \$60,000,000 only for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences (NCMS); \$7,200,000 only for the Computer-aided Acquisition and Logistics Support Technology Transfer (CATT) program within the Air Force Material Command to enhance the advanced logistic facility's ability to test and rapidly deploy Computer Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support (CALS) to the private sector and establish cooperative research and development agreements with area industries and institutions through establishment of a test site for technology development at Oklahoma City Air Logistics center and authorization of a CATT Special Project Office (SPO); \$2,000,000 only to continue the development of a ductile cast iron solidification/pattern definition simulation; and \$1,200,000 only for Platform for the Automated Construction of Intelligent Systems (PACIS).

The balance of the funding shall be used for Air Force programs which were included in the RDT&E Defense-side appropriation request for fiscal year 1994 budget request.

University Research Initiatives (0601103D) (HAC Report P. 253)

Total appropriated: \$274,611,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$90,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$90,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$274,611,000, an increase of \$32,000,000 as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill. Within this amount: \$55,000,000 in only for Augmentation Awards for Science and Education Training; and \$20,000,000 is only for an Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) in the Department of Defense.

Focused Research Initiative (0601110D) (HAC Report P. 254)

Total appropriated: \$20,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends that within the amount provided, \$10,000,000 is only for projects undertaken in conjunction with the National Medical Technology Testbed to provide seed funds for developing products for defense technologies in health care, aimed at reducing health-care costs.

Computing Systems and Communications Technology (0602301E) (HAC Report P. 254)

Total appropriated: \$272,789,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$11,700,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$11,700,000.

Description of known earmarks: An increase of: \$7,000,000 only for ASSET; and \$4,700,000 only for development of non-seismic technology for nuclear non-proliferation.

Tactical Technology (0602702E) (HAC Report P. 255)

Total appropriated: \$156,541,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$12,650,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,650,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$156,541,000, an increase of \$12,650,000 of which: \$1,750,000 is only for an advanced landing system; \$5,500,000 is only for metal-coated ceramic microsphere technology for low observable applications; and \$5,400,000 is only for the Speakeasy communications project.

Integrated Command and Control Technology (0602708E) (HAC Report P. 255)

Total appropriated: \$125,014,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$25,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Within this amount, \$25,000,000 is only for part of a two year, \$50,000,000 project to establish a pilot demonstration facility that will expedite the development of manufacturing technology for active matrix liquid crystal displays (AMLCDs).

Materials and Electronics Technology (0602712E) (HAC Report P. 256)

Total appropriated: \$303,200,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$95,200,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$30,700,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$125,900,000.

Description of known earmarks: This includes increases only for the following purposes: \$77,700,000 as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill; \$4,000,000 only for multi-chip modules; and \$13,500,000 only for the California ORTA Foundation as the first increment in support of the Joint Casting Emission Reduction project, which is projected to be completed over a five year period for \$40,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: \$9,500,000 only for infrared sensitive materials; \$13,500,000 only for the Joint Casting Emission Reduction Project; \$5,000,000 is only to continue the coal utilization center; and \$2,700,000 is only to establish a materials research program to address scientific advances through cross-disciplinary activities and potential breakthroughs in the following areas including high performance materials, electro-optical materials, and catalysis.

Defense Nuclear Agency (0602715H) (HAC Report P. 257)

Total appropriated: \$238,388,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$11,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: An increase of \$4,000,000 only for ongoing bio-environmental hazards research.

Description of possible earmarks: An increase of: \$3,000,000 only for the Nevada operations office for evaluating and assisting the transfer of technologies developed at the Nevada Test Site to the private section, development of infrastructure to support future defense program needs at the Nevada Test Site, and environmental aspects of new or proposed projects seeking to locate at the Test Site; and \$4,000,000 and directs the De-

fense Nuclear Agency to continue its ongoing high risk interdisciplinary bioenvironmental hazards research into the health, engineering and basic science aspects of environmental problems of special interest to the Department.

Ballistic Missile Defense (HAC Report P. 259)

Total appropriated: \$2,870,040,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$6,500,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$97,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$103,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$6,500,000 of theater missile defense funds are only for the classified HAVE YAK program.

Description of possible earmarks: \$97,000,000 only for the ERINT missile and to require that the Defense Department execute the PAC-III missile acquisition strategy which it justified to the Congress during hearings this year.

Experimental Evaluation of Major Innovative Technology (0603226E) (HAC Report P. 260)

Total appropriated: \$617,098,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends the following increases: \$50,000,000 for fuel cells; \$28,900,000 for programs transferred from the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization; \$5,000,000 for gamma-gamma resonance imaging; \$1,000,000 for fire detection technology; and \$1,000,000 for nuclear waste monitoring.

The Committee recommends increases only for the following purposes: \$16,000,000 for multi-function self aligned gate gallium arsenide wideband module development for shipboard radar and electronic warfare use; \$6,000,000 only for critical technology validation of the ASTOVL direct life concept; \$3,000,000 is only for the Large Millimeter Telescope; \$5,000,000 only for SELENE as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its fiscal year 1994 report; and \$4,000,000 only for unmanned undersea vehicle solid polymer fuel cells.

Concerning fuel cells: \$5,000,000 is only for phosphoric acid fuel cells to be managed in conjunction with the Army; \$5,000,000 is only for proton exchange membrane fuel cells; \$1,000,000 is only for monolithic solid oxide fuel cells; and \$34,500,000 is only for carbonate based fuel cells.

Strategic Environmental Research (0603716D) (HAC Report P. 262)

Total appropriated: \$67,958,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$61,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$61,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Within the amount provided: \$5,000,000 is only for the Consortium for International Earth Science Informational Network; \$2,200,000 is only for Global Acoustic Mapping of Ocean Temperatures; \$7,500,000 is only for a plasma-disposal project at Fort Belvoir; \$3,500,000 is only for the National Environmental Education and Training Center; \$1,400,000 is only for a spectrometer air quality monitor; \$100,000 is only for encapsulation of solid waste; \$37,800,000 is for Phase I projects; and \$3,500,000 be made available only to the National Environmental Education and Training Center for research, planning and demonstration purposes of the Center.

Computer Aided Logistics Support (0603736D) (HAC Report P. 263)

Total appropriated: \$23,224,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.

Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$12,800,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,800,000.

Description of possible earmarks: Within the amount provided: \$2,800,000 is only for development of a CALS-compliant Standardized Project Description; \$5,000,000 is only for the Defense Department to develop a plan that sets forth a clear articulation of vision, strategy, and tactics for implementation of the CALS program; and \$5,000,000 only to accelerate the CALS program within the Defense Department and United States industry.

Manufacturing Technology (0603739E) (HAC Report P. 263)

Total appropriated: \$342,340,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$47,543,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$47,543,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$342,340,000, an increase of \$42,743,000. This includes an increase of \$27,543,000 recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill for advanced lithography;

Within the amount provided for advanced lithography: \$2,200,000 is only for coronary angiography; and \$3,000,000 is only for dual energy digital subtraction angiography; \$20,000,000 only for a cost-shared, cooperative effort with industry to develop environmentally conscious manufacturing of electronics systems based on an industry-developed roadmap.

Consolidated DOD Software Initiative (0603756D) (HAC Report P. 264)

Total appropriated: \$31,651,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$22,500,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$22,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$31,651,000, an increase of \$22,500,000 of which: \$10,000,000 is only for the National Applied Software Engineering Center; \$5,000,000 is only for the Software Managers' Network; and \$7,500,000 is only for the Reuse Technology Adoption Program.

Rocket Motor Demilitarization Program (0604704D) (HAC Report P. 264)

Total appropriated: \$27,267,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$2,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$13,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$27,267,000, an increase of \$15,000,000 of which: \$2,000,000 is only for projects at the Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant to include design, test, and process prove-out for demil/reclamation of rocket motor propellant and pyrotechnic material using cryofractured, high pressure wash out and air curtain destructors and other technologies that are under development.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$27,267,000, an increase of \$15,000,000 of which: \$6,000,000 is only for disposal of energetic materials; and \$7,000,000 is only for disposal of strategic missiles at the Nevada Test Site.

DOD/CTC Joint CALS Initiative (HAC Report P. 264)

Total appropriated: \$52,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$30,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$30,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee directs that of the total fiscal year

1994 CSRC program funds recommended: \$30,000,000 is specifically earmarked only for the CSRC operated by CTC for the following tri-service initiatives:

1. \$4,000,000 for the establishment of a FCIM Tested Facility initiative in collaboration with the Department's Joint Center for FCIM;

2. \$2,000,000 for the establishment of a Collaborative Application Protocol Development initiative in collaboration with the IGES/PDES Organization (IPO);

3. \$2,000,000 for the establishment of a Manufactured Product Data Standards initiative in collaboration with national industrial interest groups, such as, but not limited to, the Society of Manufacturing Engineers, American Foundrymen's Society, Society of Automotive Engineers, American National Standards Institute, National Machine Tool Builders Association and the National Computer Graphics Association;

4. \$3,000,000 for the establishment of CALS standards and technologies development, deployment, training and education linkage between the CSRC Program and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Manufacturing Extension Partnerships (MEPs) and the Centers of Excellence and the Army's Center for Optics and DOD's National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE) administered by the Army;

5. \$1,000,000 for the establishment at the CRS located in Orange, Texas of an Instructional Technology Development initiative; and

6. \$18,000,000 for the establishment and continued operation of additional CRSs to be operated by educational or other non-profit institutions located in Oakland, California; St. Petersburg, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; Honolulu, Hawaii; Portland, Maine; and Fairmont, West Virginia.

The Committee further directs that of the total fiscal year 1994 CSRC program funds recommended: \$20,000,000 is specifically earmarked only for the continued operation of the CRSs located in Palestine Texas; Orange, Texas; San Antonio, Texas; Dayton, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; and Fairfax, Virginia.

Physical Security Equipment (0603228D) (HAC Report P. 267)

Total appropriated: \$30,676,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$30,676,000, an increase of \$10,000,000, as follows: \$5,000,000 only for the development of the Mobile Detection Assessment Response System-Exterior (MDARS-E) physical security vehicle; and \$5,000,000 only for a joint Security/Scout vehicle program.

Joint Robotics Program (0603709D) (HAC Report P. 267)

Total appropriated: \$32,125,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000 is only for development of an unmanned scout vehicle and technology that supports its development.

Advanced Sensor Applications Program (0603714D) (HAC Report P. 267)

Total appropriated: \$39,919,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$13,999,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$13,999,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$39,919,000, an increase of \$13,999,000 to consolidate non-acoustic anti-submarine warfare programs by transferring funds from the Navy.

AIM-9 Consolidated Programs (0603715D) (HAC Report P. 267)

Total appropriated: \$43,480,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$33,887,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$33,887,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$43,480,000, an increase of \$33,887,000 to consolidate AIM-9 missile programs by transferring funds from the Air Force.

Mobile Office Shore Basing (0604705D) (HAC Report P. 268)

Total appropriated: \$24,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$24,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$24,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Department did not request funds to continue the Congressional initiative begun last year to examine the feasibility of mobile off shore basing for military operations. The Committee recommends \$24,000,000.

Defense Support Activities (0605798S) (HAC Report P. 269)

Total appropriated: \$45,561,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$30,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$33,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$45,561,000, an increase of \$33,000,000. Within this amount: \$3,000,000 is only for shipbreaking technology as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill.

Description of possible earmarks: An additional \$30,000,000 is only for the following CLAS activities of the Defense Logistics Agency: developing software cost estimation models for object-oriented development environments, establishing proactive quality engineering, providing support of concurrent engineering-based business practices, developing a personal computer based logistics data server, provided benefits analysis planning tools, developing a CALS expert or rule-based system for management of consumable items, developing a CALS-compliant digital manifest record applicable to container shipments, developing a CALS-compliant automated office, developing a CALS-compliant ICP aviation component rework parts usage information system, researching and analyzing the use of CALS-compliant emerging controls and technologies to enhance procurement leadtimes and efficiencies, developing a system for utilizing mass storage in optical discs, and converting to a digital production imaging control system versus a manual work distribution and control system. Funds are also provided for the Defense Commissary Agency to develop an optical scanning and archiving capability.

Manufacturing Technology Development (HAC Report P. 270)

Total appropriated: \$45,300,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$45,300,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$45,300,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$45,300,000 for manufacturing technology. Within this amount: \$2,800,000 is only for the combat rations manufacturing technology demonstration

(GRAMTD); \$7,500,000 is only for generalized emulation of microcircuits; \$10,000,000 is only for military sewn products; \$15,000,000 is only for metalcasting as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee in its 1994 bill; and \$10,000,000 is only for machine tools also as recommended by the House Armed Services Committee.

Electric Vehicle Technology (HAC Report P. 270)

Total appropriated: \$50,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$25,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Within this amount: \$5,000,000 is only for the electric vehicle program at McClellan AFB; \$5,000,000 is only for an agile manufacturing project in advanced transportation systems (including electric vehicles) in Los Angeles, California; \$5,000,000 is only for the non-profit California Hybrid Electric Vehicle Consortium for development of hybrid electric vehicles; and \$10,000,000 is only for the non-profit organization Concurrent Technologies Corporation to establish and operate the Mid Atlantic Regional Consortium for Advanced Vehicles.

Natural Gas Vehicles (HAC Report P. 271)

Total appropriated: \$25,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 to continue the Congressional initiative begun last year. Within this amount: \$10,000,000 is only for R&D on vehicles; and \$15,000,000 is only for conversion and infrastructure demonstration.

Earth Conservancy (HAC Report P. 271)

Total appropriated: \$40,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$40,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$40,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 to continue the Earth Conservancy initiative begun by Congress last year.

Space Launch Vehicles (HAC Report P. 271)

Total appropriated: \$50,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$40,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$50,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Of the total amount provided, at least \$40,000,000 must be allocated for a long-term effort to produce an unmanned single-stage-to-orbit prototype launch vehicle. These funds may only be used for a competitive effort.

Description of possible earmarks: The remaining \$10,000,000 shall be used for additional research on such launch technologies as hybrid rocket motors and parafoils.

Special Operations Advanced Technology Development (HAC Report P. 272)

Special Operations Special Technology:
 Total appropriated: \$4,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$4,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$4,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends an additional \$4,000,000 for designing and developing prototype systems to enhance Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations (Psyops) activities associated with Special Operations Forces humanitarian, civil assistance, and combat mission.

Special Operations Advanced Technology Development (HAC Report P. 272)

Explosive Ordnance Disposal for Low Intensity Conflict:

Total appropriated: \$2,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: An additional \$2,000,000 has been provided to ensure that prototypes that address mine and unexploded ordnance requirements continue to be developed at an acceptable rate.

Special Operations Forces (HAC Report P. 272)

IntraFormation Positioning System (IFPS):

Total appropriated: \$15,500,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$15,500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,500,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$15,500,000 to continue the development of the IFPS.

Special Operations Tactical Systems Development (HAC Report P. 272)

"Quiet Knight":
 Total appropriated: \$6,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$6,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 to continue with Phase III of the Quiet Knight Technical Demonstration program and to initiate transition of successfully demonstrated subsystems into Engineering & Manufacturing Development of the Special Operations aircraft fleet.

Special Operations Tactical Systems Development (HAC Report P. 272)

CV-22:
 Total appropriated: \$20,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$.
 Subtotal of known and possible earmarks: \$20,000,000.

Description of possible earmarks: The Committee has added an additional \$20,000,000 for the CV-22 program.

INITIAL REVIEW OF EARMARKS IN HAC FY 1994 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS TITLES V-VI-VII-VIII

TITLE V—REVOLVING FUNDS

No earmarks.

TITLE VI

Defense Health Program

Of total appropriation of \$9.645 billion, "such funds as necessary shall be used for the continuation of the cooperative program model being established at Madigan Medical Center for severely disordered students" (Bill p. 47, no report language)

"From these funds the Army is directed to maintain the existing level of services at the Tobyhanna Army Depot. The Army is specifically directed not to reduce the personnel staffing levels * * *. (Report p. 282, no bill language)

"The Committee directs that the Army maintain a pharmacy operation at the Richmond Blue Grass Army Depot, Richmond, Kentucky, until a mail service pharmacy program has been implemented in Kentucky". (Report p. 283, no bill language)

\$1.5 million "to compensate William Beaumont" Army Medical Center for non-com-

pensated emergency care for indigents. (Report p. 284, no bill language)

\$1 million "to establish a collaborative program—the "Violence and Brain Project". Possible earmark, report p. 285, no bill language.

\$3 million "to purchase bandwidth time on a network in the State of Washington to allow the sending of medical imaging". Report p. 288, no bill language.

\$3.5 million "to exploit defense nuclear weapon-derived technology for breast cancer early detection. . . The Committee directs the development. . . of a prototype. . . system in a clinical setting at the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas" Report p. 289, no bill language (possible earmark, Simon didn't say "only at").

Drug Interdiction

Of total appropriation of \$757.8 million: "not less than \$5,900,000 shall be available only for the Gulf States Counter-Narcotics Initiative". (Bill p. 48, report p. 294)

\$2 million "for the Multi-jurisdictional task force training program begun in fiscal year 1992. . . available only for the Florida National Guard". Report p. 295, no bill language.

Directs DoD "to work with the Lake County Task Force. . . in northwest Indiana, to identify potential surplus military equipment. . . that can be provided to the task force." Report p. 296, no bill language.

\$1.1 million "for the establishment of a Police Research Institute as a collaborative effort between the Department of Defense and a Texas criminal justice center with a State legislative mandate to assist State and local law enforcement agencies to develop anti-crime strategies." Report p. 296, no bill language.

TITLE VII—NFIP

No earmarks.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 8025/bill p. 65 "the Department shall modify a currently operating CHAMPUS service contract to include an at-risk managed health care provision, to provide services not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, in the area of Homestead Air Force Base".

Sec. 8026/bill p. 67, "Funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be obligated and expended to continue to fully utilize the facilities at the United States Army Engineer's Waterways Experiment Station."

Sec. 8028/bill p. 69 "Of the funds appropriated to the Army, \$217,600,000 shall be available only for the Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS): Provided, That none of these funds can be expended—(1) except as approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau" etc. etc as in past years.

Sec. 8053/bill p. 85 "None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 815th Weather Squadron of the Air Force Reserve."

Sec. 8056/bill pp. 86-87. "There is established, under the direction and control of the Attorney General, the National Drug Intelligence Center. . . funding. . . shall be provided from the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense".

Sec. 8070/bill p. 95-97 \$6.5 million "shall be available only to execute the cleanup of uncontrolled hazardous waste contamination affecting the Sale Parcel at Hamilton Air Force Base, in Novato, in the State of California". This section goes on to direct a refund of a \$4.5 million deposit if the purchaser withdraws from all or a portion of the sale, and further directs that any portion of the

land not purchased "shall be sold to the City of Novato, in the State of California, for the sum of One Dollar".

Sec. 8088/bill p. 103 "None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to relocate the 116th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard from Dobbins Air Reserve Base to Robins Air Force Base, or to convert that wing from F-15A aircraft to B-1B aircraft."

Sec. 8091/bill p. 105 "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than \$750,000 of the funds appropriated [for O&M Army] . . . shall be made available until expended to conduct a demonstration program involving the Army Senior Officers' Training Corps battalion at Indiana-University-Northwest and Army Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units near the University. The purpose of this program shall be to encourage minority students in the secondary educational institutions to continue their education".

Sec. 8118/bill p. 116 "In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, \$200,000 shall be available only for settlement of claims and interest thereon, associated with contract numbered N62474-86-C-0253 for construction of a multipurpose range complex at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center in Twentynine Palms, California" (possible private relief, claims they are following GAO recommendation).

Sec. 8120, bill p. 117 "The Secretary of the Navy shall carry out the establishment of the Marine Warfare Center of Excellence at the naval station at Ingleside, Texas."

TITLE II—PROCUREMENT REALLY BAD

Aircraft Carrier Replacement Program (HAC report p. 142; bill p. 27).

Total appropriated: \$1,000,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,000,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000,000.

Description of known earmarks:
Allocate \$1,000,000,000, to start CVN-76, which shall not be available for obligation or expenditure until September 30, 1994. Lobbyists are claiming \$200-300 million savings from funding the ship a year early, but making funds available for only one day in FY 94 differs little from having FY 95 funding.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
Prior Year Programs (HAC report p. 144).
Total appropriated: \$127,000,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$127,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$127,000,000.

Description of known earmarks:
The HAC set aside \$127,000,000 only for cost growth in the prior year shipbuilding programs, all unrequested by the Navy. This sounds very much like what the HAC did for Tampa Shipbuilding and Bethlehem Steel (Sparrows Point) Shipyard last year.

LSD-41 amphibious ships (Avondale, New Orleans).

MHC-51 mine countermeasures ships in the FY 89 and FY 90 programs (Probably for Avondale, although Intermarine [Savannah, GA] and Avondale [Gulfport, MS] each have one MHC-51 funded in FY 89 and FY 90).

TAO-187 program in FY 87 (Avondale, New Orleans; these 2 ships have already delivered).

AO Jumbo conversion program (Avondale, New Orleans; these 5 ships have all delivered).

Patrol Coastal program (Bollinger Machine, Lockport, LA) All of these 13 ships were added to the FY 89-91 budgets by the Appropriators in the first place. Not a single ship was requested by the Navy.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
Have Nap (HAC report p. 168).
Total appropriated: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Air Force has bought all of the Have Nap missiles that they need. Nevertheless, HAC added \$10,000,000 to continue production of this missile and avoid a production break.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
BAD
C-21A Aircraft (HAC report p. 106).
Total appropriated: \$22,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$22,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$22,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$22,000,000 to buy 4 operational support aircraft for the Army.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
Oceanographic Research Vessels (HAC report p. 144, bill p. 28).

Total appropriated: \$110,049,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$62,500,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$62,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: The Navy had planned to competitively award TAGS-63 in FY 94 and TAGS-64 in FY 96. These are the last two of the TAGS-60 ocean survey class of ships. The HAC does not add funds, but allows the Navy to award these two ships as options to earlier TAGS-60 contracts. These earlier ships are being built by Halter Marine in Louisiana.

C-130 (HAC bill p. 32, report p. 162).
Total appropriated: \$73,794,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$20,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$20,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Not less than \$20,000,000 shall be made available only for the C-130J aircraft.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
DON'T KNOW YET
Natural Gas Utilization Equipment (HAC Report p. 102)
Total appropriated: \$48,000,000 (\$16M each for the Army, Navy and Air Force).
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$48,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$48,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: Of the \$16 million in each service: \$10,000,000 for NDI 200 kilowatt phosphoric acid natural gas fuel cells currently in production in the United States; \$6,000,000 for absorption, engine-driven, and desiccant natural gas cooling equipment. Of this total, \$2,000,000 is specifically for demonstrating equipment based on newly developed domestic, gas-fired heat pump technology.

Launcher Rail Chaff Dispenser. (HAC Report p. 103)

Total appropriated: \$12,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$12,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$12,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: \$8,000,000 for buying LAU-138/A launcher rail chaff dispenser (LRCD) systems; \$2,500,000 for chaff for the LRCD; \$1,500,000 for R&D to adapt the

LRCD system to other Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

Stinger. (HAC report p. 109)
Total appropriated: \$33,356,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$25,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$25,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add 300 Stinger missiles to Army procurement.
Description of possible earmarks: None.
Conventional Ammunition Demilitarization. (HAC report p. 121)

Total appropriated: \$.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$3,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$3,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Spend at least \$3,000,000 to continue the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant demilitarization upgrade program.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
AN/SPS-48 Radar. (HAC report p. 150)
Total appropriated: \$23,018,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$14,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$14,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000 added only for purchase of pulse doppler radar modifications kits for amphibious ships and carriers; \$4,000,000 added only for providing an interface between these upgraded radars and the RAM and CIWS weapons systems.

AN/SQR-18 Towed Array Sonar. (HAC report p. 151)

Total appropriated: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add \$10,000,000 to buy two pre-production AN/SQR-18 (V)3 sonar arrays. No funds were requested.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
Navy Tactical Data Systems. (HAC report p. 151)

Total appropriated: \$24,000,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$24,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$24,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: HAC designates \$24,000,000 only for procuring commercial emulator display systems as substitutes for MILSPEC equipment at land-based training and development sites. There may be only one "commercial" emulator display system manufacturer that will qualify for this funding.

Tactical Flag Command Center. (HAC report p. 152)

Total appropriated: \$42,787,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$9,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
Description of possible earmarks: HAC adds \$9,000,000 only for shipboard display emulator suites. There may be only one "commercial" emulator display system manufacturer that will qualify for this funding.

Tarter Support Equipment. (HAC report p. 153)

Total appropriated: \$31,872,000.
Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.
Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of possible earmarks: Add \$10,000,000 for continuous wave and track (CWAT) radars for the MK 74 Tartar missile fire control system. All but six of the ships that have this weapons systems are scheduled for retirement (two nuclear cruisers and four DDG-993s) at the next overhaul point.

Computer Acquisition Program. (HAC bill p. 30; report p. 154)
 Total appropriated: \$58,181,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$20,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$20,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of possible earmarks: Not less than \$20,000,000 shall be obligated for ADP equipment and software for the Defense Accounting Office and Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, New Orleans; the Enlisted Personnel Management Center; and the Naval Reserve Personnel Center.

Automatic Building Machines. (HAC report p. 158)
 Total appropriated: \$2,500,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$2,500,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$2,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of possible earmarks: No description provided—searching for more information.

C-130 Modifications. (HAC report p. 165)
 Total appropriated: \$149,085,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$8,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$8,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$8,000,000 designated for upgrades to the Compass Call mission training system.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 Air Traffic Control/Landing Systems. (HAC report p. 173)

Total appropriated: \$14,955,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$1,500,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,500,000.

Description of known earmarks: HAC added \$1,500,000 to install a full instrumented landing system at Richard B. Russell Airport in Rome, GA.

Description of the possible earmarks: None.
 Procurement, Defense Agencies. (HAC bill p. 34)

Total appropriated: \$1,556,344,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$0.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of possible earmarks: High Performance Computer Modernization Funds may be used only for (1) executing existing upgrade options of installed equipment that is not technically current, or (2) competitive acquisition of "architecturally stable, fully user-operational, compatible super computers possessing essentially stable system software, which have been successfully demonstrated using statistically valid samples of the current workload of the laboratories in question without substantive reprogramming or program conversion."

National Guard and Reserve Equipment. (HAC report p. 180)

Total appropriated: \$1,178,100,000. (Of this amount, \$446,000,000 in C-130 adds treated elsewhere)

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$393,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$324,100,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$717,100,000.

Description of known earmarks: (all Services):

PLS/HEMTT Trucks	\$47,000,000
HETS Trucks	36,000,000
D-9 Bulldozer	15,000,000
M-9 Armored Combat Earthmover	50,000,000
P-3 Upgrades	30,000,000
MIUW Vans (DRS)	21,000,000
AN/SQ-11 Trainer (DRS)	11,000,000
AH-1W Cobra Helicopters (6)	78,000,000
Firearms Training Systems	30,000,000
SINCGARS Radios	75,000,000
Description of possible earmarks:	
External Fuel Tanks	7,500,000
Tug Boats (USAR)	25,000,000
Automatic Building Machines	10,000,000
Medium Tactical Truck SLEP	50,000,000
KC-135 Radar Upgrade	15,000,000
ALR-67 (V) 2	15,000,000
C-9 Mods	25,000,000
C-130 Simulator	23,000,000
C-47 Simulator	15,000,000
C-47 FADEC Upgrade	9,600,000
Moving Target Simulator	5,000,000
IFTE Test Equipment	10,000,000
Night Vision Devices	35,000,000
AN/PSG-7 Digital Data Sets	9,700,000
LOCAS	1,800,000
APX-109	7,400,000
MCE/TASCI P31	17,900,000
TACS ARM Decoys	42,200,000

AUTHORIZED EARMARKS

AH-64 Helicopter (HAC report p. 106)
 Total appropriated: \$386,000,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$368,430,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$368,430,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$368,430,000 to buy 24 unrequested AH-64 Apache helicopters. SASC bill would add \$160,000,000 to keep production going.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 AHIP (HAC report p. 108)
 Total appropriated: \$216,000,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$216,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$216,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add 36 AHIP modifications to the Army budget. None were requested. Authorized by the HASC.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 TOW II. (HAC report p. 110)
 Total appropriated: \$82,282,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$57,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$57,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add money to the Army to buy 2,000 TOW IIB missiles. SACS added \$40,000,000 to protect production base.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 MLRS. (HAC report p. 110)
 Total appropriated: \$80,101,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$70,300,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$70,300,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add 12,000 MLRS rockets to Army procurement. SASC added \$60,000,000 to protect production base.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 Improved Tactical Air Launched Decoy. (HAC report p. 139)

Total appropriated: \$15,000,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$15,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$15,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: Add money to continue production of this system. \$10,000,000 authorized by the HASC.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 Standard Boats (HAC report p. 150)
 Total appropriated: \$14,350,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$5,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of known earmarks: \$5,000,000 added for the purchase of U.S.-built, totally enclosed survival systems. A similar add was authorized last year.

Submarine Pump Retrofit Kits (HAC report p. 149)
 Total appropriated: \$1,000,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$0.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$1,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: None.
 Description of possible earmarks: HAC directs purchase of 10 retrofit kits as a means of "protecting the industrial base." I understand that this is for work done in Mr. Hefner's district.

Single Channel Ground and Air Radio System (HAC report p. 158)
 Total appropriated: \$59,837,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$10,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$10,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$10,000,000 added to provide a "level procurement program." Authorized by the HASC.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 C-135 Modifications (HAC report p. 165)
 Total appropriated: \$203,143,000.

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$160,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$160,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: \$160,000,000 to re-engine KC-135E tankers to the KC-135R configuration. Authorized by the HASC.

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 Remotely Piloted Vehicles (HAC report p. 178)

Total appropriated: \$88,300,000.
 Subtotal of known earmarks: \$19,000,000.
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$0.
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$19,000,000.

Description of known earmarks: HAC added \$19,000,000 to improve the system readiness levels of the Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle program. (SASC report adds \$15,000,000 for this purpose).

Description of possible earmarks: None.
 C-130 Aircraft (HAC report p. 181)
 Total appropriated: \$

Subtotal of known earmarks: \$
 Subtotal of possible earmarks: \$
 Total of known and possible earmarks: \$

Description of known earmarks: \$446,000,000 for 14 C-130 aircraft for all services. SASC authorized \$250,000,000 for eight Air National Guard aircraft.

Description of possible earmarks: None.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, this is a disservice to American taxpayers but, more importantly, it is a disservice to men and women in uniform whose careers are being terminated prematurely because the Department

of Defense does not have the dollars to pay their salaries.

The Congress should get its priorities straight. However, I am happy to say the Senate appropriators seem to have moderated the district spending spree initiated by the House. Although I have not yet compiled a complete list of earmarks in the bill before the Senate today, it appears that most of the egregious programs included in the House bill have been deleted in the Senate Appropriations Committee version.

For example, this bill provides funding for the Guard and Reserve components for miscellaneous equipment and modernization programs, leaving to the discretion of the Guard Bureau and the chiefs of the Reserve components to prioritize among their competing needs. I applaud this approach to funding Guard and Reserve modernization, which is essentially the same approach taken by the Senate Armed Services Committee in the Defense authorization bill now in conference.

I am pleased to say most earmarks of defense conversion and medical research funds have also been removed. Again, I congratulate my colleagues, the distinguished chairman, Senator INOUE, of Hawaii, and the ranking Republican, Senator STEVENS, of Alaska. I congratulate them for their relative restraint.

However, I note with extreme dismay that the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported to this body a bill which includes over \$6.23 billion in appropriations for programs for which there is no authorization in the Senate version of the 1994 defense authorization bill. Inasmuch as the authorization bill is still in conference, I trust that the appropriators will work with the conferees on the authorization bill to ensure the appropriations bill conforms to the limits set in the authorization conference report.

Madam President, there are, in addition, objectionable provisions in this bill which clearly earmark dollars for special interest projects. Again, I will stress that these projects may have merit, but I firmly believe that funding decisions based on competitive bidding and independent evaluation are the only means to ensure that the American taxpayers' dollars are spent for the highest priority projects.

Let me take a moment to point out a few examples of earmarks which are included in this appropriations bill: \$5 million is earmarked for a Center of Excellence for Research in Ocean Sciences. I do not know where this center is located, but neither do I know what benefit will accrue to this Nation's defense from this grant.

Again, it was a \$5 million earmark for a Center of Excellence for Research in Ocean Sciences; \$1.5 million of defense dollars are directed to be spent to purchase an LCU ship converted to a

commercial cargo vessel and then deeded to the Government of American Samoa. Where is the defense requirement from this appropriation?

Two higher education systems in two separate States will share nearly \$9 million under a provision in the bill which directs the establishment of an international job training program at one college and a mathematics teachers' leadership project at the other college. These sound like very worthy programs. I do not know how, in your wildest imagination, you can connect them with national defense. These may not be the best institutions at which such programs should be conducted. Only competitive bidding can determine the answer.

So \$2.5 million is set aside to fund a joint Air Force-Navy Auroral Research Program, for which there is no request and no authorization. The dollars earmarked for these and other programs like them are dollars taken away from identified higher priority military requirements of the Department of Defense. They are dollars taken away from programs which directly support the training and welfare of our active-duty military personnel.

These special interest programs are not free. Their cost is the continued degradation of the readiness of our military forces at a time of continuing instability in the world.

Again, this year we are allowing the administration to fund foreign aid out of the defense budget. This bill contains more than \$400 million for aid to the former Soviet Union, making the total provided under the Nunn-Lugar program approximately \$1.2 billion. At the same time, knowledgeable experts warn of the continued modernization of Soviet strategic nuclear forces and the development of a new SS-25-type ICBM in the former Soviet Union, made possible by the influx of United States dollars to ease the domestic economy crisis in Russia.

I understand the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee intends to offer an amendment to condition aid to the former Soviet Union on assurances that this ICBM modernization program has been discontinued.

We are also continuing to fund humanitarian assistance programs, support for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, equipment for the Coast Guard, security support for the World Cup and summer Olympic sporting events, all out of a shrinking Defense budget. We have to draw the line at some point in time. I think that line should be drawn now.

It is time we looked around and realized what we are really doing here today. It is time we realized where lobbying, special interests, and narrow constituent concerns have brought us. If we continue this pattern of waste, we are the enemy and we will be respon-

sible for our Nation's inability to defend our interests in the future.

Madam President, I want to emphasize again about this myriad of projects that are unauthorized, unappropriated, and suddenly pop up as a result of an appropriations conference. Some of them may be worthwhile. A few of them may be in our vital national security interests. But what has happened to the process that allows the other 90 or 85—however many Members in this body who are not appropriators, who are not in the appropriations conference—the opportunity to make an input into the process?

I repeat again, I did not come here to vote on a 200-some-billion-dollar Defense appropriations bill, yes or no. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have a right to know why billions of dollars—why \$29 billion over 4 years was appropriated without being authorized; why certain billions of dollars were not only not appropriated but inserted in the Defense appropriations conference.

It should stop. There cannot be very many compelling national security requirements that call for a process where in a conference, closed to most Members of Congress, multibillion-dollar appropriations are made upon which Members of this body have only a yes or no vote. That is wrong. It has to be fixed.

I say, Madam President, what does fix it is a line-item veto, a point of order against unauthorized appropriations in the earmarking—in the earmarking. Why not try just once an open conference? Why not try an open conference where the press and the American people can see how their Government works? Would it be so devastating if we had an open conference? I do not think so. I would like to see one tried.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that the CRS report I mentioned earlier be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

To: Hon. John McCain.
From: Stephen Daggett, Specialist in National Defense and Keith Berner, Consultant in National Defense, Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division.
Subject: Requested Data on Congressional Additions to Annual DOD Budget Requests and Congressional "Earmarking" of Defense Funds.

This memo is in response to your request for data concerning (1) congressional additions to annual Department of Defense budget requests and (2) congressional "earmarking" of defense funds. It is comprised of two sets of tables for each of the four fiscal years from FY1990 through FY1993. One set of tables for each year identifies all line items for which Congress provided a larger amount in either defense authorization or defense appropriations bills than was requested or for

which the final amount appropriated exceeds the amount specifically authorized. These tables are entitled "FY19XX Congressional Additions to DOD Requests." A second set of tables identifies all language in annual Department of Defense Appropriations Acts that specifically allocates funds to particular projects or locations. These tables are entitled "Provisions in FY19XX Defense Appropriations Acts Specifying Funding by Project or Location."

CRS is providing this information as a data base for further analysis. In making use of this material, you should be aware of certain limitations of the data and of some of the issues that may arise in interpreting the information.

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

The first set of tables is based on data that the Department of Defense provided to CRS showing all congressional changes to DOD budget requests in annual defense authorization and appropriations legislation.¹ CRS then merged the data on authorization and appropriations and selected items meeting one or more of three criteria: (1) the final authorization amount exceeds the budget request; (2) the final appropriation amount exceeds the budget request; or (3) the final appropriation amount exceeds the final authorization amount. The tables indicate which of these criteria each line item fulfills.

In some cases CRS eliminated items from the analysis if it was clear that the amount that appeared to be added was instead simply reallocated from one budget account to another. For example, the FY1993 defense authorization act includes funds for real property maintenance (RPM) in individual Army, Navy, and Air Force operation and maintenance accounts. Appropriations bills, however, provide these funds in a separate RPM account for all services combined. CRS therefore eliminated the RPM lines, since they did not appear to represent an addition to the request. We did the same for some other programs. There may remain, however, instances in which we were unable to identify shifts of funds from one account to another.

In other cases, different versions of defense bills may provide funding for the same program under different names and with different identifying line numbers. In obvious instances where this occurred within a given appropriation account, we combined such items into a single line, though some counting errors may well remain. In some cases, however, authorization bills provide funding in one account while appropriation bills provide funding for an identical item in a different account (funding for C-130 aircraft, for example). In these instances we have not combined the line items together. As a result, the amount appropriated for such items appears as a case in which the amount specified in appropriations bills or reports exceeds the amount specified in authorization bills or reports—which is true within the particular account but may not be true overall.

A unique set of difficulties applies to data on operation and maintenance (O&M) funding. Since operation and maintenance budget requests have not been submitted at the line item level, congressional reports have simply made note of various additions or reductions to particular activities. DOD records

any such changes as adjustments in line items. Where appropriators did not specifically comment on a reduction in O&M funding that was identified in an authorization measure, then the difference may appear as a case in which the appropriation exceeds the authorized level. Rather than record these as cases in which the amount specified in appropriation measures exceeds the amount specified in authorization measures, we eliminated such items. If appropriation measures specifically acted on items that were reduced in authorization measures, however, we reported the amounts. We also eliminated O&M lines that reflect merely offsetting financial adjustments, including, notably, many Defense Business Operations Fund (DBOF) transfers.

With these exceptions, changes in individual line items cited in the attached tables on congressional additions may be added together to estimate the total amount of congressional additions to annual defense budget requests and/or the total amount of appropriations for line items not specifically authorized. Please note that these do not constitute net additions to military budgets, since congressional increases to amounts requested may be offset by reductions to Administration requests that are not recorded here.

Funding amounts displayed in the second set of table—i.e., tables showing provisions in annual defense appropriations act specifying funding by project or location—are not of a nature that would allow them to be added without considerably more research. These tables were prepared by reviewing the text of annual defense appropriations acts, copying all provisions that appear to specify funding for particular projects or locations, and then restructuring the selected provisions into table form showing amounts of funding in a separate column. No effort was made to determine whether specified funding levels differ from amounts requested, nor was any effort made to avoid overlap. Many of the items cited also appear in the first set of attached tables showing congressional additions to budget requests by line item.

OTHER ISSUES

The data in the attached tables may be interpreted in ways that involve some controversial matters of definition which CRS is not directly addressing. One issue concerns the "unauthorized appropriation" of funds. The attached tables identify line items for which amounts specifically provided in final appropriations bills and/or appropriations conference reports exceed the amounts specifically provided in final authorization bills and/or authorization conference reports. The amounts by which the appropriation levels for various items in the law or in report language exceed the authorization levels in the law or in report language are commonly referred to as "unauthorized appropriations."

It is important to note, however, that defense authorization and appropriation acts seldom specify in law funding levels for particular line items. Instead, both kinds of laws provide specific amounts at the "account" level—for example, the FY1993 defense authorization act provides \$5,899,395,000 for Navy aircraft procurement, while the FY1993 defense appropriation act provides \$6,026,213,000. Levels of funding for individual programs, like the F/A-18 fighter, are stipulated in committee reports, but, except in unusual circumstances, not in the language of the law. Appropriators, therefore, have ar-

gued that they have considerable leeway to adjust funding levels for particular programs at least within the limits of amounts for particular accounts specified in authorization laws. Moreover, appropriations acts or committee reports quite often specify funding within a particular account for programs that are not specifically mentioned in authorization acts or reports at all while remaining within the funding level authorized for the account.

Under the circumstances, Defense Department officials generally try to avoid becoming embroiled in reconciling differences between authorizers and appropriators—regulations require that officials act on the basis of "congressional intent." Within Congress, disputes over funding for particular programs are matters that authorizing and appropriating committees have periodically tried to work out through informal compromises.

Given this unsettled state of affairs, CRS is not suggesting that the amounts by which levels of funding for particular line items in appropriations committee reports exceed levels in authorization committee reports either do or do not represent unauthorized appropriations. Users of the attached data may apply their own definitions.

Another definitional issue concerns so-called "earmarking" of funds. In general, to earmark funds means simply to set aside an amount for a specific purpose. Earmarking, however, refers to quite different things in different legislative contexts. In foreign assistance legislation, for example, the practice of specifying in law or in committee reports that particular amounts are available only for particular countries is often referred to as earmarking. In this sense, almost all defense funding could be seen as earmarked, since budget requests and committee reports specify funding levels at an extremely detailed line item level (except in operation and maintenance accounts).

In discussing defense funding, therefore, "earmarking" generally refers to occasions in which amounts are specified in law or in committee reports for purposes even more narrow than those of typical line items. For example, provisions that allocate funding to particular universities, out of amounts in a line item for university research grants, are often described as earmarks. Sometimes, however, the term "earmark" is applied more broadly to refer to all instances in which the allocation of funds is specified in the language of the law itself.

In light of the flexibility of the term in common usage, CRS has not referred to "earmarked" funds in any of the attached material. Rather we have tried to identify all provisions of defense appropriations acts that specify that funds should be allocated to particular projects or locations. We leave it to others to determine whether any or all these provisions constitute "earmarks."

As you may note, we have not provided a similar table of provisions from defense authorization acts. The reason is that authorization measures typically include dozens if not hundreds of provisions that define or establish particular programs and activities. The results of citing them all would be unwieldy. We do not mean to suggest, however, that only appropriators may earmark funds.

If CRS can be of any further assistance, please call Stephen Daggett at 707-7642.

¹ CRS did a limited check of the DOD data against congressional committee reports and found no errors.

FY1990 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
MILITARY PERSONNEL									
TOA	79,185,300	NA	78,719,900	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	79,185,300	NA	78,719,900	NA		NA			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE									
TOA	90,435,700	86,897,747	88,036,117				1,132,300	1,930,380	1,034,456
FAJ	(237,200)	(667,200)	(237,200)				1.3%	2.2%	1.2%
Appropriations	90,198,500	86,210,547	85,798,917						
PROCUREMENT									
TOA	78,754,000	81,879,489	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,670	3,115,800	6,047,239	4,021,155
FAJ							3.8%	7.2%	4.6%
Appropriations	78,754,000	81,879,489	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,670			
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL									
TOA	39,545,300	37,943,772	37,109,446				1,254,907	1,316,325	751,297
FAJ							3.3%	3.5%	2.0%
Appropriations	39,545,300	37,943,772	37,109,446						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS									
TOA	774,400	244,700	344,700			100,000	0	100,000	100,000
FAJ							0.0%	29.0%	29.0%
Appropriations	774,400	244,700	344,700			100,000			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION									
TOA	4,842,500	4,698,489	5,329,909		487,409	631,420	591,930	1,161,934	764,294
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)				12.6%	21.8%	14.3%
Appropriations	4,822,500	4,678,489	5,309,909		487,409	631,420			
FAMILY HOUSING									
TOA	3,232,747	3,274,369	3,220,629	41,622			140,591	92,782	5,322
FAJ	(47)	(47)	(47)				4.3%	2.9%	0.2%
Appropriations	3,232,700	3,274,322	3,220,582	41,622					

FY1990 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES									
TOA	(156,600)	NA		NA	156,600	NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	(156,600)	NA		NA	156,600	NA			
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS									
TOA									
FAJ	(760,000)		(664,000)						
Appropriations	(760,000)	NA	(664,000)	NA	96,000	NA			
TRUST FUNDS									
TOA									
FAJ	27,900		27,900						
Appropriations	27,900	NA	27,900	NA		NA			
INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS									
TOA									
FAJ	(26,300)		(26,300)						
Appropriations	(26,300)	NA	(26,300)	NA		NA			
HOMEOWNERS ASST FUND, DEFENSE									
TOA	2,553	NA	2,553	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	2,553	NA	2,553	NA		NA			
TOTAL									
TOA	296,815,900	214,938,566	294,876,413			79,937,847	8,235,528	10,648,660	6,676,524
FAJ	(1,015,647)	(707,247)	(919,647)				2.9%	3.6%	2.3%
Appropriations	295,800,253	214,231,319	293,956,766			79,725,447			

FY1993 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
MILITARY PERSONNEL									
TOA	76,982,028	NA	76,275,025	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	76,982,028	NA	76,275,025	NA		NA			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE									
TOA	86,485,246	82,768,402	83,369,186			600,784	1,137,010	1,104,954	842,433
FAJ	(2,494,900)	(1,882,900)	(3,454,000)				1.4%	1.3%	1.0%
Appropriations	83,990,346	80,885,502	79,915,186						
PROCUREMENT									
TOA	56,290,898	54,948,282	55,894,531			946,249	3,789,103	5,713,719	3,436,528
FAJ							6.9%	10.2%	6.1%
Appropriations	56,290,898	54,948,282	55,894,531			946,249			
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL									
TOA	38,812,701	39,813,580	38,234,848	800,879			3,931,184	4,764,216	2,244,368
FAJ							9.9%	12.5%	5.9%
Appropriations	38,812,701	39,813,580	38,234,848	800,879					
OTHER									
TOA									
FAJ									
Appropriations									
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS									
TOA	2,325,200	1,608,200	1,737,200			129,000	21,200	0	200
FAJ							1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Appropriations	2,325,200	1,608,200	1,737,200			129,000			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION									
TOA	6,500,880	5,173,098	4,698,301				899,888	788,265	32,822
FAJ	(245,800)	(245,800)	(245,800)				17.4%	16.8%	0.7%
Appropriations	6,254,880	4,927,298	4,452,501						

**FY1993 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)**

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
FAMILY HOUSING									
TOA	4,060,735	3,948,417	3,941,499				734,466	211,762	1,169,730
FAJ	(4,873)	(4,873)	(4,873)				18.6%	5.4%	29.7%
Appropriations	4,055,862	3,943,544	3,936,626						
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES									
TOA	(110,000)	NA	(110,000)	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	(110,000)	NA	(110,000)	NA		NA			
TRUST FUNDS									
TOA									
FAJ									
Appropriations									
TOTAL									
TOA	271,347,488	188,059,977	264,040,590	800,879	0	1,676,033	10,512,851	12,562,916	7,726,079
FAJ	(2,745,573)	(2,133,573)	(3,704,673)				5.6%	4.8%	2.9%
Appropriations	268,601,915	185,926,404	260,335,917	800,879	0	1,075,249			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
MILITARY PERSONNEL										
Military Personnel, Army										
TOA	24,704,300	NA	NA	NA	24,610,000	24,558,217	24,510,980	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	24,704,300	NA	NA	NA	24,610,000	24,558,217	24,510,980	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Navy										
TOA	19,337,400	NA	NA	NA	19,363,300	19,290,816	19,307,700	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	19,337,400	NA	NA	NA	19,363,300	19,290,816	19,307,700	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	5,806,100	NA	NA	NA	5,813,800	5,800,200	5,800,200	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,806,100	NA	NA	NA	5,813,800	5,800,200	5,800,200	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	20,224,100	NA	NA	NA	20,155,800	20,047,750	19,994,040	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,224,100	NA	NA	NA	20,155,800	20,047,750	19,994,040	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Army										
TOA	2,243,300	NA	NA	NA	2,265,700	2,225,164	2,234,400	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,243,300	NA	NA	NA	2,265,700	2,225,164	2,234,400	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Navy										
TOA	1,588,800	NA	NA	NA	1,591,800	1,575,170	1,582,800	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,588,800	NA	NA	NA	1,591,800	1,575,170	1,582,800	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	319,200	NA	NA	NA	319,200	317,898	319,200	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	319,200	NA	NA	NA	319,200	317,898	319,200	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	668,900	NA	NA	NA	674,400	672,129	672,700	NA	3,800	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	668,900	NA	NA	NA	674,400	672,129	672,700	NA	3,800	NA

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
National Guard Personnel, Army										
TOA	3,246,700	NA	NA	NA	3,252,200	3,246,700	3,246,700	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,246,700	NA	NA	NA	3,252,200	3,246,700	3,246,700	NA		NA
National Guard Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	1,046,700	NA	NA	NA	1,044,800	1,046,700	1,051,200	NA	4,500	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,046,700	NA	NA	NA	1,044,800	1,046,700	1,051,200	NA	4,500	NA
TOTAL - MILITARY PERSONNEL										
TOA	79,185,300	NA	NA	NA	79,091,000	78,780,742	78,719,900	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	79,185,300	NA	NA	NA	79,091,000	78,780,742	78,719,900	NA		NA
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
TOA	23,708,600	23,422,750	23,453,700	22,973,309	23,603,843	22,856,662	22,787,559			
FAJ										
Appropriations	23,708,600	23,422,750	23,453,700	22,973,309	23,603,843	22,856,662	22,787,559			
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
TOA	26,191,800	24,733,720	24,595,400	24,163,951	25,985,801	24,343,407	24,136,621			
FAJ	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)			
Appropriations	25,954,600	24,496,520	24,358,200	23,926,751	25,748,601	24,106,207	23,902,621			
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
TOA	1,716,300	1,703,500	1,700,500	1,657,800	1,855,300	1,640,419	1,657,719			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,716,300	1,703,500	1,700,500	1,657,800	1,855,300	1,640,419	1,657,719			
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
TOA	22,812,200	22,368,640	22,709,500	21,909,296	22,708,743	21,986,987	21,808,213			
FAJ										
Appropriations	22,812,200	22,368,640	22,709,500	21,909,296	22,708,743	21,986,987	21,808,213			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. ^{>} Request	Amount Approp. ^{>} Request	Amount Approp. ^{>} Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
TOA	8,021,600	7,974,910	7,926,000	7,850,472	7,829,137	7,879,444	7,800,156			
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,021,600	7,974,910	7,926,000	7,850,472	7,829,137	7,879,444	7,800,156			
Office of the Inspector General										
TOA	95,800	94,749	96,200	94,749	95,749	95,800	95,749			1,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	95,800	94,749	96,200	94,749	95,749	95,800	95,749			1,000
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
TOA	861,900	863,000	864,300	861,800	863,100	861,900	861,800			
FAJ										
Appropriations	861,900	863,000	864,300	861,800	863,100	861,900	861,800			
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
TOA	980,000	917,200	895,700	894,800	1,002,400	895,200	894,800			
FAJ										
Appropriations	980,000	917,200	895,700	894,800	1,002,400	895,200	894,800			
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
TOA	77,400	77,400	77,500	77,400	77,400	77,400	77,400			
FAJ										
Appropriations	77,400	77,400	77,500	77,400	77,400	77,400	77,400			
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	1,004,600	964,387	961,900	978,500	1,010,487	961,900	978,500			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,004,600	964,387	961,900	978,500	1,010,487	961,900	978,500			
Oper. & Maint., Army Nat'l Guard										
TOA	1,870,200	1,867,100	1,875,500	1,867,100	1,867,100	1,870,200	1,867,100			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,870,200	1,867,100	1,875,500	1,867,100	1,867,100	1,870,200	1,867,100			
Oper. & Maint., Air Nat'l Guard										
TOA	2,041,200	1,999,793	1,988,400	1,981,900	2,054,093	1,988,400	1,981,900			
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,041,200	1,999,793	1,988,400	1,981,900	2,054,093	1,988,400	1,981,900			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Rifle Practice, Army										
TOA	4,700	3,970	4,700	3,970	4,700	4,700	4,700			730
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,700	3,970	4,700	3,970	4,700	4,700	4,700			730
Court of Military Appeals, Defense										
TOA	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,800	4,000	4,000			
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,800	4,000	4,000			
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
TOA	517,800	600,800	517,800	601,100	900,800	517,800	601,100	83,300	83,300	
FAJ										
Appropriations	517,800	600,800	517,800	601,100	900,800	517,800	601,100	83,300	83,300	
Goodwill Games										
TOA	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600			
FAJ										
Appropriations	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600	14,600			
Humanitarian Assistance										
TOA	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000			
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000			
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D										
TOA		450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	575,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	
FAJ			(450,000)	(450,000)						
Appropriations		450,000			450,000	575,000	450,000		450,000	450,000
Base Realignment & Closure Act										
TOA	500,000	500,000	300,000	500,000	500,000	300,000				
FAJ										
Appropriations	500,000	500,000	300,000	500,000	500,000	300,000				
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	90,435,700	88,593,519	88,488,700	88,897,747	90,840,053	88,908,819	88,038,117			
FAJ	(237,200)	(237,200)	(687,200)	(687,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)			
Appropriations	90,198,500	88,356,319	87,781,500	88,210,547	90,602,853	88,669,619	85,798,917			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
TOA	2,906,100	3,183,644	2,706,500	3,120,500	3,081,798	4,423,000	3,789,937	214,400	863,637	669,437
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,906,100	3,183,644	2,706,500	3,120,500	3,081,798	4,423,000	3,789,937	214,400	863,637	669,437
Missile Procurement, Army										
TOA	2,661,600	2,702,600	2,748,256	2,756,827	2,942,399	2,361,529	2,708,399	95,227	46,799	
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,661,600	2,702,600	2,748,256	2,756,827	2,942,399	2,361,529	2,708,399	95,227	46,799	
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
TOA	2,724,000	2,715,719	2,637,600	2,717,500	2,692,436	2,698,194	2,707,611			
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,724,000	2,715,719	2,637,600	2,717,500	2,692,436	2,698,194	2,707,611			
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
TOA	1,704,800	1,667,800	1,697,400	1,867,047	2,021,317	1,691,147	2,011,243	182,247	306,443	124,196
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,704,800	1,667,800	1,697,400	1,867,047	2,021,317	1,691,147	2,011,243	182,247	306,443	124,196
Other Procurement, Army										
TOA	4,169,100	4,036,861	2,892,713	3,068,771	3,896,365	3,455,236	3,699,219			600,448
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,169,100	4,036,861	2,892,713	3,068,771	3,896,365	3,455,236	3,699,219			600,448
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
TOA	8,826,100	8,665,802	8,346,762	9,500,222	9,164,718	9,101,863	9,369,266	674,122	563,166	
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,826,100	8,665,802	8,346,762	9,500,222	9,164,718	9,101,863	9,369,266	674,122	563,166	
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
TOA	5,725,000	5,570,500	4,012,620	3,884,035	5,816,879	3,897,954	5,392,312			1,506,277
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,725,000	5,570,500	4,012,620	3,884,035	5,816,879	3,897,954	5,392,312			1,506,277
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
TOA	9,550,600	9,925,306	9,756,466	10,958,400	12,456,200	12,140,600	11,557,900	1,407,800	2,007,300	599,500
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,550,600	9,925,306	9,756,466	10,958,400	12,456,200	12,140,600	11,557,900	1,407,800	2,007,300	599,500

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Other Procurement, Navy										
TOA	4,915,000	5,840,000	6,314,300	8,207,125	4,636,485	8,181,432	7,970,784	3,292,125	3,055,784	
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,915,000	5,840,000	6,314,300	8,207,125	4,636,485	8,181,432	7,970,784	3,292,125	3,055,784	
Procurement, Marine Corps										
TOA	1,196,800	1,202,700	1,178,000	1,215,600	1,246,800	1,185,385	1,213,792	16,800	16,992	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,196,800	1,202,700	1,178,000	1,215,600	1,246,800	1,185,385	1,213,792	16,800	16,992	
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	16,787,200	15,972,700	15,930,600	16,329,857	14,531,196	16,206,530	15,679,242			
FAJ										
Appropriations	16,787,200	15,972,700	15,930,600	16,329,857	14,531,196	16,206,530	15,679,242			
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	7,362,200	7,140,500	7,119,300	7,110,900	6,544,612	7,240,724	6,916,893			
FAJ										
Appropriations	7,362,200	7,140,500	7,119,300	7,110,900	6,544,612	7,240,724	6,916,893			
Other Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	8,561,600	8,605,200	8,450,200	8,536,454	8,087,219	8,273,799	8,524,110			
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,561,600	8,605,200	8,450,200	8,536,454	8,087,219	8,273,799	8,524,110			
Procurement, Defensewide										
TOA	1,321,800	1,321,200	1,284,400	1,332,251	1,318,173	1,272,700	1,300,720	10,451		
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,321,800	1,321,200	1,284,400	1,332,251	1,318,173	1,272,700	1,300,720	10,451		
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
TOA		1,391,500	1,923,400	986,300	1,481,400	1,402,761	973,720	986,300	973,720	
FAJ										
Appropriations		1,391,500	1,923,400	986,300	1,481,400	1,402,761	973,720	986,300	973,720	
Inspector General										
TOA		1,051			1,051		1,051		1,051	1,051
FAJ										
Appropriations		1,051			1,051		1,051		1,051	1,051

68-059 O-97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 17) 35

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Defense Production Act Purchases										
TOA	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	50,000	10,500	50,000	39,500	39,500	
FAJ										
Appropriations	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	50,000	10,500	50,000	39,500	39,500	
Space & Related Activities Augmentation,										
TOA					555,000	485,000				
FAJ										
Appropriations					555,000	485,000				
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruction, Def										
TOA	311,400	311,400	311,400	263,700	269,800	259,355	257,010			
FAJ										
Appropriations	311,400	311,400	311,400	263,700	269,800	259,355	257,010			
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	78,754,000	80,274,483	77,309,917	81,879,489	80,796,850	84,307,909	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,870
FAJ										
Appropriations	78,754,000	80,274,483	77,309,917	81,879,489	80,796,850	84,307,909	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,870
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
RDT&E, Army										
TOA	5,693,500	5,858,500	5,723,898	5,666,210	5,568,700	5,362,737	5,434,378			
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,693,500	5,858,500	5,723,898	5,666,210	5,568,700	5,362,737	5,434,378			
RDT&E, Navy										
TOA	9,830,300	10,313,999	9,928,851	9,901,897	9,785,454	9,823,827	9,733,174	71,597		
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,830,300	10,313,999	9,928,851	9,901,897	9,785,454	9,823,827	9,733,174	71,597		
RDT&E, Air Force										
TOA	14,551,900	14,613,086	14,629,932	13,938,879	12,438,021	13,915,171	13,635,570			
FAJ										
Appropriations	14,551,900	14,613,086	14,629,932	13,938,879	12,438,021	13,915,171	13,635,570			

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RDT&E, Defensewide										
TOA	8,965,800	7,747,111	9,015,912	8,158,701	7,530,872	8,201,833	8,113,049			
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,965,800	7,747,111	9,015,912	8,158,701	7,530,872	8,201,833	8,113,049			
Developmental Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	309,300	309,550	294,300	211,200	224,505	222,311	180,550			
FAJ										
Appropriations	309,300	309,550	294,300	211,200	224,505	222,311	180,550			
Operational Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	194,500	124,500	164,500	67,085	12,725	118,849	12,725			
FAJ										
Appropriations	194,500	124,500	164,500	67,085	12,725	118,849	12,725			
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
TOA	39,545,300	36,966,746	39,757,393	37,943,772	35,540,277	37,664,528	37,109,448			
FAJ										
Appropriations	39,545,300	36,966,746	39,757,393	37,943,772	35,540,277	37,664,528	37,109,448			
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
Army Stock Fund										
TOA	107,600	134,600	97,600		134,600					
FAJ										
Appropriations	107,600	134,600	97,600		134,600					
Navy Stock Fund										
TOA	223,400	223,400	201,400	40,500	223,400	40,500	40,500			
FAJ										
Appropriations	223,400	223,400	201,400	40,500	223,400	40,500	40,500			
Air Force Stock Fund										
TOA	339,300	339,300	308,300	126,100	339,300	126,100	126,100			
FAJ										
Appropriations	339,300	339,300	308,300	126,100	339,300	126,100	126,100			
Defense Stock Fund										
TOA	104,100	104,100	94,100	78,100	104,100	78,100	78,100			
FAJ										
Appropriations	104,100	104,100	94,100	78,100	104,100	78,100	78,100			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Emergency Response Fund, Defense										
TOA						100,000	100,000		100,000	100,000
FAJ										
Appropriations						100,000	100,000		100,000	100,000
TOTAL - REV. AND MANGMNT. FUNDS										
TOA	774,400	801,400	899,400	244,700	801,400	344,700	344,700			100,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	774,400	801,400	899,400	244,700	801,400	344,700	344,700			100,000
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
TOA	745,300	767,018	732,614	782,655	834,222	726,075	819,129	37,555	73,829	36,274
FAJ										
Appropriations	745,300	767,018	732,614	782,655	834,222	726,075	819,129	37,555	73,829	36,274
Military Construction, Navy										
TOA	1,133,200	1,155,270	1,137,599	1,111,221	1,167,750	1,151,783	1,139,250		6,050	28,029
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,133,200	1,155,270	1,137,599	1,111,221	1,167,750	1,151,783	1,139,250		6,050	28,029
Military Construction, Air Force										
TOA	1,393,300	1,202,076	1,296,729	1,248,640	1,208,136	1,122,249	1,227,296			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,393,300	1,202,076	1,296,729	1,248,640	1,208,136	1,122,249	1,227,296			
Military Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	598,200	531,320	563,200	541,420	531,320	468,332	537,440			
FAJ										
Appropriations	598,200	531,320	563,200	541,420	531,320	468,332	537,440			
Mil. Con., Army National Guard										
TOA	114,000	193,333	175,109	187,411	192,533	246,830	223,490	73,411	109,490	36,079
FAJ										
Appropriations	114,000	193,333	175,109	187,411	192,533	246,830	223,490	73,411	109,490	36,079

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
TOA	164,600	196,590	216,180	196,628	190,660	251,480	236,330	34,028	73,730	39,702
FAJ										
Appropriations	164,600	196,590	216,180	196,628	190,660	251,480	236,330	34,028	73,730	39,702
Mil. Con., Army Reserve										
TOA	76,900	80,505	91,455	80,800	80,505	104,000	97,460	3,900	20,560	16,660
FAJ										
Appropriations	76,900	80,505	91,455	80,800	80,505	104,000	97,460	3,900	20,560	16,660
Mil. Con., Naval Reserve										
TOA	50,900	56,600	50,900	56,600	56,600	62,400	56,600	5,700	5,700	
FAJ										
Appropriations	50,900	56,600	50,900	56,600	56,600	62,400	56,600	5,700	5,700	
Mil. Con., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	46,200	46,200	46,200	46,200	46,200	53,200	46,200			
FAJ										
Appropriations	46,200	46,200	46,200	46,200	46,200	53,200	46,200			
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part I										
TOA							500,000		500,000	500,000
FAJ										
Appropriations							500,000		500,000	500,000
NATO Infrastructure										
TOA	521,900	444,714	482,300	444,714	444,714	482,300	444,714			
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)			
Appropriations	501,900	424,714	462,300	424,714	424,714	462,300	424,714			
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
TOA	4,842,500	4,675,626	4,792,266	4,696,466	4,752,870	4,666,649	5,329,909		487,409	631,420
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)			
Appropriations	4,822,500	4,655,626	4,772,266	4,676,466	4,732,870	4,646,649	5,309,909		487,409	631,420

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
TOA	55,200	138,810	55,200	73,810	143,810	91,171	78,982	18,610	23,782	5,172
FAJ										
Appropriations	55,200	138,810	55,200	73,810	143,810	91,171	78,982	18,610	23,782	5,172
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
TOA	1,362,700	1,362,700	1,377,100	1,377,100	1,380,300	1,368,300	1,374,700			
FAJ	300	300	300	300	300	300	300			
Appropriations	1,363,000	1,363,000	1,377,400	1,377,400	1,380,600	1,368,600	1,375,000			
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
TOA	127,400	267,890	137,100	191,290	264,769	123,873	174,621	63,890	47,221	
FAJ										
Appropriations	127,400	267,890	137,100	191,290	264,769	123,873	174,621	63,890	47,221	
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy &										
TOA	624,800	668,604	605,264	660,424	653,816	618,200	623,700	35,624		
FAJ										
Appropriations	624,800	668,604	605,264	660,424	653,816	618,200	623,700	35,624		
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
TOA	241,100	250,690	280,797	201,690	252,735	105,000	200,071			
FAJ										
Appropriations	241,100	250,690	280,797	201,690	252,735	105,000	200,071			
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
TOA	774,800	774,800	760,208	743,308	773,300	765,800	741,808			
FAJ										
Appropriations	774,800	774,800	760,208	743,308	773,300	765,800	741,808			
Family Housing Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	600	600	600	600	600	600	600			
FAJ										
Appropriations	600	600	600	600	600	600	600			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Defense										
TOA	20,700	20,700	19,800	20,700	20,700	20,700	20,700			
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,700	20,700	19,800	20,700	20,700	20,700	20,700			
Homeowners Asst Fund, Def.										
TOA	5,447	5,447	5,447	5,447	5,447	5,447	5,447			
FAJ	(347)	(347)	(347)	(347)	(347)	(347)	(347)			
Appropriations	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100			
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
TOA	3,232,747	3,510,241	3,241,518	3,274,369	3,495,477	3,099,091	3,220,629	41,622		
FAJ	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)			
Appropriations	3,232,700	3,510,194	3,241,469	3,274,322	3,495,430	3,099,044	3,220,582	41,622		
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES										
Other Legislation										
TOA	129,500	NA	NA	NA				NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	129,500	NA	NA	NA				NA		NA
Anticipated Savings										
TOA	(286,100)	NA	NA	NA		275,800		NA	286,100	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	(286,100)	NA	NA	NA		275,800		NA	286,100	NA
TOTAL - DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES										
TOA	(156,600)	NA	NA	NA		275,800		NA	156,600	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	(156,600)	NA	NA	NA		275,800		NA	156,600	NA
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS										
TOA										
FAJ	(210,000)				(210,000)	(187,000)	(187,000)			
Appropriations	(210,000)	NA	NA	NA	(210,000)	(187,000)	(187,000)	NA	23,000	NA

FY1991 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
MILITARY PERSONNEL									
TOA	79,053,700	NA	78,080,467	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	79,053,700	NA	78,080,467	NA		NA			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE									
TOA	90,070,700	85,452,493	84,636,160				741,227 0.9%	1,708,574 2.0%	2,075,943 2.5%
FAJ									
Appropriations	90,070,700	85,452,493	84,636,160						
PROCUREMENT									
TOA	77,642,450	67,184,710	67,469,348			284,638	5,270,776 7.8%	5,217,766 7.7%	4,208,515 6.2%
FAJ									
Appropriations	77,642,450	67,184,710	67,469,348			284,638			
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL									
TOA	38,092,800	36,095,903	35,974,792				3,124,171 8.7%	3,583,194 10.0%	1,980,501 5.5%
FAJ									
Appropriations	38,092,800	36,095,903	35,974,792						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS									
TOA	2,228,200	1,584,200	1,984,200			400,000			
FAJ									
Appropriations	2,228,200	1,584,200	1,984,200			400,000			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION									
TOA	5,708,900	5,426,572	5,350,042				868,180 16.0%	866,240 16.2%	137,669 2.6%
FAJ	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)						
Appropriations	5,668,900	5,386,572	5,310,042						
FAMILY HOUSING									
TOA	3,455,565	3,378,507	3,363,313				24,965 0.7%	30,059 0.9%	26,903 0.8%
FAJ	1,235	1,235	1,235						
Appropriations	3,456,800	3,379,742	3,364,548						

FY1991 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES									
TOA	(300,000)	NA		NA	300,000	NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	(300,000)	NA		NA	300,000	NA			
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS									
TOA									
FAJ	(849,300)		(849,300)						
Appropriations	(849,300)	NA	(849,300)	NA		NA			
TRUST FUNDS									
TOA									
FAJ	73,000		73,000						
Appropriations	73,000	NA	73,000	NA		NA			
INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS									
TOA									
FAJ	(29,100)		(29,100)						
Appropriations	(29,100)	NA	(29,100)	NA		NA			
HOMEOWNERS ASST FUND, DEFENSE									
TOA	1,435	NA	1,435	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	1,435	NA	1,435	NA		NA			
TOTAL									
TOA	295,953,750	199,122,385	278,859,757			77,737,372	10,029,319	11,405,833	8,429,531
FAJ	(844,185)	(38,785)	(844,185)				5.0%	4.1%	3.0%
Appropriations	295,109,585	199,083,620	278,015,592			76,931,972			

FY1992 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.>	Amount Approp.>	Amount Approp>	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA%TOA)
MILITARY PERSONNEL									
TOA	78,018,900	NA	78,266,327	NA	249,427	NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	78,018,900	NA	78,266,327	NA	249,427	NA			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE									
TOA	86,686,300	84,340,080	84,663,081			323,021	936,030	1,599,290	1,508,560
FAJ							1.1%	1.9%	1.8%
Appropriations	86,686,300	84,340,060	84,663,081			323,021			
PROCUREMENT									
TOA	63,845,800	63,884,659	64,639,407	38,859	793,607	754,748	4,258,015	5,452,018	3,260,791
FAJ							6.7%	8.4%	5.0%
Appropriations	63,845,800	63,884,659	64,639,407	38,859	793,607	754,748			
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL									
TOA	39,221,533	40,056,803	39,401,923	835,070	180,390		3,019,741	3,154,782	944,487
FAJ							7.5%	8.0%	2.4%
Appropriations	39,221,533	40,056,803	39,401,923	835,070	180,390				
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS									
TOA	3,400,200	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000	0	24,000	24,000
FAJ							0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
Appropriations	3,400,200	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION									
TOA	4,556,900	5,383,210	5,127,645	826,310	570,745		1,329,480	1,217,281	200,798
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)				24.7%	23.7%	3.9%
Appropriations	4,536,900	5,363,210	5,107,645	826,310	570,745				
FAMILY HOUSING									
TOA	3,810,900	3,659,568	3,649,743	48,668	38,843		59,080	71,360	12,300
FAJ	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)				1.6%	2.0%	0.3%
Appropriations	3,805,900	3,654,568	3,644,743	48,668	38,843				

FY1992 SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO LINE ITEMS
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	Enacted Auth.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.	Auth. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. Amounts Added to Line Items (TOA/%TOA)	Approp. >Auth. Amounts for Line Items (TOA/%TOA)
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES									
TOA	(335,900)	NA	(335,900)	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	(335,900)	NA	(335,900)	NA		NA			
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS									
TOA									
FAJ	(727,500)		(727,500)						
Appropriations	(727,500)	NA	(727,500)	NA		NA			
TRUST FUNDS									
TOA									
FAJ	34,700		34,700						
Appropriations	34,700	NA	34,700	NA		NA			
INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS									
TOA									
FAJ	(28,000)		(28,000)						
Appropriations	(28,000)	NA	(28,000)	NA		NA			
HOMEOWNERS ASST FUND, DEFENSE									
TOA	5,000	NA	5,000	NA		NA			
FAJ									
Appropriations	5,000	NA	5,000	NA		NA			
TOTAL									
TOA	279,007,633	200,724,300	278,841,428			78,117,126	9,602,326	11,518,731	5,948,936
FAJ	(745,800)	(25,000)	(745,800)				4.6%	4.1%	2.1%
Appropriations	278,261,833	200,699,300	278,095,628			77,396,326			

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Offsetting Receipts, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	(172,000)				(172,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)			
Appropriations	(172,000)	NA	NA	NA	(172,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	NA	22,000	NA
Offsetting Receipts, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	(300,000)				(300,000)	(249,000)	(249,000)			
Appropriations	(300,000)	NA	NA	NA	(300,000)	(249,000)	(249,000)	NA	51,000	NA
Offsetting Receipts, Defense										
TOA										
FAJ	(78,000)				(78,000)	(78,000)	(78,000)			
Appropriations	(78,000)	NA	NA	NA	(78,000)	(78,000)	(78,000)	NA		NA
TOTAL - DEDUCTNS. FOR OFFSTNG. RCPTS.										
TOA										
FAJ	(780,000)				(780,000)	(664,000)	(664,000)			
Appropriations	(780,000)	NA	NA	NA	(780,000)	(664,000)	(664,000)	NA	96,000	NA
TRUST FUNDS										
Trust Funds, Army										
TOA										
FAJ	415				415	415	415			
Appropriations	415	NA	NA	NA	415	415	415	NA		NA
Trust Funds, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	27,400				27,400	27,400	27,400			
Appropriations	27,400	NA	NA	NA	27,400	27,400	27,400	NA		NA
Trust Funds, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	85				85	85	85			
Appropriations	85	NA	NA	NA	85	85	85	NA		NA

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
								Request	Request	Auth.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
Undistributed										
032 OVEROCEAN TRANSPORTATION	0	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	
034 HELICOPTER DAMAGE REPAIRS	0	0	0	0	51,200	7,000	7,000		7,000	7,000
036 BASE OPERATIONS	0	100,000	0	85,000	0	(62,850)	(62,850)	85,000		
038 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS/TRANSPORTATION	0	5,500	0	5,500	0	0	0	5,500		
054 SUPPLY OPERATIONS	0	0	45,000	45,000	0	0	0	45,000		
056 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	0	105,000	100,000	100,000	150,000	0	150,000	100,000	150,000	50,000
064 COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
068 PANAMA OPERATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	16,000	16,000	16,000		16,000
112 INTERNS	0	0	0	0	0	5,500	5,500	5,500		5,500
114 MEDICAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	20,000	20,000		20,000
116 HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	0	0	500	500	500		500
126 ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000		100,000	100,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								335,500	400,000	200,000
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
Undistributed										
014 STOCK FUND CASH	0	(42,000)	(100,000)	(240,450)	(200,000)	(190,450)	(200,000)			40,450
020 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	(2,300)	(1,300)	(2,328)	(50,000)	0	(1,200)			1,128
022 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	0	36,300	0	36,300	50,000	0	0	36,300		
024 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS/TRANSPORTATION	0	500	0	500	0	0	0	500		
026 RENOV OF NAVY EXHIBITS-CHICAGO MUSEUM I	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
028 NAVAL AVIATION MUSEUM, PENSACOLA	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
062 SHIP MAINTENANCE	0	0	0	186,300	186,300	190,900	190,000	186,300	190,000	3,700
066 ADVERTISING	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	2,500		2,500	2,500
076 FORMER NAVY TRNG CTR, BAINBRIDGE	0	0	0	0	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500
080 USS CABOT/DEDALO FIRE & DAMAGE CONTROL	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
086 MEDICAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
106 ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0	9,500	34,500	34,500	34,500	34,500
110 STEAMING DAYS/SHIP OPTEMPO	0	0	0	0	0	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000	78,000
114 REPAIR OF U.S.S. "IOWA"	0	0	0	0	0	15,800	15,800	15,800	15,800	15,800
116 SHIPYARD MODERNIZATION	0	0	0	0	0	81,000	81,000		81,000	81,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								227,100	473,300	324,576

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senets Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senets Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
Undistributed										
008 FOREIGN CURRENCY	0	0	(25,500)	(25,500)	0	(15,000)	(21,000)			4,500
014 ADVERTISING	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
200 UNDISTRIBUTED	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	4,500	0	4,500	9,000
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
Undistributed										
022 CIVIL AIR PATROL	0	1,900	0	1,900	1,900	700	1,900	1,900	1,900	
024 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS/TRANSPORTATION	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	0	0	4,000		
038 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	0	0	65,000	0	150,000	0	60,000		60,000	60,000
042 BR-71	0	0	211,000	0	100,000	179,107	175,000		175,000	175,000
050 ADVERTISING	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	1,000		1,000	1,000
076 KC-135 FLYING HOURS	0	0	0	0	0	30,700	30,700		30,700	30,700
080 AF HURRICANE PLANES	0	0	0	0	0	4,200	4,200		4,200	4,200
104 MEDICAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	20,000		20,000	20,000
118 ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0	75,000	50,000		50,000	50,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	1,900	0	0	162,000	0	130,000	5,900	332,800	330,900
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
Undistributed										
004 CONTRACTING OUT STUDIES	0	(5,000)	0	(9,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)			4,000
014 OVERSEAS DEPENDENT SCHOOLS	0	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	
022 COMMAND, CONTROL & COMMUNICATION	0	0	(10,000)	(10,000)	0	(10,000)	(5,000)			5,000
038 ADP - DEFENSE MEDICAL SUPPORT AGENCY	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
072 PEDIATRIC EMERGENCY STUDY	0	0	0	0	0	300	300		300	300
074 TRAVEL	0	0	0	(10,000)	0	0	(5,000)			5,000
078 CINC INITIATIVES	0	0	0	25,000	0	100,000	50,000	25,000	50,000	25,000
088 MEDICAL CLAIMS	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
092 SUPPLY OPERATIONS SHORTFALLS	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	60,000		60,000	60,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	500	0	0	100,000	0	130,000	30,500	135,800	119,300

FY1990 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Office of the Inspector General Undistributed										
001 CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION (56 E/S)	95,800	95,800	95,800	95,800	95,749	95,800	96,800		1,000	1,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	1,000	1,000
Oper & Maint , Army Reserve										
006 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	1,200	0	0	1,200	0	1,200		1,200	1,200
Oper & Maint , Navy Reserve										
012 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,200		18,200	18,200
Oper & Maint , Air Force Reserve										
006 REINSTATEMENT FY 1990 FORCE STRUCTURE F	0	5,887	0	0	5,887	5,887	5,887		5,887	5,887
014 AF HURRICANE PLANES	0	0	0	0	0	3,200	3,200		3,200	3,200
Oper & Maint , Air Natl Guard										
006 REINSTATE FY 1990 FORCE STRUCTURE RED	0	12,893	0	0	12,893	14,193	14,193		14,193	14,193
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	40,680	40,680
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
001 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEF PROGS	517,800	600,800	517,800	601,100	900,800	517,800	601,100	83,300	83,300	
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act , D										
001 DRUG INTERDICTION	0	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	0	450,000	450,000	450,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								533,300	533,300	0
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
- TOA	90,435,700	88,593,519	88,468,700	86,897,747	90,840,053	86,906,819	86,036,117			
- FAJ	(237,200)	(237,200)	(687,200)	(687,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)	(237,200)			450,000
- Appropriations	90,198,500	88,356,319	87,781,500	86,210,547	90,602,853	86,669,619	85,798,917			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO O&M*								1,132,300	1,930,380	1,034,456

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Request	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. > Auth.
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
Emergency Response Fund, Defense										
001 EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEF	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000
TOTAL - REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
- TOA	774,400	801,400	699,400	244,700	801,400	344,700	344,700			100,000
- FAJ										
- Appropriations	774,400	801,400	699,400	244,700	801,400	344,700	344,700			100,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO REVOLVING FUNDS*								0	100,000	100,000
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES										
Defense Production Act Purchases										
001 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	10,500	10,500	10,500	39,500		
TOTAL - DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES										
- TOA	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	10,500	10,500	10,500	39,500		
- FAJ										
- Appropriations	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	10,500	10,500	10,500	39,500		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DEF PROD ACT PURCHASES*								39,500	0	0

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
Aircraft										
008 AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE) (MYP)	752,056	680,800	701,756	701,756	752,056	2,433,356	1,487,527		735,471	785,771
011 UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	174,284	174,284	102,684	206,084	206,084	170,784	206,084	31,800	31,800	
Modification of aircraft										
026 COMMAND & CONTROL CONSOLES	0	0	0	0	0	4,800	4,800		4,800	4,800
046 AIRBORNE AVIONICS	0	0	4,800	4,800	0	0	0	4,800		
048 AHP	0	0	0	195,000	195,000	0	195,000	195,000	195,000	
Spares and repair parts										
033 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	553,423	600,423	681,223	600,423	600,423	544,023	553,423	47,000		
Missile Procurement, Army										
Other missiles										
004 ADS HVY MSL SYSTEM	238,871	238,871	75,000	138,871	238,871	75,000	170,000			31,129
010 STINGER(MYP)	117,545	117,545	208,545	187,545	208,545	117,545	117,545	70,000		
014 LASER HELLFIRE SYSTEM	138,326	138,326	231,826	208,326	231,826	103,326	103,326	70,000		
017 MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP)	311,374	352,374	440,174	440,174	400,600	440,174	440,174	128,600	128,600	
Undistributed										
900 UNDISTRIBUTED	0	27	27	27	0	0	0	27		
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
Tracked combat vehicles										
044 FIELD ARTILLERY AMMO SUPT. VEH	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	45,000		45,000	45,000
Undistributed										
043 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	0	0	6,400	0	0	6,400	6,400	6,400	
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
Ammunition										
004 CTG, 6.86MM, ALL TYPES	41,747	41,747	41,747	45,247	45,247	41,747	45,247	3,500	3,500	
012 CTG, 7.62MM ALL TYPES	18,843	18,843	18,843	28,843	28,843	18,843	28,843	10,000	10,000	
022 CTG, 20MM, MPT-SD, M840	9,431	9,431	19,431	19,431	19,431	19,431	19,431	10,000	10,000	
026 CTG, 25MM, APFSDS-T, M819	9,075	9,075	10,075	19,075	19,075	19,075	19,075	10,000	10,000	
030 CTG, 40MM HEDP M430	0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
050 CTG, TANK, 35MM, SUBCAL PRAC, M988	15,234	15,234	2,834	2,834	3,434	3,434	3,434			600
061 CTG, TANK, 120MM, TP-T, M831	28,500	28,500	48,900	48,900	64,300	48,900	48,900	20,400	20,400	
062 CTG, TANK, 120MM, TPCSDS-T, M986	63,519	63,519	85,419	85,419	85,419	85,419	85,419	21,900	21,900	
070 PROJ. ARTY. 165MM DPICM, M483A1	0	0	0	0	90,000	0	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
071 PROJ. ARTY. 165MM, SMOKE WP, M825	0	0	0	60,000	40,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	
072 PROJ. ARTY. 165MM, ADAM-L M731	62,098	62,098	62,098	82,198	82,198	82,198	82,198	20,100	20,100	
077 PROJ. ARTILLERY 165MM TRNG, M904	0	0	0	0	17,000	0	17,000		17,000	17,000
079 PROP CHG, 165MM, GREEN BAG, M3	11,685	11,685	40,385	40,385	40,385	11,685	29,000	28,700	17,315	
081 PROP CHG, 165MM, RED BAG, M119	0	0	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	
087 AT-4 MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON	56,031	56,031	34,431	59,031	89,031	56,031	70,000	3,000	13,969	10,969
108 DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	0	11,800	11,800	11,800	0	5,000	11,800	5,000	
Ammunition production base support										

FY1998 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
055 MK-15 CLOSE IN WEAPONS SYSTEM Other Ordnance	59,990	74,990	59,990	74,990	74,990	59,990	59,990	15,000		
067 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS Undistributed	94,441	94,441	94,441	94,441	110,455	94,441	111,341		16,900	16,900
071 INSTALLATION OF MODERNIZATION EQUIPMENT Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy Mine warfare and patrol ships	0	0	0	33,800	0	33,800	30,420	33,800	30,420	
017 MHC COASTAL MINE HUNTER Auxiliaries, craft, and prior-year progr	120,300	282,000	120,300	282,000	282,000	120,300	197,800	161,700	77,300	
026 LCAC LANDING CRAFT Auxiliaries, craft, and prior-year progr	196,400	196,400	336,166	250,400	250,400	250,400	250,400	54,000	54,000	
028 FAST SEALIFT SHIP (AF) 202 COAST GUARD PATROL BOATS Undistributed	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	1,000,000	1,020,000	600,000	20,000	600,000	580,000
200 ICEBREAKERS Other Procurement, Navy Ships support equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000
320 MOLDED CASE CIRCUIT BREAKERS Communications and electronics equipment	0	0	0	0	0	468,000	329,000		329,000	329,000
053 AN/SPS-48 Aviation support equipment	5,174	5,174	5,174	5,174	44,174	5,174	44,174		39,000	39,000
183 SONOBUOYS-GENERAL INCREASE 192 MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION 193 PRACTICE BOMBS Ordnance support equipment	0	0	45,000	45,000	45,000	0	46,000	45,000	45,000	
219 CWS AMMUNITION Civil engineering support equipment	13,364	13,364	33,364	23,364	33,364	13,364	33,364	10,000	20,000	10,000
270 AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT Spares and repair parts	34,403	34,403	34,403	34,403	34,403	20,703	41,903		7,500	7,500
303 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	30,776	30,776	30,776	30,776	40,776	30,776	40,776		10,000	10,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	5,398	5,398	21,898	21,898	21,898	5,398	21,898	16,500	16,500	
	547,405	547,405	547,405	529,905	544,305	547,405	552,905		5,500	23,000
								1,198,460	2,214,680	1,270,782

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
Procurement, Marine Corps										
Ammunition										
039 UNALLOCATED INCREASE - AMMUNITION	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	25,000	25,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
Combat aircraft										
003 B-2A ADV PROC (CY)	409,800	169,800	409,800	424,800	169,800	409,800	424,800	15,000	15,000	
Airitt aircraft										
016 C-130H	0	0	0	0	0	0	262,500		262,500	262,500
Other aircraft										
016 MH-60G	52,822	52,822	52,822	52,822	52,822	52,822	203,822		151,000	151,000
017 CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,000	2,000	2,500	2,500	2,000	2,500	2,500	500	500	
Modification of inservicio aircraft										
046 C-135 (MYP)	488,310	488,310	620,310	488,310	737,810	488,310	858,310		168,000	168,000
076 HC-130H	0	0	0	0	0	0	43,000		43,000	43,000
077 C-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49,600		49,600	49,600
Aircraft support equipment and facilities										
067 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	591,430	591,430	591,430	591,430	685,092	584,430	611,930		20,500	20,500
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
Ballistic missiles										
077 MX MK-21 REENTRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,000		80,000	80,000
Other missiles										
016 AGM-86A HARM	79,339	79,339	188,639	79,339	188,639	79,339	133,989		54,650	54,650
Other support										
042 DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP)	359,330	359,330	359,330	331,330	310,530	334,330	334,330			3,000
057 MILSTAR (MYP)	0	0	0	88,200	0	0	0	88,200		
Other Procurement, Air Force										
Munitions and associated equipment										
018 MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	0	0	8,462	8,462	8,462	0	8,462	8,462	8,462	
030 CBU-87(COMB EFFECTS MUNITION)(MYP)	136,630	136,630	136,630	136,630	136,630	206,630	206,630		70,000	70,000
Vehicular equipment										
072 CAP VEHICLES	0	0	800	800	0	800	800	800	800	
Electronics and telecommunications equip										
182 CAP COM & ELECT	0	0	500	500	0	0	500	500	500	
186 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	253,749	253,749	253,749	236,655	236,655	218,656	238,998			2,343
Other base maintenance and support equip										
199 CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG	56,544	56,544	64,744	64,744	70,544	70,544	70,544	8,200	14,000	5,800
223 SELECTED ACTIVITIES	4,732,801	4,746,801	4,716,101	4,738,601	4,717,473	4,712,401	4,904,862	5,800	172,081	166,281
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								127,462	1,110,593	1,076,674

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Procurement, Defensewide										
Major equipment										
002 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/W-HS	69,312	69,312	69,312	69,312	74,312	69,312	74,312		5,000	5,000
027 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION IG	0	0	0	1,051	0	0	0	1,051		
Undistributed										
047 SOUTHERN IMAGERY SUPPORT	0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	6,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								7,051	5,000	5,000
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
Undistributed										
-010 ARMY RESERVE										
01 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	25,000	0	25,000	116,600	92,661	25,000	25,000	25,000	
02 6-TON TRUCK	0	50,000	0	50,000	100,000	0	60,000	50,000	60,000	10,000
18 FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEH (MYP)	0	0	3,900	0	0	3,900	3,900		3,900	3,900
-020 NAVY RESERVE										
01 C-130H AIRCRAFT	0	48,000	0	0	48,000	48,000	48,000		48,000	48,000
02 LAMPB MARK-1 ASW UPGRADE	0	45,000	0	45,000	45,000	0	45,000	45,000	45,000	
05 C-20 AIRCRAFT	0	24,800	0	0	24,800	0	24,800		24,800	24,800
08 SH-3H/SH-2G ASW MISSION DATA RECORDERS	0	4,500	0	0	4,500	4,500	4,500		4,500	4,500
07 AN/SQQ-58 SONOBUOYS	0	0	1,000	1,000	4,500	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
-030 MARINE CORPS RESERVE										
01 KC-130T AIRCRAFT	0	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	
02 AH-1W COBRA AIRCRAFT	0	30,000	0	0	58,600	0	58,600		58,600	58,600
14 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
-040 AIR FORCE RESERVE										
01 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	35,000	0	35,000	35,000	0	0	35,000		
02 C-130H AIRCRAFT	0	44,500	0	44,500	44,500	44,500	0	44,500		
03 MH-60G HELO	0	151,000	0	75,000	151,000	151,000	0	75,000		
04 F-16 IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE	0	55,000	0	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	
-050 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD										
01 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	30,000	0	30,000	80,000	75,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	
02 M113 APR/M577 COMMAND VEHICLES	0	91,000	91,000	101,000	91,000	91,000	101,000	101,000	101,000	
04 C-23 AIRCRAFT	0	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	42,000	42,000	28,000	42,000	14,000
07 6-TON TRUCKS/6-TON TRUCK REBUILD	0	50,000	0	50,000	141,800	0	60,000	50,000	60,000	10,000
25 FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEH (MYP)	0	0	20,100	0	0	20,100	20,100		20,100	20,100
26 TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915A1	0	0	7,600	0	0	7,600	7,600		7,600	7,600
44 SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE	0	0	0	0	0	29,200	29,200		29,200	29,200
46 UH-60B BLACKHAWK HELICOPTERS	0	0	0	0	0	25,000	25,000		25,000	25,000
-060 AIR NATIONAL GUARD										
01 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	0	25,000		

Program	Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
02 C-130 AIRCRAFT	0	44,500	218,000	174,000	44,500	218,000	0	174,000	49,000	36,000
03 F-15/F-16 IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE	0	49,000	0	49,000	49,000	49,000	49,000	49,000	25,000	25,000
04 C-28 AIRCRAFT	0	24,000	0	0	36,000	0	36,000	36,000	75,000	75,000
05 HC-130 AIRCRAFT	0	0	43,000	43,000	0	43,000	0	43,000		
64 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000			
65 KC-135 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	0	75,000	75,000			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								890,500	885,700	391,700

Program	Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
001 DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL PROGRAMS	0	1,051	0	0	1,051	0	1,051	1,051	1,051	1,051
001 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	50,000	10,500	50,000	39,500	39,500	39,500
001 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - ROT&E	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	7,200	1,900	8,000	6,900	6,900	6,900
010 RETROGRADE	0	0	0	0	0	26,655	27,610	27,610	27,610	27,610
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	75,061	75,061

TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
- TOA	78,754,000	80,274,483	77,309,917	81,879,489	80,796,850	84,307,909	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,870
- FAJ										
- Appropriations	78,754,000	80,274,483	77,309,917	81,879,489	80,796,850	84,307,909	84,113,159	3,125,489	5,359,159	2,233,870
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO PROCUREMENT*								3,115,800	6,047,239	4,021,165

FY1998 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL											
RD&E, Army											
Technology base											
006 SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT	080212	5,949	5,949	25,949	15,949	5,949	5,949	15,949	10,000	10,000	
217 UNDISTRIBUTED TECH BASE		0	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
Advanced technology development											
030 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	080300	48,774	68,774	108,674	67,774	67,774	52,701	77,774	19,000	29,000	10,000
035 TRACTOR HOLE	080301	8,193	8,193	13,993	13,993	0	8,193	11,583	4,800	2,400	
040 MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080331	10,878	25,878	10,878	25,878	25,878	10,878	10,878	15,000		
186 AIDS (AIDS) RESEARCH		0	0	0	0	34,000	0	34,000		34,000	34,000
188 BATTERY TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Strategic programs											
051 CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION COMPL MONITO		0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	(25,000)	15,000	15,000	15,000	
Tactical programs											
058 JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM	080330	38,098	88,098	38,098	81,098	88,098	38,098	48,098	25,000	10,000	
074 FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE (FAAD) SYSTEM	080375	40,210	40,210	119,210	58,210	40,210	58,210	58,210	18,000	18,000	
121 AVIATION - ENG DEV	080480	8,393	15,393	8,393	15,393	15,893	8,393	15,893	7,000	7,500	500
122 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	080480	18,384	28,384	21,384	28,384	28,384	18,384	22,884	10,000	8,500	
133 TRACTOR TRAILER	080481	4,927	4,927	0	0	0	0	4,927			4,827
148 AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEME	020374	81,289	88,289	81,289	81,453	31,818	81,289	87,318	184		
150 OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRA	020380	80,825	82,825	80,825	82,825	74,825	80,825	80,825	2,000		
187 SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (ARMY		0	0	18,000	18,000	0	20,808	18,000	18,000	18,000	
Defensewide Mission Support											
220 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTIONS		0	0	0	(2,500)	0	0	0			2,500
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									157,984	149,400	51,927
RD&E, Navy											
Technology base											
003 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080115	341,851	349,851	351,851	351,851	341,851	341,851	341,851	10,000		
011 ASW TECHNOLOGY	080231	95,888	129,488	95,888	129,488	129,488	95,888	129,488	33,800	33,800	
017 UNDISTRIBUTED TECH BASE		0	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
Advanced technology development											
024 ELECTRIC DRIVE	080357	11,998	11,998	58,187	38,064	8,998	38,064	32,064	24,088	20,088	
033 COUNTERMINE LASER		0	8,500	0	8,500	8,500	0	8,500	8,500	8,500	
034 ADVANCED ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TECHNOLO	080374	4,803	38,303	4,803	38,303	38,303	4,803	38,303	33,700	33,700	
036 PLUME CHARACTERIZATION		0	4,500	0	4,500	4,500	0	4,500	4,500	4,500	
038 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	080378	80,558	80,558	80,558	80,558	80,558	63,770	85,358		4,800	4,800
Strategic programs											
041 SATELLITE LASER COMMUNICATIONS	080374	2,001	17,001	2,001	17,001	28,001	0	0	15,000		
Tactical programs											
055 AIR CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	080321	8,777	8,777	8,777	8,777	12,515	8,777	12,515		3,738	3,738
081 SKIPPER ENHANCEMENTS	080322	0	10,000	0	10,000	20,000	0	12,500	10,000	12,500	2,500
082 T-45	080320	2,775	28,475	2,775	0	2,775	2,775	2,775			2,775
082 ADVANCED ASW TARGET	080352	25,307	25,307	30,807	30,807	35,307	28,807	30,807	5,500	5,500	
098 MINE DEVELOPMENT	080380	4,345	4,345	4,345	4,345	21,772	4,345	14,345		10,000	10,000

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
129 ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE ENVIRONMENTAL ACO	080378	16,816	31,816	16,816	31,816	31,816	16,816	31,816	15,000	15,000	
143 V-22A		0	351,000	255,000	255,000	351,000	255,000	255,000	255,000	255,000	
183 CHALK BANYAN		0	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	20,000		
195 SURFACE ASW SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	080471	69,142	69,142	69,142	69,142	69,142	69,142	69,142	30,000	30,000	
199 MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATI	080471	26,074	26,074	26,074	26,074	26,074	26,074	26,074	2,000	2,000	
230 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING AR	020662	52,664	52,664	52,664	51,369	51,369	42,951	52,664			1,295
234 MEDIUM DEPTH MINE		0	15,000	0	7,500	0	0	0	7,500		
285 TORPEDO DETECTION PROCESSOR		0	15,000	0	0	15,000	0	9,000		9,000	9,000
287 SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (MC)		0	0	12,000	12,000	0	0	12,000	12,000	12,000	
303 TACIT RAINBOW		0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000		4,000	4,000
Defensewide Mission Support											
275 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	40,499	50,499	45,499	45,499	50,499	40,499	50,499	5,000	10,000	5,000
Undistributed											
290 TACTICAL OCEANOGRAPHY		0	0	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
291 FAST BEALIFT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	0	30,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									524,566	489,104	43,108
RDT&E, Air Force											
Technology base											
004 GEOPHYSICS	080210	36,025	36,025	36,025	36,025	36,025	36,025	37,825		1,800	1,800
008 AEROSPACE PROPULSION	080220	64,921	67,921	64,921	64,921	67,921	64,921	67,921		3,000	3,000
253 UNDISTRIBUTED TECH BASE		0	0	0	13,000	0	0	0	13,000		
Advanced technology development											
030 NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY PRO		0	285,000	100,000	0	285,000	0	184,000		184,000	184,000
034 ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	080340	8,998	18,998	8,998	8,998	8,998	8,748	18,748		9,750	8,750
Tactical programs											
121 EW DEVELOPMENT	080427	130,358	130,358	130,358	67,256	64,856	67,256	70,256			3,000
153 F-16 SQUADRONS	020713	74,212	17,412	74,212	15,000	17,412	58,812	25,000			10,000
178 BEEK SPINNER		0	0	(19,900)	(19,900)	0	0	0			19,900
191 COPPER HELIX		0	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Intelligence and communications											
201 SPECIAL ACTIVITIES PRIOR YEAR		0	0	(18,100)	(18,100)	0	0	0			18,100
Defensewide Mission Support											
238 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	70,751	95,751	95,751	95,751	95,751	70,751	85,000	25,000	14,249	
Undistributed											
250 PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS		0	0	(54,000)	(22,800)	0	0	0			22,800
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									40,000	224,799	280,350
RDT&E, Defensewide											
Technology base											
002 IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	080110	2,123	2,123	2,123	2,123	2,123	2,188	2,188		65	65
003 ADVANCED NEURAL TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	12,776	0	0	0	12,776		
004 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	080110	25,000	45,000	40,000	25,000	25,000	50,016	98,000		71,000	71,000

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
007 URI-UNOBLIGATED PRIOR YEAR FUNDS		0	0	0	44,500	0	0	0	44,500		
008 STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY	080230	214,708	288,708	288,708	254,338	218,708	254,338	242,887	38,628	27,858	
011 INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	080270	34,000	84,000	54,000	54,000	84,000	34,000	54,000	20,000	20,000	
012 MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	080271	31,000	71,000	83,000	38,000	80,500	78,000	87,500	7,000	28,500	19,500
013 NUCLEAR MONITORING	080271	24,500	38,000	34,300	34,300	36,000	24,500	36,000	8,800	11,500	1,700
015 GALLIUM ARSENIDE TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	25,000	0	0	0	25,000		
018 X-RAY LITHOGRAPHY		0	0	0	40,000	0	0	0	40,000		
105 LIGHTER THAN AIR TECHNOLOGY (DARPA)		0	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
108 NON-ACOUSTIC ASW (DOD-DOE)		0	0	0	0	28,000	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
109 UNDISTRIBUTED TECH BASE		0	0	0	7,000	0	0	0	7,000		
<i>Advanced technology development</i>											
022 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAGOR INNOVAT	080322	187,300	202,300	187,500	188,850	188,850	188,200	174,200		6,900	7,550
024 ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY		0	85,000	0	85,000	145,000	0	85,000	85,000	85,000	
025 SPECIAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		0	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	
026 MICROWAVE/MILLIMETER WAVE MONOLITHIC INT	080370	79,580	81,080	79,580	81,080	81,080	79,580	81,080	1,500	1,500	
028 BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE	080373	208,082	238,082	298,082	238,082	120,000	298,082	208,082	32,000		
030 COOPERATIVE DODVA MEDICAL RESEARCH		0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
032 RANKINE CYCLE ENERGY RECOVERY (RACER)		0	0	0	(4,000)	15,000	0	0			4,000
034 CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE	080375	32,428	32,428	39,928	35,428	42,428	35,428	45,428	3,000	13,000	10,000
035 SUPERMAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE SYS		0	0	0	0	11,000	11,000	11,000		11,000	11,000
037 INFRARED FOCAL PLANE ARRAY	070280	18,810	0	24,810	24,810	0	18,810	18,810	5,000		
038 FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE	111001	15,530	5,030	15,530	10,530	5,030	10,530	11,100			570
111 LIGHTBAT		0	0	0	25,000	0	0	0	25,000		
113 MEDICAL FACILITY		0	0	0	18,000	0	0	0	18,000		
116 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		0	0	0	(18,000)	0	0	0			18,000
117 NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		0	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
<i>Tactical programs</i>											
112 TORPEDO SOFTWARE VALIDATION		0	0	0	0	3,000	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
<i>Intelligence and communications</i>											
084 AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT PROGRAM	030515	84,800	184,800	(2,000)	35,000	348,800	48,000	85,000			30,000
<i>Defensewide Mission Support</i>											
073 NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	080378	88,674	88,674	200,000	125,674	58,174	200,000	115,674	29,000	19,000	
<i>Undistributed</i>											
087 SCIENCE & ENGINEERING EDUCATION		0	0	10,500	10,500	0	0	0	10,500		
088 SOLID ROCKET DEMILITARIZATION		0	0	6,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
120 JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM		0	0	0	0	0	21,805	21,588		21,588	21,588
125 ACTIVE IONOSPHERIC AURORAL RESEARCH		0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
136 RESEARCH PROJECTS		0	0	0	0	0	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
138 LASER VERIFICATION		0	0	0	2,000	0	0	2,000		2,000	
800 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTIONS		0	0	0	(57,278)	0	0	0			57,278
<i>Developmental Test & Eval., Defense</i>											
<i>Defensewide Mission Support</i>											
003 FOREIGN WEAPONS EVALUATION	080511	15,737	15,737	15,737	0	15,737	15,737	15,737			15,737
004 NATO COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT TESTING	080513	28,915	28,915	28,915	0	28,915	24,861	11,915			11,915
009 FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING		0	0	0	42,652	0	0	0	42,652		
010 PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS		0	0	0	(15,000)	0	0	0			15,000

FY 1999: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
30 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMPLEX FACILITY	0	0	4,000	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
047 IRA EAKER AFB AR										
10 CIV ENG SHOP FAC	0	2,700	0	2,700	2,700	0	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700
20 CONVOY ROAD	0	500	0	500	500	0	500	500	500	500
30 WATER WELL & ELEV STORAGE	0	850	0	850	850	0	850	850	850	850
065 MCCLELLAN AFB CA										
50 UPGRADE ELEC DIST SYS	0	9,500	0	9,500	9,500	0	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
80 CHILD CARE CENTER	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
080 VANDENBERG AFB CA										
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050
086 LOWRY AFB CO										
20 COMPUTER OPS CENTER	0	15,500	0	15,500	15,500	0	15,500	15,500	15,500	15,500
30 PRECISION MEAS EQUIP LAB	0	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
130 TYNDALL AFB FL										
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
135 ROBINS AFB GA										
60 C-141 MAINT HANGAR	0	13,700	0	13,700	13,700	14,400	13,700	13,700	13,700	13,700
70 ADD/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	0	0	1,100	1,100	0	0	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
144 SCOTT AFB IL										
10 DORMITORY	0	0	8,400	8,400	0	8,400	8,400	8,400	8,400	8,400
146 GRISSOM AFB IN										
10 WASTE WATER TRTMT PLANT MOD	0	4,650	0	4,650	4,650	0	4,650	4,650	4,650	4,650
20 WING HQ & COMMAND POST	0	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150
147 MCCONNELL AFB KS										
10 ADD/ALT PHYS FIT CENTER	0	5,200	0	5,200	5,200	0	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200
166 ENGLAND AFB LA										
20 BASE SUPPLY COMPLEX	0	0	4,100	4,100	0	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100
30 FLIGHTLINE FENCE & LIGHTS	0	0	300	300	0	0	0	300	300	300
40 ALTER DORMS	0	0	3,200	3,200	0	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
171 K.I. SAWYER AFB MI										
10 FITNESS CENTER	0	0	4,300	4,300	0	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300
228 GRAND FORKS AFB ND										
10 CHILD CARE FACILITY	0	1,900	0	1,900	1,900	0	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
230 NEWARK AFB OH										
20 CHILD CARE CENTER	0	0	680	680	0	0	680	680	680	680
235 WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH										
20 LAB FUEL STORAGE FACILITY	0	0	5,500	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
30 CHILD CARE CENTER	0	0	1,950	1,950	0	0	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950
40 ADD/ALTER OPTICAL SYSTEMS LAB	0	0	3,700	3,700	0	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700
245 TINKER AFB OK										
90 CHILD CARE CENTER	0	1,550	1,550	1,550	0	0	1,550	1,550	1,550	1,550

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	500	500	0	500	500	500	500	
073 DURANGO CO										
10 ARMORY	0	906	906	906	906	906	906	906	906	
074 MONTROSE CO										
10 ARMORY	0	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	
077 ST AUGUSTINE FL										
10 ARMORY	0	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,332	2,500	2,332	
091 DECATUR IL										
10 ARMORY	0	3,304	2,660	3,304	3,304	2,660	3,304	3,304	3,304	
096 MACHESNEY PARK IL										
10 ARMORY	0	2,920	0	2,920	2,920	0	2,920	2,920	2,920	
20 ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	586	0	586	586	0	586	586	586	
097 MARSEILLES IL										
10 SMALL ARMS STORAGE FACILITY	0	307	0	307	307	0	307	307	307	
20 SURFACED ROADWAY	0	325	0	325	325	0	325	325	325	
103 URBANA IL										
10 ARMORY	0	0	865	865	0	865	865	865	865	
104 WILLIAMSON IL										
10 ARMORY W/ MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	2,592	0	2,592	2,592	0	2,592	2,592	2,592	
111 CAMP DODGE IA										
10 LAND ACQUISITION - TRAINING AREA	0	6,857	0	6,857	6,857	0	6,857	6,857	6,857	
121 ASHLAND KY										
10 ARMORY	0	2,464	0	2,464	2,464	0	2,464	2,464	2,464	
134 BERRIEN COUNTY MI										
10 ARMORY	0	1,250	1,206	1,250	1,250	1,206	1,250	1,250	1,250	
135 CAMP GRAYLING MI										
20 WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY	0	0	3,283	3,283	0	3,283	3,283	3,283	3,283	
136 MENOMINEE COUNTY MI										
10 ARMORY	0	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	1,167	
137 SHAWANASSEE COUNTY MI										
10 ARMORY	0	1,450	1,408	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	
140 CAMP RIPLEY MN										
20 BARRACKS	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	
30 BARRACKS	0	800	0	800	0	0	800	800	800	
141 ACKERMAN MS										
10 ARMORY ADDITION	0	735	0	735	735	0	735	735	735	
142 AMORY MS										
10 ARMORY ADDITION	0	310	0	310	310	0	310	310	310	
143 CAMP MCCAIN MS										
10 LAND ACQUISITION	0	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	
144 FLOWOOD MS										

FY 1998: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
10 US PROPERTY & FISCAL OFFICE	0	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	
146 CAMP SHELBY MS										
10 BOQ	0	0	700	700	0	700	700	700	700	
20 M-16 FIRING RANGE	0	0	300	300	0	300	300	300	300	
30 ALT ENGINEERING BLDG	0	0	400	400	0	400	400	400	400	
148 IUKA MS										
10 ARMORY ADDITION	0	710	0	710	710	0	710	710	710	
147 LOUISVILLE MS										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	600	0	600	600	0	600	600	600	
148 PHILADELPHIA MS										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	400	0	400	400	0	400	400	400	
166 LINCOLN NE										
10 COMB SUPPORT MAINT SHOP	0	0	3,438	3,438	0	3,438	3,438	3,438	3,438	
20 ADD AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	0	0	597	597	0	597	597	597	597	
166 BELEN NM										
10 ARMORY	0	1,397	1,350	1,397	1,397	1,397	1,397	1,397	1,397	
187 CLOVIS NM										
10 ARMORY	0	1,603	1,603	1,603	1,603	1,603	1,603	1,603	1,603	
20 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	714	714	0	714	714	714	714	
166 FARMINGTON NM										
10 ARMORY	0	1,163	1,163	1,163	1,163	1,163	1,163	1,163	1,163	
161 SANTE FE NM										
10 COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	3,092	3,092	3,092	3,092	3,092	3,092	3,092	3,092	
20 US PROPERTY & FISCAL OFFICE	0	905	905	905	905	905	905	905	905	
192 SPRINGER NM										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINT SHOP	0	0	714	714	0	714	714	714	714	
205 CAMP GRUBER OK										
70 TROOP SUPPORT FACILITY - PHASE IV	0	3,752	3,820	0	3,752	3,752	3,752	3,752	3,752	3,752
211 KLEIVER OR										
10 ARMORY	0	1,444	0	1,444	1,444	1,444	1,444	1,444	1,444	
212 MEDFORD OR										
10 ARMORY	0	832	820	832	832	832	832	832	832	
215 FT INDIANTOWN GAP PA										
20 FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM	0	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	
218 EASTOVER SC										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
219 LEXINGTON SC										
10 ARMORY	0	0	2,400	2,400	0	2,400	2,175	2,400	2,175	
236 BROWNSVILLE TN										
10 ARMORY	0	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	992	
242 CLINTON TN										

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,180	1,180	0	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,180	
244 HUMBOLT TN										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,453	1,453	0	1,453	1,453	1,453	1,453	
248 JACKSON TN										
10 AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	0	0	1,636	1,636	0	1,636	1,636	1,636	1,636	
258 CAMP BOWIE BROWNWOOD TX										
10 CANTONEMENT FACILITY	0	1,341	0	1,341	1,341	0	1,341	1,341	1,341	
20 LAND ACQUISITION	0	1,750	0	1,750	1,750	0	1,750	1,750	1,750	
261 LAREDO TX										
10 ARMORY	0	2,263	0	2,263	2,263	0	2,263	2,263	2,263	
262 ROSENBERG TX										
10 ARMORY	0	943	0	943	943	0	943	943	943	
267 TEMPLE TX										
10 ARMORY W/ ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	3,792	0	3,792	3,792	0	3,792	3,792	3,792	
278 ARLINGTON HALL STATION VA										
10 NATIONAL GUARD CENTER-PHASE II	0	0	11,000	11,000	0	11,000	8,630	11,000	8,630	
283 BUCKHANNON WV										
10 US PROP & FISCAL OFFICE	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
284 WHEELING WV										
10 AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY/ARMORY	0	0	5,326	5,326	0	5,326	5,326	5,326	5,326	
288 WHITEWATER WI										
10 ARMORY W/ MAINTENANCE-VEHICLE STORAGE	0	2,251	0	2,251	2,251	0	3,492	2,251	3,492	1,241
287 RICHMOND WI										
10 ARMORY	0	0	0	1,241	0	0	0	1,241		
288 CHEYENNE WY										
20 ARMORY ANNEX	0	0	2,351	2,351	0	2,351	2,351	2,351	2,351	
306 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
30 DEFICIENCY ALLOWANCE	0	0	0	0	0	40,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
80 GENERAL REDUCTIONS	0	0	0	(33,100)	0	0	0			33,100
Planning										
315 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,800	4,800	6,858	6,858	4,800	15,000	11,600	2,058	6,800	4,742
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
Major construction										
006 GADSDEN AL										
10 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	0	2,100	2,100	2,100	
20 BASE SUPPORT & EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	0	900	900	900	900	0	900	900	900	
007 FORT HUACHUCA AZ										
10 COMPOSITE DEPLOYMENT SUPPORT FACILITY	0	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	
030 BUCKLEY ANGB CO										
30 ARMORY	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
40 US PROPERTY & FISCAL OFFICE	0	1,400	0	1,400	0	0	1,400	1,400	1,400	
50 US PROPERTY & FO WAREHOUSE	0	1,300	0	1,300	0	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	
061 SIOUX GATEWAY AIRPORT IA										
10 LAND ACQUISITION	0	0	550	550	0	550	550	550	550	
20 BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	0	0	2,550	2,550	0	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	
30 ADD ECM SHOP	0	0	390	390	0	390	390	390	390	
065 MCCONNELL AFB KS										
20 LAND ACQUISITION	0	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	
30 OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	3,700	3,700	0	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	
061 OTIS ANG8 MA										
10 FUEL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	0	0	5,200	5,200	0	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	
126 KEY FIELD MS										
20 COMPOSITE MAINTENANCE HANGAR	0	12,000	0	12,000	12,000	0	12,000	12,000	12,000	
200 PORTLAND IAP OR										
20 ADD/ALT TAXIWAY	0	0	6,000	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	
231 MEMPHIS TN										
10 ADD/ALT AIRCRAFT HANGAR	0	0	4,900	4,900	0	4,900	4,900	4,900	4,900	
20 AIRCRAFT APRON/FUEL STOR & DIST	0	0	11,800	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	11,800	11,800	
279 TRUAX FIELD WI										
10 ALTER VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	950	950	950	950	950	950	950	950	
20 ALTER WEAPONS SECURITY & MISSION SUPPORT FAC	0	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	
280 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	6,450	8,250	10,450	8,250	8,250	14,250	12,400	1,800	5,950	4,150
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	9,000	3,000		500	500
308 GENERAL REDUCTIONS				(35,062)						35,062
Mil. Con., Army Reserve										
Major construction										
066 SANTA FE NM										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	2,955	2,955	0	3,000	2,955	2,955	2,955	
061 JOHNSTOWN PA										
10 RESERVE CENTER W/ MAINT SHOP	0	3,805	0	3,805	3,805	0	3,805	3,805	3,805	
062 BECKLEY WV										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	3,200	3,200	0	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	
063 KINGWOOD WV										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	1,400	1,400	0	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	
064 ELKINS WV										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	1,400	1,400	0	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	
066 MORGANTOWN WV										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	1,900	1,900	0	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	
066 RAINELLE WV										
10 ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (300)	0	30,000	0	18,000	30,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
017 FORT LEE VA										
10 GENERAL OFFICER HOUSING (1)	0	210	0	210	210	0	160	210	160	210
Post-Acquisition Construction										
020 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	38,329	89,329	38,329	38,329	89,329	72,300	40,000		3,671	3,671
10 CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS										
Planning and design										
022 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	1,349	1,349	1,349	1,349	6,349	1,349	3,000	0	1,651	1,651
20 PLANNING										
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	131,888	0	131,888	0	0	0	18,610	23,762	5,322
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
Construction of new housing										
004 MARINE CORPS AIR STA EL TORO CA							200,000		200,000	200,000
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (200)	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
005 MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETOCA										
20 NEW CONSTRUCTION (300)	0	25,000	0	15,000	25,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
018 NAVAL AIR STA MOFFETT FIELD CA								8,600	8,600	8,600
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (74)	0	8,600	0	8,600	8,600	0	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600
023 NAS GLENVIEW IL										
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (140)	0	0	15,300	15,300	0	15,300	16,300	15,300	15,300	15,300
034 NAVAL STA GUANTANAMO CU										
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (264)	0	31,669	0	31,669	31,669	0	16,000	31,669	15,000	15,000
Planning and design										
046 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	1,000	6,100	1,000	3,100	6,100	1,000	3,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
20 PLANNING										
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy &										
Operating expenses										
008 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	18,688	41,688	18,688	28,000	28,000	18,688	18,688	9,312		9,312
10 FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT										
Mortgage insurance premiums										
011 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	208	208	208	27,208	208	208	208	27,000		27,000
60 MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS										
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	131,888	0	131,888	0	0	0	121,961	69,000	0

LA 1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

100	220'400	HY	HY	HY	220'400	220'400	220'400	HY		
101	220'400	HY	HY	HY	220'400	220'400	220'400	HY		
102	1'834'800	HY	HY	HY	1'834'800	1'834'800	1'834'800	HY	30'800	HY
103	1'001'000	HY	HY	HY	1'001'000	1'001'000	1'001'000	HY	30'800	HY
104	3'221'400	HY	HY	HY	3'221'400	3'221'400	3'221'400	HY	30'800	HY
105	3'221'400	HY	HY	HY	3'221'400	3'221'400	3'221'400	HY	30'800	HY

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

		Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senats Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senats Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING											
- TOA	3,232,747	3,232,747	3,510,241	3,241,516	3,274,369	3,495,477	3,099,091	3,220,629	41,622		HY
- FAJ	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)	(47)			
- Appropriations	3,232,700	3,232,700	3,510,194	3,241,469	3,274,322	3,495,430	3,099,044	3,220,582	41,622		HY
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO FAMILY HOUSING*									140,591	92,782	5,322

FY 1994: CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
MILITARY PERSONNEL										
Military Personnel, Army										
TOA	24,295,600	NA	NA	NA	23,959,991	23,863,803	23,869,226	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	24,295,600	NA	NA	NA	23,959,991	23,863,803	23,869,226	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Navy										
TOA	19,363,100	NA	NA	NA	19,149,527	19,044,785	19,065,967	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	19,363,100	NA	NA	NA	19,149,527	19,044,785	19,065,967	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	5,918,600	NA	NA	NA	5,867,484	5,868,652	5,897,502	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,918,600	NA	NA	NA	5,867,484	5,868,652	5,897,502	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	20,046,800	NA	NA	NA	19,915,200	19,617,100	19,736,372	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,046,800	NA	NA	NA	19,915,200	19,617,100	19,736,372	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Army										
TOA	2,337,100	NA	NA	NA	2,394,200	2,322,800	2,363,300	NA	26,200	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,337,100	NA	NA	NA	2,394,200	2,322,800	2,363,300	NA	26,200	NA
Reserve Personnel, Navy										
TOA	1,624,600	NA	NA	NA	1,665,700	1,606,100	1,645,000	NA	20,400	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,624,600	NA	NA	NA	1,665,700	1,606,100	1,645,000	NA	20,400	NA
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	336,400	NA	NA	NA	340,800	325,500	336,400	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	336,400	NA	NA	NA	340,800	325,500	336,400	NA		NA

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Reserve Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	684,000	NA	NA	NA	697,800	684,110	686,800	NA	2,800	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	684,000	NA	NA	NA	697,800	684,110	686,800	NA	2,800	NA
National Guard Personnel, Army										
TOA	3,358,700	NA	NA	NA	3,428,800	3,331,900	3,379,500	NA	20,800	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,358,700	NA	NA	NA	3,428,800	3,331,900	3,379,500	NA	20,800	NA
National Guard Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	1,069,000	NA	NA	NA	1,113,700	1,066,950	1,066,400	NA	9,400	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,069,000	NA	NA	NA	1,113,700	1,066,950	1,066,400	NA	9,400	NA
TOTAL - MILITARY PERSONNEL										
TOA	79,053,700	NA	NA	NA	78,553,202	77,753,700	78,080,467	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	79,053,700	NA	NA	NA	78,553,202	77,753,700	78,080,467	NA		NA
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
TOA	23,562,900	20,843,456	22,008,345	21,699,681	21,549,271	21,664,190	21,515,694			
FAJ										
Appropriations	23,562,900	20,843,456	22,008,345	21,699,681	21,549,271	21,664,190	21,515,694			
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
TOA	24,531,600	23,258,998	23,283,784	23,165,935	23,775,605	23,230,691	23,161,647			
FAJ										
Appropriations	24,531,600	23,258,998	23,283,784	23,165,935	23,775,605	23,230,691	23,161,647			
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
TOA	1,948,100	1,831,300	1,892,700	1,892,200	1,866,280	1,860,100	1,892,200			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,948,100	1,831,300	1,892,700	1,892,200	1,866,280	1,860,100	1,892,200			

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
TOA	22,048,900	20,389,779	20,785,714	20,624,110	20,977,532	20,084,092	20,080,735			
FAJ										
Appropriations	22,048,900	20,389,779	20,785,714	20,624,110	20,977,532	20,084,092	20,080,735			
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
TOA	8,663,100	8,070,308	8,372,263	8,317,421	8,516,144	8,148,163	8,448,957			131,536
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,663,100	8,070,308	8,372,263	8,317,421	8,516,144	8,148,163	8,448,957			131,536
Office of the Inspector General										
TOA	99,500	98,519	98,519	98,519	99,500	99,500	99,500			981
FAJ										
Appropriations	99,500	98,519	98,519	98,519	99,500	99,500	99,500			981
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
TOA	890,400	913,400	888,100	909,100	933,807	871,380	909,100	18,700	18,700	
FAJ										
Appropriations	890,400	913,400	888,100	909,100	933,807	871,380	909,100	18,700	18,700	
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
TOA	984,800	1,004,800	977,800	998,000	1,015,800	976,114	998,000	13,400	13,400	
FAJ										
Appropriations	984,800	1,004,800	977,800	998,000	1,015,800	976,114	998,000	13,400	13,400	
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
TOA	86,100	86,100	84,800	84,800	86,400	83,180	84,800			
FAJ										
Appropriations	86,100	86,100	84,800	84,800	86,400	83,180	84,800			
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	1,042,500	1,050,800	1,057,800	1,065,900	1,078,500	1,055,360	1,065,900	23,400	23,400	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,042,500	1,050,800	1,057,800	1,065,900	1,078,500	1,055,360	1,065,900	23,400	23,400	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Army Nat'l Guard										
TOA	1,988,500	1,988,500	1,970,400	1,980,400	2,049,241	1,980,380	1,980,400			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,988,500	1,988,500	1,970,400	1,980,400	2,049,241	1,980,380	1,980,400			
Oper. & Maint., Air Nat'l Guard										
TOA	2,175,400	2,203,000	2,219,600	2,247,200	2,235,100	2,217,990	2,247,200	71,800	71,800	
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,175,400	2,203,000	2,219,600	2,247,200	2,235,100	2,217,990	2,247,200	71,800	71,800	
Rifle Practice, Army										
TOA	5,600	4,000	5,600	4,000	5,000	5,600	5,000			1,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,600	4,000	5,600	4,000	5,000	5,600	5,000			1,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense										
TOA	5,600	5,400	5,500	5,400	5,000	5,500	5,400			
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,600	5,400	5,500	5,400	5,000	5,500	5,400			
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
TOA	817,000	1,000,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	1,900,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	245,527	245,527	
FAJ										
Appropriations	817,000	1,000,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	1,900,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	245,527	245,527	
Humanitarian Assistance										
TOA	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	15,000	13,000	15,000		2,000	2,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	15,000	13,000	15,000		2,000	2,000
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D										
TOA	1,207,900	939,300	1,207,900	1,084,100	1,009,410	1,207,900	1,084,100			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,207,900	939,300	1,207,900	1,084,100	1,009,410	1,207,900	1,084,100			
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	90,070,700	83,810,858	85,932,152	85,452,483	87,135,360	84,545,627	84,636,180			
FAJ										
Appropriations	90,070,700	83,810,858	85,932,152	85,452,483	87,135,360	84,545,627	84,636,180			

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
TOA	1,583,200	1,493,683	857,609	1,274,363	1,576,329	853,366	1,096,182			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,583,200	1,493,683	857,609	1,274,363	1,576,329	853,366	1,096,182			
Missile Procurement, Army										
TOA	2,623,500	1,996,345	2,105,140	2,081,123	2,335,164	2,103,231	2,218,422			137,299
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,623,500	1,996,345	2,105,140	2,081,123	2,335,164	2,103,231	2,218,422			137,299
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
TOA	1,312,300	1,926,423	2,331,200	2,063,672	2,290,718	1,895,552	2,172,021	751,372	859,721	106,349
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,312,300	1,926,423	2,331,200	2,063,672	2,290,718	1,895,552	2,172,021	751,372	859,721	106,349
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
TOA	1,424,400	1,324,171	1,051,326	1,346,632	1,394,669	1,040,459	1,367,549			20,717
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,424,400	1,324,171	1,051,326	1,346,632	1,394,669	1,040,459	1,367,549			20,717
Other Procurement, Army										
TOA	2,627,500	2,781,799	2,182,517	2,526,664	2,296,054	2,117,812	2,463,057			
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,627,500	2,781,799	2,182,517	2,526,664	2,296,054	2,117,812	2,463,057			
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
TOA	9,836,600	9,024,150	7,359,306	8,107,696	8,306,229	7,343,737	7,810,452			
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,836,600	9,024,150	7,359,306	8,107,696	8,306,229	7,343,737	7,810,452			
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
TOA	6,161,400	5,376,097	5,960,726	5,961,191	5,315,504	5,692,242	5,625,171			
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,161,400	5,376,097	5,960,726	5,961,191	5,315,504	5,692,242	5,625,171			
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
TOA	11,195,200	9,016,600	9,314,200	9,414,600	12,329,600	9,313,672	10,160,604			746,004
FAJ										
Appropriations	11,195,200	9,016,600	9,314,200	9,414,600	12,329,600	9,313,672	10,160,604			746,004

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Other Procurement, Navy										
TOA	6,081,500	5,488,826	6,055,242	5,468,550	5,344,811	5,811,675	5,827,180			138,601
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,081,500	5,488,826	6,055,242	5,468,550	5,344,811	5,811,675	5,827,180			138,601
Procurement, Marine Corps										
TOA	782,100	778,279	715,130	752,479	726,637	667,530	719,141			
FAJ										
Appropriations	782,100	778,279	715,130	752,479	726,637	667,530	719,141			
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	13,718,650	7,295,575	10,293,256	9,805,933	7,663,667	10,277,853	9,541,455			
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,718,650	7,295,575	10,293,256	9,805,933	7,663,667	10,277,853	9,541,455			
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	9,005,700	5,569,848	6,722,657	6,109,469	5,912,653	6,243,922	5,813,532			
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,005,700	5,569,848	6,722,657	6,109,469	5,912,653	6,243,922	5,813,532			
Other Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	8,307,400	7,993,697	7,526,513	7,826,452	7,835,903	7,465,442	7,503,356			
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,307,400	7,993,697	7,526,513	7,826,452	7,835,903	7,465,442	7,503,356			
Procurement, Defensewide										
TOA	1,999,400	1,853,514	1,913,908	2,149,954	2,074,542	1,913,846	2,354,646	180,554	365,246	204,692
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,999,400	1,853,514	1,913,908	2,149,954	2,074,542	1,913,846	2,354,646	180,554	365,246	204,692
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
TOA	455,400	1,581,100	2,647,361	1,871,700	1,566,115	2,469,499	2,463,700	1,416,300	2,006,300	592,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	455,400	1,581,100	2,647,361	1,871,700	1,566,115	2,469,499	2,463,700	1,416,300	2,006,300	592,000

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Inspector General										
TOA		981	981	981				981		
FAJ										
Appropriations		981	981	981				981		
Defense Production Act Purchases										
TOA	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	50,000	30,000	50,000		48,200	48,200
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	50,000	30,000	50,000		48,200	48,200
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruction, Def										
TOA	354,400	377,300	365,700	362,600	289,700	365,700	292,700	28,200		
FAJ										
Appropriations	354,400	377,300	365,700	362,600	289,700	365,700	292,700	28,200		
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	77,642,450	63,650,368	67,412,783	67,184,710	67,310,745	65,655,517	67,469,348			284,638
FAJ										
Appropriations	77,642,450	63,650,368	67,412,783	67,184,710	67,310,745	65,655,517	67,469,348			284,638
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
RDT&E, Army										
TOA	6,025,900	5,675,827	5,696,323	5,732,740	5,366,811	5,299,793	5,607,379			
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,025,900	5,675,827	5,696,323	5,732,740	5,366,811	5,299,793	5,607,379			
RDT&E, Navy										
TOA	9,102,400	9,359,977	9,281,528	9,417,934	8,954,950	8,459,853	9,037,684	315,534		
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,102,400	9,359,977	9,281,528	9,417,934	8,954,950	8,459,853	9,037,684	315,534		
RDT&E, Air Force										
TOA	13,276,300	12,940,062	12,275,578	12,664,662	11,804,366	11,575,574	11,961,310			
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,276,300	12,940,062	12,275,578	12,664,662	11,804,366	11,575,574	11,961,310			

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RDT&E, Defensewide										
TOA	9,240,300	7,391,235	8,972,702	8,013,939	8,536,997	8,563,407	9,115,099			1,101,700
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,240,300	7,391,235	8,972,702	8,013,939	8,566,997	8,563,407	9,115,099			1,101,700
Developmental Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	348,100	289,100	277,591	251,619	229,767	226,679	237,720			100,000
FAJ										100,000
Appropriations	348,100	289,100	277,591	251,619	229,767	226,679	237,720			100,000
Operational Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	90,800	17,000	17,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000			
FAJ										
Appropriations	90,800	17,000	17,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000			
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
TOA	38,092,800	35,673,221	38,520,722	36,095,903	34,937,611	34,140,308	35,974,792			
FAJ										
Appropriations	38,092,800	35,673,221	38,520,722	36,095,903	34,937,611	34,140,308	35,974,792			
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
Army Stock Fund										
TOA	407,000	302,500	302,500	302,500	407,000	302,500	376,520			74,020
FAJ										
Appropriations	407,000	302,500	302,500	302,500	407,000	302,500	376,520			74,020
Navy Stock Fund										
TOA	37,200				37,200		28,350			28,350
FAJ										
Appropriations	37,200				37,200		28,350			28,350
Air Force Stock Fund										
TOA	1,340,200	887,900	887,900	887,900	1,039,900	887,900	1,152,110			264,210
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,340,200	887,900	887,900	887,900	1,039,900	887,900	1,152,110			264,210

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Defense Stock Fund										
TOA	50,000				50,000	2,355,000	35,420			35,420
FAJ										
Appropriations	50,000				50,000	2,355,000	35,420			35,420
Army Industrial Fund										
TOA	151,100	151,100	151,100	151,100	75,500	151,100	151,100			
FAJ										
Appropriations	151,100	151,100	151,100	151,100	75,500	151,100	151,100			
Navy Industrial Fund										
TOA	238,700	238,700	238,700	238,700	119,350	238,700	238,700			
FAJ										
Appropriations	238,700	238,700	238,700	238,700	119,350	238,700	238,700			
Defense Industrial Fund										
TOA	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	4,000	4,000			
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	4,000	4,000			
TOTAL - REV. & MANGMNT. FUNDS										
TOA	2,228,200	1,584,200	1,584,200	1,584,200	1,730,950	3,939,200	1,984,200			400,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,228,200	1,584,200	1,584,200	1,584,200	1,730,950	3,939,200	1,984,200			400,000
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
TOA	774,900	652,387	718,220	748,187	747,067	697,967	746,137			
FAJ										
Appropriations	774,900	652,387	718,220	748,187	747,067	697,967	746,137			
Military Construction, Navy										
TOA	1,113,300	1,090,126	1,090,126	1,142,396	1,137,278	1,083,626	1,132,606	29,096	19,306	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,113,300	1,090,126	1,090,126	1,142,396	1,137,278	1,083,626	1,132,606	29,096	19,306	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Military Construction, Air Force										
TOA	1,376,200	1,000,893	1,015,134	1,004,294	944,346	891,784	949,094			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,376,200	1,000,893	1,015,134	1,004,294	944,346	891,784	949,094			
Military Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	787,500	565,328	659,313	618,478	625,326	600,113	601,286			
FAJ										
Appropriations	787,500	565,328	659,313	618,478	625,326	600,113	601,286			
Mil. Con., Army National Guard										
TOA	66,400	208,898	196,373	297,544	201,558	235,549	313,224	231,144	246,824	15,680
FAJ										
Appropriations	66,400	208,898	196,373	297,544	201,558	235,549	313,224	231,144	246,824	15,680
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
TOA	66,500	119,620	134,310	172,340	135,240	146,369	180,560	105,640	114,060	8,220
FAJ										
Appropriations	66,500	119,620	134,310	172,340	135,240	146,369	180,560	105,640	114,060	8,220
Mil. Con., Army Reserve										
TOA	59,300	66,992	66,826	76,128	66,297	75,226	77,426	16,826	18,126	1,300
FAJ										
Appropriations	59,300	66,992	66,826	76,128	66,297	75,226	77,426	16,826	18,126	1,300
Mil. Con., Naval Reserve										
TOA	50,200	63,300	67,207	80,307	63,300	75,207	80,307	30,107	30,107	
FAJ										
Appropriations	50,200	63,300	67,207	80,307	63,300	75,207	80,307	30,107	30,107	
Mil. Con., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	37,700	37,700	37,700	37,700	37,700	41,100	36,800		900	900
FAJ										
Appropriations	37,700	37,700	37,700	37,700	37,700	41,100	36,800		900	900
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part I										
TOA	916,500	1,016,500	998,500	1,016,500	998,100	916,500	998,100	100,000	81,600	
FAJ										
Appropriations	916,500	1,016,500	998,500	1,016,500	998,100	916,500	998,100	100,000	81,600	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
NATO Infrastructure										
TOA	480,400	215,000	250,400	232,700	290,000	250,400	232,700			
FAJ	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)			
Appropriations	420,400	175,000	210,400	192,700	250,000	210,400	192,700			
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
TOA	5,708,900	5,036,744	5,203,109	5,426,572	5,248,212	5,014,041	5,350,042			
FAJ	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)			
Appropriations	5,668,900	4,996,744	5,163,109	5,386,572	5,208,212	4,974,041	5,310,042			
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
TOA	61,800	66,800	74,300	74,300	61,800	61,700	74,300	12,500	12,500	
FAJ										
Appropriations	61,800	66,800	74,300	74,300	61,800	61,700	74,300	12,500	12,500	
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
TOA	1,492,400	1,492,650	1,482,650	1,457,650	1,463,717	1,463,717	1,463,717			6,067
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,492,400	1,492,650	1,482,650	1,457,650	1,463,717	1,463,717	1,463,717			6,067
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
TOA	185,000	209,019	163,625	174,827	185,000	138,807	174,917			90
FAJ										
Appropriations	185,000	209,019	163,625	174,827	185,000	138,807	174,917			90
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy &										
TOA	719,500	719,500	719,500	697,000	691,101	691,101	691,101			
FAJ										
Appropriations	719,500	719,500	719,500	697,000	691,101	691,101	691,101			
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
TOA	182,600	208,594	182,600	182,965	185,100	138,968	162,957	365		
FAJ										
Appropriations	182,600	208,594	182,600	182,965	185,100	138,968	162,957	365		

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
TOA	789,300	789,300	779,300	766,800	771,442	771,442	771,442			4,642
FAJ										
Appropriations	789,300	789,300	779,300	766,800	771,442	771,442	771,442			4,642
Family Housing Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	500	100	500	500	500	500	500			
FAJ										
Appropriations	500	100	500	500	500	500	500			
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Defens										
TOA	20,600	20,600	20,600	20,600	20,514	20,514	20,514			
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,600	20,600	20,600	20,600	20,514	20,514	20,514			
Homeowners Asst Fund, Def.										
TOA	3,865	55,475	3,865	3,865	3,865	3,865	3,865			
FAJ	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235			
Appropriations	5,100	56,710	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100			
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
TOA	3,455,565	3,580,038	3,428,940	3,378,507	3,383,039	3,290,434	3,363,313			
FAJ	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235			
Appropriations	3,456,800	3,581,273	3,428,175	3,379,742	3,384,274	3,291,669	3,364,548			
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES										
Anticipated Savings										
TOA	(300,000)	NA	NA	NA	(300,000)			NA	300,000	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	(300,000)	NA	NA	NA	(300,000)			NA	300,000	NA
Appropriations	(300,000)	NA	NA	NA	(300,000)			NA	300,000	NA

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS										
Offsetting Receipts, Army										
TOA										
FAJ	(220,300)				(220,300)	(220,300)	(220,300)			
Appropriations	(220,300)	NA	NA	NA	(220,300)	(220,300)	(220,300)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	(193,000)				(193,000)	(193,000)	(193,000)			
Appropriations	(193,000)	NA	NA	NA	(193,000)	(193,000)	(193,000)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	(349,000)				(349,000)	(349,000)	(349,000)			
Appropriations	(349,000)	NA	NA	NA	(349,000)	(349,000)	(349,000)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Defense										
TOA										
FAJ	(87,000)				(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)			
Appropriations	(87,000)	NA	NA	NA	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	NA		NA
TOTAL - DEDUCTNS. FOR OFFSTNG. RCPTS.										
TOA										
FAJ	(849,300)				(849,300)	(849,300)	(849,300)			
Appropriations	(849,300)	NA	NA	NA	(849,300)	(849,300)	(849,300)	NA		NA
TRUST FUNDS										
Trust Funds, Army										
TOA										
FAJ	42,700				42,700	42,700	42,700			
Appropriations	42,700	NA	NA	NA	42,700	42,700	42,700	NA		NA

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Trust Funds, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	30,200				30,200	30,200	30,200			
Appropriations	30,200	NA	NA	NA	30,200	30,200	30,200	NA		NA
Trust Funds, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	100				100	100	100			
Appropriations	100	NA	NA	NA	100	100	100	NA		NA
TOTAL - TRUST FUNDS										
TOA										
FAJ	73,000				73,000	73,000	73,000			
Appropriations	73,000	NA	NA	NA	73,000	73,000	73,000	NA		NA
INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS										
Interfund Transactions, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	(29,100)				(29,100)	(29,100)	(29,100)			
Appropriations	(29,100)	NA	NA	NA	(29,100)	(29,100)	(29,100)	NA		NA
HOMEOWNERS ASST FUND, DEFENSE										
Homeowners Asst Fund, Def.										
TOA	1,435				1,435	1,435	1,435			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,435	NA	NA	NA	1,435	1,435	1,435	NA		NA

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
Undistributed										
002 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FREEZE	0	(342,000)	(334,600)	(342,000)	(33,000)	(325,800)	(104,300)			237,700
008 SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	0	0	1,300	1,300	0	0	0	1,300		
014 TRAINING AND EDUCATION	0	(78,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(4,500)	(100,000)	(38,400)			81,600
048 ADMINISTRATIVE AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING	0	(138,000)	0	(80,000)	0	(12,000)	(12,000)			48,000
086 CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	0	120,000	0	120,000	120,000	0	120,000	120,000	120,000	
078 RUSSIAN INSTITUTE	0	0	0	1,600	0	0	0	1,500		
084 DEPOT MAINT BACKLOG	0	0	0	0	150,080	0	100,000		100,000	100,000
088 CHAMPUS	0	0	0	0	249,900	0	150,000		150,000	150,000
090 USUHS TRANSFER	0	0	0	0	4,100	0	4,100		4,100	4,100
116 FREE POSTAL MAILING	0	0	0	11,000	11,000	0	11,000	11,000	11,000	
140 CURRENCY FLUCTUATION	0	0	0	0	0	101,700	134,500		134,500	134,500
900 UNDISTRIBUTED	0	0	0	0	(9,000)	0	60,000		60,000	60,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								133,800	879,800	796,900
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
Undistributed										
002 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FREEZE	0	(355,000)	(287,800)	(306,000)	(85,000)	(285,800)	(105,000)			200,000
010 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	0	(87,400)	(100,000)	(100,000)	0	(100,000)	(75,000)			25,000
014 TRAINING AND EDUCATION	0	(83,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(33,000)	(100,000)	(77,700)			22,300
080 DEMONSTRATION PROJ - COOPYMCA, NETC NE	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	0	0	1,000		
078 CHAMPUS	0	0	0	0	821,000	0	200,000		200,000	200,000
116 STOCK FUND OPERATIONS COST ADJS	0	0	0	0	0	22,300	22,300		22,300	22,300
122 SEALIFT	0	0	0	0	0	0	38,268		38,268	38,268
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,000	280,568	507,868
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
Undistributed										
002 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FREEZE	0	(20,000)	(20,200)	(20,200)	(15,000)	(20,200)	(15,000)			5,200
022 SPARE PARTS	0	(20,000)	0	(15,200)	(14,000)	0	(14,000)			1,200
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	0	6,400

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
Undistributed										
002 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FREEZE	0	(298,000)	(288,200)	(279,200)	(17,887)	(362,800)	(36,687)			240,613
010 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	0	(278,800)	(150,000)	(180,000)	(111,000)	(150,000)	(180,000)			30,000
014 TRAINING AND EDUCATION	0	(41,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)	(41,052)	(90,000)	(78,852)			11,348
030 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	0	0	(9,000)	(9,000)	(8,900)	0	(8,900)			2,100
032 MILSTAR TERMINATION	0	0	(17,800)	(17,800)	0	(3,822)	(3,822)			13,778
062 MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION	0	(49,000)	0	(16,000)	0	(15,000)	(15,000)			1,000
062 COMPUTER-AIDED LOGISTICS INITIATIVES	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
071 CHAMPUS	0	0	0	0	375,000	0	180,000		150,000	150,000
104 CHEM/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG	0	0	0	0	0	3,422	3,422		3,422	3,422
800 UNDISTRIBUTED	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								20,000	183,422	472,181
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
Undistributed										
008 SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	0	0	8,800	8,800	(71,400)	(19,800)	(11,400)	8,800		
020 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	0	3,000	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	
022 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	(63,862)	(54,084)	(52,479)	(66,836)	(41,000)	(46,086)			6,383
036 DEPENDENT SCHOOLS	0	(92,000)	0	(10,000)	4,150	0	4,150		4,150	14,150
066 ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	0	200,000	0	200,000		200,000	200,000
068 DMA	0	0	0	10,000	0	(25,000)	0	10,000		
080 LEGACY RESOURCE MGMT PROG	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
088 OSD	0	0	0	0	0	0	300		300	300
088 CINC FUND	0	0	0	0	0	0	36,000		36,000	36,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								19,200	252,850	266,843
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
Undistributed										
002 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(4,300)	(4,300)	0	(4,300)	(2,150)			2,150
004 FORCE STRUCTURE	0	23,000	0	23,000	18,700	0	23,000	23,000	23,000	
018 INCREASED MISSIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,461		9,461	9,461
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
Undistributed										
002 INCREASED USE OF RESERVE FORCES	0	0	4,400	4,400	0	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	
004 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(11,200)	(11,200)	0	(11,200)	(9,895)			1,505
008 SPECIAL OPERATIONS - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	14,200	0	14,200	6,000	0	0	14,200		

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
008 NAVAL RESERVE BASES - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	6,000	0	6,000	0	0	0	6,000		
010 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	0	0	0	20,200	0	20,200		20,200	NA
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
Undistributed										
002 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(1,300)	(1,300)	0	(1,300)	(550)			750
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
Undistributed										
002 INCREASED USE OF RESERVE FORCES	0	0	18,000	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	
004 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(2,900)	(2,900)	0	(2,900)	(1,615)			1,285
008 TAC FIGHTER - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	0	0	2,300		
008 TAC AIRLIFT - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
010 RESCUE AND RECOVERY - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	1,400	0	1,400	0	0	0	1,400		
012 SPECIAL OPERATIONS - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	1,600	0	1,600	20,000	0	0	1,600		
014 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	0	0	0	8,300	0	8,300		8,300	NA
Oper. & Maint., Army Natl Guard										
Undistributed										
002 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(18,100)	(18,100)	0	(18,100)	(17,321)			779
004 FORCE STRUCTURE	0	10,000	0	10,000	22,600	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	
014 AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING	0	0	0	0	4,241	0	4,241		4,241	4,241
Oper. & Maint., Air Natl Guard										
Undistributed										
002 INCREASED USE OF RESERVE FORCES	0	0	53,000	53,000	0	53,000	49,405	53,000	49,405	
004 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT	0	0	(8,800)	(8,800)	0	(8,800)	(4,400)			4,400
008 TAC FIGHTER - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	17,800	0	17,800	0	0	0	17,800		
008 TAC AIRLIFT - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	7,400	0	7,400	0	0	0	7,400		
010 RESCUE AND RECOVERY - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	1,400	0	1,400	0	0	0	1,400		
012 SPECIAL OPERATIONS - FORCE STRUCTURE	0	1,000	0	1,000	12,200	0	0	1,000		
014 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	0	0	0	35,000	0	27,600		27,600	NA
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								184,500	174,607	24,571
Rifle Practice, Army										
Undistributed										
001 RIFLE PRACTICE PROGRAMS	5,600	4,000	5,600	4,000	5,000	5,600	5,000			1,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense										
Undistributed										
001 COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS PROGRAMS	5,600	5,400	5,500	5,400	5,600	5,600	5,600			200
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
001/002 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	817,000	1,000,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	1,900,000	1,082,527	1,082,527	245,527	245,527	

001 HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	0	15,000	0
004 NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT (PROCUREMENT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 PAY AND ALLOWANCES	0	0	40,000	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	40,000	40,000
20 PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT	0	38,000	10,000	38,000	0	0	0	38,000	38,000	38,000
30 TRAINING	0	0	3,200	3,200	0	0	0	3,200	3,200	3,200
008 PERSONNEL (ARMY NATL GD)	0	0	0	1,000	32,500	0	0	1,000	32,500	32,500
030 ROT&E (DEF AGENCIES)	0	0	0	25,000	20,000	0	0	25,000	20,000	20,000
060 LEA SUPPORT	0	40,000	60,000	60,000	40,000	0	0	60,000	60,000	60,000

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Humanitarian Assistance	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Undistributed	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
001 HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	15,000	13,000	15,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-004 NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT (PROCUREMENT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 PAY AND ALLOWANCES	0	0	40,000	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	40,000	40,000
20 PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT	0	38,000	10,000	38,000	0	0	0	38,000	38,000	38,000
30 TRAINING	0	0	3,200	3,200	0	0	0	3,200	3,200	3,200
008 PERSONNEL (ARMY NATL GD)	0	0	0	1,000	32,500	0	0	1,000	32,500	32,500
030 ROT&E (DEF AGENCIES)	0	0	0	25,000	20,000	0	0	25,000	20,000	20,000
060 LEA SUPPORT	0	40,000	60,000	60,000	40,000	0	0	60,000	60,000	60,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								402,727	247,527	3,200
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	80,070,700	83,810,958	86,932,152	86,452,493	87,125,390	84,545,627	84,636,180			
FAJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Appropriations	80,070,700	83,810,958	86,932,152	86,452,493	87,135,390	84,545,627	84,636,180			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO O&M*								741,227	1,708,574	2,075,943

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
024 SER LIFE EXT PRO FOR MED TRUCKS	0	80,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
Communications and electronics equipment										
048 MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE)	0	29,267	29,267	14,267	0	0	0	14,267		
074 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (29,728	26,387	28,836	27,191	28,808	28,835	29,089			1,808
108 MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	8,500	0	6,000		6,000	6,000
117 INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)	33,587	33,587	23,587	4,000	33,587	33,587	33,587			29,587
126 SPECIAL PROGRAMS	139,662	164,662	0	68,000	60,000	0	68,662			662
Other support equipment										
132 RECON SYSTEM, NBC	38,914	38,914	38,914	38,914	38,914	40,414	40,414		3,500	3,800
187 BASE LEVEL COML EQUIPMENT	16,254	16,254	16,254	16,254	24,254	16,254	24,254		8,000	8,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								635,082	560,785	548,047
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
Combat aircraft										
007 AV-8B (AUYYP) (AP-CY)	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000		40,000	40,000
008 F-14A/DREMPG (FIGHTER) TOMCAT	779,946	789,946	789,946	789,946	779,946	789,946	779,946	1,000		
011 F/A-18 (FIGHTER) HORNET ADV PROC (CY)	150,832	191,732	96,032	110,000	110,832	96,032	110,832			832
016 V-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	186,000	0	186,000	186,000	0	186,000	186,000	186,000	
017 HH-60H (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK (MYP)	104,077	104,077	104,077	104,077	119,577	104,077	119,577		15,500	15,500
022 E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	360,914	350,914	367,414	367,414	340,914	350,914	350,914	46,800		
024 HH-60H (AP-CY)	0	0	0	0	6,000	0	6,000		6,000	6,000
Trainer aircraft										
027 T-48TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	0	158,148	282,900	113,200	0	0	0	113,200		
028 T-48 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	44,838	44,838	44,838	0	0	0	44,838		
Modification of aircraft										
029 A-3 SERIES	102	102	0	0	102	0	102			102
031 A-6 SERIES	84,083	178,083	169,083	178,083	184,083	84,083	99,083	82,000	15,000	
047 H-2 SERIES	8,932	25,832	8,932	25,832	8,932	8,932	8,932	16,700		
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
Ballistic missiles										
008 TRIDENT II	0	1,336,225	1,536,225	1,343,780	0	0	0	1,343,780		
010 TRIDENT II ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0	0	192,565	0	0	0	192,565		
Other missiles										
007 TRIDENT II	1,120	1,120	1,120	0	1,120	1,120	1,120			1,120
020 AERIAL TARGETS	142,421	167,421	142,421	142,421	149,700	167,421	149,700		7,279	7,279
021 DRONES AND DECOYS	0	0	0	25,000	0	0	0	25,000		
026 SIDEWINDER MODS	7,078	0	0	0	7,078	0	7,078			7,078
028 PHOENIX MODS	3,808	3,808	63,808	63,808	3,808	76,808	63,808	80,000	60,000	
030 WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	24,986	11,886	38,086	38,086	24,986	38,086	38,086	13,100	13,100	
Spare and repair parts										

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(Thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Other missiles										
016 AGM-86D MAVERICK	7,325	80,328	7,325	80,325	80,325	80,325	80,325	83,000	83,000	
017 AMRAAM	893,382	0	463,382	463,382	463,382	568,000	636,298			71,916
Other support										
037 SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS	15,128	15,128	15,128	15,128	15,128	23,128	23,128		8,000	8,000
039 DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP) ADV F	83,651	37,651	67,351	63,851	33,851	83,651	83,651			10,000
051 SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	237,345	40,945	137,345	40,945	237,345	37,345	40,991			46
Other Procurement, Air Force										
Munitions and associated equipment										
004 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	6,307	6,307	5,007	5,007	6,307	6,307	6,307			1,300
017 MK-82 INERT/BDU-80	23,908	23,748	23,908	23,828	23,908	15,908	23,908			80
020 BOMB HARD TARGET 2000LB	0	12,300	0	12,300	12,300	0	12,300	12,300	12,300	
021 LASER BOMB GUIDANCE KIT	2,078	2,078	2,078	42,978	43,078	41,078	41,078	40,900	39,000	
023 BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	23,910	23,808	23,910	23,858	23,910	23,910	23,910			52
024 BOMB PRACTICE BDU-38	104	0	104	52	104	104	104			52
034 SPECIAL PROGRAMS	7,663	7,310	7,310	4,910	25,500	7,663	25,500		17,837	20,560
Vehicle equipment										
052 14-23 PASSENGER BUS	148	0	148	0	148	148	148			148
053 LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	3,779	3,779	3,079	3,079	3,779	3,779	3,779			700
058 TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM	4,808	4,482	4,808	4,482	4,808	4,808	4,808			126
058 TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	3,785	3,732	3,785	3,732	3,785	3,785	3,785			53
057 TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	3,142	2,554	3,142	2,554	3,142	3,142	3,142			598
058 TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	6,352	0	6,352	0	6,352	6,352	6,352			6,352
058 TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	2,451	0	2,451	0	2,451	2,451	2,451			2,451
052 TRUCK CARRYALL	5,719	0	5,719	0	5,719	5,719	5,719			5,719
070 CAP VEHICLES	0	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	
071 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	11,190	10,298	11,190	10,298	11,190	11,190	11,190			892
072 TRUCK, TANK, 1200 GAL	1,425	1,425	925	925	1,425	1,425	1,425			500
074 TRUCK, TANK, FUEL, M-48	2,610	2,610	2,010	2,010	2,610	2,610	2,610			600
079 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	13,517	12,574	13,517	12,574	13,517	13,517	13,517			943
088 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	2,100	1,998	2,100	1,998	2,100	2,100	2,100			102
088 TRUCK FL 4000 LB OED/DED 144 INCH	4,183	4,014	4,183	4,014	4,183	4,183	4,183			149
087 TRUCK, FL 6000 LB	3,348	3,088	3,348	3,088	3,348	3,348	3,348			258
088 TRUCK, FL 10,000 LB	13,458	13,331	13,458	13,331	13,458	13,458	13,458			127
091 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	4,188	4,177	4,188	4,177	4,188	4,188	4,188			11
083 CLEANER, RUNWAY/STREET	3,759	3,624	3,759	3,624	3,759	3,759	3,759			136
Electronics and telecommunications equip										
111 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYS (ATCALB)	11,198	11,198	11,198	11,198	31,198	11,198	31,198		20,000	20,000
116 OTH-B Radar	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
116 SAC COMMAND AND CONTROL	68,374	58,174	68,374	63,274	58,174	64,174	64,174			900
184 TELEPHONE EXCHANGE	70,882	70,882	50,882	50,882	65,882	70,882	65,882			15,000
184 ADV COMMUNIC SATELLITE RELAY TERMINALS	0	0	0	98,000	0	0	0	98,000		

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
02 AH-1W COBRA AIRCRAFT	0	0	79,000	79,000	79,000	0	79,000	79,000	79,000	
04 KC-130T AIRCRAFT	26,000	50,000	25,000	50,000	50,000	28,000	56,000	25,000	31,000	8,000
12 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	25,000		25,000	25,000
-004 AIR FORCE RESERVE										
02 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	5,000	30,000	5,000	20,000	30,000	75,000	30,000	15,000	25,000	10,000
04 C-130 AIRCRAFT	24,000	98,000	24,000	98,000	98,000	27,000	106,000	72,000	84,000	12,000
10 AIR RESERVE SPARES	0	5,100	0	5,100	5,100	0	0	5,100		
National Guard Equipment										
-005 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD										
02 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	15,000	30,000	15,000	10,000	20,000	75,000	20,000	5,000		10,000
03 OH-68D HELICOPTER (AHP)	0	0	0	200,000	0	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	
06 UH-60 HELICOPTERS	0	0	158,000	158,000	0	158,000	158,000	158,000	158,000	
10 NIGHT VISION DEVICES	0	0	35,000	35,000	35,000	0	35,000	35,000	35,000	
16 MLRS LAUNCHERS	0	0	80,000	80,000	0	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
18 M577 COMMAND POST CARRIERS	24,900	50,000	24,900	50,000	50,000	24,900	0	25,100		
24 M113 ARMORED PERSONNEL CARRIER MODS	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	100,000	100,000	10,000	100,000	80,000
28 MLRS-BN (SUPPORT PACKAGE)	0	34,000	0	34,000	34,000	0	34,000	34,000	34,000	
28 C-28 AIRCRAFT	0	12,800	0	12,800	29,900	0	29,900	12,800	29,900	17,100
30 C-23C AIRCRAFT	0	30,000	0	30,000	54,000	54,000	62,000	30,000	62,000	32,000
38 COMMUNICATIONS ELECTRONICS	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	18,000
-006 AIR NATIONAL GUARD										
02 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (AIR NG)	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
04 C-130 AIRCRAFT	48,000	48,000	268,100	268,100	48,000	324,000	324,000	220,100	278,000	55,900
06 C-28 AIRCRAFT (AIR NG)	0	12,800	0	12,800	25,500	0	25,800	12,800	25,800	12,800
10 F-16 MODIFICATIONS	8,000	32,000	8,000	18,000	32,000	8,000	32,000	10,000	26,000	18,000
20 AIR GUARD SPARES	0	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	0	0	1,500		
22 JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROG	0	0	0	0	0	72,485	56,500		56,500	56,500
24 TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROV	0	0	0	0	0	75,000	75,000		75,000	75,000
26 MH-60 HELICOPTERS	0	0	0	0	0	18,800	18,800		18,800	18,800
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,481,300	2,102,000	711,500
Defense Production Act Purchases										
001 DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	50,000	30,000	50,000		48,200	48,200
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruct-RDT&E										
001 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E	0	0	5,000	5,300	0	5,300	(96,500)	5,300		
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruct-Proc										
002 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	211,800	202,900	217,900	202,900	115,100	184,900	211,800			8,700
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruct-O&M										
003 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	142,800	162,200	142,800	162,200	157,100	175,500	159,100	19,400	16,300	
Retrograde										

004 RETROGRADE	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	13,200	12,200	13,200	1,000
005 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	18,500	17,500	18,500	6,300

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(Thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
004 RETROGRADE	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	13,200	12,200	13,200	1,000
005 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	18,500	17,500	18,500	6,300
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT	77,842,460	63,850,388	67,412,763	67,184,710	67,310,746	66,856,617	67,409,348	67,409,348	67,409,348	284,838
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO PROCUREMENT*	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	18,500	17,500	18,500	6,300

004 RETROGRADE	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	13,200	12,200	13,200	1,000
005 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*	0	12,200	0	12,200	12,200	0	18,500	17,500	18,500	6,300

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL											
RDT&E, Army											
Technology base											
003 MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	080210	13,278	18,278	13,278	15,278	18,278	13,278	15,278	2,000	2,000	
005 SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT	080212	6,285	6,285	11,285	11,285	11,285	11,285	11,285	5,000	5,000	
009 MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	080230	27,153	27,153	37,153	37,153	27,153	32,153	32,153	10,000	5,000	
015 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	080262	38,888	38,888	58,888	58,888	48,888	48,888	48,888	20,000	10,000	
016 ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	080270	17,808	19,808	14,808	19,808	19,808	20,108	20,108	2,000	2,500	500
019 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	080272	9,815	14,815	11,815	12,815	14,815	14,715	12,815	3,000	3,000	
020 NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICE TECHNOLOGY	080272	3,807	3,807	3,807	3,807	3,807	3,807	3,807	5,000	2,500	
021 COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECH	080276	20,458	20,458	22,458	22,458	20,458	20,458	20,458	2,000		
022 COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	080278	5,073	5,073	7,073	7,073	3,800	5,073	3,800	2,000		
025 LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	080278	35,811	35,811	35,811	35,811	35,811	50,811	50,811		15,000	15,000
026 MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	080278	98,902	98,902	98,902	98,902	100,902	109,402	109,402		12,500	12,500
Advanced technology development											
029 MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080300	34,809	34,809	34,809	34,809	34,809	47,309	47,309		12,500	12,500
030 AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080300	34,713	34,713	34,713	34,713	44,713	32,713	38,193		3,480	3,480
031 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECH	080300	33,471	33,471	33,471	64,471	41,471	29,671	29,671	31,000		
039 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (A	080310	22,558	22,558	22,558	22,558	32,558	44,558	44,558		22,000	22,000
045 ADV SPECIAL OPS RESRCH, DEVEL & ACQUIS		0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	5,000		
051 ADVANCED ELECTRONIC DEVICES DEVELOPME	080374	5,640	5,640	7,640	7,640	7,640	7,640	7,640	2,000	2,000	
055 ADV FIELD ARTILLERY SYSTEM		0	0	0	0	12,800	21,800	21,800		21,800	21,800
058 ARMOR GUN SYSTEM		0	0	0	0	40,000	0	5,000		5,000	5,000
Tactical programs											
074 FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM		0	0	0	92,000	92,000	0	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
079 AVIATION - ADV DEV	080380	5,134	5,134	5,134	5,134	7,513	5,134	7,513		2,379	2,379
084 CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT -	080380	24,511	24,511	24,511	44,511	44,511	34,511	44,511	20,000	20,000	
103 MIA1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	080483	48,337	48,337	10,037	10,037	48,337	0	31,000			20,963
105 NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	080471	17,726	17,726	17,726	17,726	17,726	17,726	17,726		2,000	2,000
117 AVIATION - ENG DEV	080480	19,378	19,378	19,378	19,378	20,863	19,378	20,863		1,487	1,487
118 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	080480	11,108	26,108	24,108	24,108	26,108	11,108	24,108	13,000	13,000	
127 TRACTOR FULL	080481	35,149	20,149	55,149	55,149	55,149	45,149	55,149	20,000	20,000	
129 TRACTOR TRAILER	080481	0	0	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	
134 LONGBOW-CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM [a]		0	0	0	0	0	171,514	195,514		195,514	195,514
138 COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	020373	97,751	97,751	97,751	97,751	104,751	97,751	104,751		7,000	7,000
148 TRACTOR CARD	020380	7,378	7,378	7,378	7,378	17,378	7,378	17,378		10,000	10,000
149 TACJAM		0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
179 CCTT/BRIMNET - RESERVE COMPONENTS		0	0	100,000	9,000	0	7,500	7,500	9,000	7,500	
182 SOLDIER/MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	
180 ARMORED GUN SYSTEM		0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
Defensewide Mission Support											
171 TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	080580	7,858	7,858	5,858	19,458	5,858	5,858	5,858	11,800		
176 BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	080589	204,380	204,380	191,500	191,500	204,380	0	204,380			12,880
178 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	26,708	36,708	0	26,708	36,708	0	31,708		5,000	5,000
188 RANGE SECURITY		0	0	0	0	9,000	0	4,500		4,500	4,500

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
188 ARROYO CENTER		0	0	0	0	0	22,850	22,850	11,000	22,850	22,850
192 SECURITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	6,000	0	0
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									294,000	570,710	397,333
RDT&E, Navy											
Technology base											
003 ANTI-AIR WARFARE/ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE	080211	63,105	63,105	63,105	68,105	68,105	68,105	68,105	5,000	5,000	0
004 SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY	080212	15,982	25,982	15,982	25,982	25,982	15,982	15,982	10,000	0	0
011 ASW TECHNOLOGY	080231	114,677	129,677	114,677	119,677	129,677	114,677	125,000	5,000	10,323	5,323
012 MINE AND SPECIAL WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	080231	17,926	25,926	17,926	17,926	25,926	17,926	22,926	5,000	5,000	5,000
013 SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	080232	16,701	21,701	16,701	21,701	21,701	16,701	16,701	5,000	0	0
015 OCEAN AND ATMOSPHERIC SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	080243	32,099	37,099	34,099	34,099	32,099	34,099	33,099	2,000	1,000	0
262 TACTICAL OCEANOGRAPHY TECHNOLOGY		0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
273 MATERIALS		0	5,000	0	3,000	5,000	0	2,500	3,000	2,500	0
Advanced technology development											
022 ELECTRIC DRIVE	080357	43,799	43,799	93,799	53,799	0	53,799	53,799	10,000	10,000	0
023 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	080370	16,998	16,998	16,998	16,998	24,998	23,998	23,998	2,000	7,000	22,998
027 GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMO	080371	14,040	14,040	19,040	19,040	14,040	27,640	27,640	5,000	13,600	8,600
032 ADVANCED ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	080374	16,351	26,351	16,351	31,351	26,351	16,351	16,351	15,000	0	0
033 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	080379	51,143	51,143	51,143	51,143	51,143	61,143	61,143	10,000	10,000	0
263 UNMANNED UNDERSEA VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY		0	0	4,000	4,000	0	0	0	4,000	0	0
Strategic programs											
037 NAVY LASER COMMUNICATIONS		0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000	0	0
042 SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	010122	43,131	43,131	60,000	51,566	43,131	51,566	43,131	8,435	0	0
271 TRIDENT II MISSILE		0	70,670	70,670	70,670	0	0	0	70,670	0	0
Tactical programs											
080 INTEGRATED AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	080310	4,992	4,992	4,992	4,992	4,992	4,992	6,642	0	3,650	3,650
089 AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	080326	16,930	16,930	16,930	26,930	16,930	16,930	14,930	10,000	0	0
090 TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	080326	30,950	30,950	30,950	28,950	28,950	28,950	30,950	0	0	2,000
072 SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	080361	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	10,000	15,000	10,000	0
074 SUBMARINE ARCTIC WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	080352	2,892	4,892	2,892	4,892	4,892	2,892	3,892	2,000	1,000	0
076 NON-ACOUSTIC ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE (A)	080352	22,884	22,884	22,884	37,884	22,884	14,000	14,000	15,000	0	0
084 SHIP DEVELOPMENT	080356	18,864	18,864	48,864	38,864	7,564	4,729	4,729	20,000	0	0
110 CHALK CORAL	080373	31,129	31,129	31,129	46,929	36,929	31,129	36,929	15,800	5,800	0
113 RETRACT MAPLE	080374	165,505	165,505	165,505	165,505	251,505	165,505	226,505	61,000	61,000	61,000
116 RETRACT ELM	080375	105,085	105,085	105,085	105,085	109,785	105,085	109,785	4,700	4,700	0
121 SPECIAL PROCESSES	080378	31,819	31,819	31,819	40,019	40,019	31,819	40,019	8,200	8,200	0
124 LAMPS	080421	21,627	21,627	21,627	21,627	24,627	21,627	24,627	0	3,000	3,000
134 V-22A	080426	0	236,000	36,000	236,000	236,000	36,000	236,000	236,000	236,000	0
141 SEA LANCE	080430	0	50,000	71,000	56,000	71,000	71,000	71,000	56,000	71,000	16,000
143 AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	080435	26,467	26,467	0	35,000	0	0	0	8,513	0	0
144 VERTICAL LAUNCH ASROC	080435	30,000	0	30,000	5,000	30,000	0	15,000	0	0	10,000
184 SURFACE ASW SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	080471	122,609	152,609	122,609	152,609	152,609	99,995	137,607	30,000	14,996	0

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
185 SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES	080471	12,357	12,357	12,357	12,357	14,357	12,357	14,357		2,000	2,000
189 JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	080472	24,981	14,981	24,981	18,481	9,981	22,981	18,581			100
193 FIXED DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM - ENG	080478	210,178	141,178	210,178	198,178	195,178	210,178	210,178			12,000
217 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING	020982	43,725	43,725	55,725	55,725	42,725	55,725	55,725	12,000	12,000	
267 ASSAULT BALLISTIC ROCKET SYSTEM		0	0	31,000	31,000	0	0	0	31,000		
269 FEWSG AIRCRAFT COMPETITION		0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
272 T-45 TRAINING SYSTEM		0	14,803	14,803	14,803	0	0	0	14,803		
274 SKIPPER ENHANCEMENTS		0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
280 ADV MINOR CALIBER GUN SYSTEM		0	0	0	0	0	0	5,500		5,500	5,500
282 IMPROVED TACT AIR LAUNCHED DECOY		0	0	0	0	0	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
Defensewide Mission Support											
236 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	080372	11,580	18,580	11,580	13,080	18,580	11,580	11,580	1,500		
259 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	41,827	101,827	3,000	87,827	101,827	3,000	110,727	48,000	68,000	22,900
273 UNSUBMIC MINE WARFARE		0	0	0	0	0	15,697	15,697		15,697	15,697
278 SECURITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS		0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	6,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									695,721	627,888	210,470
RDT&E, Air Force											
Technology base											
002 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	193,158	203,458	193,158	193,758	203,458	192,158	195,158	800	2,000	1,400
004 MATERIALS	080210	80,847	80,847	80,847	80,847	80,847	80,847	80,000	5,000	2,153	
008 HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	080220	51,142	58,142	51,142	54,142	58,142	51,142	54,142	3,000	3,000	
007 AEROSPACE PROPULSION	080220	62,583	65,583	65,583	65,583	65,583	62,583	65,583	3,000	3,000	
010 CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUA	080220	5,615	10,615	5,615	7,115	5,615	5,615	5,615	1,500		
014 COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	080270	79,409	79,409	80,409	80,409	79,409	79,409	79,409	1,000		
Advanced technology development											
017 ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	080311	15,042	15,042	18,042	18,042	18,042	15,042	15,042	3,000		
018 AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEG	080320	28,404	158,000	0	118,000	28,404	20,527	20,527	90,596		
028 NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY F	080326	158,000	158,000	158,000	158,000	163,000	0	163,000		5,000	5,000
Strategic programs											
051 SPACE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	080342	34,138	0	10,000	0	0	1,000	1,000			1,000
054 B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER (a)	080424	1,568,692	1,568,692	1,750,692	1,750,692	1,568,692	1,750,692	1,750,692	184,000	184,000	
068 NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEMS	010231	104,899	104,899	104,899	104,899	118,499	104,899	118,499		11,800	11,800
074 SPACETRACK	010242	15,527	15,527	21,527	30,527	5,527	30,527	25,527	15,000	9,985	
077 NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	010243	5,125	5,125	23,625	23,625	5,125	23,625	23,625	18,500	18,500	
085 ADVANCED SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS RELAY		0	0	0	500,000	0	0	0	500,000		
227 ADVANCED WARNING SYSTEM		0	230,000	0	210,000	260,000	0	210,000	210,000	210,000	
Tactical programs											
107 SHORT RANGE ATTACK MISSILE - TACTICAL	080424	118,581	0	118,581	35,000	118,581	118,581	118,581			83,581
127 COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECH	080474	12,610	12,610	12,610	12,610	14,610	12,610	14,610		2,000	2,000
145 TR-1 SQUADRON	020721	54,764	1,563	44,084	28,500	54,764	54,764	49,764			21,264
148 TACT RAINBOW	020731	9,759	36,759	36,759	36,759	36,759	36,759	36,759	27,000	27,000	
173 LINKED OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY		0	0	0	15,434	0	0	0	15,434		

FY1994 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
226 C-130J		0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
241 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		0	0	0	0	13,408	83,000	26,708		26,708	26,708
Defensewide Mission Support											
199 RANGE IMPROVEMENT	080473	100,928	73,928	80,963	51,828	72,928	78,828	78,828			27,000
201 IMPROVED CAPABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT TEST	080475	45,720	37,720	45,720	29,720	37,720	37,720	37,720			8,000
207 TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	080580	318,639	265,739	294,352	241,452	294,352	294,352	294,352			52,900
208 DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	080580	9,138	9,138	7,500	7,500	7,500	9,138	9,138			1,638
220 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	72,133	112,133	0	102,133	112,133	0	112,133	30,000	40,000	10,000
223 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	100100	4,011	4,011	4,011	3,278	3,288	3,288	3,288			10
228 AIR FORCE DEVELOPMENT TEST CENTER		0	108,900	0	94,100	0	0	0	94,100		
243 RANGE SECURITY		0	0	0	0	9,000	0	4,500		4,500	4,500
252 SECURITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	0	6,000	0	0	0	6,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									1,217,730	559,456	256,601
RDT&E, Defensewide											
Technology base											
001 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	85,238	121,538	85,238	98,238	121,538	85,238	100,538	13,000	15,300	2,300
002 IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	080110	2,342	2,342	2,342	2,342	2,342	2,467	2,467		125	125
003 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	080110	98,681	126,681	98,681	108,681	158,181	98,681	174,181	10,000	75,500	65,500
009 TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	080270	121,535	141,535	126,535	126,535	141,531	104,035	122,035	5,000	500	
011 INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	080270	37,553	137,553	37,553	67,053	137,553	67,053	112,053	29,500	74,500	45,000
012 MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	080271	43,098	123,098	69,098	123,098	143,098	69,098	158,098	80,000	113,000	33,000
102 DOD GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM		0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
103 US-JAPAN MANAGEMENT TRAINING		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
104 HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING		0	50,000	138,000	138,000	50,000	128,000	128,000	138,000	128,000	
105 PRE-COMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	0	100,000	50,000	100,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	
127 ENGINEERING-TRAINING INITIATIVE		0	0	0	0	50,000	0	50,000		50,000	50,000
Advanced technology development											
021 JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	080322	8,522	8,522	30,000	20,000	8,522	20,000	18,000	11,478	9,478	
022 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAGOR INNOVATION	080322	179,397	179,397	190,397	134,995	175,397	158,357	139,357			4,402
024 ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	080366	0	75,000	95,000	95,000	75,000	0	75,000	95,000	75,000	
026 MICROWAVE/MILLIMETER WAVE MONOLITHIC INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	080370	86,657	108,657	86,657	108,657	108,657	86,657	108,657	20,000	20,000	
028 COMPUTER AIDED LOGISTICS SUPPORT	080373	13,779	13,779	15,779	15,779	15,779	13,779	15,779	2,000	2,000	
030 COOPERATIVE DODVA MEDICAL RESEARCH	080373	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
032 CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE	080375	12,661	12,661	12,661	12,661	22,661	12,661	22,661		10,000	10,000
108 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY		0	0	175,000	25,000	0	170,000	50,000	25,000	50,000	25,000
114 LIGHTBAT		0	20,000	0	49,442	20,000	0	35,000	49,442	35,000	
129 MINATURE DIAGNOSTIC PROTON ACCELERATOR		0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
Tactical programs											
051 NON-Acoustic ASW	080371	0	0	30,000	10,000	0	30,000	30,000	10,000	30,000	20,000
057 JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM	030514	82,099	133,099	82,099	82,099	92,099	67,099	92,099		10,000	10,000
058 FORCE ENHANCEMENTS-ACTIVE	111001	182,368	172,368	202,668	202,668	184,977	180,230	173,678	20,300		
108 GENERAL SUPPORT FOR SOLIC		0	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
109 TECHNICAL SUPPORT WORKING GROUP		0	0	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
Intelligence and communications											
132 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		0	0	0	0	767,038	0	734,783		734,783	734,783
Defensewide Mission Support											
075 INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	080370	7,520	7,520	7,520	0	7,520	0	4,000	7,520	4,000	4,000
100 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	10,912	20,912	0	5,000	20,912	0	10,912	10,912	5,912	5,912
110 CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY INSTITUTE		0	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
111 JT WARGAMING SIMULATION MGMT OFC		0	0	25,000	15,000	25,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
112 AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM		0	0	35,000	0	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
113 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM		0	0	200,000	200,000	0	200,000	150,000	200,000	150,000	150,000
118 WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE		0	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	20,000	0	0
120 SUPERCOMPUTER ACQUISITION		0	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	20,000	0	0
121 DARPA LASER COMMUNICATIONS		0	0	0	8,000	0	0	0	8,000	0	0
133 RESEARCH PROJECTS		0	0	0	0	20,000	0	40,000	0	40,000	40,000
134 ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER		0	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	5,000
Undistributed											
017 SINGLE PULSE EXCIMER LASER TECH		0	0	30,000	20,000	0	0	0	20,000	0	0
135 EXCIMER LASER TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	0	30,000	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000
137 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		0	0	0	0	21,000	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000
Developmental Test & Eval., Defense											
Defensewide Mission Support											
001 TEST INSTRUMENTATION DEVELOPMENT	080494	185,899	126,899	155,000	110,899	112,000	107,959	112,000	112,000	112,000	1,101
005 LIVE FIRE TESTING	080513	0	17,974	0	15,000	17,974	0	17,974	15,000	17,974	2,974
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*		0	0	10,900	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	916,720	1,825,160	1,116,087
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL											
- TOA		38,082,800	36,673,221	38,520,722	36,095,903	34,937,611	34,140,308	35,974,792			
- FAJ		0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
- Appropriations		38,082,800	36,673,221	38,520,722	36,095,903	34,937,611	34,140,308	35,974,792			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO RDT&E*									3,124,171	3,583,194	1,980,501

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
Major construction										
020 FT J M WAINWRIGHT AK										
30 SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION	0	0	8,300	8,300	0	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	
058 FORT GORDON GA										
10 SOLDIER SERVICE CENTER	0	0	10,800	10,800	0	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800	
068 FORT POLK LA										
20 MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	0	0	22,000	0	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	
110 FORT LEONARD WOOD MO										
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	3,050	0	3,050	0	0	0	3,050		
120 FORT BRAGG NC										
80 LAND ACQUISITION	0	720	0	720	720	0	720	720	720	
70 ADDITION SOF HDQTRS FAC	0	4,950	0	4,950	4,950	0	4,950	4,950	4,950	
148 FORT BLISS TX										
10 BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	0	10,200	0	10,200	10,200	0	10,200	10,200	10,200	
20 BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	0	9,800	0	9,800	9,800	0	9,800	9,800	9,800	
158 CAMP SWIFT TX										
10 SEALING UTILITY HOLES	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	100	100	
165 TOOLEE ARMY DEPOT UT										
10 AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY	11,800	81,200	52,200	81,200	52,200	81,200	81,200	49,400	49,400	
285 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,803	7,803	7,803	7,803	7,803	8,803	8,803	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								119,120	117,070	1,000
Military Construction, Navy										
Major construction										
021 BRIDGEPORT CA										
10 SAFETY/MODERNIZATION	0	0	11,300	11,300	0	11,300	0	11,300		
075 MIRAMAR NAVAL AIR STATION CA										
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	2,300	
40 TACTICAL AIRCREW COMBAT TRAINING FAC	0	1,250	0	1,250	1,250	0	1,250	1,250	1,250	
078 MONTEREY FLEET NUM OCEAN CT CA										
10 COMPUTER CENTER	0	0	0	0	6,010	6,440	6,010		6,010	6,010
115 SAN DIEGO NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE CA										
20 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	4,130	0	4,130	4,130	0	4,130	4,130	4,130	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
205 KINGS BAY NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE GA										
50 COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSISTANCE	0	10,800	10,278	10,800	10,800	10,278	10,800	10,800	10,800	
265 INDIAN HEAD NAVAL ORDNANCE STAT MD										
20 CHEMISTRY LABORATORY	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	
270 PATUXENT RIVER NAVAL AIR TEST C MD										
30 ENTRY GATE/ROAD	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
315 NEWPORT NAVAL EDUCATION & TRAIN RI										
20 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	1,200	0	1,200	1,000	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	
318 NAVAL UNDERWATER SYS CMD, NWPRT RI										
10 ADVANCED UNDERWATER WEAPONS RES LAB	0	13,700	0	13,700	13,700	13,700	13,700	13,700	13,700	
326 NORTH RHETT AVENUE SC										
10 ACCESS ROAD	0	3,000	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
366 LITTLE CREEK VA										
10 SMALL ARMS RANGE	0	2,400	0	2,400	0	0	2,400	2,400	2,400	
375 NORFOLK NAVAL STATION VA										
20 SHIP SERVICES SUPPORT FAC	0	14,800	0	14,800	14,800	0	14,800	14,800	14,800	
415 BREMERTON PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHI WA										
20 LAND ACQUISITION	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								91,680	84,380	6,010
Military Construction, Air Force										
Major construction										
021 ELMENDORF AFB AK										
10 DORMITORY	0	0	8,900	8,900	0	8,900	8,900	8,900	8,900	
080 CASTLE AFB CA										
20 COMBAT CREW TRAINING SCHOOL	0	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	
30 STANDARDIZATION EVALUATION CENTER	0	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
085 EDWARDS AFB CA										
30 CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	0	8,500	0	8,500	7,000	0	8,500	8,500	8,500	
091 AIR FORCE ACADEMY CO										
10 CONSOLIDATE ED AND TRNG FAC	0	15,000	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
20 BARRACKS UPGRADE	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
098 LITTLE ROCK AR										
10 PERSONNEL PROCESSING CENTER	0	0	5,300	5,300	0	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	
088 LOWERY AFB CO										
10 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	4,550	0	4,550	4,550	0	4,550	4,550	4,550	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
100 PETERSON AFB CO										
30 PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	0	0	0	0	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
110 CAPE CANAVERAL AFB FL										
20 LEASE ACQUISITION	0	0	2,953	2,953	0	2,953	2,953	2,953	2,953	
155 SCOTT AFB IL										
20 DORMITORY	0	0	7,900	7,900	0	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	
156 GRISSOM IN										
10 ADD/ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CEN	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
20 RENOVATE DORMITORY	0	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	2,000
157 MCCONNELL KS										
10 ENLISTED DORMITORY	0	0	9,100	9,100	9,750	9,100	9,100	9,100	9,100	
180 BARKSDALE AFB LA										
90 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	0	6,300	6,300	0	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	
175 ANDREWS AFB MD										
30 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	3,850	0	3,850	3,850	0	3,850	3,850	3,850	
200 COLUMBUS AFB MS										
20 UPGRADE BOQ	0	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	
230 HOLLOMAN AFB NM										
92 F-117 FACILITIES (PHASE I)	0	0	0	36,000	0	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	
236 GRIFFISS AFB NY										
10 ADD/ALTER INTEGRATED MAIN FAC	0	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	2,300	
20 MUNITIONS STORAGE IGLOO	0	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	
237 PLATTSBURGH AFB NY										
10 COLD STORAGE FACILITY	0	1,200	0	1,200	0	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	
270 TINKER AFB OK										
90 LAND ACQUISITION	0	1,850	0	1,850	1,850	0	1,850	1,850	1,850	
261 SHAW AFB SC										
10 UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
290 ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEV CENTER TN										
345 HILL AFB UT										
60 ICBM NON DEST INSPECT BUNKER	0	2,800	0	2,800	2,800	0	2,800	2,800	2,800	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								120,103	135,903	20,800

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Auth. > Approp.
Military Construction, Defensewide										
Major construction										
050 FORT BENNING GA										
20 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	0	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	
30 ADD/ALTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
081 TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER HI										
10 ALTER FAMILY PRACTICE CLINIC	0	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	
158 DAHLGREN NAVAL SPACE SURV. SYS VA										
10 ADD/ALTER SCHOOL	0	0	1,360	1,360	0	1,360	1,360	1,360	1,360	
185 FORT LEE VA										
10 HOSPITAL LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE	2,650	4,850	2,650	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	2,200	2,200	
200 CLASSIFIED LOCATION XC										
30 BUILDING ADD W SUPPORT FACILITIES	27,425	26,800	26,800	26,600	27,425	27,425	27,425			825
40 CLASSIFIED PROJECT	5,375	0	0	0	5,375	5,375	5,375			5,375
305 CLASSIFIED OVERSEAS LOCATIONS YC										
10 CLASSIFIED PROJECT	1,600	7,800	1,600	7,800	1,600	1,600	1,600	6,200		
315 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
83 UNSPEC MINOR CONSTRUCTION	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
94 DEFICIENCY ALLOWANCE	0	0	0	0	0	11,000	10,100		10,100	10,100
325 VARIOUS LOCATIONS ZV										
10 CONFORMING STORAGE FACILITIES	10,000	5,000	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000			5,000
331 ENERGY CONSERVATION										
10 ENERGY CONSERVATION	0	50,000	0	30,000	0	0	10,000	30,000	10,000	
400 UNDISTRIBUTED										
		6,790								
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								53,360	37,260	21,300
Mil. Con., Army National Guard										
Major construction										
026 BREWTON AL										
10 ARMORY	0	0	903	903	0	903	903	903	903	
027 MARION AL										
10 ARMORY	0	0	764	764	0	764	764	764	764	
028 BELLEMONT AZ										
10 CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SITE	0	0	0	0	0	6,522	6,522		6,522	6,522
029 MARANA AZ										
10 APACHE SIMULATOR FACILITY	0	0	0	0	0	4,554	4,554		4,554	4,554

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
30 OMS	0	0	0	0	0	942	942		942	942
40 USP&FO WAREHOUSE	0	0	0	0	0	2,800	2,800		2,800	2,800
50 EDUCATION FACILITY	0	0	0	0	0	2,329	2,329		2,329	2,329
80 SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	0	0	0	7,880	7,880		7,880	7,880
081 CAMP RIPLEY MN										
10 MAINTENANCE FAC ADDITION	0	0	0	0	6,108	0	6,108		6,108	6,108
082 CAMP MCCAIN MS										
10 TANK TABLES 9 & 11	0	800	0	800	800	0	800	800	800	
20 TROOP ISSUE SUBSISTENCE ACT	0	780	0	780	780	0	780	780	780	
30 AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	0	500	0	500	500	0	500	500	500	
083 CAMP SHELBY MS										
10 BACHELOR OFF QTRS PHASE III	0	450	0	450	450	0	450	450	450	
20 AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	0	280	0	280	280	0	280	280	280	
30 COMBINE SPT MAINT SHOP	0	3,900	0	3,900	0	0	0	3,900		
086 ESPANOLA NM										
10 ARMORY	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	
087 PORTALES NM										
10 ARMORY	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	
088 RIO PUERCO NM										
10 ARMORY	0	0	3,400	3,400	0	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	
20 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	1,950	1,950	0	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950	
30 UTILITIES/INFRASTRUCTURE	0	0	2,127	2,127	0	2,127	2,127	2,127	2,127	
089 SANTA FE NM										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	850	850	0	850	850	850	850	
101 MUSKINGHAM COUNTY OH										
10 LAND ACQUISITION	0	0	5,870	5,870	0	0	0	5,870		
102 CAMP GRUBER OK										
10 BARRACKS	0	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	3,332	
20 WATER TREATMENT PLANT	0	1,204	0	1,204	1,204	0	1,204	1,204	1,204	
103 MONMOUTH OR										
10 MILITARY EDUCATION FACILITY	0	0	4,080	4,080	4,080	4,080	4,080	4,080	4,080	
104 PENDLETON OR										
10 ARMORY	0	1,542	1,542	1,542	1,542	1,542	1,542	1,542	1,542	
108 ALBUQUERQUE NM										
10 TRAINING SITE	0	0	0	0	0	1,549	1,549		1,549	1,549
107 GOLDSBORO NC										
10 ARMORY	0	2,057	0	2,057	1,863	0	1,863	2,057	1,863	
20 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINT SHOP	0	0	0	0	394	0	394		394	394

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
10 ADD/ALTER ARMORY	0	2,888	0	2,888	2,162	0	2,162	2,888	2,162	
20 EXPAND ORG MAINT SHOP	0	0	0	0	728	0	728		728	728
148 WYLIE TX										
10 ARMORY	0	2,227	0	2,227	2,227	0	2,227	2,227	2,227	
149 DALLAS (REDBIRD) TX										
10 ADD/ALTER ARMORY	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
152 WEST JORDAN UT										
10 ARMORY	0	0	4,145	4,145	0	4,145	4,145	4,145	4,145	
20 AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	0	0	8,955	8,955	0	8,952	8,952	8,955	8,952	
30 OMS	0	0	800	800	0	799	799	800	799	
158 EMPORIA VA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,897	0	1,897	1,700	0	1,897	1,897	1,897	
168 WOODSTOCK VA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,857	1,493	1,493	0	1,493	1,493	1,493	1,493	
167 BELOIT WI										
10 ARMORY	0	2,200	0	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	
168 MADISON WI										
10 ARMORY	0	7,372	0	7,372	7,372	0	7,372	7,372	7,372	
169 WAUKESHA WI										
10 ADD/ALTER ARMORY	0	1,341	0	1,341	1,341	0	1,341	1,341	1,341	
171 TACOMA WA										
10 PIER ACQUISITION	0	0	2,800	2,800	0	0	0	2,800		
20 WATERCRAFT SUPP AND TRAING COMPLEX	0	0	0	0	2,863	2,863	2,863		2,863	2,863
172 RICHLAND CENTER WI										
10 ARMORY & VEHICLE STORAGE	0	1,159	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
173 CHARLESTON WV										
10 ARMORY	0	0	2,800	2,800	0	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	
174 KINGWOOD WV										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	1,100	1,100	0	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	
176 PARKERSBURG WV										
10 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	800	800	0	800	800	800	800	
177 CAMP DAWSON WV										
10 PHASE IV	0	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	
178 CAMP GUERNSEY WY										
10 AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	2,947	2,947	0	2,947	2,947	2,947	2,947	
180 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,100	8,600	13,100	13,100	4,100	13,100	13,100	9,000	9,000	
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,788	3,788	3,788	3,788	4,084	4,084	4,084		278	278

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
Major construction										
010 KULIS ANGB AK										
20 BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	0	0	4,300	4,300	0	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	
031 EAST GRANDLEY CT										
10 LAND ACQUISITION	0	0	1,900	1,900	0	0	0	1,900		
20 COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY	0	0	0	0	1,900	1,900	1,900		1,900	1,900
032 BUCKLEY ANGB CO										
10 OPS AND TRAINING FAC	0	4,150	0	1,800	4,150	0	4,150	1,800	4,150	2,350
20 FIRE STATION	0	1,800	0	4,150	1,800	0	1,800	4,150	1,800	
035 CAMP BLANDING FL										
30 CIVIL ENGINEERING MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	2,500	1,500	
40 CIVIL ENGINEERING HEAVY EQUIPMENT SHOP	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
50 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	0	0	1,000	1,300	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
057 DES MOINES IA										
10 INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	0	0	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	
058 SIOUX CITY IA										
10 GATEWAY AIRPORT	0	0	680	680	0	680	680	680	680	
061 FORBES AIRPORT KS										
10 UTILITIES UPGRADE	0	0	1,140	1,140	0	1,140	1,140	1,140	1,140	
062 STANDIFORD AIRPORT KY										
10 AIRCRAFT APRON & TAXWAY	0	0	3,900	3,900	0	3,900	3,900	3,900	3,900	
063 BARNES ANGB, WESTFIELD MA										
10 JET FUEL STORAGE COMPLEX	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
075 GLENN L MARTIN AIRPORT MD										
20 UTILITIES REMOVAL	0	0	0	0	0	3,700	3,700		3,700	3,700
077 MARTIN ST MD										
10 UTILITY LINES	0	0	7,300	7,300	0	0	0	7,300		
081 MINNEAPOLIS IAP MN										
10 REGIONAL SIMULATOR	0	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
20 MEDICAL/DINING FACILITY	0	0	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700	
30 COMPOSITE SUPPORT FACILITY	0	0	0	0	4,350	0	4,350		4,350	4,350
085 GULFPORT MS										
30 ADD/ALTER BASE ENGINEERING FACILITY	0	520	490	520	490	490	490	520	490	
40 COMB/LECT TRAINING FACILITY	0	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	
086 THOMPSON FIELD MS										
10 MEDICAL/SECURITY POLICE FACILITY	0	1,500	1,300	1,500	1,500	1,300	1,500	1,500	1,500	
20 BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING FACILITY	0	1,800	1,500	1,800	1,800	1,500	1,800	1,800	1,800	

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
10 LAND ACQUISITION	0	0	1,829	1,829	0	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,829	
075 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,756	4,756	5,756	7,056	8,056	8,356	8,356	2,300	3,600	1,300
MI. Con., Naval Reserve										
Major construction										
021 GLENVIEW NAVAL AIR STATION IL										
10 AIRCRAFT INTER MAINT FAC	0	0	10,400	10,400	0	10,400	10,400	10,400	10,400	
20 TRANSMITTER/RECEIVER BUILDING	0	0	640	640	0	640	640	640	640	
040 NAVAL AIR STATION NEW ORLEANS LA										
20 AIRCRAFT HANGAR (C-130)	0	13,100	0	13,100	13,100	0	13,100	13,100	13,100	
078 BURLINGTON VT										
10 RESERVE CENTER	0	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	
085 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,665	3,665	7,352	7,352	3,665	7,352	7,352	3,467	3,467	
MI. Con., Air Force Reserve										
Major construction										
110 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,309	3,309	3,309	3,309	3,309	4,209	4,209		900	900
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								363,917	410,017	66,559
Base Realignment & Closure Act, Part I										
Base Closure										
005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE AC ZU										
10 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE	916,500	1,016,500	998,500	1,016,500	998,100	916,500	998,100	100,000	81,600	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								100,000	81,600	0
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
- TOA	5,708,900	5,036,744	5,203,109	5,426,572	5,248,212	5,014,041	5,350,042			
- FAJ	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)			
- Appropriations	5,668,900	4,996,744	5,163,109	5,386,572	5,208,212	4,974,041	5,310,042			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO MILITARY CONSTRUCTION*								668,180	668,240	137,669

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
Construction of new housing										
007 FT RILEY KS										
10 ENLISTED HOUSING CONSTRUCTION	0	0	12,500	12,500	0	16,500	18,500	12,500	16,500	4,000
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
Operating expenses										
005 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
10 FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	73,469	73,469	60,969	60,969	70,035	70,035	70,035			9,066
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								12,500	16,500	13,066
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
Construction of new housing										
010 NAVAL STATION LONG BEACH CA										
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (300)	24,928	24,928	24,928	24,928	25,018	0	25,018		90	90
022 FALLON NAS NV										
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (60 UNITS)	0	0	0	10,500	0	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy & Maintenance of real property										
008 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
30 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	371,037	371,037	371,037	348,537	353,695	353,695	353,695			5,158
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								10,500	10,590	5,248
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
Construction of new housing										
008 NELLIS AFB NV										
20 13 UNITS	0	0	0	1,600	0	0	1,600	1,600	1,600	
027 TEXAS TX										
10 KELLY AFB	0	0	0	0	1,369	0	1,369		1,369	1,369
028 BEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB NC										
10 FAM HOUS MNGMNT OFFICE	0	365	0	365	0	0	0	365		

100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY

FY1991 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
Maintenance of real property										
008 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS ZU										
30 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	326,922	326,922	316,922	304,422	311,642	311,642	311,642			7,220
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,965	2,969	8,569
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
- TOA	3,455,565	3,560,038	3,426,940	3,378,507	3,363,039	3,290,434	3,363,313			
- FAJ	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235			
- Appropriations	3,456,800	3,561,273	3,428,175	3,379,742	3,364,274	3,291,669	3,364,548			
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO FAMILY HOUSING*								24,965	30,059	26,803

100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY
100	300	NY	NY	NY	331,300	342,100	378,300	NY	10,000	NY

TRANSFORMER DOD NO HODCA YAKREBNOH ERTYU

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
MILITARY PERSONNEL										
Military Personnel, Army										
TOA	24,226,100	NA	NA	NA	24,526,100	24,136,000	24,176,100	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	24,226,100	NA	NA	NA	24,526,100	24,136,000	24,176,100	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Navy										
TOA	19,597,700	NA	NA	NA	19,577,700	19,603,025	19,602,967	NA	5,267	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	19,597,700	NA	NA	NA	19,577,700	19,603,025	19,602,967	NA	5,267	NA
Military Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	6,066,600	NA	NA	NA	6,066,600	6,055,360	6,065,560	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,066,600	NA	NA	NA	6,066,600	6,055,360	6,065,560	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	18,905,500	NA	NA	NA	18,905,500	18,836,600	18,866,300	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	18,905,500	NA	NA	NA	18,905,500	18,836,600	18,866,300	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Army										
TOA	2,192,600	NA	NA	NA	2,320,600	2,296,600	2,296,600	NA	106,000	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,192,600	NA	NA	NA	2,320,600	2,296,600	2,296,600	NA	106,000	NA
Reserve Personnel, Navy										
TOA	1,648,600	NA	NA	NA	1,718,600	1,710,600	1,714,600	NA	66,000	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,648,600	NA	NA	NA	1,718,600	1,710,600	1,714,600	NA	66,000	NA
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	326,900	NA	NA	NA	354,900	342,400	348,900	NA	22,000	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	326,900	NA	NA	NA	354,900	342,400	348,900	NA	22,000	NA
Reserve Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	705,300	NA	NA	NA	721,500	715,100	718,900	NA	13,600	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	705,300	NA	NA	NA	721,500	715,100	718,900	NA	13,600	NA

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
National Guard Personnel, Army										
TOA	3,201,700	NA	NA	NA	3,395,700	3,320,400	3,326,700	NA	125,000	NA
FAJ	3,201,700	NA	NA	NA	3,395,700	3,320,400	3,326,700	NA	125,000	NA
Appropriations	3,201,700	NA	NA	NA	3,395,700	3,320,400	3,326,700	NA	125,000	NA
National Guard Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	1,145,500	NA	NA	NA	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	NA		NA
FAJ	1,145,500	NA	NA	NA	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	NA		NA
Appropriations	1,145,500	NA	NA	NA	1,145,500	1,145,500	1,145,500	NA		NA
TOTAL - MILITARY PERSONNEL										
TOA	78,016,900	NA	NA	NA	78,753,100	78,165,965	78,266,327	NA	249,427	NA
FAJ	78,016,900	NA	NA	NA	78,753,100	78,165,965	78,266,327	NA	249,427	NA
Appropriations	78,016,900	NA	NA	NA	78,753,100	78,165,965	78,266,327	NA	249,427	NA
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
TOA	21,896,800	20,647,526	21,263,100	21,155,854	18,362,945	20,913,805	17,722,903			
FAJ	21,896,800	20,647,526	21,263,100	21,155,854	18,362,945	20,913,805	17,722,903			
Appropriations	21,896,800	20,647,526	21,263,100	21,155,854	18,362,945	20,913,805	17,722,903			
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
TOA	23,834,200	22,576,427	23,148,350	23,185,360	21,394,932	23,012,360	21,079,548			
FAJ	23,834,200	22,576,427	23,148,350	23,185,360	21,394,932	23,012,360	21,079,548			
Appropriations	23,834,200	22,576,427	23,148,350	23,185,360	21,394,932	23,012,360	21,079,548			
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
TOA	1,894,600	1,786,305	2,170,300	1,845,500	2,062,500	2,109,665	1,892,110			46,610
FAJ	1,894,600	1,786,305	2,170,300	1,845,500	2,062,500	2,109,665	1,892,110			46,610
Appropriations	1,894,600	1,786,305	2,170,300	1,845,500	2,062,500	2,109,665	1,892,110			46,610
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
TOA	20,351,900	19,163,113	19,963,360	19,657,010	17,660,213	19,242,014	17,180,259			
FAJ	20,351,900	19,163,113	19,963,360	19,657,010	17,660,213	19,242,014	17,180,259			
Appropriations	20,351,900	19,163,113	19,963,360	19,657,010	17,660,213	19,242,014	17,180,259			
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
TOA	8,794,600	10,352,563	8,635,600	8,652,716	18,599,037	8,635,766	16,408,161		7,613,361	7,755,445
FAJ	8,794,600	10,352,563	8,635,600	8,652,716	18,599,037	8,635,766	16,408,161		7,613,361	7,755,445
Appropriations	8,794,600	10,352,563	8,635,600	8,652,716	18,599,037	8,635,766	16,408,161		7,613,361	7,755,445

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Office of the Inspector General										
TOA	115,900	120,600	120,100	120,100	121,600	115,900	115,900	4,200		
FAJ										
Appropriations	115,900	120,600	120,100	120,100	121,600	115,900	115,900	4,200		
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
TOA	937,200	946,550	963,100	968,200	965,600	962,200	966,200	31,000	31,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations	937,200	946,550	963,100	968,200	965,600	962,200	966,200	31,000	31,000	
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
TOA	816,100	796,697	841,500	824,600	825,500	840,600	825,500	8,500	9,400	900
FAJ										
Appropriations	816,100	796,697	841,500	824,600	825,500	840,600	825,500	8,500	9,400	900
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
TOA	75,900	78,227	81,900	80,900	85,900	81,700	81,700	5,000	5,800	800
FAJ										
Appropriations	75,900	78,227	81,900	80,900	85,900	81,700	81,700	5,000	5,800	800
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	1,075,400	1,067,360	1,080,900	1,078,700	1,081,200	1,077,000	1,078,700	3,300	3,300	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,075,400	1,067,360	1,080,900	1,078,700	1,081,200	1,077,000	1,078,700	3,300	3,300	
Oper. & Maint., Army Nat'l Guard										
TOA	2,080,700	2,097,140	2,128,900	2,124,800	2,165,600	2,125,800	2,125,800	44,100	45,100	1,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,080,700	2,097,140	2,128,900	2,124,800	2,165,600	2,125,800	2,125,800	44,100	45,100	1,000
Oper. & Maint., Air Nat'l Guard										
TOA	2,287,800	2,243,116	2,280,400	2,276,300	2,275,700	2,276,300	2,281,300			5,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,287,800	2,243,116	2,280,400	2,276,300	2,275,700	2,276,300	2,281,300			5,000
Rifle Practice, Army										
TOA	5,000	4,000	5,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000			1,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,000	4,000	5,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000			1,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Court of Military Appeals, Defense										
TOA	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500			
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500			
Summer Olympics										
TOA			2,000	2,000		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations			2,000	2,000		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
TOA	1,252,900	1,252,900	1,183,900	1,183,900	2,152,900	1,183,900	1,183,900			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,252,900	1,252,900	1,183,900	1,183,900	2,152,900	1,183,900	1,183,900			
Humanitarian Assistance										
TOA	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	15,000	13,000	15,000		2,000	2,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	15,000	13,000	15,000		2,000	2,000
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D										
TOA	1,158,600	1,133,704	1,158,600	1,158,600	1,155,994	1,117,075	1,188,600		30,000	30,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,158,600	1,133,704	1,158,600	1,158,600	1,155,994	1,117,075	1,188,600		30,000	30,000
World University Games										
TOA		3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations		3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
Real Property Maintenance, Defense										
TOA						1,000,000	500,000		500,000	500,000
FAJ										
Appropriations						1,000,000	500,000		500,000	500,000
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	88,886,300	84,287,748	85,046,730	84,340,080	88,998,121	84,720,817	84,683,081			323,021
FAJ										
Appropriations	88,886,300	84,287,748	85,046,730	84,340,080	88,998,121	84,720,817	84,683,081			323,021

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
TOA	1,667,700	1,873,700	1,666,200	1,783,800	1,730,787	1,640,200	1,662,800	115,900	25,100	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,667,700	1,873,700	1,666,200	1,783,800	1,730,787	1,640,200	1,662,800	115,900	25,100	
Missile Procurement, Army										
TOA	1,035,800	1,503,206	1,042,335	1,046,762	1,109,595	1,009,456	1,006,462	10,962		
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,035,800	1,503,206	1,042,335	1,046,762	1,109,595	1,009,456	1,006,462	10,962		
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
TOA	839,100	1,240,000	1,022,300	1,007,300	1,084,813	1,003,096	1,111,066	166,200	271,996	103,796
FAJ										
Appropriations	839,100	1,240,000	1,022,300	1,007,300	1,084,813	1,003,096	1,111,066	166,200	271,996	103,796
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
TOA	1,249,800	1,266,400	1,529,200	1,362,400	1,364,659	1,325,421	1,369,080	112,600	119,280	6,660
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,249,800	1,266,400	1,529,200	1,362,400	1,364,659	1,325,421	1,369,080	112,600	119,280	6,660
Other Procurement, Army										
TOA	3,163,800	3,366,200	3,014,643	3,081,801	3,021,435	3,013,796	3,063,799			
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,163,800	3,366,200	3,014,643	3,081,801	3,021,435	3,013,796	3,063,799			
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
TOA	7,966,400	7,509,530	7,080,800	7,069,800	7,663,633	7,025,920	6,948,620			
FAJ										
Appropriations	7,966,400	7,509,530	7,080,800	7,069,800	7,663,633	7,025,920	6,948,620			
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
TOA	4,581,300	4,776,565	4,834,700	4,720,660	4,726,795	4,611,848	4,562,621	139,560		
FAJ										
Appropriations	4,581,300	4,776,565	4,834,700	4,720,660	4,726,795	4,611,848	4,562,621	139,560		
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
TOA	8,493,200	8,499,200	7,726,400	8,365,790	10,595,704	7,725,362	9,153,267		660,067	787,497
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,493,200	8,499,200	7,726,400	8,365,790	10,595,704	7,725,362	9,153,267		660,067	787,497

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Other Procurement, Navy										
TOA	6,471,200	6,812,519	6,373,400	6,492,355	6,574,568	6,308,544	6,432,463	21,155		
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,471,200	6,812,519	6,373,400	6,492,355	6,574,568	6,308,544	6,432,463	21,155		
Procurement, Marine Corps										
TOA	1,039,400	1,123,700	1,736,737	1,124,637	1,043,218	1,255,470	1,079,951	85,237	40,551	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,039,400	1,123,700	1,736,737	1,124,637	1,043,218	1,255,470	1,079,951	85,237	40,551	
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	11,115,500	8,103,056	10,324,739	10,636,931	7,444,121	11,071,568	10,412,350			
FAJ						(722,200)				
Appropriations	11,115,500	8,103,056	10,324,739	10,636,931	7,444,121	10,349,368	10,412,350			
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	5,569,800	5,580,489	5,362,110	5,204,863	5,243,841	5,428,171	5,235,450			30,567
FAJ						95,500				
Appropriations	5,569,800	5,580,489	5,362,110	5,204,863	5,243,841	5,523,671	5,235,450			30,567
Other Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	8,058,100	8,124,604	7,939,282	8,194,009	8,001,524	7,859,298	8,068,104	135,909	10,004	
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,058,100	8,124,604	7,939,282	8,194,009	8,001,524	7,859,298	8,068,104	135,909	10,004	
Procurement, Defensewide										
TOA	2,089,600	2,576,350	2,127,708	2,239,029	2,708,448	2,087,400	2,230,826	149,429	161,226	11,797
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,089,600	2,576,350	2,127,708	2,239,029	2,708,448	2,087,400	2,230,826	149,429	161,226	11,797
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
TOA		650,000	667,700	1,081,100	1,292,500	667,300	1,877,800	1,081,100	1,877,800	816,700
FAJ										
Appropriations		650,000	667,700	1,081,100	1,292,500	667,300	1,877,800	1,081,100	1,877,800	816,700
Inspector General										
TOA	300	300	600	600	300	300	300	500		
FAJ										
Appropriations	300	300	600	600	300	300	300	500		

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp> Auth.
Defense Production Act Purchases										
TOA	2,086,800	2,248,300	2,431,200	2,338,050	25,000	2,081,800	2,307,650	189,050	281,200	21,500
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,086,800	2,248,300	2,431,200	2,338,050	25,000	2,081,800	2,307,650	189,050	281,200	21,500
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruction, Def										
TOA	474,800	488,700	508,700	472,602	451,800	474,800	374,308	130,800	111,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations	474,800	488,700	508,700	472,602	451,800	474,800	374,308	130,800	111,000	
Procurement of Prepositioned Equipment,										
TOA	2,086,800	2,248,300	2,431,200	2,338,050	2,995,000	2,000,000	2,322,400			2,781
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,086,800	2,248,300	2,431,200	2,338,050	2,995,000	2,000,000	2,322,400			2,781
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	63,845,800	63,314,519	62,959,754	63,864,659	65,097,839	64,505,898	64,639,407	38,859	793,607	754,748
FAJ						(626,700)				
Appropriations	63,845,800	63,314,519	62,959,754	63,864,659	65,097,839	63,879,298	64,639,407	38,859	793,607	754,748
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
 RDT&E, Army										
TOA	6,307,300	6,457,100	6,522,068	6,666,600	6,241,621	6,280,391	6,662,672	379,300	296,372	
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,307,300	6,457,100	6,522,068	6,666,600	6,241,621	6,280,391	6,662,672	379,300	296,372	
 RDT&E, Navy										
TOA	7,342,633	9,176,041	8,417,708	8,633,875	7,464,910	7,666,142	8,557,835	1,291,242	1,215,002	
FAJ										
Appropriations	7,342,633	9,176,041	8,417,708	8,633,875	7,464,910	7,666,142	8,557,835	1,291,242	1,215,002	
 RDT&E, Air Force										
TOA	15,032,600	15,338,254	14,678,254	14,467,094	14,263,941	13,898,675	14,077,834			
FAJ										
Appropriations	15,032,600	15,338,254	14,678,254	14,467,094	14,263,941	13,898,675	14,077,834			

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Defense Business Operations Fund										
TOA	3,400,200		3,400,200	3,400,200		3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,400,200		3,400,200	3,400,200		3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
TOTAL - REV. & MNGMNT. FUNDS										
TOA	3,400,200	2,420,100	3,400,200	3,400,200	2,444,100	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,400,200	2,420,100	3,400,200	3,400,200	2,444,100	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
TOA	851,300	1,431,820	865,500	928,429	877,585	798,770	880,820	77,129	29,520	
FAJ										
Appropriations	851,300	1,431,820	865,500	928,429	877,585	798,770	880,820	77,129	29,520	
Military Construction, Navy										
TOA	657,800	1,305,079	668,781	923,009	848,429	878,211	883,859	265,209	226,059	
FAJ										
Appropriations	657,800	1,305,079	668,781	923,009	848,429	878,211	883,859	265,209	226,059	
Military Construction, Air Force										
TOA	1,082,400	1,522,930	952,290	1,018,320	1,129,420	987,570	1,005,954			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,082,400	1,522,930	952,290	1,018,320	1,129,420	987,570	1,005,954			
Military Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	571,600	784,818	658,440	683,140	745,960	654,330	724,740	111,540	153,140	41,800
FAJ										
Appropriations	571,600	784,818	658,440	683,140	745,960	654,330	724,740	111,540	153,140	41,800
MIL. CON., Army National Guard										
TOA	50,400	166,268	122,874	210,745	161,281	233,274	231,117	180,345	180,717	20,372
FAJ										
Appropriations	50,400	166,268	122,874	210,745	161,281	233,274	231,117	180,345	180,717	20,372

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
TOA	131,800	203,914	189,100	218,780	172,680	231,506	217,566	86,960	85,766	
FAJ										
Appropriations	131,800	203,914	189,100	218,780	172,680	231,506	217,566	86,960	85,766	
Mil. Con., Army Reserve										
TOA	57,500	115,910	66,241	106,507	94,660	114,723	110,369	49,007	52,869	3,862
FAJ										
Appropriations	57,500	115,910	66,241	106,507	94,660	114,723	110,369	49,007	52,869	3,862
Mil. Con., Naval Reserve										
TOA	20,900	46,376	56,900	56,900	20,900	60,400	59,900	36,000	39,000	3,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,900	46,376	56,900	56,900	20,900	60,400	59,900	36,000	39,000	3,000
Mil. Con., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	20,800	32,340	20,800	20,800	20,800	22,800	9,700			
FAJ										
Appropriations	20,800	32,340	20,800	20,800	20,800	22,800	9,700			
Base Realignment & Closure Act, Part I										
TOA	633,600	658,600	674,600	674,600	658,600	674,600	658,600	41,000	25,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations	633,600	658,600	674,600	674,600	658,600	674,600	658,600	41,000	25,000	
Base Realignment & Closure Act, Part II										
TOA	100,000	100,000	297,000	297,000	100,000	297,000	100,000	197,000		
FAJ										
Appropriations	100,000	100,000	297,000	297,000	100,000	297,000	100,000	197,000		
NATO Infrastructure										
TOA	378,800	178,800	334,417	245,000	178,800	274,400	245,000			
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)			
Appropriations	358,800	158,800	314,417	225,000	158,800	254,400	225,000			
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
TOA	4,556,900	6,526,873	5,108,943	5,363,210	5,009,355	5,207,584	5,127,645	826,310	570,745	
FAJ	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)			
Appropriations	4,536,900	6,506,873	5,088,943	5,363,210	4,989,355	5,187,584	5,107,645	826,310	570,745	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
360 NORFOLK NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CTR VA										
10 ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES	0	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	
20 STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	0	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	
375 YORKTOWN NAVAL WEAPONS STATION VA										
10 TOMAHAWK MISSILE MAGAZINES	0	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	
380 BREMERTON PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPWA										
10 INACTIVE SUBMARINE MOORING FACILITY	0	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	
20 INDUSTRIAL SPT COMPLEX (INC II)	0	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	23,500	
30 MOORING PLATFORM	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
40 PIER UPGRADE	0	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	
385 BREMERTON PUGET SOUND NAVAL SUPWA										
10 HAZARDOUS AND FLAMMABLE STOREHOUSE	0	12,550	12,550	12,550	12,550	12,550	12,550	12,550	12,550	
408 GREEN BANK WV										
10 ALTER OPERATIONS CENTER	0	0	5,400	5,400	0	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	
420 NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER GU										
10 OIL SPILL PREVENTION	0	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	
430 KEFLAVIK NAVAL AIR STATION IC										
10 FUEL FACILITIES (INCREMENT VII)	0	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300	
455 ROOSEVELT ROADS NAVAL STATION PR										
20 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	2,850	0	2,850	2,850	0	2,850	2,850	2,850	
480 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
20 PLANNING AND DESIGN	77,200	79,700	88,800	88,800	79,700	67,000	78,000	11,400		
480 UNDISTRIBUTED						(7,000)				
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								278,178	278,078	11,300
Military Construction, Air Force										
Major construction										
010 EIELSON AFB AK										
30 RANGE CONTROL FACILITY	0	0	4,500	4,500	0	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	
024 DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB AZ										
10 WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY	0	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	
035 BEALE AFB CA										
10 ALERT CREW READINESS CENTER	800	800	800	0	800	800	800			800
065 TRAVIS AFB CA										
50 ALTER DORMITORIES	0	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	
80 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	3,350	0	3,350	3,350	0	3,350	3,350	3,350	
70 CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER	0	9,000	0	9,000	9,000	0	9,000	9,000	9,000	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
182 RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT TX										
10 CENTRAL DISTRIBUTION CENTER (PHASE II)	0	0	0	0	39,000	39,000	39,000		39,000	39,000
202 FORT LEE VA										
10 HOSPITAL MOD	0	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	11,800	
215 CRANEY ISLAND DEF FUEL SPT PNT VA										
10 FUEL TANKAGE	0	19,800	19,800	19,800	19,800	19,800	19,800	19,800	19,800	
235 DIEGO GARCIA DG										
10 FUEL TANKAGE	0	18,100	18,100	18,100	18,100	18,100	18,100	18,100	18,100	
290 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
30 PLANNING AND DESIGN (DMSA)	38,100	43,700	38,100	43,700	43,700	30,100	43,700	5,600	5,600	
270 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN (SOCOM)	1,700	1,700	3,200	3,200	1,800	4,700	4,000	1,600	2,300	800
30 CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	15,000	0	15,000	10,000	0	20,000	19,000	4,000	4,000	9,000
40 ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROOF	30,000	38,000	30,000	38,000	38,000	30,000	38,000	8,000	8,000	
85 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (SOCOM)	0	0	0	0	0	8,000	8,000		5,000	5,000
275 VARIOUS LOCATIONS ZV										
10 CONFORMING STORAGE FACILITIES	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								232,840	281,840	53,800
Mil. Con., Army National Guard										
Major construction										
001 DANIELLY FIELD AL										
10 AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	0	7,528	0	7,528	7,528	0	7,528	7,528	7,528	
20 ARMORY	0	2,813	0	2,813	2,813	0	2,813	2,813	2,813	
002 MARANA AZ										
10 AVIATION MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	8,870	0	8,870	8,870	0	8,870	8,870	8,870	
011 STOCKTON CA										
10 COMBINED SUPT MAINT SHOP REHAB	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,813		1,813	1,813
012 VARIOUS CA										
10 ARMORY MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	0	800	0	0	800	0	800		800	800
20 CONVERSION PROJECTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,172		2,172	2,172
014 LONGMONT CO										
10 OMS	0	3,218	0	3,218	3,218	0	3,218	3,218	3,218	
017 CAMP BLANDING FL										
10 LAW RANGE	0	0	550	550	0	550	550	550	550	
20 AVIATION FUEL FACILITY	0	0	275	275	0	275	275	275	275	
30 MAC RANGE	0	0	954	954	0	954	954	954	954	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
10 OMS	0	370	0	370	370	0	370	370	370	
230 CAMP FOGARTY RI										
10 ARMORY	0	5,151	0	5,151	5,151	0	5,151	5,151	5,151	
235 CAMP VARNUM RI										
10 SEWER AND WATER SYSTEM	0	578	0	578	578	0	578	578	578	
240 MANNING SC										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
245 LEESBURG SC										
10 MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	
20 SEWER SYSTEM	0	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
260 COVINGTON TN										
10 ARMORY	0	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	0	1,237	1,800	1,237	
265 ERWIN TN										
10 ARMORY	0	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	
270 FAYETTESVILLE TN										
10 ARMORY	0	0	882	882	0	882	882	882	882	
280 LIVINGSTON TN										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,181	1,181	0	1,181	1,181	1,181	1,181	
285 UNION CITY TN										
10 ARMORY	0	1,858	0	1,858	1,858	0	1,858	1,858	1,858	
290 CAMP MABRY TX										
10 COMBINE SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	0	0	5,982	5,982	5,982		5,982	5,982
20 SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	5,982	5,982	0	0	0	5,982		
295 CAMP SWIFT TX										
10 ARMORY	0	0	0	0	1,843	1,843	1,843		1,843	1,843
20 TRAINING SITE FACILITIES	0	0	0	0	5,138	0	5,138		5,138	5,138
30 ARMORY	0	0	1,843	1,843	0	0	0	1,843		
300 KINGSVILLE TX										
10 ARMORY	0	388	0	388	388	0	388	388	388	
305 LONGVIEW TX										
10 ARMORY EXPANSION	0	388	0	388	388	0	388	388	388	
310 NEW BOSTON TX										
10 ARMORY	0	1,884	0	1,884	1,884	0	1,884	1,884	1,884	
320 REDBIRD TX										
10 ARMORY	0	702	0	702	702	0	702	702	702	
325 VICTORIA TX										
10 ADD/ALTER ARMORY	0	0	0	0	388	0	388		388	388
330 WEATHERFORD TX										
10 ARMORY	0	388	0	388	388	0	388	388	388	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senats Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senats Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
335 UTAH COUNTY UT										
10 ARMORY	0	0	2,880	2,880	0	2,880	2,880	2,880	2,880	
20 OMS	0	0	998	998	0	998	998	998	998	
345 HUNTINGTON WV										
10 GUARD/RESERVE CENTER	0	0	9,600	2,983	0	9,600	2,983	2,983	2,983	
355 FORT MCCOY WI										
10 MOBILIZATION & TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE	0	8,941	0	8,941	8,941	0	8,941	8,941	8,941	
20 MOTOR VEHICLE STORAGE BUILDING	0	493	0	493	493	0	493	493	493	
360 SUSSEX WI										
10 ARMORY	0	1,574	0	1,574	1,574	0	0	1,574		
20 OMS	0	1,039	0	1,039	1,039	0	0	1,039		
40 MOTOR VEHICLE STORAGE BUILDING	0	317	0	317	317	0	0	317		
365 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,300	7,800	2,300	7,800	8,040	12,300	12,300	5,300	10,000	4,700
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	7,500	7,500		2,400	2,400
Mil. Con., Air National Guard										
Major construction										
003 DANNELLY FIELD AL										
10 JET FUEL STORAGE COMPLEX	0	3,500	0	3,500	3,500	0	3,500	3,500	3,500	
004 EIELSON AFB AK										
10 SQUADRON OPERATIONS	0	0	4,800	4,800	0	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	
005 KULIS ANGB AK										
40 FIRE STATION	0	0	400	400	0	400	400	400	400	
007 TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AZ										
10 NEW HANGER, 162ND TACTICAL FIGHTER GROU	0	5,800	7,900	7,900	5,800	7,900	7,900	7,900	7,900	
008 LIBBY AAF AZ										
10 UPGRADE RUNWAY LIGHTS	0	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
010 BUCKLEY ANGB CO										
30 ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGER	0	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
40 CONSTRUCT VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	
015 BRADLEY FIELD CT										
20 UPGRADE FACILITIES	0	8,980	0	8,980	8,980	0	8,980	8,980	8,980	
022 JACKSONVILLE AIRPORT FL										
10 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE	0	700	0	700	700	700	700	700	700	
027 GOWEN FIELD ID										
10 POWER CHECK PAD	0	0	800	800	0	800	800	800	800	
20 MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	0	0	2,100	0	0	0	2,100		
030 GREATER PEORIA AIRPORT IL										
30 COMPOSITE OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	4,800	4,800	4,800	0	4,800	4,800	4,800	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
032 TERRE HAUTE IN										
10 MUNITIONS MAINT STORAGE COMPLEX	0	2,200	0	0	2,200	2,200	2,200		2,200	2,200
037 HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT IN										
10 MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE & STORAGE FACILITY	0	0	2,200	2,200	0	0	0	2,200		
040 MCCONNELL AFB KS										
10 ADD TO CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	550	550	750	750	550	750	750	200	200	
042 STANDIFORD KY										
10 RELOCATION, PHASE II	0	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
082 BARNES AIRPORT MA										
10 ENGINE CHECK FACILITY	0	0	1,250	1,250	0	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	
20 AIRCRAFT BARRIER	0	0	2,050	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	
085 WK KELLOGG REGIONAL AIRPORT MI										
40 ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	2,250	2,250	0	2,250	2,250	2,250	2,250	
077 RENO AIRPORT NV										
10 POWER CHECK PAD	0	0	700	700	0	700	700	700	700	
082 PEASE APT NH										
10 ADAL SQUADRON OPERATIONS	0	0	1,450	1,450	0	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	
087 HECTOR FIELD ND										
10 REPLACE FUEL TANKS	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
108 TULSA AIRPORT OK										
10 FUEL CELL CENTER/CORROSION FACILITY	0	0	2,750	2,750	0	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	
20 AVONICS/ECM SHOP	0	0	1,050	1,050	0	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,050	
110 WILL ROGERS WORLD AIRPORT OK										
20 APRON ADDITION	0	4,350	0	4,350	4,350	0	4,350	4,350	4,350	
120 GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP PA										
30 ALTER ENGINE SHOP	450	450	450	680	680	450	680	210	210	
40 ADD/ALTER SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITIES	0	0	0	1,950	1,950	0	1,950	1,950	1,950	
138 MEMPHIS ANGB TN										
10 POWER CHECK PAD	0	0	800	800	0	800	800	800	800	
20 AERIAL PORT TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	1,850	1,850	0	1,850	1,850	1,850	1,850	
30 FIRE STATION	0	0	1,300	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	
137 CAMP MABRY TX										
10 HEADQUARTERS BUILDING	0	500	0	770	500	0	770	770	770	
140 BURLINGTON IAP VT										
20 CIVIL ENGINEERING SHOP	0	0	1,850	1,850	0	1,850	1,850	1,850	1,850	
185 E WV REGIONAL APT (MARTINSBURG) WV										
20 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	0	1,700	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	
30 SMALL ARMS RANGE	0	0	750	750	0	750	750	750	750	
40 FIRE STATION	0	0	1,100	1,100	0	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senats Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senats Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
156 YAEGAR AIRPORT WV										
10 SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	0	0	650	650	0	650	650	650	650	
157 TRUAX FIELD WI										
10 POWER CHECK PAD WITH SOUND SUPPRESSOR	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	
20 AVIONICS & ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURE P	0	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	
30 AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEM	0	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	
165 CHEYENNE MAP WY										
20 AVIONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	0	2,200	2,200	0	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200	
30 CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	0	0	2,000	3,500	0	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	
40 POL FACILITY	0	0	2,500	700	0	700	700	700	700	
180 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	15,200	17,400	15,200	17,400	17,400	20,200	20,200	2,200	8,000	2,800
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	5,000	5,000		1,200	1,200
40 REPROGRAMMING ALLOWANCE	0	0	0	0	0	308	308		308	308
Mil. Con., Army Reserve										
Major construction										
008 TALTON MA										
10 USAR CENTER	0	0	3,526	3,526	0	3,526	3,526	3,526	3,526	
022 PERRYSBURG OH										
10 RESERVE CENTER ADDITIONS	0	2,748	0	2,748	0	0	0	2,748		
023 TOLEDO OH										
10 CTR/MAINTENANCE FACILITY (PHASE II)	0	0	0	0	2,748	0	2,748		2,748	2,748
033 JOHNSTOWN PA										
10 JOINT ARMY/MC AVIATION FACILITY	0	30,224	0	30,224	30,224	0	30,224	30,224	30,224	
043 JACKSON TN										
10 JOINT TRAINING FACILITY	0	1,537	0	1,537	1,537	0	1,537	1,537	1,537	
045 CONROE TX										
10 ADDONAL TO USARCA/AVN 8PT FAC/ORG MNT 8+	9,855	9,855	11,359	11,359	9,855	11,359	11,359	1,504	1,504	
063 HUNTINGTON WV										
10 GUARD/RESERVE CTR (JOINT W/ARMY NG)	0	0	0	8,817	0	0	8,817	8,817	8,817	
055 STURTEVANT WI										
20 RESERVE CENTER ROADS, HOLDING POND	0	750	0	750	750	0	750	750	750	
065 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	5,400	7,500	6,400	7,500	7,500	8,500	8,500	2,100	3,100	1,000
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	500	500	500	500	500	2,500	2,000		1,500	1,500
40 REPROGRAMMING ALLOWANCE	0	0	0	0	0	1,382	1,382		1,382	1,382
075 UNDISTRIBUTED						7,000				

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Mil. Con., Naval Reserve										
Major construction										
027 NAS MILLINGTON TN										
10 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	0	0	10,900	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	10,900	10,900	
029 MARTINSBURG WV										
10 C-130 SUPPORT FACILITIES	0	0	25,100	25,100	0	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	
035 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,500	18,563	0	0	2,500	5,000	5,000		2,500	5,000
20 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,000	6,893	0	0	1,000	2,000	1,500		500	1,500
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								337,312	368,772	59,098
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part I										
005 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACZU										
10 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE	633,600	658,600	674,600	674,600	658,600	674,600	658,600	41,000	25,000	
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part II										
005 BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990 ZU										
10 BASE CLOSURE 1990	100,000	100,000	297,000	297,000	100,000	297,000	100,000	197,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								238,000	25,000	0
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
TOA	4,556,900	6,526,873	5,108,943	5,383,210	5,008,355	5,207,584	5,127,845	826,310	570,745	
Appropriations	4,536,900	6,506,873	5,086,943	5,363,210	4,988,355	5,187,584	5,107,845	826,310	570,745	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO MILITARY CONSTR*								1,329,480	1,217,281	200,798
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
Construction of new housing										
018 CAMP MERRILL GA										
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (36)	0	0	4,550	4,550	4,550	4,550	4,550	4,550	4,550	
025 VARIOUS OAHU HI										
20 NEW CONSTRUCTION (220)	0	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
032 FORT LEE VA 10 GENERAL OFFICER QUARTER (1 UNIT)	0	270	0	270	270	0	270	270	270	0
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								29,820	29,820	0
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
<i>Construction of new housing</i>										
032 NAS GLENVIEW IL 10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (200)	0	0	18,000	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	0
037 NAVAL SUR. WEA. CTR, DAHLGREN VA 10 FAMILY HOUSING (190)	0	13,240	0	13,240	13,240	0	13,240	13,240	13,240	0
040 NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO BAY GB										
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								29,240	29,240	0
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
<i>Construction of new housing</i>										
022 MCCONNELL AFB KS 10 TORNADO DAMAGE REPLACEMENT	0	0	0	0	0	12,300	10,000		10,000	10,000
045 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU 20 PLANNING	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,500		500	500
<i>Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF</i>										
005 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU 30 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	378,712	378,712	378,712	378,712	383,712	328,712	380,512		1,800	1,800
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	12,300	12,300
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
TOA	3,810,900	3,851,335	3,831,575	3,858,588	3,887,443	3,478,233	3,848,743	48,888	38,843	
Appropriations	3,805,900	3,848,335	3,828,575	3,854,588	3,883,443	3,471,233	3,844,743	48,888	38,843	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO FAMILY HOUSING*								58,080	71,380	12,300

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
TOA	137,400	162,670	141,950	167,220	167,220	141,950	167,220	29,820	29,820	
FAJ										
Appropriations	137,400	162,670	141,950	167,220	167,220	141,950	167,220	29,820	29,820	
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
TOA	1,366,900	1,367,025	1,367,025	1,367,025	1,411,900	1,366,900	1,366,900	125		
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,366,900	1,367,025	1,367,025	1,367,025	1,411,900	1,366,900	1,366,900	125		
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
TOA	166,200	182,440	185,200	196,440	182,440	166,200	186,440	29,240	29,240	
FAJ										
Appropriations	166,200	182,440	185,200	196,440	182,440	166,200	186,440	29,240	29,240	
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy &										
TOA	710,700	695,700	710,700	710,700	725,700	694,700	703,700			
FAJ										
Appropriations	710,700	695,700	710,700	710,700	725,700	694,700	703,700			
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
TOA	172,100	186,900	172,100	161,563	161,563	163,663	172,063			10,500
FAJ										
Appropriations	172,100	186,900	172,100	161,563	161,563	163,663	172,063			10,500
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
TOA	909,400	909,400	909,400	909,400	924,400	827,400	903,200			
FAJ										
Appropriations	909,400	909,400	909,400	909,400	924,400	827,400	903,200			
Family Housing Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	200	200	200	200	200	200	200			
FAJ										
Appropriations	200	200	200	200	200	200	200			
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Defense										
TOA	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000			
FAJ										
Appropriations	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000			

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp> Auth.
Homeowners Asst Fund, Def.										
TOA	89,000	89,000	89,000	89,000	89,000	89,000	89,000			
FAJ	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)			
Appropriations	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000	84,000			
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
TOA	3,610,900	3,651,335	3,631,575	3,650,568	3,688,443	3,478,233	3,649,743	48,668	38,843	
FAJ	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)			
Appropriations	3,605,900	3,646,335	3,626,575	3,654,568	3,683,443	3,471,233	3,644,743	48,668	38,843	
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES										
Anticipated Savings										
TOA	(335,900)	NA	NA	NA	(335,900)	(335,900)	(335,900)	NA		NA
FAJ										
DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS										
Offsetting Receipts, Army										
TOA										
FAJ	(224,000)				(224,000)	(224,000)	(224,000)			
Appropriations	(224,000)	NA	NA	NA	(224,000)	(224,000)	(224,000)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	(204,800)				(204,800)	(204,800)	(204,800)			
Appropriations	(204,800)	NA	NA	NA	(204,800)	(204,800)	(204,800)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	(294,400)				(294,400)	(294,400)	(294,400)			
Appropriations	(294,400)	NA	NA	NA	(294,400)	(294,400)	(294,400)	NA		NA
Offsetting Receipts, Defense										
TOA										
FAJ	(4,500)				(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)			
Appropriations	(4,500)	NA	NA	NA	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)	NA		NA

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
TOTAL - DEDUCTIONS FOR OFFSETTING RCPTS										
TOA										
FAJ	(727,500)				(727,500)	(727,500)	(727,500)			
Appropriations	(727,500)	NA	NA	NA	(727,500)	(727,500)	(727,500)	NA		NA
TRUST FUNDS										
Trust Funds, Army										
TOA										
FAJ	700				700	700	700			
Appropriations	700	NA	NA	NA	700	700	700	NA		NA
Trust Funds, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	29,400				29,400	29,400	29,400			
Appropriations	29,400	NA	NA	NA	29,400	29,400	29,400	NA		NA
Trust Funds, Air Force										
TOA										
FAJ	200				200	200	200			
Appropriations	200	NA	NA	NA	200	200	200	NA		NA
Surcharge Coll., Sale of Comm. Stores, Def										
TOA										
FAJ	4,400				4,400	4,400	4,400			
Appropriations	4,400	NA	NA	NA	4,400	4,400	4,400	NA		NA
TOTAL - TRUST FUNDS										
TOA										
FAJ	34,700				34,700	34,700	34,700			
Appropriations	34,700	NA	NA	NA	34,700	34,700	34,700	NA		NA
INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS										
Interfund Transactions, Navy										
TOA										
FAJ	(28,000)				(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)			
Appropriations	(28,000)	NA	NA	NA	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	NA		NA

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
Undistributed										
015 MEALS-READY-TO-EAT	0	0	0	0	87,700	0	37,000		37,000	37,000
016 FOREIGN NATIONAL CIVILIANS	0	(110,000)	0	(85,000)	(110,000)	0	(33,000)			32,000
019 DEPOT MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	40,000	40,000	36,800	0	25,000	40,000	25,000	
020 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	(218,374)	(48,300)	(54,746)	(264,324)	(142,700)	(43,791)			10,955
021 MEMORIAL DAY & JULY 4TH CELEBRATIONS	0	0	0	0	700	0	700		700	700
022 AAFES EUROPEAN HEADQUARTERS RELOCATK	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	
023 AIRBORNE & SPECIAL OPERATIONS MUSEUM	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	4,000		4,000	4,000
026 CHEMICAL EQUIPMENT AND TRAINING	0	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	
027 UMATILLA ARMY DEPOT	0	0	0	0	350	0	350		350	350
028 MONTEREY INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STU	0	0	0	0	6,800	0	6,800		6,800	6,800
030 COMBAT TRAINING CENTER	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
032 NATIONAL D-DAY MUSEUM	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	4,000		4,000	4,000
033 FORT IRWIN EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PRC	0	0	0	0	22,000	0	22,000		22,000	22,000
035 FT BRAGG EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
040 REVOLVING FUND BALANCES	0	0	(100,000)	(230,000)	0	(100,000)	(180,000)			80,000
044 JOINT MIL-CIV AIRPORT STUDY	0	0	0	0	0	0	250		250	250
045 POW/MIA OFFICE	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,000		5,000	5,000
046 FT RILEY RAILYARD STUDY	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,800		6,800	6,800
047 COLD-WET WEATHER BOOTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
050 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
052 ARMY TRAINING PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	150,000	150,000		150,000	150,000
056 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER ACT OF 1980	0	0	3,500	3,500	0	0	0	3,500		
060 ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	
062 PERSONNEL ADJUSTMENT	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
066 ARMS CONTROL	0	0	0	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	11,800	11,800	
072 CHAMPUS	0	0	23,400	11,000	0	0	0	11,000		
074 PENTAGON RESERVATION IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	25,600	25,600	0	0	0	25,600		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								186,400	386,200	372,855
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
Undistributed										
005 ADP MANAGEMENT	0	0	0	0	800	0	500		500	500
014 FOREIGN NATIONAL CIVILIANS	0	(90,000)	0	(18,000)	(90,000)	0	(7,500)			7,500
018 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	(118,253)	(22,400)	(14,070)	(99,793)	(81,800)	(2,100)			11,970
022 MODEL RECYCLING CENTER	0	0	0	0	210	0	210		210	210
023 NAVAL UNDERSEA MUSEUM	0	0	0	0	2,100	0	2,100		2,100	2,100

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
024 DEPOT MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	75,000	75,000	800,000	260,000	400,000	75,000	400,000	325,000
025 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	100,000	80,000	330,000	0	0	90,000		
027 MEALS READY TO EAT	0	0	0	0	800	0	400		400	400
028 SEALIFT PREPOSITIONING SURGE	0	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
030 QUALITY OF LIFE IMPROVEMENTS, NAPLES, ITAL	0	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
032 FENWICK PIER DEMO PROJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000		1,000	1,000
033 ARMY 2.5 TON TRUCK ENGINE & SPARES	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
034 MOKAPU INTERNMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	300		300	300
036 USS BLUEBACK MUSEUM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,800		1,800	1,800
040 REVOLVING FUND BALANCES	0	0	(100,000)	(230,000)	0	(150,000)	(200,000)			30,000
048 DELAYED DECOMMISSIONS	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	17,000		17,000	17,000
048 ANTARTIC LOGISTICS	0	0	0	0	0	105,000	105,000		105,000	105,000
050 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
056 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER ACT OF 1980	0	0	1,850	1,850	0	0	0	1,850		
058 NAVY EARTH ORBIT ACTIVITIES	0	0	900	900	0	0	0	900		
082 NAVAL OBSERVATORY	0	0	0	0	0	900	900		900	900
072 CHAMPUS	0	0	26,300	13,000	0	0	0	13,000		
074 PENTAGON RESERVATION IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	9,800	9,800	0	0	0	9,800		
078 SHIPYARD MODERNIZATION	0	0	0	0	0	78,000	78,000		78,000	78,000
084 FENWICK PIER DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	1,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								211,380	882,010	831,480
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
Undistributed										
003 DEPOT MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	10,000	10,000	27,200	0	18,000	10,000	18,000	8,000
005 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	15,000	15,000	70,000	0	0	15,000		
008 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	0	0	0	78,000	0	42,000		42,000	42,000
007 MEALS READY TO EAT	0	0	0	0	37,200	0	22,000		22,000	22,000
030 CHEMICAL EQUIPMENT AND TRAINING	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
036 FOREIGN CURRENCY REPRICING	0	0	(5,000)	3,000	0	(5,000)	(5,000)	3,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								43,000	87,000	72,000
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
Undistributed										
009 CIVIL AIR PATROL	0	0	880	1,380	1,380	0	1,380	1,380	1,380	
011 DEPOT MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	75,000	75,000	136,000	0	25,000	75,000	25,000	
013 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	0	0	80,000	55,000	150,000	0	0	55,000		

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
016 FOREIGN NATIONAL CIVILIANS	0	(30,000)	0	(15,000)	(30,000)	0	(7,500)			7,500
018 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	(339,337)	(47,800)	(45,470)	(198,482)	(233,700)	(1,100)			44,370
020 MEALS READY TO EAT	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
021 MILITARY FAMILY SERVICES	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
025 THEATER AIR COMMAND & CONTROL	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,000		7,000	7,000
026 COMMANDERS TACTICAL INFO SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
030 JUNIOR ROTC	0	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	
032 COMPUTER AIDED ACQUISITION & LOGISTICS S*	0	27,000	0	27,000	27,000	0	27,000	27,000	27,000	
040 REVOLVING FUND BALANCES	0	0	(100,000)	(230,000)	0	(100,000)	(150,000)			80,000
050 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		
056 CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER ACT OF 1980	0	0	7,000	7,000	0	0	0	7,000		
072 CHAMPUS	0	0	21,300	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
074 PENTAGON RESERVATION IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	18,400	18,400	0	0	0	18,400		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								211,280	89,380	146,370
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
Undistributed										
004 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY (DCAA)	0	0	0	14,000	2,500	0	2,500	14,000	2,500	
008 DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE (DIS)	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	7,000		7,000	7,000
009 FEDERAL HEALTH CARE STUDY	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
018 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	638,200	(102,300)	(77,284)	289,209	202,800	(50,829)			26,458
019 FOREIGN NATIONAL CIVILIANS	0	(12,000)	0	(5,000)	(12,000)	0	(2,500)			2,500
020 RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT CL	0	0	0	0	5,000	15,000	30,000		30,000	30,000
025 ARMS CONTROL (DLA)	0	0	0	8,800	0	0	0	8,800		
026 PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (DLA)	0	9,000	0	9,000	9,000	8,800	18,800	9,000	18,800	8,800
030 OPERATIONS AND TRAINING (BOCOM)	0	43,000	0	0	43,000	42,300	43,000	43,000	43,000	43,000
048 SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	0	0	42,300	43,000	0	0	0	43,000		
060 HAWAII LAND INVENTORY	0	0	0	0	0	0	750		750	750
061 DEFENSE CONVERSION COMMISSION	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,000		5,000	5,000
062 POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER CTRS	0	0	0	0	0	0	800		800	800
063 COMMISSION ON DEFENSE & NATIONAL SECURITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
064 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	0	0	1,000	0	0	4,000	4,850		4,850	4,850
068 GAINSHARING	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
070 LEGACY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	0	0	18,000	18,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
074 PENTAGON RESERVATION IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	28,500	28,500	0	0	0	28,500		
080 NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE OPERATIONS	0	0	0	32,000	0	0	0	32,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								146,300	128,500	130,955

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Office of the Inspector General										
Undistributed										
006 LEGISLATIVE WORKLOAD	0	0	4,700	4,700	0	0	0	4,700	4,700	4,700
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								4,700	0	0
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
Undistributed										
031/048 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	37,000	31,000	37,000	66,000	31,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
Undistributed										
008 HARBOR MINE HUNTING COOP PROGRAM	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	2,000		
009/048 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	12,000	30,000	12,000	20,000	28,000	14,900	12,000	14,900	2,800
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
Undistributed										
012/048 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	10,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	1,000
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
Undistributed										
005 WC-130 WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE MISSION	0	0	0	0	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300
010/048 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	8,000	6,000	8,000	16,000	(1,400)	300	8,000	300	
Oper. & Maint., Army Nat'l Guard										
Undistributed										
011/048 FORCE STRUCTURE REINSTATEMENT	0	64,000	66,000	64,000	100,000	66,000	66,000	64,000	66,000	1,000
Oper. & Maint., Air Nat'l Guard										
Undistributed										
002 AIR REFUELING SQ EXPANSION	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,000		6,000	6,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								128,000	133,900	16,200
Rifle Practice, Army										
001 RIFLE PRACTICE PROGRAMS	6,000	4,000	6,000	4,000	6,000	6,000	6,000			1,000
Summer Olympics										
082 1996 SUMMER OLYMPICS	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Humanitarian Assistance										
006 TRANSPORT TO SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D										
046 AEROSTATS (SAB) - COAST GUARD	0	0	0	0	0	21,200	19,400		19,400	19,400
088 E-2C COAST GUARD	0	0	0	0	0	13,200	12,180		12,180	12,180
080 AEROSTATS - COAST GUARD	0	0	0	0	23,250	23,900	23,120		23,120	23,120

088 VEHICLES - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
089 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
090 VEHICLES - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000
091 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
092 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
093 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
094 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
095 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
096 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
097 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
098 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
099 EQUIPMENT - CONVEYANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
068 NDIC	0	0	0	0	40,000	0	40,000		40,000	40,000
074 HH-60 HELICOPTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
080 R&D	30,000	20,000	30,000	30,000	35,000	30,000	35,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
084 OTH TEST BED	0	0	0	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
World University Games										
005/010 1993 WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES	0	3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	1,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								8,000	142,700	138,700
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	88,888,300	84,287,748	85,048,730	84,340,080	88,988,121	84,720,817	84,863,081			323,021
Appropriations	88,888,300	84,287,748	85,048,730	84,340,080	88,988,121	84,720,817	84,863,081			323,021
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO O&M*								838,030	1,698,280	1,508,860
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
Defense Business Operations Fund										
001 DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND	3,400,200	0	3,400,200	3,400,200	0	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
TOA	3,400,200	2,420,100	3,400,200	3,400,200	2,444,100	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
Appropriations	3,400,200	2,420,100	3,400,200	3,400,200	2,444,100	3,400,200	3,424,200		24,000	24,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO REVOLVING FUNDS*								0	24,000	24,000

002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
018	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
019	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
020	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
021	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
022	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
023	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
026	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
027	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
028	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
029	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
030	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
031	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
032	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
033	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
034	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
035	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
036	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
037	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
038	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
039	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
040	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
041	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
042	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
043	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
044	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
045	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
046	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
047	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
048	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
049	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
050	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
051	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
052	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
053	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
054	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
055	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
056	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
057	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
058	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
059	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
060	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
061	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
062	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
063	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
064	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
065	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
066	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
067	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
068	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
069	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
070	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
071	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
072	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
073	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
074	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
075	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
076	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
077	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
078	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
079	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
080	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
081	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
082	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
083	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
084	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
085	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
086	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
087	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
089	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
090	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
091	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
092	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
093	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
094	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
095	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
096	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
097	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
098	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
099	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (Thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
Aircraft										
010 TRAINING HELICOPTER	0	0	0	23,500	0	23,900	23,900	23,500	23,500	0
Modification of aircraft										
012 C-23 MODS	0	0	0	0	0	16,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000
016 AH-64 MODS	82,771	82,771	83,771	83,771	0	82,771	82,771	1,000	0	0
022 UH-1 MODS	9,166	15,166	9,166	14,166	14,166	9,166	9,166	0	5,000	0
024030 ARMED OH-68D/AHP	183,244	383,244	183,244	273,644	383,244	138,644	271,644	80,400	88,400	0
Support equipment and facilities										
034 AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	48,035	48,035	49,535	48,035	48,035	48,035	48,535	0	1,500	1,500
036 EXTERNAL FUEL TANKS	0	0	0	0	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000
Missile Procurement, Army										
Other missiles										
013 MLRS ROCKET	2,111	17,111	32,111	61,700	58,000	61,700	61,700	59,589	59,589	0
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
Tracked combat vehicles										
002 BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (AP-CV)	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	0	80,000	80,000
005 ARMORED GUN SYSTEM (AGS)	0	0	15,000	3,000	0	3,000	0	3,000	0	0
006 M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP)	43,744	90,044	90,044	90,044	90,044	90,044	90,044	46,300	46,300	0
007 FAASV	0	0	0	0	80,000	0	80,000	0	80,000	80,000
013/014 M1 ABRAMS TANK MODUPGRADE	79,864	304,864	304,864	304,864	304,864	304,864	304,864	226,000	226,000	0
019 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	73,287	73,287	62,987	62,987	63,000	63,000	66,000	0	0	3,013
Weapons and other combat vehicles										
024 GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	0	13,100	16,800	16,800	13,100	16,800	17,800	16,800	17,800	1,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
Ammunition										
004 CTG, 6.8MM, ALL TYPES	64,601	70,101	64,601	70,101	70,101	61,901	70,101	5,600	5,600	0
005 CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	10,362	10,662	10,362	10,662	10,662	10,362	10,662	300	300	0
006 CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	4,500	21,000	4,500	21,000	21,000	4,500	13,000	16,500	8,500	0
011 CTG, 20MM, PVADS, M940	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0	0
013 CTG, 30MM, ALLTYPES	0	0	0	8,000	10,000	0	0	0	0	0
016 CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, HE/MO, XM834	0	0	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	0
033 PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, BASEBURNER M984	120,914	120,914	120,914	150,914	150,914	150,914	180,914	30,000	30,000	0
035 PROJ, ARTY, 155MM, HE, M107	0	0	0	0	4,600	0	36,500	0	36,500	36,500
044 FUZE, ARTILLERY, ELEC TIME, M792	0	0	20,800	20,800	0	22,000	22,000	20,800	22,000	1,500
062 ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	0	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	0
Ammunition production base support										
066 PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	74,923	74,923	76,423	76,423	74,923	76,423	76,923	1,500	1,000	0
074 CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	24,000	24,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	29,000	5,000	5,000	0

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Other Procurement, Army										
Tactical and support vehicles										
001 TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	8,311	8,311	8,311	8,311	7,500	33,311	33,311		26,000	26,000
003 SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	0	23,900	0	23,900	23,900	0	23,900	23,900	23,900	
012 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	7,184	7,184	3,584	3,584	3,582	3,582	3,582			8
Communications and electronics equipment										
036 ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS)	17,199	44,199	44,199	44,199	44,199	17,199	44,199	27,000	27,000	
042 EAC COMMUNICATIONS	27,574	27,574	27,574	27,574	27,574	40,774	40,774		13,200	13,200
043 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EAC COMB)	16,209	16,209	12,209	12,209	12,209	16,209	16,209			4,000
087 AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	75,278	75,278	115,278	115,278	75,278	86,571	86,633	40,000	11,356	
103 INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)	48,048	48,048	48,048	48,048	62,048	48,048	62,048		14,000	14,000
111 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	12,500	1,000	12,500		11,500	11,500
Other support equipment										
119 CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR	6,376	6,376	6,376	10,176	6,376	10,176	10,176	3,800	3,800	
134 LAUNDRY UNIT/TRL MTD	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	3,000	3,000	
188 MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	84,893	84,893	84,893	84,893	89,893	84,893	89,893		5,000	5,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								733,388	811,444	238,221
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
Combat aircraft										
002 AV-8B (V/STOL) HARRIER (MYP)	0	0	0	(40,000)	40,000	40,000	40,000		40,000	80,000
003 EA-6B/REMFG (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROMI	86,434	83,434	86,434	83,434	86,434	86,434	86,434		6,000	6,000
021 E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	600,808	470,808	600,808	470,808	600,808	600,808	600,808		30,000	
Trainer aircraft										
024 T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	322,467	362,467	322,467	362,467	362,467	322,467	362,467	40,000	40,000	
Modification of aircraft										
030 A-6 SERIES	5,485	5,485	5,485	5,485	35,484	5,485	21,485		16,000	16,000
035 F-14 SERIES	83,562	83,562	83,562	83,562	83,562	83,562	228,562		175,000	175,000
044 H-1 SERIES	118,201	118,201	118,201	118,201	118,201	133,201	133,201		15,000	15,000
046 H-2 SERIES	108,202	112,202	113,202	108,202	118,202	108,202	116,202		8,000	8,000
047 EP-3 SERIES	18,486	18,486	33,486	33,486	18,486	33,486	33,486	16,000	16,000	
056 E-6 SERIES	19,523	19,523	57,823	57,823	7,523	57,823	57,823	36,300	36,300	
059 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	101,414	101,414	116,414	101,414	119,414	101,414	119,414		18,000	18,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
Ballistic missiles										
002 TRIDENT II	977,363	977,363	1,207,063	1,117,803	977,363	1,189,753	977,363	140,489		
Other missiles										
008 HARPOON	37,803	212,803	37,803	37,803	212,803	37,803	167,803		130,000	130,000
018 DRONES AND DECOYS	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
026 ROCKEYE PIP	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,000		4,000	4,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
027 WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	31,575	31,575	44,775	44,775	31,575	44,775	44,775	13,200	13,200	
Other Ordnance										
080 MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	8,198	8,198	31,898	31,898	31,898	31,898	31,898	23,500	23,500	
086 CWS AMMUNITION	12,023	12,023	22,023	22,023	33,000	22,023	22,023	10,000	10,000	
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
Other warships										
005 SSN-21	1,527,725	1,527,725	1,427,725	1,427,725	1,527,725	1,527,725	1,527,725			100,000
Mine warfers and patrol ships										
015 MHC MINE HUNTER COASTAL	231,098	231,098	381,098	381,098	231,098	381,098	341,098	130,000	110,000	
017 TAGOS SURTASS SHIPS	0	0	0	0	149,000	0	149,000		149,000	149,000
Auxiliaries, craft, and prior-year progr										
020 TAGS JB/40	0	0	0	0	0	0	85,000		85,000	85,000
021 SEALIFT	0	0	1,364,100	0	1,300,000	0	800,000		800,000	800,000
022 SERVICE CRAFT	15,468	15,468	15,468	15,468	15,468	15,468	35,468		20,000	20,000
024 LCAC LANDING CRAFT	265,902	265,902	265,902	265,902	807,102	253,902	804,000		238,098	238,098
Other Procurement, Navy										
Ships support equipment										
040 STANDARD BOATS	19,940	19,940	19,940	19,940	19,940	19,940	21,940		2,000	2,000
047 MODERNIZATION SUPPORT	788,158	788,158	788,158	788,158	788,158	878,158	878,158		83,000	83,000
Communications and electronics equipment										
048 AN/SPS-48	20,354	20,354	20,354	20,354	88,854	20,354	44,804		24,280	24,280
068 AN/SQR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR	0	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
069 ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	91,200		91,200	91,200
074 AN/SQ-85	0	0	0	0	12,000	0	12,000		12,000	12,000
079 C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	21,398	38,398	21,398	38,398	19,498	21,398	20,398	15,000		
088 SQQ-T1 ANTISUBMARINE TRAINERS	0	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
Aviation support equipment										
181 AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	65,033	65,033	70,033	70,033	64,288	70,033	64,288	5,000		
180 METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	33,008	33,008	29,808	29,808	29,808	33,008	30,808			1,200
Ordnance support equipment										
218 RAM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
Civil engineering support equipment										
248 AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	88,048	88,048	88,048	88,048	82,048	88,048	82,048		6,000	6,000
Personnel and command support equipment										
273 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	42,138	42,838	40,838	42,883	38,173	38,838	38,873	786		
277 ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	13,417	13,417	23,417	23,417	13,417	23,417	23,417	10,000	10,000	
279 OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	4,000	0	4,000	0	0	0	4,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								490,205	1,851,548	1,782,748

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Procurement, Marine Corps										
Ammunition										
005 40 MM, ALL TYPES	107,481	107,481	82,158	82,158	107,481	82,181	82,181			33
018 158MM HE ADAM	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200	40,200	80,400	80,400	40,200	40,200	40,200
025 83MM ROCKET HEAA (SMAW)	0	10,000	35,800	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
026 LIGHT ANTI-ARMOR WEAPON	5,277	5,277	30,002	30,002	36,277	30,002	30,002	24,725	24,725	
Guided missiles and equipment										
049 TOW	0	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
052 MLRS LAUNCHERS	0	0	23,000	23,000	0	0	0	23,000		
053 MLRS ROCKETS	0	0	72,300	72,300	0	0	0	72,300		
Communications and electronics equipment										
058 TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE ENHANCEMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,000		26,000	26,000
065 TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM)	0	0	0	0	27,000	0	27,000		27,000	27,000
089 TACTICAL GROUND INTERCEPT FACILITY	0	0	15,000	12,000	0	0	0	12,000		
074 COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL-HYBRID	0	0	4,200	4,200	0	0	0	4,200		
078 COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERMINAL-RECEIVE C	0	0	4,800	4,800	0	0	0	4,800		
077 TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE INITIATIVES	0	0	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
079 NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	9,481	9,481	44,481	39,481	9,481	9,481	39,481	30,000	30,000	
Engineer and other equipment										
084 TOWED ASSAULT BRIDGE	0	6,900	0	6,900	0	6,900	6,900	6,900	6,900	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								190,526	183,426	122,233
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
Combat aircraft										
002/008/010 B-2A	2,468,028	(184,827)	2,468,028	2,800,000	0	2,468,028	2,800,000	343,972	343,972	
005 F-15 E	188,857	188,857	188,857	188,857	188,857	881,857	804,857		336,300	336,300
008 F-117	0	0	1,027,000	680,000	0	1,027,000	0	680,000		
Airlift aircraft										
012 C-17 ADV PROC (CY)	222,424	122,424	122,424	122,424	222,424	122,424	172,424			80,000
014 C-130H	245,479	245,479	245,479	245,479	245,479	272,979	290,000		44,521	44,521
016 LC-130H	0	0	0	0	0	82,000	82,000		82,000	82,000
Trainer aircraft										
017 ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER	8,478	14,012	8,478	14,012	14,012	14,012	14,012	6,534	6,534	
Other aircraft										
022 E-8B ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	82,700	82,700	126,400	126,400	82,700	126,400	126,400	82,700	82,700	
Modification of in-service aircraft										
027 B-1B ECM	0	288,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	20,000		
030 F-16	294,537	294,537	294,537	294,537	294,537	297,037	297,037		2,800	2,800
031 F-16	250,985	250,985	250,985	250,985	250,985	253,985	253,985		3,000	3,000
052 C-135	485,108	828,808	428,808	586,808	485,108	428,808	586,808	121,700	121,700	

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
063 CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	66,254	22,273	66,254	45,862	22,273	66,254	66,254		12,000	22,392
Aircraft spares and repair parts										
066 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	664,465	695,365	622,765	596,965	660,765	770,665	603,965			7,000
Aircraft support equipment and facilities										
070 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	445,331	443,831	545,931	547,051	419,750	562,731	547,750	101,720	102,419	699
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
Ballistic missiles										
001 PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	195,178	195,178	385,778	252,000	124,200	661,600	195,178	66,822		
Modification of In-service missiles										
021 MM/IR MODIFICATIONS	144,715	144,715	144,715	152,115	144,715	152,115	152,115	7,400	7,400	
Other support										
046 SPECIAL PROGRAMS	2,419,740	2,419,740	2,106,340	2,180,340	2,146,840	2,180,340	2,230,340			60,000
063 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,806		9,806	9,806
Other Procurement, Air Force										
Munitions and associated equipment										
005 20MM COMBAT	0	0	8,100	8,100	25,000	0	8,120	8,100	8,120	20
006 20MM TRAINING	0	0	16,900	16,900	0	0	16,880	16,900	16,880	
013 MK-82 INERT/BDU-80	0	0	0	0	0	13,800	13,800		13,800	13,800
Vehicular equipment										
065 CAP VEHICLES	0	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	
062 TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	10,020	10,020	10,020	10,620	10,020	10,020	10,020	800		
Electronics and telecommunications equip										
100 AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALB)	14,135	14,135	14,135	0	14,135	0	14,135			14,135
114 TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	20,471	20,471	6,771	4,871	19,371	4,871	4,871			100
129 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS	51,665	51,665	51,665	51,665	46,665	66,665	66,665		35,000	35,000
150 RADIO EQUIPMENT	2,268	2,268	2,268	2,268	2,268	2,768	2,768		500	500
155 CAP COM & ELECT	0	600	600	500	500	600	600	600	600	
Other base maintenance and support equip										
175 BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	33,485	33,485	33,485	33,485	35,985	33,485	35,985		2,600	2,600
187 INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTMITY	62,868	29,788	172,488	33,902	36,022	0	34,519			717
189 SELECTED ACTMTIES	5,387,165	5,366,235	5,456,665	5,536,115	5,271,266	5,466,665	5,456,515	146,660	71,350	
201 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	0	130,700		130,700	130,700
210 SENIOR YEAR GROUND STATIONS	0	0	0	130,668	0	0	0	130,668		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,566,367	1,423,002	814,660
Procurement, Defensewide										
Major equipment										
005 SUPERCOMPUTERS	0	0	0	0	65,000	0	42,000		42,000	42,000
007 C-20F AIRCRAFT	0	93,000	0	93,000	86,400	93,000	93,000	93,000	93,000	
023 OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	32,800	0	0	32,500	0	10,000		10,000	10,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
038 VEHICLES	20	20	50	50	20	50	50	30	30	
040 OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	7,501	7,501	25,571	22,880	7,501	8,471	8,471	15,378	970	
042 MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM	0	0	15,000	30,000	0	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	
Special Operations Command										
045 C-130 MODIFICATIONS	101,863	101,863	114,563	114,563	157,183	101,863	157,183	12,900	55,900	42,600
051 PATROL BOAT, COASTAL	2,805	2,805	2,805	2,805	41,205	2,805	4,205	1,800	1,800	1,800
066 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	40,999	51,999	51,999	51,999	51,999	50,499	50,499	10,700	9,100	
067 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	124,264	124,264	124,264	124,264	86,470	124,264	129,263		4,989	4,989
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								162,008	247,189	101,199
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
Reserve Equipment										
-001 ARMY RESERVE										
02 TACTICAL TRUCKS	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
04 COMMUNICATION ELECT	0	5,000	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
08 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	25,000	25,000	10,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
08 SINGARS RADIOS	0	0	15,000	18,000	15,000	0	18,000	15,000	15,000	
10 NIGHT VISION	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
12 C-12F	0	0	7,500	9,300	0	0	9,300	9,300	9,300	
-002 NAVY RESERVE										
02 LAMPS MK-1 BLOCK UPGRADE (9H-20)	0	35,000	0	35,000	35,000	0	35,000	35,000	35,000	
04 HH-80 UPGRADE KITS	0	45,000	0	0	45,000	0	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
08 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	10,000	23,500	10,000	15,000	10,000	15,000	5,000
08 AH-90T1 TRAINERS	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
10 C-130T AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	57,000	0	114,000	114,000	114,000	114,000
12 P-3 UPGRADES	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
14 MH-53 HELICOPTERS	0	0	129,000	0	0	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000
18 MDW VANS	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
-003 MARINE CORPS RESERVE										
02 COMMO EQUIPMENT	0	5,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	10,000	15,000	10,000	
04 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	10,000	15,000	7,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	
08 KC-130T AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	57,000	0	57,000	57,000	57,000	57,000
08 AH-1W COBRA AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	71,000	0	71,000	71,000	71,000	71,000
-004 AIR FORCE RESERVE										
02 C-130 AIRCRAFT	0	200,000	0	200,000	200,000	0	348,000	200,000	348,000	148,000
08 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	25,000	25,000	7,500	10,000	25,000	10,000	
-005 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD										
02 C-23 AIRCRAFT	0	80,000	0	80,000	82,000	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
04 TACTICAL TRUCKS	0	20,000	0	10,000	20,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	
08 COMMUNICATIONS/ELECT	0	5,000	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
06 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	20,000	25,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	15,000	
10 C-26 AIRCRAFT	0	0	8,000	0	21,000	8,000	3,000		3,000	3,000
12 NIGHT VISION DEVICES	0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
14 SINGARS RADIOS	0	0	0	0	35,000	0	35,000		35,000	35,000
18 AH-1 MODS	0	0	15,000	0	0	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
20 FAMILY OF M113 VEHICLES	0	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
22 MLRS LAUNCHERS	0	0	110,000	110,000	0	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	
23 MLRS ROCKETS	0	0	0	0	0	0	48,000		48,000	48,000
24 SQUAD ENGAGEMENT TRAINING DEVICES	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
26 TCT UPGRADE	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,200		8,200	8,200
26 RESERVE STAFF SIMULATION CENTER	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
-008 AIR NATIONAL GUARD										
02 C-130 AIRCRAFT	0	80,000	308,800	308,800	80,000	337,300	337,300	308,800	337,300	27,900
03 MH-60 HELICOPTERS	0	0	0	0	0	35,000	35,000		35,000	35,000
04 F-16A/B MSP/INSTALLATION	0	40,000	0	20,000	40,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
05 F-15F-18 ENGINE UPGRADE	0	40,000	0	20,000	40,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
08 F-18 MODS	0	15,000	0	10,000	15,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	
11 LANTERN	0	80,000	0	45,000	80,000	0	0	45,000		
14 C-26 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	21,000	0	18,000		18,000	18,000
16 T-C AIR CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	0	80,000	125,000	0	85,000	80,000	95,000	45,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,081,100	711,500	191,700
Inspector General										
010 DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL	300	300	800	800	300	300	300	500		
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruct-RDT&E										
001 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E	0	13,900	0	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900	
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruct-O&M										
008 CRYOFRACTURE - PROC	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	0	0	20,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								34,400	13,900	0
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	63,845,800	63,314,519	62,958,754	63,884,858	65,087,838	64,508,998	64,838,407	38,868	793,807	754,748
Appropriations	63,845,800	63,314,519	62,958,754	63,884,858	65,087,838	63,879,298	64,838,407	38,868	793,807	754,748
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO PROCUREMENT*								4,258,018	8,452,018	3,280,791

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (Thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RD&E, Army											
Technology base											
002	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	179,363	179,363	179,363	179,363	200,863	173,801	180,863	11,500	11,500
005	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	080210	11,537	11,537	15,537	20,537	11,537	18,537	9,000		
007	SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT	080212	5,769	5,769	24,269	10,769	5,769	20,769	5,000	5,000	
008	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	080221	45,544	45,544	45,544	51,844	51,844	51,844	6,300	6,300	
014	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	080261	53,977	62,977	53,977	62,977	73,977	53,977	9,000	9,000	
018	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	080270	18,894	25,894	18,894	25,894	25,894	19,994	9,000	3,100	
021	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	080272	18,984	28,984	18,984	28,984	28,984	24,734	10,000	10,750	750
027	LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	080278	31,552	31,552	31,552	31,552	34,352	31,552	34,352	2,800	2,800
028	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	080278	89,579	139,579	91,579	126,579	139,579	98,579	37,000	18,200	
045	MPIM TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	0	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	7,000
191	SIMULATION FACILITY		0	0	0	0	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
Advanced technology development											
032	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080300	22,245	22,245	22,245	23,745	28,745	23,745	1,500	4,500	3,000
034	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080300	40,865	50,865	43,865	49,365	49,365	43,865	8,500	15,000	6,500
041	TRACTOR RED	080301	6,721	6,721	11,721	11,721	6,721	11,721	5,000	5,000	
043	ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) RESEARCH	080310	3,259	3,259	3,259	28,009	18,259	28,009	24,750	24,750	
049	TRACTOR CAGE	080332	20,988	20,988	20,988	20,988	20,988	24,988	4,000	4,000	
051	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080360	8,728	23,728	18,728	28,728	23,728	18,728	20,000	18,000	
080	MULTI-PURPOSE WEAPON		0	0	0	0	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	6,000
189	LASER BURN TREATMENT		0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
193	PROSTATE DISEASE RESEARCH		0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
198	BREAST CANCER RESEARCH		0	0	0	0	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
Tactical programs											
086	ADVANCED ANTI-TANK WEAPON SYSTEMS		0	68,300	0	137,000	0	0	137,000	137,000	137,000
071	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	080371	19,534	19,534	19,534	19,534	22,534	19,534	22,534	3,000	3,000
077	FORWARD AREA AIR DEFENSE (FAAD) SYSTEM	080375	97,387	97,387	97,387	97,387	97,387	107,387	107,387	10,000	10,000
081	AVIATION - ADV DEV	080380	13,828	13,828	13,828	13,828	14,928	13,828	14,928	1,100	1,100
085	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT COMPUTER SYSTEMS	080380	24,635	24,635	24,635	24,635	28,635	24,635	28,635	4,000	4,000
086	JOINT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM	080432	130,775	105,775	109,275	109,275	109,275	115,275	115,275		6,000
089	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	080480	11,879	20,979	23,479	23,479	20,979	23,479	11,600	11,600	
108	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	080471	9,958	9,958	9,958	9,958	19,958	27,958	27,958	18,000	18,000
109	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	080471	51,298	51,298	61,298	61,298	37,900	61,298	10,000	10,000	
114	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	080474	11,232	11,232	11,232	11,232	18,232	11,232	7,000	7,000	
119	TRACTOR HELM	080476	68,973	68,973	101,973	101,973	101,973	112,573	36,000	36,400	1,400
120	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR	080477	48,721	48,721	73,721	73,721	48,721	73,721	25,000	20,000	
122	AVIATION - ENG DEV	080480	12,517	12,517	12,517	12,517	14,017	12,517	14,017	1,500	1,500
135	LONGBOW - ENG DEV	080481	233,201	233,201	267,701	267,701	244,201	233,201	254,201	34,900	21,000
143	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	020373	29,713	99,113	29,713	84,713	71,013	29,713	66,000	41,300	
144	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	020374	31,439	31,439	36,439	36,439	36,439	31,439	5,000	5,000	
150	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	020380	53,042	53,042	53,042	53,042	58,042	58,042	58,042	5,000	5,000
195/202	UNICHAARGE PROPELLANT/FSD		0	0	0	8,000	0	0	8,000	8,000	8,000
199/203	COMMAND AND CONTROL VEHICLE		0	0	0	15,000	0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
197/199 ATACS RESTRUCTURE		0	0	0	40,000	0	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	
200 INTEGRATED DEVELOP, TEST & TRAINING SYS		0	0	0	15,000	0	0	15,000	15,000		
201 SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	0	18,000	0	0	0	18,000		
Defensewide Mission Support											
184 RAND ARROYO CENTER	080510	19,974	22,974	23,800	22,850	22,850	19,974	19,974	2,876		
185 ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	080530	181,464	181,464	179,464	198,984	181,464	180,984	180,984	18,500		
170 TECHNOLOGY AND VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT	080560	43,127	48,127	43,127	48,127	48,127	43,127	48,127	5,000	5,000	
181 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE - PROG 8	080565	52,474	62,474	52,474	62,474	62,474	52,474	52,474	10,000		
188 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	21,058	28,058	0	28,058	28,058	0	28,058	7,000	7,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									597,528	593,800	134,950
RDT&E, Navy											
Technology base											
004 SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY	080212	17,008	32,008	17,008	32,008	32,008	32,008	32,008	15,000	15,000	
009 SYSTEMS SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	080223	80,521	87,521	80,521	87,521	57,000	80,521	79,000	7,000		
015 OCEAN AND ATMOSPHERIC SUPPORT TECHNOL	080243	39,724	44,724	39,724	44,724	44,724	39,724	44,724	5,000	5,000	
Advanced technology development											
025 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	080370	18,222	17,222	18,222	37,222	37,222	37,222	37,222	21,000	21,000	
027 GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMO	080371	13,829	21,329	13,829	13,829	21,329	13,829	14,429	600	600	
033 C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080379	1,373	1,373	1,373	1,373	0	1,373	18,373	15,000	15,000	
Strategic programs											
038 TRIDENT II	080438	61,803	78,803	61,803	78,803	78,803	18,303	53,803	15,000		
Tactical programs											
052 AIR CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	080321	10,388	15,388	10,388	15,388	15,388	10,388	15,388	5,000	5,000	
055 NAVY ADVANCED TECHNICAL FIGHTER		0	0	0	0	80,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
058 TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	080328	15,574	21,774	24,774	24,774	21,774	15,574	15,574	8,200		
082 MINE COUNTERMEASURES INITIATIVE FUND		0	0	30,000	20,500	0	0	20,500	16,800	16,800	
083 LOW COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER		0	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	
087 ADVANCED SUBMARINE ASW DEVELOPMENT	080350	31,232	31,232	31,232	31,232	38,000	31,232	40,232	9,000	9,000	
089 SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	080351	11,440	11,440	11,440	11,440	0	11,440	15,840	4,400	4,400	
080 ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	080358	35,821	35,821	35,821	35,821	25,000	35,821	35,821	20,000		
082 MINE COUNTERMEASURES INITIATIVE FUND		0	0	0	0	0	20,500	16,800	16,800	16,800	
084 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SY	080383	9,319	11,819	11,819	11,819	23,319	9,319	9,319	2,500	2,500	
088 ADVANCED MINOR CALIBER GUN		0	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	
101 ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM	080370	1,888	1,888	4,888	4,888	1,888	1,888	4,888	3,000	3,000	
103 OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPW	080371	13,548	17,548	13,548	15,548	17,548	13,548	15,548	2,000	2,000	
123 IFF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	080421	22,343	32,343	22,343	32,343	32,343	22,343	32,343	10,000	10,000	
124 LAMP8	080421	30,215	30,215	30,215	30,215	34,215	20,290	34,215	4,000	4,000	
129 AIRBORNE ASW DEVELOPMENTS	080421	25,843	25,843	25,843	8,310	0	8,310	19,843			11,533
130 F-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	080422	41,144	82,644	82,644	58,747	58,747	51,044	82,644	17,603	41,500	23,897
134 SHIP FIRE SUPPORT		0	0	31,000	18,000	0	0	0	18,000		

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
135 AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	060426	17,318	21,518	17,318	21,518	21,518	17,318	21,518	4,200	4,200	
144 5" ROLLING AIR FRAME MISSILE		0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
149 TOMAHAWK	060436	26,815	26,815	26,815	26,815	32,815	26,815	32,815		4,000	4,000
150/151 V-22A/V-22 PRIOR YEAR		0	625,000	0	625,000	625,000	0	625,000	625,000	625,000	
153 AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES - ENG		0	14,000	9,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	
156 NAVY STANDARD SIGNAL PROCESSORS	060450	9,266	9,266	9,266	9,266	9,266	0	20,366		11,100	11,100
163 SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	060452	270,272	270,272	270,272	242,972	220,272	242,972	267,272			24,300
172 UNOUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPON	060460	8,369	8,369	8,369	8,369	2,400	8,369	10,769		2,400	2,400
179 MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES - ENG DEV	060465	19,104	23,004	19,104	23,004	23,004	19,104	19,104	3,900		
194 FIXED DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM - ENG	060478	229,154	229,154	229,154	209,154	189,154	243,223	236,223		9,069	29,069
198 F/A-18 SQUADRONS	020413	452,077	472,077	472,077	484,077	472,077	319,077	420,000	32,000		
200 MULTI-SENSOR INTEGRATION		0	0	25,000	23,000	0	0	0	23,000		
202 SURFACE COMBATANT ORDNANCE AND MISSILE	020422	26,426	26,426	26,426	27,226	20,426	27,226	26,426			1,200
203 UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS	020431	72,594	72,594	72,594	66,604	42,594	66,604	72,594			3,700
204 SHIP-TOWED ARRAY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS	020431	17,622	17,622	17,622	17,622	9,622	27,622	23,922		6,300	6,300
215 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/ SUPPORT TANK	020662	20,469	24,669	27,769	36,769	24,669	27,769	27,769	19,300	7,300	
217 MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ ELECTRONICS	020662	26,305	67,605	32,305	31,305	55,405	26,305	26,305	3,000		
219 MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	12,000	0	0	12,000	12,000		12,000	12,000
221 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		0	0	34,900	55,000	0	0	0	55,000		
267 CENTURION		0	0	0	0	0	90,000	23,000		23,000	23,000
262 ADVANCED DEPLOYABLE SYSTEMS		0	0	0	20,000	0	0	0	20,000		
263 SHIP SELF DEFENSE		0	0	0	0	0	0	221,000		221,000	221,000
264 IMPROVED TACTICAL AIR LAUNCHED DECOY		0	0	0	0	0	0	17,000		17,000	17,000
Intelligence and communications											
265 LASER COMMUNICATIONS		0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
Defensewide Mission Support											
241 MARINE CORPS OPERATIONS ANALYSIS GROUP	060513	4,157	4,657	4,157	4,549	4,549	4,157	4,157	392		
242 CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSIS	060515	24,321	26,821	24,321	26,196	26,196	24,321	24,321	1,675		
251 RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	060566	66,341	101,341	101,341	101,341	61,000	101,341	66,000	15,000	6,600	
259 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070601	25,302	100,002	5,000	74,407	100,002	5,000	74,407	49,105	49,105	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									1,046,075	1,160,633	452,298
RDT&E, Air Force											
Technology base											
002 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	060110	203,208	209,208	213,508	209,208	209,208	195,307	209,208	6,000	6,000	
006 HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	060220	53,673	63,673	53,673	63,673	63,673	53,673	63,673	10,000	10,000	
007 AEROSPACE PROPULSION	060220	69,355	72,355	69,355	72,355	72,355	66,055	71,055	3,000	1,700	
010 CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	060220	6,744	16,744	6,744	11,744	16,744	6,744	6,744	5,000		
Advanced technology development											
033 ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	060340	17,914	27,914	17,914	22,914	27,914	17,914	27,914	5,000	10,000	5,000
037 ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	060360	57,152	57,152	57,152	57,152	29,370	57,152	61,552		4,400	4,400
038 CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	060372	12,036	12,036	12,036	12,036	12,036	13,036	13,036		1,000	1,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Strategic programs											
049 B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	080424	1,563,072	1,563,072	1,563,072	1,562,872	1,563,072	1,563,072	1,563,072			200
-051 ICBM MODERNIZATION	080431										
10 ICBM MODERNIZATION (START COMPLIANCE)		4,083	4,083	4,083	14,883	4,083	4,083	4,083	10,800		
089 SPACETRACK	010242	20,124	20,124	20,124	20,124	10,124	22,824	34,624		14,500	14,500
Tactical programs											
092 ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP)	080421	1,022	1,022	1,022	1,022	1,022	1,022	4,022		3,000	3,000
094 F-117A IMPROVEMENT		0	223,000	0	83,000	83,000	0	42,000	83,000	42,000	
100 TRI-SVC ATTACK MISSILE ENGINE DEVELOP		0	0	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
108 EW DEVELOPMENT	080427	215,221	211,221	215,221	197,971	119,221	197,971	200,071			2,100
108 HARDENED TARGET MUNITIONS	080432	7,183	7,183	7,183	7,183	17,183	7,183	13,183		8,000	8,000
120 COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECHN	080474	8,419	8,419	8,419	8,419	17,419	8,419	17,419		8,000	8,000
124 JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR	1080477	311,859	311,859	325,859	316,859	308,059	316,859	311,859	5,000		
140 FOLLOW-ON TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE BY	81020721	56,553	173,953	86,153	86,553	173,953	86,553	86,553	32,000	32,000	
154 BEEK EAGLE	020759	29,010	29,010	29,010	21,010	18,010	21,090	21,090			80
Intelligence and communications											
186 NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPAC	030518	52,005	52,005	52,005	70,105	52,005	70,105	52,005	18,100		
Defensewide Mission Support											
194 ADVANCED LAUNCH SYSTEM	080440	147,744	72,744	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	55,000			5,000
208 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE - RDT&E	080589	105,123	101,123	95,123	101,123	101,123	105,123	103,123			2,000
215 TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES	030514	143,915	143,915	143,915	143,915	88,915	183,915	145,415		1,500	1,500
220 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	070801	50,535	110,535	0	80,535	110,535	0	80,535	10,000	10,000	
225 EXIMER LASER		0	0	0	0	30,000	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									190,700	188,100	88,780
RDT&E, Defensewide											
Technology base											
001 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	88,290	108,290	95,490	101,090	108,290	95,058	113,590	12,800	25,300	12,500
003 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	080110	87,373	182,373	107,373	182,373	182,373	90,580	225,973	95,000	138,800	43,600
004 FOCUS HOPE		0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
005 ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIAL PROJECT		0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
008 DOD ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT		0	10,000	0	5,000	10,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
007 SUPERCONDUCTIVE MAGNETIC ENERGY STO		0	40,000	0	20,000	40,000	0	40,000	20,000	40,000	20,000
010 MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	080222	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000	20,000	23,600		3,600	3,600
011 STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY	080230	288,380	288,380	288,380	288,380	288,380	288,380	288,380	20,000	20,000	
012 TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	080270	117,900	132,900	137,900	120,900	117,900	120,900	126,900	3,000	9,000	8,000
014 INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNI	080270	35,500	135,500	35,500	110,500	135,500	38,800	110,500	75,000	75,000	
015 MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	080271	82,036	137,036	100,036	143,036	143,036	93,036	187,536	81,000	125,500	44,500
026 US-JAPAN TRAINING		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	0		10,000	
027 HICUMI S&E EDUCATION SUPPORT		0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	0		15,000	
133 MILITARY NURSING RESEARCH		0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
134 HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES & UNIVERSITI		0	0	0	0	0	15,000	15,000		15,000	15,000

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
138 U.S. JAPAN MANAGEMENT TRAINING		0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
Advanced technology development											
028 JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVI	080322	10,260	10,260	24,980	20,000	10,260	20,000	18,000	9,740	7,740	
030 RELOCATABLE TARGET DETECTION TECHNOLO	080322	10,000	28,000	10,000	28,000	28,000	10,000	28,000	18,000	18,000	
032 ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY		0	20,000	45,000	45,000	75,000	0	75,000	45,000	75,000	30,000
033 PRE-COMPETITIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOP		0	50,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	75,000	80,000	100,000	80,000	
037 LASER COMMUNICATIONS		0	0	20,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
041 COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH		0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
044/045 CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE	080375	50,932	80,932	50,932	80,932	80,932	44,032	80,932	30,000	30,000	
048 MEDICAL RESEARCH		0	30,000	0	30,000	30,000	0	10,000	30,000	10,000	
051 CTACS		0	0	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000		
053 SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	116040	13,700	18,700	18,900	18,700	18,700	15,700	18,700	3,000	3,000	
057 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM		0	0	100,000	50,000	0	885,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	
069 EXCIMER LASER TECHNOLOGY		0	0	5,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
Strategic programs											
056 AIR DEFENSE INITIATIVE	080374	273,000	123,000	218,000	184,000	123,000	273,000	207,000			43,000
Tactical programs											
064 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	080322	39,928	60,928	39,928	60,928	60,928	39,928	60,928	21,000	21,000	
065 JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	080370	20,740	20,740	30,740	25,740	20,740	20,740	20,740	5,000		
066 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM - C3I	080371	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	10,300	5,300	10,300			5,000
067 NON-ACOUSTIC ASW		0	0	40,000	52,000	100,000	30,000	43,800	52,000	43,800	
068 AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM	080371	43,781	43,781	43,781	43,781	70,139	43,781	62,339		18,558	18,558
073 MOBILE OFF SHORE BASE		0	0	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	1,000		
076 JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM	030514	68,562	114,862	68,562	108,962	68,300	70,513	104,213	38,400	36,851	
079 SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEV	116040	194,290	194,290	213,090	207,090	207,250	172,878	208,290	12,800	14,000	1,200
080 SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	116040	10,637	15,837	15,837	15,837	15,837	10,637	15,837	5,200	5,200	
087 JOINT SIMULATION OFFICE		0	0	50,000	40,000	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	
104 GENERAL SUPPORT FOR SOLIC		0	0	3,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Intelligence and communications											
092 DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTVMT	030515	52,878	74,878	67,878	74,878	74,878	52,878	82,878	22,000	30,000	8,000
Defensewide Mission Support											
099 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY		0	50,000	250,000	100,000	50,000	157,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	
105 MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PROGRAM		0	0	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	80,000		
108 FCIMS PROGRAMS		0	0	21,500	21,500	0	27,000	27,000	21,500	27,000	5,500
107 MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING EDUCATION		0	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
108 MANAGERS IN THE CLASSROOMS		0	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
111 GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I		0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
126 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		0	17,000	0	17,000	17,000	0	17,000	17,000	17,000	
127 MOBILE OFF SHORE BASING		0	0	0	0	0	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
137 ADVANCED MATERIALS		0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	

30	0	830	830	830	830	830	830	830	830			
34	0	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100			
36	0	10,300	0	10,300	10,300	0	10,300	10,300	10,300			
38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
39	0	11,900	0	11,900	11,900	0	11,900	11,900	11,900			
40	0	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	0	10,900	10,900	10,900			
41	0	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300			
42	0	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	1,800			
43	0	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100			
44	0	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300	8,300			
45	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700			

FY1992 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RD&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
Developmental Test & Eval., Defense		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defensewide Mission Support		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
001 CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT (080404)		125,527	125,527	120,527	89,927	85,117	89,927	93,327	125,527	120,527	3,400
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*		0	0	1,203	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,185,440	1,203,949	286,858
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL		0	0	1,203	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,185,440	1,203,949	286,858
TOA		39,221,533	40,705,584	40,285,708	40,056,803	37,185,113	38,353,684	39,401,923	835,070	180,360	
Appropriations		39,221,533	40,705,584	40,285,708	40,056,803	37,185,113	38,353,684	39,401,923	835,070	180,360	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO RD&E*		0	0	1,203	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	3,019,741	3,154,782	944,487

... (text partially obscured) ...

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
MILITARY PERSONNEL										
Military Personnel, Army										
TOA	23,372,800	NA	NA	NA	23,153,900	23,236,700	23,236,457	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	23,372,800	NA	NA	NA	23,153,900	23,236,700	23,236,457	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Navy										
TOA	19,641,570	NA	NA	NA	19,529,200	19,231,770	19,228,564	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	19,641,570	NA	NA	NA	19,529,200	19,231,770	19,228,564	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	6,104,900	NA	NA	NA	6,113,200	5,973,700	5,980,988	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,104,900	NA	NA	NA	6,113,200	5,973,700	5,980,988	NA		NA
Military Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	18,647,800	NA	NA	NA	18,663,400	18,520,900	18,522,963	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	18,647,800	NA	NA	NA	18,663,400	18,520,900	18,522,963	NA		NA
Reserve Personnel, Army										
TOA	2,147,480	NA	NA	NA	2,187,700	2,218,860	2,170,466	NA	23,018	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,147,480	NA	NA	NA	2,187,700	2,218,860	2,170,466	NA	23,018	NA
Reserve Personnel, Navy										
TOA	1,634,527	NA	NA	NA	1,679,000	1,672,327	1,653,200	NA	18,673	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,634,527	NA	NA	NA	1,679,000	1,672,327	1,653,200	NA	18,673	NA
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps										
TOA	340,132	NA	NA	NA	349,900	346,632	345,526	NA	5,394	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	340,132	NA	NA	NA	349,900	346,632	345,526	NA	5,394	NA

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Reserve Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	737,119	NA	NA	NA	735,200	727,219	729,019	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	737,119	NA	NA	NA	735,200	727,219	729,019	NA		NA
National Guard Personnel, Army										
TOA	3,167,100	NA	NA	NA	3,293,400	3,272,573	3,239,702	NA	72,602	NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,167,100	NA	NA	NA	3,293,400	3,272,573	3,239,702	NA	72,602	NA
National Guard Personnel, Air Force										
TOA	1,188,800	NA	NA	NA	1,191,300	1,167,922	1,168,100	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,188,800	NA	NA	NA	1,191,300	1,167,922	1,168,100	NA		NA
TOTAL - MILITARY PERSONNEL										
TOA	78,982,028	NA	NA	NA	78,898,200	78,388,623	78,275,025	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	78,982,028	NA	NA	NA	78,898,200	78,388,623	78,275,025	NA		NA
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
TOA	16,873,735	15,087,408	15,679,215	15,387,912	12,909,168	15,652,198	15,671,418			283,508
FAJ	(1,486,000)	(1,486,000)	(1,486,000)	(1,486,000)		(2,229,000)	(2,229,000)			
Appropriations	15,387,735	13,581,408	14,193,215	13,901,912	12,909,168	13,423,198	13,442,418			
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
TOA	20,594,974	18,131,394	20,231,181	19,392,898	19,272,649	19,365,258	19,203,058			
FAJ	140,100	140,100	140,100	140,100		(94,500)	(94,500)			
Appropriations	20,735,074	18,271,494	20,371,281	19,532,998	19,272,649	19,290,758	19,108,558			
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
TOA	1,848,728	1,598,300	1,492,515	1,597,515	1,431,700	1,511,288	1,441,838			
FAJ	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)		(58,500)	(58,500)			
Appropriations	1,809,728	1,559,300	1,453,515	1,558,515	1,431,700	1,452,788	1,383,338			

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
TOA	18,033,005	15,865,134	17,324,477	17,040,857	18,141,190	18,878,218	18,881,040			
FAJ	(448,000)	(448,000)	(448,000)	(448,000)		(872,000)	(872,000)			
Appropriations	17,585,005	15,437,134	16,876,477	16,592,857	18,141,190	18,204,218	18,009,040			
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
TOA	9,083,000	9,813,094	8,434,605	9,316,879	9,473,310	8,798,325	8,778,004	233,879		
FAJ	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)						
Appropriations	9,033,000	9,563,094	8,384,605	9,266,879	9,473,310	8,798,325	8,778,004	233,879		
Office of the Inspector General										
TOA	128,000	218,900	125,500	125,200	219,700	128,000	128,000			800
FAJ										
Appropriations	128,000	218,900	125,500	125,200	219,700	128,000	128,000			800
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
TOA	880,300	881,218	1,033,773	1,014,773	1,033,842	1,018,808	1,038,525	24,473	48,225	23,752
FAJ										
Appropriations	880,300	881,218	1,033,773	1,014,773	1,033,842	1,018,808	1,038,525	24,473	48,225	23,752
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
TOA	852,700	852,700	878,792	885,482	844,048	883,981	880,745	12,782		
FAJ										
Appropriations	852,700	852,700	878,792	885,482	844,048	883,981	880,745	12,782		
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
TOA	74,700	75,950	74,821	75,171	78,592	74,820	77,870	471	3,170	2,889
FAJ										
Appropriations	74,700	75,950	74,821	75,171	78,592	74,820	77,870	471	3,170	2,889
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	1,215,723	1,214,823	1,213,887	1,214,287	1,209,312	1,191,874	1,195,024			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,215,723	1,214,823	1,213,887	1,214,287	1,209,312	1,191,874	1,195,024			

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.>	Amount Approp.>	Amount Approp.>
Oper. & Maint., Army Natl Guard										
TOA	2,134,100	2,216,700	2,251,213	2,236,013	2,218,560	2,191,677	2,255,623	103,913	121,523	17,610
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,134,100	2,216,700	2,251,213	2,236,013	2,218,560	2,191,677	2,255,623	103,913	121,523	17,610
Oper. & Maint., Air Natl Guard										
TOA	2,552,624	2,551,924	2,512,475	2,513,175	2,535,250	2,493,039	2,493,689			
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,552,624	2,551,924	2,512,475	2,513,175	2,535,250	2,493,039	2,493,689			
Rifle Practice, Army										
TOA	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700			
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense										
TOA	5,900	5,900	5,893	5,893	5,900	5,893	5,900			7
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,900	5,900	5,893	5,893	5,900	5,893	5,900			7
Summer Olympics										
TOA		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Environmental Restoration Fund, Defense										
TOA	1,513,200	1,513,200	1,513,200	1,513,200	901,200	1,511,700	1,198,700			
FAJ	(612,000)	(612,000)								
Appropriations	901,200	901,200	1,513,200	1,513,200	901,200	1,511,700	1,198,700	612,000	298,900	
Humanitarian Assistance										
TOA	13,000	13,000	25,000	25,000	15,000	25,000	28,000	12,000	15,000	3,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	13,000	13,000	25,000	25,000	15,000	25,000	28,000	12,000	15,000	3,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Act., D										
TOA	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,261,900	1,259,200	1,140,651			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,263,400	1,261,900	1,259,200	1,140,651			
World University Games										
TOA		6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations		6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	
World Cup - 1994										
TOA			9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	
FAJ										
Appropriations			9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	
Defense Health Program										
TOA	9,507,457	9,069,424	9,507,072	9,159,039	9,302,675	9,263,226	9,242,572			63,533
FAJ										
Appropriations	9,507,457	9,069,424	9,507,072	9,159,039	9,302,675	9,263,226	9,242,572			63,533
Real Property Maintenance, Defense										
TOA					3,622,762	2,332,029	1,820,029		1,820,029	1,820,029
FAJ						(612,000)	(400,000)			
Appropriations					3,622,762	1,720,029	1,820,029		1,820,029	1,820,029
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
TOA	86,465,246	80,311,166	83,568,719	82,768,402	82,494,477	84,566,270	83,369,166			600,764
FAJ	(2,494,900)	(2,494,900)	(1,862,900)	(1,862,900)		(3,666,000)	(3,454,000)			
Appropriations	83,970,346	77,816,266	81,705,819	80,905,502	82,494,477	80,900,270	79,915,166			
PROCUREMENT										
Aircraft Procurement, Army										
TOA	1,291,259	1,501,259	1,328,909	1,553,909	1,414,659	1,256,842	1,441,842	262,650	160,563	
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,291,259	1,501,259	1,328,909	1,553,909	1,414,659	1,256,842	1,441,842	262,650	160,563	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Missile Procurement, Army										
TOA	962,298	1,063,110	1,037,893	1,118,652	1,139,004	1,022,126	1,051,667	136,354	69,369	
FAJ										
Appropriations	962,298	1,063,110	1,037,893	1,118,652	1,139,004	1,022,126	1,051,667	136,354	69,369	
Procurement of W&TCV, Army										
TOA	623,441	736,641	639,841	677,754	607,969	678,552	621,369	254,313	297,946	43,635
FAJ										
Appropriations	623,441	736,641	639,841	677,754	607,969	678,552	621,369	254,313	297,946	43,635
Procurement of Ammunition, Army										
TOA	623,600	940,007	764,280	629,444	1,175,433	707,180	1,094,260	5,644	270,660	264,816
FAJ										
Appropriations	623,600	940,007	764,280	629,444	1,175,433	707,180	1,094,260	5,644	270,660	264,816
Other Procurement, Army										
TOA	3,093,508	3,157,893	3,032,220	3,129,452	3,022,667	2,978,318	3,047,053	35,944		
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,093,508	3,157,893	3,032,220	3,129,452	3,022,667	2,978,318	3,047,053	35,944		
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
TOA	6,653,679	6,352,167	5,950,477	5,669,365	6,636,127	5,734,209	6,026,213			126,816
FAJ										
Appropriations	6,653,679	6,352,167	5,950,477	5,669,365	6,636,127	5,734,209	6,026,213			126,816
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
TOA	3,718,950	3,728,950	3,536,946	3,700,096	3,337,462	3,593,915	3,760,697		41,747	60,599
FAJ										
Appropriations	3,718,950	3,728,950	3,536,946	3,700,096	3,337,462	3,593,915	3,760,697		41,747	60,599
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
TOA	5,319,472	6,590,672	5,526,463	5,958,663	5,513,231	5,526,322	5,978,267	639,191	658,815	19,624
FAJ					1,900,000					
Appropriations	5,319,472	6,590,672	5,526,463	5,958,663	7,413,231	5,526,322	5,978,267	639,191	658,815	19,624

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Other Procurement, Navy										
TOA	5,666,813	5,756,876	5,722,263	5,660,664	5,774,446	5,629,152	5,615,325			
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,666,813	5,756,876	5,722,263	5,660,664	5,774,446	5,629,152	5,615,325			
Procurement, Marine Corps										
TOA	586,546	931,246	690,127	729,727	792,128	626,877	624,607	141,181	236,061	94,680
FAJ										
Appropriations	586,546	931,246	690,127	729,727	792,128	626,877	624,607	141,181	236,061	94,680
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	10,928,701	10,144,817	9,274,999	10,034,314	9,427,005	9,260,783	10,029,265			
FAJ										
Appropriations	10,928,701	10,144,817	9,274,999	10,034,314	9,427,005	9,260,783	10,029,265			
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	5,378,708	4,937,540	4,125,990	4,399,390	4,327,902	4,125,590	4,369,524			
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,378,708	4,937,540	4,125,990	4,399,390	4,327,902	4,125,590	4,369,524			
Other Procurement, Air Force										
TOA	8,346,566	8,132,500	8,100,970	7,694,396	7,640,666	7,926,649	7,666,524			
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,346,566	8,132,500	8,100,970	7,694,396	7,640,666	7,926,649	7,666,524			
Procurement, Defensewide										
TOA	2,146,935	1,746,634	2,536,963	1,950,704	1,575,178	2,066,752	1,962,058			11,354
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,146,935	1,746,634	2,536,963	1,950,704	1,575,178	2,066,752	1,962,058			11,354
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
TOA		635,800	672,100	695,600	1,132,150	751,100	1,567,200	695,600	1,567,200	671,600
FAJ										
Appropriations		635,800	672,100	695,600	1,132,150	751,100	1,567,200	695,600	1,567,200	671,600
Inspector General										
TOA		800	800	800				800		
FAJ										
Appropriations		800	800	800				800		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Defense Production Act Purchases										
TOA					25,000					
FAJ										
Appropriations					25,000					
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruction, Def										
TOA	526,400	526,400	517,300	515,300	494,100	524,400	518,800			3,300
FAJ										
Appropriations	526,400	526,400	517,300	515,300	494,100	524,400	518,800			3,300
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	56,290,898	56,907,512	53,861,863	54,946,262	54,237,369	52,612,567	55,694,531			946,249
FAJ					1,900,000					
Appropriations	56,290,898	56,907,512	53,861,863	54,946,262	56,137,369	52,612,567	55,694,531			946,249
RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
RDT&E, Army										
TOA	5,414,477	5,461,133	5,307,744	5,919,046	5,962,532	5,307,737	6,032,860	604,571	618,363	113,812
FAJ										
Appropriations	5,414,477	5,461,133	5,307,744	5,919,046	5,962,532	5,307,737	6,032,860	604,571	618,363	113,812
RDT&E, Navy										
TOA	8,517,778	8,802,298	8,921,805	8,964,717	9,315,969	7,096,773	8,930,381	466,939	412,803	
FAJ										
Appropriations	8,517,778	8,802,298	8,921,805	8,964,717	9,315,969	7,096,773	8,930,381	466,939	412,803	
RDT&E, Air Force										
TOA	14,532,375	14,242,067	14,070,731	14,231,700	13,731,803	11,373,360	13,189,006			
FAJ										
Appropriations	14,532,375	14,242,067	14,070,731	14,231,700	13,731,803	11,373,360	13,189,006			
RDT&E, Defensewide										
TOA	10,053,361	9,629,643	10,390,969	10,203,425	9,510,354	8,301,222	9,799,911	150,044		
FAJ										
Appropriations	10,053,361	9,629,643	10,390,969	10,203,425	9,510,354	8,301,222	9,799,911	150,044		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Developmental Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	281,707	281,707	281,707	281,707	281,707	280,707	259,707			
FAJ										
Appropriations	281,707	281,707	281,707	281,707	281,707	280,707	259,707			
Operational Test & Eval., Defense										
TOA	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983			
FAJ										
Appropriations	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983	12,983			
Advanced Tactical Aviation, Defense										
TOA						3,468,877				
FAJ										
Appropriations						3,468,877				
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL										
TOA	38,812,701	38,429,849	38,965,939	39,613,580	38,795,146	35,843,779	38,234,848	800,879		
FAJ										
Appropriations	38,812,701	38,429,849	38,965,939	39,613,580	38,795,146	35,843,779	38,234,848	800,879		
OTHER										
Former Soviet Union (FSU) Threat Reducti										
TOA		(3,500,000)								
FAJ										
Appropriations		(3,500,000)								
International Nuclear Nonproliferation A										
TOA		40,000								
FAJ										
Appropriations		40,000								
Reinvestment for Economic Growth, Defense										
TOA		1,000,000	200,000							
FAJ										
Appropriations		1,000,000	200,000							

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
TOTAL - OTHER										
TOA		(2,460,000)	200,000							
FAJ										
Appropriations		(2,460,000)	200,000							
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
National Defense Stockpile Transaction F										
TOA				(150,000)						150,000
FAJ										
Appropriations				(150,000)						150,000
Defense Business Operations Fund										
TOA	1,123,800	16,600	1,123,800	1,145,000	16,600	1,123,800	1,123,800	21,200		
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,123,800	16,600	1,123,800	1,145,000	16,600	1,123,800	1,123,800	21,200		
National Defense Sealift Fund										
TOA	1,201,400			613,200		1,201,400	613,400			200
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,201,400			613,200		1,201,400	613,400			200
TOTAL - RVLVNG. & MNGMNT. FUNDS										
TOA	2,325,200	16,600	1,123,800	1,808,200	16,600	2,325,200	1,737,200			129,000
FAJ										
Appropriations	2,325,200	16,600	1,123,800	1,808,200	16,600	2,325,200	1,737,200			129,000
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
TOA	1,009,548	1,015,818	512,450	470,660	529,175	366,260	425,270			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,009,548	1,015,818	512,450	470,660	529,175	366,260	425,270			

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Military Construction, Navy										
TOA	808,978	853,425	354,109	403,849	392,098	338,829	368,867			
FAJ										
Appropriations	808,978	853,425	354,109	403,849	392,098	338,829	368,867			
Military Construction, Air Force										
TOA	1,118,844	1,048,594	773,530	850,980	891,813	704,690	717,260			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,118,844	1,048,594	773,530	850,980	891,813	704,690	717,260			
Military Construction, Defensewide										
TOA	479,888	521,818	284,198	354,448	305,094	194,518	262,118			
FAJ										
Appropriations	479,888	521,818	284,198	354,448	305,094	194,518	262,118			
MIL. Con., Army National Guard										
TOA	48,700	199,411	142,827	208,672	159,058	145,331	209,639	181,972	182,939	987
FAJ										
Appropriations	48,700	199,411	142,827	208,672	159,058	145,331	209,639	181,972	182,939	987
MIL. Con., Air National Guard										
TOA	173,270	281,259	229,679	305,759	227,907	233,790	287,569	132,469	114,269	
FAJ										
Appropriations	173,270	281,259	229,679	305,759	227,907	233,790	287,569	132,469	114,269	
MIL. Con., Army Reserve										
TOA	31,500	31,500	36,905	34,850	8,217	42,150	42,150	3,360	10,850	7,300
FAJ										
Appropriations	31,500	31,500	36,905	34,850	8,217	42,150	42,150	3,360	10,850	7,300
MIL. Con., Naval Reserve										
TOA	37,772	37,772	15,715	17,200	9,801	17,200	15,400			
FAJ										
Appropriations	37,772	37,772	15,715	17,200	9,801	17,200	15,400			
MIL. Con., Air Force Reserve										
TOA	52,880	56,360	34,353	36,560	33,987	43,210	29,900			
FAJ										
Appropriations	52,880	56,360	34,353	36,560	33,987	43,210	29,900			

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.>	Amount Approp.>	Amount Approp.>
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part I										
TOA	627,400	627,400	627,400	627,400	596,243	627,400	602,400			
FAJ	(186,700)	(186,700)	(186,700)	(186,700)	(186,700)	(186,700)	(186,700)			
Appropriations	440,700	440,700	440,700	440,700	411,543	440,700	415,700			
Base Realignment & Closure Acct, Part II										
TOA	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,602,414	1,743,600	1,618,600			
FAJ										
Appropriations	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,743,600	1,602,414	1,743,600	1,618,600			
NATO Infrastructure										
TOA	280,300	180,300	280,300	119,100	179,088		119,100			
FAJ	(59,100)	(59,100)	(59,100)	(59,100)	(59,100)		(59,100)			
Appropriations	221,200	121,200	221,200	60,000	119,988		60,000			
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
TOA	6,500,660	6,577,077	6,034,464	5,173,098	4,736,665	4,454,976	4,698,301			
FAJ	(245,800)	(245,800)	(245,800)	(245,800)	(245,800)	(186,700)	(245,800)			
Appropriations	6,254,860	6,331,277	4,788,664	4,927,298	4,490,865	4,268,276	4,452,501			
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
TOA	175,600	211,400	196,000	160,040	206,298	127,340	160,122			82
FAJ										
Appropriations	175,600	211,400	196,000	160,040	206,298	127,340	160,122			82
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
TOA	1,360,360	1,375,360	1,360,360	1,363,570	1,349,933	1,360,360	1,363,570			
FAJ	127	127	127	127	127	127	127			
Appropriations	1,360,517	1,375,517	1,360,517	1,363,697	1,350,060	1,360,517	1,363,697			
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
TOA	377,770	339,640	491,750	365,434	336,244	359,410	378,434	7,664	664	
FAJ										
Appropriations	377,770	339,640	491,750	365,434	336,244	359,410	378,434	7,664	664	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Navy &										
TOA	696,177	696,177	696,177	661,246	662,956	696,177	661,246			
FAJ										
Appropriations	696,177	696,177	696,177	661,246	662,956	696,177	661,246			
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
TOA	322,110	332,954	346,610	263,766	329,624	261,766	263,766			
FAJ										
Appropriations	322,110	332,954	346,610	263,766	329,624	261,766	263,766			
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
TOA	942,266	937,266	942,266	927,941	918,662	942,266	927,941			
FAJ										
Appropriations	942,266	937,266	942,266	927,941	918,662	942,266	927,941			
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Defense										
TOA	28,400	28,400	28,400	28,400	28,116	28,400	28,400			
FAJ										
Appropriations	28,400	28,400	28,400	28,400	28,116	28,400	28,400			
Homeowners Asset Fund, Def.										
TOA	136,000	136,000	136,000	136,000	136,670	136,000	136,000			
FAJ	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)			
Appropriations	133,000	133,000	133,000	133,000	131,670	133,000	133,000			
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING										
TOA	4,060,735	4,059,249	4,221,615	3,946,417	3,966,503	3,833,791	3,941,469			
FAJ	(4,673)	(4,673)	(4,673)	(4,673)	(4,673)	(4,673)	(4,673)			
Appropriations	4,055,662	4,054,376	4,216,742	3,943,544	3,963,630	3,828,918	3,936,626			
DEFENSEWIDE CONTINGENCIES										
Savings from Reform of Davis-Bacon										
TOA	(110,000)	NA	NA	NA	(111,330)	(110,000)	(110,000)	NA		NA
FAJ										
Appropriations	(110,000)	NA	NA	NA	(111,330)	(110,000)	(110,000)	NA		NA

100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
TRUST FUNDS										
National Security Education Trust Fund										
TOA						35,000				
FAJ										
Appropriations						35,000				
TOA										
FAJ										
Appropriations										

TABLE 1. ADDITIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: SUMMARY

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE										
Oper. & Maint., Army										
Undistributed										
008 MILITARY POLICE TRAINING TRANSFER FROM A	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
007 ADMINISTRATION & ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES	0	0	0	0	0	8,471	8,471		8,471	8,471
080 NURSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	
100 MEMORIAL DAY & JULY 4TH CELEBRATIONS	0	0	0	0	900	900	900		900	900
108 PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO REAL PROP MNT	0	0	0	0	80,000	22,330	22,330		22,330	22,330
130 COMMUNICATIONS & ELEC DEPOT MAINT BACK	0	0	0	0	51,000	0	51,000		51,000	51,000
136 ROTC DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	0	0	0	0	750	0	750		750	750
138 JROTC	0	0	18,880	18,880	0	0	0	18,880		
280 POHAKULOA TRAINING	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
288 ARMY ENV POLICY INSTITUTE	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
300 MADIGON ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	0	0	0	150	0	0	23,270	150	23,270	23,120
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								22,340	108,221	108,871
Oper. & Maint., Navy										
Undistributed										
085 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(13,000)	(4,700)	(4,700)	(2,000)	(4,700)	(2,000)			2,700
088 GUANTANAMO BASE OPERATIONS	0	2,000	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
117 DISTRIBUTION COSTS FOR PEARL HARBOR MEX	0	0	0	0	100	100	100		100	100
118 CONTINUING EDUCATION ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	0	175	0	175		175	175
210 TRAVEL	0	0	(12,405)	(12,405)	0	(8,000)	(8,000)			4,405
235 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS	0	0	4,800	7,400	0	0	0	7,400		
250 NAVAL EARTH ORBIT ACTIVITIES	0	0	1,800	1,800	0	0	0	1,800		
280/320 JROTC/ROTC BUDGET AMENDMENT	8,474	0	8,488	8,488	0	8,474	8,474	12		
311 USS SANCTUARY	0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
312 CLASSIFIED WEAPONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,000		6,000	6,000
318 NAVAL OBSERVATORY	0	0	0	0	0	1,800	1,800		1,800	1,800
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								13,012	8,878	13,980
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps										
Undistributed										
025 TRAINING & OTH GEN PERS ACTIVITIES	0	0	(8,000)	(3,000)	0	(8,000)	(2,000)			1,000
085 REVISED INFLATION	0	0	(2,000)	(2,000)	0	(1,700)	(1,700)			300
100 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS	0	0	800	800	0	0	0	800		
108 MP TRAINING	0	0	480	480	0	0	0	480		
115 MC ENHANCEMENTS	0	0	14,800	14,800	0	0	0	14,800		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								15,960	0	1,300
Oper. & Maint., Air Force										
Undistributed										
050 TRAINING AND EDUCATION	0	(5,000)	(1,800)	(1,800)	(200)	(1,800)	(200)			1,800
095 CIVIL AIR PATROL	0	400	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331	
100/310 JUNIOR ROTC/JROTC BUDGET AMENDMENT	4,005	2,500	4,022	4,022	2,500	4,005	4,005	17		
105 COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUIS & LOGISTICS SYS	0	13,000	0	13,000	13,000	0	37,000	13,000	37,000	24,000
110 PACAF EXERCISES AND OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	(61,061)	6,139		6,139	6,139
155 WINDSOR SCHOOL RENOVATION	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
165 JCS EXERCISES	0	0	0	0	9,000	0	9,000		9,000	9,000
180 MILITARY FAMILY SERVICES	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
187 MANUAL DESALINATORS	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	2,000		2,000	2,000
235 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS	0	0	7,800	11,800	0	0	0	11,800		
295 NOAA	0	0	0	0	0	17,000	17,000		17,000	17,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								25,946	76,970	66,239
Oper. & Maint., Defensewide										
Undistributed										
050 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(2,000)	(400)	(400)	0	(400)	(200)			200
085 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	0	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	0	8,700		
085 PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT DEMO PROGRAM	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	
100 GD & RESERVE MEDICAL CARE PILOT PROGRAM	0	1,500	0	0	1,500	0	1,500		1,500	1,500
130 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	0	0	0	0	15,000	(33,000)	12,000		12,000	12,000
240 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	0	0	25,000	90,000	0	25,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	
245 PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS	0	0	58,000	58,000	0	0	0	58,000		
290 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS	0	0	4,000	8,000	0	0	0	8,000		
255 LEGACY RES. MANAGE PROG	0	0	40,000	40,000	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	
265 CINC INITIATIVES FUND	0	0	25,000	25,000	0	0	0	25,000		
305 MOBILITY ENHANCEMENTS	0	0	0	0	0	70,000	70,000		70,000	70,000
325 DEFENSE CONVERSION COMMISSION	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000
340 ACADEMY ATHLETIC PROGRAMS	0	0	0	0	0	350	350		350	350
345 DISASTER RELIEF PLANNING	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000
360 DISASTER RELIEF EFFORTS	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	80,000		80,000	80,000
360 NUCLEAR WASTE RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
365 ABUSED DEPENDENTS	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	1,000
370 CIVILIAN COMMUNITY CORPS	0	0	0	30,000	0	0	40,000	30,000	40,000	10,000
375 NATIONAL & COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM	0	0	0	30,000	0	0	0	30,000		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
380 ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT PLANNING PILOT PRC	0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
385 ASSISTANCE THROUGH IM	0	0	0	80,000	0	0	0	80,000		
390 TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	75,000		
395 TROOPS TO TEACHERS PROGRAM	0	0	0	65,000	0	0	0	65,000		
400 ENVIRONMENTAL DEMOLATION TRG SCHOLAR	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
405 COLLEGE GRANTS - ENV. RESTORATION TRG	0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
410 UPWARD REACH PROJECTS	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	5,000		
415 JOB BACK PROGRAM	0	0	0	4,000	0	0	0	4,000		
420 SERV. MEMBER OCCUPATION CONV. & TRG.	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	75,000		
425 PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENT	0	0	0	12,000	0	0	0	12,000		
428 DCAA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,700		8,700	8,700
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								586,700	290,560	188,790
Oper. & Maint., Army Reserve										
Undistributed										
005 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(5,300)	(1,800)	(1,800)	0	(1,800)	(800)			800
015 END STRENGTH RESTORATION	0	8,000	48,000	27,000	4,300	48,000	32,308	27,000	32,308	8,308
020 MISSION FORCES - RESTRUCTURED TRAINING	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
035 ARMY RESERVE CENTER - UNIV OF MIAMI	0	0	0	0	400	0	400		400	400
085 EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION	0	0	0	0	19,000	0	19,000		19,000	19,000
Oper. & Maint., Navy Reserve										
Undistributed										
005 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(2,000)	(800)	(800)	0	(800)	(400)			400
010 CRAFT OF OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM	0	2,000	0	3,200	0	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	
040 FORCE STRUCTURE ADJUSTMENT	0	0	0	0	17,000	33,000	13,384		13,384	13,384
090 C-130 SQUADRONS	0	0	0	0	8,000	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
075 GUARDRESERVE STRENGTH	0	0	33,000	18,800	0	0	0	18,800		
085 REVISED INFLATION	0	0	(1,000)	(1,000)	0	(800)	(800)			100
Oper. & Maint., Marine Corps Reserve										
Undistributed										
010/030 END STRENGTH/FORCE STRUCTURE	0	2,280	0	2,280	5,100	2,000	5,000	2,280	5,000	2,780
Oper. & Maint., Air Force Reserve										
Undistributed										
005 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(800)	(300)	(300)	0	(300)	(180)			180
045 WC-130 WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE	0	0	0	0	3,100	3,100	5,900		5,900	5,900
070 GUARDRESERVE STRENGTH	0	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,200	1,000	1,200	200
080 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS	0	0	700	1,100	0	0	0	1,100		
Oper. & Maint., Army National Guard										
Undistributed										
005 RECRUITING, ADVERTISING AND EXAMINING	0	(4,400)	(1,800)	(1,800)	0	(1,800)	(800)			800

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senats Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senats Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
World Cup - 1994										
001 WORLD CUP USA 1994	0	0	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	
Defense Health Program										
060 TRANSITION BENEFITS	0	0	78,000	78,000	0	3,814	0	78,000		
055 CHAMPUS	0	0	49,000	14,000	0	25,000	0	14,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								268,300	330,500	301,500
TOTAL - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE¹										
TOA	88,485,248	80,311,168	83,586,719	82,788,402	82,484,477	84,596,270	83,368,188			800,784
FAJ	(2,484,900)	(2,484,900)	(1,882,900)	(1,882,900)	0	(3,666,000)	(3,454,000)	812,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO O&M*								1,137,010	1,104,854	842,433
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
Defense Business Operations Fund										
001 DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND	1,123,800	1,123,800	1,123,800	1,145,000	1,123,800	1,123,800	1,123,800	21,200		
National Defense Sealift Fund										
001 PROGRAM TERMINATION	1,201,400	0	0	813,200	0	1,201,400	813,400			200
TOTAL - REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS										
TOA	2,325,200	16,800	1,123,800	1,808,200	16,800	2,325,200	1,737,200			129,000
Appropriations	2,325,200	16,800	1,123,800	1,808,200	16,800	2,325,200	1,737,200			129,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO REVOLVING FUNDS*								21,200	0	200

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
PROCUREMENT										
<i>Aircraft Procurement, Army</i>										
<i>Aircraft/Modification of Aircraft</i>										
040024 AHP/ARMED OH-58D	96,167	346,157	96,157	321,167	321,157	96,157	321,167	226,000	226,000	
<i>Modification of aircraft</i>										
015 AH-64 MODS	46,139	9,139	91,839	91,839	9,139	91,839	91,839	42,700	42,700	
<i>Spares and repair parts</i>										
030 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	101,012	101,012	95,962	95,962	101,012	99,467	99,467			2,526
<i>Missile Procurement, Army</i>										
<i>Other missiles</i>										
005 STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	9,459	9,459	9,459	9,459	94,459	9,459	36,000		26,541	26,541
011 MLRS ROCKET	2,199	110,900	110,999	110,999	94,300	110,999	110,999	109,729	109,729	
013 MLRS LAUNCHER	197,270	199,351	146,270	227,000	203,000	146,329	146,329	29,730		
015 ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	163,241	163,241	163,241	163,241	167,399	167,399	167,399		4,146	4,146
<i>Modification of missiles</i>										
021 TOW MODS	4,998	4,998	4,998	4,998	14,998	4,998	14,998		10,000	10,000
<i>Procurement of W&TCV, Army</i>										
<i>Tracked combat vehicles</i>										
002/07/020 BRADLEY/MODS/BASE SUSTAINMENT	138,390	227,590	293,390	263,390	339,390	299,390	263,390	126,000	126,000	
011/022 M1 ABRAMS TANK MOD/UPGRADE	25,202	25,202	95,202	147,902	25,202	122,400	196,202	122,400	161,000	38,900
012 MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-WTCV)	999	999	999	999	999	999	9,999		8,000	8,000
<i>Weapons and other combat vehicles</i>										
019/025 GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	0	24,000	24,000	24,000	0	26,000	26,000	24,000	26,000	1,000
<i>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</i>										
<i>Ammunition</i>										
002 CTG, 6.56MM, ALL TYPES	26,167	33,797	26,167	33,797	44,797	26,167	33,797	8,900	8,900	
003 CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	10,494	16,294	10,494	16,294	16,294	10,494	16,294	4,800	4,800	
006 CTG, .50-CAL, ALL TYPES	11,420	11,420	8,720	11,420	16,420	16,420	16,420		8,000	8,000
009 CTG, .50 CAL, SLAP	0	0	10,000	8,000	0	0	0	8,000		
016 CTG, MORTAR, 60MM, 1/10 PRACTICE	0	0	0	0	3,200	0	3,200		3,200	3,200
018 CTG, TANK, 105MM, TP-T, M490A1	0	0	0	0	29,300	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
019 CTG, TANK, 105MM, DS-TP, M724A1	0	0	0	0	29,500	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
030 PROJ. ARTY, 155MM, HE, M107	0	0	0	0	36,000	17,900	36,000		36,000	36,000
032 PROP CHG, 155MM, RED BAG, M209	37,613	37,613	37,613	37,613	149,613	37,613	80,000		22,487	22,487
040 MINE, VOLCANO, ATAP, M87	0	80,000	0	80,000	80,000	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
044 ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	10,030	10,030	33,030	33,030	36,430	10,030	10,030	23,000		
060 AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	18,182	14,082	18,182	18,182	14,082	14,082	24,082		8,900	8,900
<i>Ammunition production base support</i>										
062 CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	23,900	36,000	31,800	36,000	36,000	23,900	36,000	11,400	11,400	
070 ARMS INITIATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	200,000		200,000	200,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
Other Procurement, Army										
Tactical and support vehicles										
001 TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	11,787	11,787	41,787	41,787	11,787	41,787	41,787	30,000	30,000	
003 SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	0	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	
008 HEAVY EQUIPMENT TRANSPORTER SYS	0	40,000	0	40,000	40,000	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	
019 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	11,797	11,797	11,207	11,207	11,797	11,297	11,297			80
Communications and electronics equipment										
034 ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADD6)	27,297	69,297	27,297	99,297	99,297	24,297	64,297	32,000	29,000	
038 EAC COMMUNICATIONS	8,459	15,459	40,959	40,959	8,459	40,959	40,959	34,500	34,500	
081 ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	64,319	44,319	44,319	44,319	44,319	47,719	47,719			3,400
089 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	20,842	20,842	20,842	20,842	20,842	20,842	24,342		3,500	3,500
089 AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	147,799	147,799	147,799	147,799	159,799	141,799	160,799		3,000	3,000
090 RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RC/)	162,222	162,222	162,222	162,222	167,222	162,222	167,222		16,000	16,000
094 INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)	39,095	51,095	39,095	51,095	51,095	33,095	51,095	12,000	12,000	
097 INITIAL SPARES	66,911	66,911	66,405	66,405	66,911	62,911	66,911			452
101 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	3,610	3,610	3,610	3,610	11,710	3,610	11,710		8,100	8,100
Other support equipment										
113 TOWED ASSAULT BRIDGE	0	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
149 NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	8,000	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
174 LRV LANDING CRAFT	0	0	0	0	18,000	0	18,000		18,000	18,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								995,959	1,399,802	460,840
Aircraft Procurement, Navy										
Combat aircraft										
007 F/A-18 (FIGHTER) HORNET	1,868,301	1,868,301	1,079,301	1,146,800	1,670,801	1,079,301	1,200,000			64,400
017 AV-8B HARRIER	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
Other aircraft										
021 C-20 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
Modification of aircraft										
025 A-6 SERIES	196,598	196,598	196,598	196,598	196,598	196,598	196,598		10,000	10,000
031 F-14 SERIES	25,555	25,555	25,555	25,555	200,555	200,555	200,555		175,000	175,000
035 F-18 SERIES	30,021	30,021	30,021	30,021	30,021	80,021	70,021		40,000	40,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy										
Other missiles										
007 HARPOON/BLM	0	0	90,000	90,000	100,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	
016 AERIAL TARGETS	170,199	170,199	162,199	162,199	162,199	170,199	166,199			4,000
016 DRONES AND DECOYS	0	10,000	0	10,000	17,900	17,900	17,900	10,000	17,900	7,900
025 WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	28,971	28,971	41,471	41,471	28,971	41,471	41,471	12,500	12,500	
026 ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	77,199	77,199	119,199	57,199	77,199	149,199	149,199		72,000	92,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Torpedoes and related equipment										
030 VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC (AP)	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
Other Ordnance										
054 PRACTICE BOMBS	8,441	8,441	8,441	8,441	15,441	8,441	18,441		10,000	10,000
058 CWVS AMMUNITION	917	917	10,000	10,000	10,000	917	10,000	9,083	9,083	
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy										
Amphibious ships										
011 LHD-1	0	70,000	1,208,000	1,208,000	1,208,000	1,080,000	308,000	1,208,000	308,000	
012 LSD-41 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0	0	0	300,000	0	300,000		300,000	300,000
Auxiliaries, craft, and prior-year progr										
014 AOE	0	0	0	0	300,000	0	300,000		300,000	300,000
Other Procurement, Navy										
Ships support equipment										
037 STANDARD BOATS	18,228	18,228	23,228	23,228	23,498	23,288	23,288	8,000	8,030	30
Communications and electronics equipment										
044 AN/SPS-48	9,927	9,927	9,927	9,927	81,427	9,927	81,427		81,800	81,800
081 NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	84,008	84,008	84,008	84,008	88,708	80,883	84,000		9,982	9,982
Aviation support equipment										
182 WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	81,484	81,484	81,484	81,484	81,484	81,484	82,784		11,310	11,310
Ordnance support equipment										
181 AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	184,317	184,317	184,317	184,317	188,317	184,317	188,317		8,000	8,000
Civil engineering support equipment										
210 AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	1,714	1,714	1,714	1,714	23,714	1,714	23,714		22,000	22,000
220 NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	8,000	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
Supply support equipment										
224 SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	118,830	78,883	118,830	78,748	100,830	78,747	78,747			1
Undistributed										
280 INFLATION ADJUSTMENT	0	0	0	(41,340)	0	0	(34,000)			7,340
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								1,331,883	1,813,918	1,188,073
Procurement, Marine Corps										
Ammunition										
002 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	8,333	12,333	8,333	12,333	12,333	8,333	9,000	7,000	3,887	
018 120MM TPCSDS-T M888	0	0	4,000	4,000	0	0	0	4,000		
017 120MM TP-T M831	0	0	8,000	8,000	0	0	0	8,000		
022 100MM M884 PROJ BASEBURNER	0	0	81,200	81,200	0	0	81,200	81,200	81,200	
Weapons and combat vehicles										
043 MLRS	0	264,700	0	0	182,200	0	88,800		88,800	88,800
044 MODIFICATION HTS (TRND VEH)	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,180	18,180	18,180		18,000	18,000
048 LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
Communications and electronics equipment										
059085 MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT	0	0	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
080 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	18,387	41,387	28,387	40,387	41,387	28,387	41,387	22,000	23,000	1,000
087 NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	20,143	20,143	30,143	30,143	30,143	30,143	30,143	10,000	10,000	
Support vehicles										
098 LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM	0	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	
Engineer and other equipment										
101 ARMORED COMBAT EXCAVATOR (ACE)	28,011	88,011	28,011	28,011	83,700	28,011	83,700		36,888	36,888
117 TRAINING DEVICES	4,580	4,580	4,580	4,580	4,580	8,580	8,580		4,000	4,000
124 AUTOMATIC BUILDING MACHINES	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	2,500		2,500	2,500
125 MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	0	0	11,500	11,800	0	11,500	8,000	11,800	8,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								182,700	280,856	134,888
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force										
Combat aircraft										
008 F-16 C/D ADV PROC (CY)	0	88,400	0	0	88,400	0	88,400		88,400	88,400
Airlift aircraft										
008 C-17 ADV PROC (CY)	205,805	185,805	205,805	290,805	195,805	290,805	290,805	45,300	45,300	
011 HC-130H	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000		100,000	100,000
Other aircraft										
015 CIVIL AIR PATROL AC	1,884	2,700	1,884	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	718	718	
018 E-88	310,572	310,572	488,772	811,772	310,572	811,772	811,772	201,200	201,200	
017 E-88 ADV PROC (CY)	80,858	80,858	102,858	78,118	38,058	78,118	78,118	28,458	28,458	
Modification of Inservice aircraft										
037 C-141	14,873	14,873	40,873	40,873	14,873	40,873	40,873	28,000	28,000	
038 T-38	5,537	5,537	5,537	5,537	30,537	30,537	30,537		25,000	25,000
047 C-135	826,874	826,874	826,874	438,800	826,874	382,874	826,874			87,174
Missile Procurement, Air Force										
Ballistic missiles										
004 PEACEKEEPER (M-J)	0	0	0	0	0	27,800	27,800		27,800	27,800
Other missiles										
003 HAVE NAP	0	24,000	0	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	
005 ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	0	0	34,800	127,100	0	127,100	127,100	127,100	127,100	
012 AGM-88A HARM	218,400	218,400	104,700	104,700	218,400	104,700	218,400			113,700
013 TARGET DRONES	80,883	72,883	72,883	72,883	72,883	72,883	88,883	12,000	6,000	
Other Procurement, Air Force										
Munitions and associated equipment										
005 20MM COMBAT	0	0	21,200	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	
008 20MM TRAINING	3,807	3,807	3,807	3,807	17,000	3,807	10,300		6,483	6,483
011 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	2,542	2,542	857	857	757	757	757			100

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
012 CBU-87 (COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITIONS)	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	80,000		80,000	80,000
034 M-208 CARTRIDGE FLARE	0	0	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	3,000		
035 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	6,607	6,607	6,277	6,277	6,607	6,607	6,607			330
Vehicular equipment										
069 CAP VEHICLES	0	825	800	825	825	825	825	825	825	
079 TRUCK CRASH P-23	22,116	22,116	0	0	0	22,116	22,116			22,116
Electronics and telecommunications equip										
099 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,859	1,859	1,759	1,759	1,859	1,859	1,859			100
138 AFMC CALLS	0	0	0	0	18,000	0	9,000		9,000	9,000
140 TELEPHONE EXCHANGE	80,490	80,490	81,390	73,390	73,390	77,933	77,933			4,543
145 MILSTAR	211,470	211,470	203,470	82,000	211,470	20,890	88,400			6,400
155 CAP COM & ELECT	0	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	
Other base maintenance and support equip										
187 INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTMITY	72,878	75,234	91,878	88,178	68,878	76,778	73,742	13,500	1,088	
182 NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	8,000	0	8,000		8,000	8,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								480,888	773,658	638,898
Procurement, Defensewide										
Major equipment										
002 MOTOR VEHICLES	379	379	69	69	379	224	224			155
007 SUPERCOMPUTERS	0	0	0	0	80,000	0	46,000		46,000	46,000
019 MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM	0	0	55,000	56,000	0	86,000	46,000	86,000	46,000	
020 DEFENSE MODELING/SIMULATION OFFICE	0	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
037 TACTICAL SIGINT/ELINT FUND	0	0	188,982	98,982	0	0	86,982	86,982	86,982	
038 OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	7,238	7,238	6,838	6,838	7,238	7,238	7,238			600
039 PATRIOT	82,500	82,500	82,500	78,200	82,500	78,200	78,200	12,700	12,700	
Special Operations Command										
043 C-130 MODIFICATIONS	110,560	110,560	110,560	110,560	181,560	110,560	133,880		23,000	23,000
044 HH-63 MODIFICATIONS	7,319	7,319	7,319	7,319	7,846	7,319	7,846		326	326
045 OTHER AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS	0	0	0	0	7,674	0	3,000		3,000	3,000
058 COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	81,887	81,887	81,887	81,887	88,187	81,887	88,187		7,600	7,600
060 SOP INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	34,288	42,288	19,288	42,288	32,838	19,288	46,288	8,000	11,000	3,000
064 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	14,885	14,885	6,885	6,885	10,382	8,762	10,382			3,487
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								142,862	214,488	86,088

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
National Guard & Reserve Equipment										
Reserve Equipment										
-001 ARMY RESERVE										
03 HEMTT TRUCK	0	7,500	0	7,500	7,300	0	7,500	7,500	7,500	
05 EXTERNAL AUX. FUEL TANKS	0	0	0	0	3,000	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000
08 C-12J	0	0	42,000	0	0	42,300	42,300		42,300	42,300
76 NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	40,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
-002 NAVY RESERVE										
10 C-130H AIRCRAFT	0	80,000	0	80,000	80,000	34,100	0	80,000		
11 C-130T AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	0	0	88,000		88,000	88,000
13 P-3 UPGRADES	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
14 MH-53 HELICOPTERS	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
15 LAMPS MK-1 ASW UPGRADE	0	38,000	0	38,000	88,000	0	38,000	38,000	35,000	
16 MILV VANS	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
17 FFG-7 DISPLAY SYSTEMS	0	0	0	0	8,750	0	8,750		8,750	8,750
-003 MARINE CORPS RESERVE										
18 KC-130T AIRCRAFT	0	70,000	0	0	70,000	0	70,000		70,000	70,000
19 AH-1W COBRA AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	128,000	0	128,000		128,000	128,000
20 NIGHT VISION	0	9,000	0	9,000	9,000	0	9,000	9,000	9,000	
88 C-20 AIRCRAFT	0	0	25,000	0	0	28,000	27,000		27,000	27,000
-004 AIR FORCE RESERVE										
21 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	15,000	0	10,000	0	14,750	0	10,000		
22 C-130 AIRCRAFT	0	80,000	0	80,000	100,000	0	120,000	80,000	120,000	70,000
71 MH-60G HELICOPTER	0	0	0	0	4,800	0	4,800		4,800	4,800
National Guard Equipment										
-005 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD										
23 MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,700		80,700	80,700
26 MB ACE	0	38,000	0	38,000	38,000	0	25,000	28,000	25,000	
28 MEDIUM TACTICAL TRUCK BLEP	0	80,000	18,000	80,000	80,000	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
30 FIVE TON TRUCKS	0	0	0	0	80,000	0	30,000		30,000	30,000
31 C-23 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	80,000	80,000	80,000		80,000	80,000
32 C-23 SIMULATOR	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	2,000
33 FAMILY OF M113 VEHICLES	0	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	
38 CH-47D HELICOPTER	0	0	0	0	0	78,000	78,000		78,000	78,000
41 AH-1 MOD8 C-NITE	0	0	0	0	18,000	0	18,000		18,000	18,000
42 EXTERNAL AUX. FUEL TANKS	0	0	0	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	
43 M-815/816 TRUCKS	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
44 C-212 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	87,900	0	87,900		87,900	87,900
48 C-28 AIRCRAFT	0	0	23,000	0	23,000	0	23,000		23,000	23,000
64 SIMULATORS/TRAINING DEVICES	0	0	20,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
70 FIRE ARMS TRAINING SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	700	700		700	700
72 ELECTRONIC TANDEM NETWORK	0	0	0	0	0	790	790		790	790

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
73 UH-60 HELICOPTER	0	0	0	0	0	56,000	56,000		56,000	56,000
74 F-160 AIRCRAFT	0	0	12,000	0	0	0	16,000		16,000	16,000
76 NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	
-006 AIR NATIONAL GUARD										
80 F-15 MSIP	0	15,000	0	0	0	0	10,000		10,000	10,000
81 F-15/F-16 ENGINE UPGRADES	0	40,000	0	10,000	0	0	20,000	10,000	20,000	10,000
82 F-15 ALE-40	0	0	0	0	1,200	0	1,200		1,200	1,200
84 MCE/TASCI	0	80,000	0	80,000	71,000	0	71,000	80,000	71,000	21,000
86 C-130 AIRCRAFT	0	50,000	228,100	228,100	200,000	308,800	308,800	228,100	308,800	78,500
88 C-26 AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0	23,000	0	23,000		23,000	23,000
89 STABASE	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
-007 NATIONAL GD & RESERVE COMPONENTS										
91 OPERATIONAL SPT/MEDEVAC AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	80,000	0	0	0	80,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								685,800	1,867,200	1,043,800
Chem Agents & Munitions Destruction, Def										
001 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	0	2,800	6,800		4,000	4,000
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								0	4,000	4,000
TOTAL - PROCUREMENT										
TOA	88,290,898	88,907,812	83,881,883	84,948,282	84,237,388	82,612,987	85,884,831			948,248
FAJ	0	0	0	0	1,900,000	0	0			
Appropriations	88,290,898	88,907,812	83,881,883	84,948,282	86,137,388	82,612,987	85,884,831			948,248
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO PROCUREMENT*								3,788,100	6,713,718	3,438,828

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: PROCUREMENT

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION											
RD&E, Army											
Technology base											
001 IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEAR	080110	6,697	6,697	6,697	6,697	12,404	12,404	12,404		5,707	5,707
002 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	186,645	146,645	186,145	218,177	218,549	213,463	213,463	51,532	46,638	
005 MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	080210	13,983	13,983	17,983	17,983	13,983	17,983	17,983	4,000	4,000	
006 ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY AND FUZING TECH	080212	19,204	19,204	19,204	19,204	29,204	19,204	29,204		10,000	10,000
007 SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT	080212	14,551	14,551	24,551	17,551	14,551	24,551	24,551	3,000	10,000	7,000
011 MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	080230	33,164	33,164	33,164	33,164	33,164	33,164	41,764		8,600	8,600
013 MODELING AND SIMULATION		0	4,550	3,000	3,500	5,000	3,000	5,000	3,500	5,000	1,500
014 COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLI	080260	46,992	84,992	55,992	84,992	89,992	46,992	89,992	36,000	14,000	
019 ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	080270	18,011	22,981	18,011	21,361	22,981	21,361	21,661	3,350	3,650	300
020 NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	080270	35,708	35,708	40,708	40,708	42,708	29,708	34,708	5,000		
022 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	080272	18,447	42,447	42,447	51,947	67,447	23,947	66,347	33,500	47,900	14,400
028 LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	080278	36,241	36,241	36,241	36,241	4,241	36,241	36,241		2,000	2,000
029 MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY		0	0	2,000	109,764	149,820	96,455	96,455	109,764	96,455	
197 AKAMAJ		0	0	0	0	0	7,000	7,100		7,100	7,100
Advanced technology development											
032 TRACTOR PULL		25,862	16,862	16,782	16,782	16,862	16,862	16,862			100
033 LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080300	11,289	11,289	16,289	11,289	11,289	11,289	19,089		7,800	7,800
034 MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	36,172	55,462	250,922	255,437	36,172	255,437	218,265
035 AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY		38,532	40,532	42,532	40,532	40,532	40,532	40,532	2,000	2,000	
036 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG		49,074	62,474	57,474	67,474	81,974	67,474	62,474	18,400	13,400	
043 TRACTOR RED		969	2,089	7,089	2,089	2,089	2,089	2,089	1,100	1,100	
044 MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES ADVANCED TEC	080310	3,177	3,177	6,677	6,677	3,177	6,677	6,677	3,500	3,500	
045 AIDS RESEARCH		0	0	0	23,247	36,247	56,891	56,891	23,247	56,891	33,644
046 GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECI	080323	50,000	25,000	50,000	25,000	50,000	23,000	36,500			11,500
055 NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY		28,436	32,436	46,436	46,436	32,436	46,436	26,436	18,000		
Tactical programs											
065 TRACTOR TREAD	080301	9,199	12,199	22,199	12,199	12,199	12,199	12,199	3,000	3,000	
075 ARTILLERY PROPELLENT DEVELOPMENT	080364	7,057	7,057	7,057	7,057	7,057	17,057	17,057		10,000	10,000
079 TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	080373	14,937	7,337	14,937	7,337	14,937	14,937	14,937			7,600
081 SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RAI	080374	214	214	5,214	5,214	214	5,214	5,214	5,000	5,000	
082 SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	080374	7,921	7,921	13,921	13,921	7,921	13,921	13,921	6,000	6,000	
083 ADV AUTOMOTIVE DEVELOPMENT FOR ASM		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	0		10,000	
087 AVIATION - ADV DEV	080380	14,029	17,229	14,029	17,229	17,229	14,029	17,229	3,200	3,200	
092 MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV		0	0	0	29,042	32,099	29,042	29,042	29,042	29,042	
098 ARMED, DEPLOYABLE CH-98D		0	0	0	0	8,100	0	8,100		8,100	8,100
101 ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	080432	50,754	50,754	50,754	50,754	40,754	50,754	57,054		6,300	6,300
105 JAVELIN (AAWS-M)	080481	91,440	91,440	101,440	101,440	101,440	101,440	101,440	10,000	10,000	
107 HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	080482	961	1,961	961	1,961	1,961	961	1,961	1,000	1,000	
108 ADVANCED TANK CANNON (ATAC)	080483	41,526	0	10,026	17,000	31,526	27,026	27,026			10,026
114 COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMEN	080471	9,463	9,463	27,463	27,463	9,463	27,463	27,463	18,000	18,000	
118 TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV	080474	20,036	20,036	20,036	27,636	20,036	20,036	20,036	7,800		
120 AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	080474	8,461	17,461	8,461	17,461	17,461	8,461	17,461	9,000	9,000	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
123 TRACTOR JEWEL	080476	74,208	74,208	98,208	98,208	0	98,208	98,208	22,000	22,000	
126 JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR	080477	31,213	31,213	66,213	51,213	31,213	66,213	66,213	20,000	35,000	15,000
132 MEDICAL MATERIAL/MED BIOLOGICAL DEF EQUI		0	0	0	20,209	25,937	20,209	20,209	20,209	20,209	
136 SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - EA	080481	63,037	63,037	63,037	92,037	63,037	98,000	98,000	29,000	34,963	5,963
137 LONGBOW - ENG DEV	080481	281,802	281,802	308,802	308,802	308,802	0	308,802	25,000	25,000	
144 COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	020373	22,558	81,158	49,358	18,300	81,158	13,282	38,300		15,742	20,000
147 AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVE	020374	4,821	7,821	7,821	7,821	7,821	7,821	7,821	3,000	3,000	
149 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		0	0	0	0	29,000	0	29,000		29,000	29,000
150 MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMEN	020380	58,315	58,315	58,315	58,315	68,315	67,315	71,815		15,500	15,500
151 OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PRO	020380	16,429	18,429	16,429	18,429	18,429	30,029	30,029	2,000	13,800	11,800
Defensewide Mission Support											
170 DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	080580	17,852	17,852	27,852	27,852	27,852	27,852	27,852	10,000	10,000	
175 PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	080580	86,420	86,420	86,420	89,915	89,915	89,915	89,915	3,495	3,495	
181 PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	080587	7,547	7,547	7,547	7,547	11,747	7,547	11,747		4,200	4,200
186 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH A)	080589	8,661	8,661	8,661	14,113	14,531	14,113	14,113	5,452	5,452	
188 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	41,203	0	49,000	49,262	0	34,473	49,000	34,473	
191 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE RDT&E		0	0	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
200 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS		0	0	0	2,300	0	0	0	2,300		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									872,363	1,008,654	472,205
RDT&E, Navy											
Technology base											
001 IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LABORATORY RESEAR	080115	18,180	18,180	18,180	18,180	17,425	17,425	17,425		1,245	1,245
002 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080115	457,369	412,369	407,369	412,369	417,053	429,632	429,632			17,443
003 ANTI-AIR WARFARE/ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE	080211	86,931	71,931	78,931	71,931	71,931	66,060	72,699			798
004 SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY	080212	26,113	26,113	21,113	26,113	50,113	30,113	50,113		24,000	24,000
005 AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	080212	25,821	25,821	20,821	20,821	20,821	25,307	25,638			4,815
006 MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	080213	21,019	21,019	19,019	19,019	21,019	19,019	21,019			2,000
007 COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS	080223	22,627	22,627	17,627	17,627	17,627	20,480	20,480			2,853
008 MISSION SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	080223	36,118	33,618	36,118	40,448	45,084	34,285	42,748	4,300	6,630	2,300
009 SYSTEMS SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY	080223	93,810	98,810	78,810	78,810	102,310	80,713	87,611		3,801	18,801
011 UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE & WEAPONS TECH	080231	148,194	131,194	148,194	131,194	131,194	122,368	138,194			7,000
013 SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	080232	21,478	18,478	21,478	17,178	16,478	17,178	17,891			712
Advanced technology development											
017 AIR SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVEL	080321	20,079	30,156	20,079	30,156	30,156	20,079	30,156	10,077	10,077	
021 UNDERSEA SUPERIORITY TECHNOLOGY DEMO	080335	100,000	50,000	88,000	58,000	50,000	65,000	65,000			7,000
024 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	080370	4,250	4,250	4,250	16,899	43,450	16,899	47,899	12,448	43,848	31,200
026 GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMO	080371	18,551	18,551	18,551	18,551	40,551	26,051	30,051		13,500	13,500
028 ADVANCED ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE TECH	080374	49,898	49,898	49,898	49,898	67,898	49,898	67,898		18,000	18,000
029 SHALLOW WATER MCM DEMOS	080378	10,625	10,625	10,625	14,825	10,625	14,825	10,625	4,200		
030 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	080379	84,662	69,662	88,662	74,662	69,662	89,262	89,262		4,800	14,800
031 C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	080379	2,110	2,110	2,110	2,110	25,810	2,110	25,810		23,700	23,700

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Item #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senato Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senato Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
Tactical programs											
048 T-45 TRAINING SYSTEM	080320	32,028	32,028	57,028	57,028	32,028	57,028	52,028	25,000	20,000	
049 AIR CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	080321	9,697	13,697	9,697	13,697	19,697	9,697	19,697	4,000	10,000	6,000
061 SEALIFT TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		0	0	13,400	13,400	0	13,400	13,400	13,400	13,400	
072 RETRACT JUNIPER	080353	48,725	48,725	48,725	48,725	48,725	63,725	63,725	24,900	15,000	
075 ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	080356	154,967	94,967	154,967	132,767	98,967	132,767	134,767			2,000
082 JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS	080358	108,783	108,783	152,783	152,783	0	152,783	152,783	48,000	48,000	
084 CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	080360	62,317	52,317	62,317	52,317	52,317	62,317	62,317			10,000
103 LIGHTWEIGHT 155MM HOWIZER		0	0	13,100	13,100	0	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100	
112 B-SHIP SELF DEFENSE	080373	180,408	180,408	188,408	178,008	193,408	207,058	222,408	17,800	62,000	44,400
119 LAMPS	080421	31,840	31,840	31,840	31,840	36,340	31,840	36,340		4,500	4,500
120 HELICOPTER DEVELOPMENT	080421	15,117	5,415	5,415	15,117	10,415	15,117	20,117		5,000	5,000
121 AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	080421	11,053	11,053	11,053	11,053	12,553	11,053	12,553		1,500	1,500
130 V-72A		0	755,000	755,000	755,000	755,000	0	755,000	755,000	755,000	
131 AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	080426	18,246	21,946	18,246	21,946	21,946	18,246	21,946	3,700	3,700	
134 EW DEVELOPMENT	080427	138,903	111,903	138,903	126,227	111,903	126,227	134,041			7,814
137 AEGIS COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	080430	89,902	89,902	81,008	89,902	99,902	70,408	109,302		18,400	18,400
139 CLOSE-IN WEAPON SYSTEM (PHALANX)	080436	9,013	9,013	9,013	9,013	9,013	14,013	14,013		6,000	5,000
143 5" ROLLING AIRFRAME MISSILE		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
146 NON-ACOUSTIC MINE DETECTION		0	0	0	22,800	27,000	0	13,500	22,800		13,500
156 SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM		0	0	0	0	55,200	55,200	55,200		55,200	55,200
158 SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS		0	0	0	0	95,200	95,200	95,200		95,200	95,200
169 JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	080461	26,541	11,541	26,541	21,541	11,541	26,541	26,541			5,000
171 MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES - ENG DEV		0	14,700	14,700	14,700	14,700	0	14,700	14,700	14,700	
178 SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES	080471	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	8,100	3,100	8,100		5,000	5,000
184 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENTS		0	0	0	4,113	4,160	4,113	4,113	4,113	4,113	
186 FIXED DISTRIBUTED SYSTEM - ENG	080478	154,486	80,000	154,486	154,486	154,486	168,486	168,486		14,000	14,000
182 ADVANCED DEPLOYABLE SYSTEM		0	0	14,000	14,000	0	0	0	14,000		
194 SURFACE COMBATANT ORDNANCE - TOMAHAWK	020422	25,450	30,450	40,450	30,450	30,450	25,450	28,450	5,000	3,000	
198 B-SHIP-TOWED ARRAY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS	020431	21,381	21,381	21,381	21,381	21,381	23,581	23,581		2,200	2,200
202 F-14 UPGRADE	020666	101,226	101,226	101,226	101,226	151,226	101,226	126,226		25,000	25,000
208 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT INF	020662	20,445	20,445	20,445	20,445	20,445	48,845	35,845		15,400	15,400
208 MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS	020662	22,838	24,838	25,838	25,838	25,838	25,838	25,838	3,000	3,000	
210 LAV-AD		0	0	9,400	9,400	0	0	0	9,400		
270 MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		0	0	12,000	12,000	0	0	0	12,000		
271 RAAM		0	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
Intelligence and communications											
280 LASER COMMUNICATIONS		0	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	15,000		15,000	15,000
Defense-wide Mission Support											
227 TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	080425	40,036	40,036	30,036	30,036	30,036	33,236	40,036			10,000
230 STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	080515	5,680	5,680	5,680	5,791	5,790	2,951	2,951	111		
235 TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	080560	14,619	14,619	14,619	14,619	9,619	14,619	14,619			3,000
238 RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEM	080568	54,357	54,357	54,357	62,347	62,347	62,347	62,347	7,990	7,990	
239 RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	080568	15,500	15,500	15,500	18,638	19,358	18,638	18,638	3,138	3,138	
240 RDT&E B-SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	080568	108,555	103,555	108,555	103,555	98,355	108,555	108,555			5,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
241 TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	080588	353,228	335,228	353,228	335,228	335,228	345,700	345,700			10,474
249 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	80,384	0	119,250	138,250	0	104,999	119,250	104,999	
250 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE ROT&E		0	0	0	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000	
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									1,202,258	1,545,243	956,025
ROT&E, Air Force											
Technology base											
005 AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	080220	73,928	68,928	71,928	68,928	73,928	68,417	71,117			2,189
008 HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	080220	68,199	58,199	61,704	61,704	68,199	64,034	64,034			2,330
011 ROCKET PROPULSION AND ASTRONAUTICS TECH	080230	42,180	37,180	39,180	37,180	32,180	40,400	37,800			700
012 ADVANCED WEAPONS	080280	43,493	33,493	43,493	38,493	43,493	48,493	48,493		5,000	10,000
250 SPACE NUCLEAR PROPULSION		0	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	10,000		
Advanced technology development											
020 AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	080320	18,329	18,329	13,329	13,329	18,329	18,329	18,329			3,000
024 CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION	080323	18,049	19,149	18,049	19,149	18,049	18,049	19,149	1,100	1,100	
034 ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	080340	38,205	38,205	28,205	28,205	25,205	33,205	29,000			2,785
038 ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	080380	54,837	33,041	54,837	33,041	54,837	54,837	68,437		11,600	11,600
042 ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	080372	11,138	11,138	11,138	11,138	11,138	11,138	17,138		6,000	6,000
Strategic programs											
006 B-52 SQUADRONS	010111	13,300	28,300	13,300	28,300	28,300	13,300	22,000	15,000	8,700	
085 SPACETRACK	030591	53,100	38,200	82,600	103,500	10,200	83,800	73,400	60,400	20,300	
Tactical programs											
113 EW DEVELOPMENT	080427	158,500	108,000	88,900	158,500	158,500	88,900	184,500		6,000	6,000
116 CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	080460	15,200	16,500	15,200	16,500	16,500	15,200	16,500	1,300	1,300	
122 AEROMEDICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	080470	4,200	4,200	4,200	6,953	6,953	6,953	6,953	2,753	2,753	
128 COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECH	080474	8,900	8,900	8,900	8,900	21,400	12,400	21,400		12,500	12,500
135 F-15A/B/C/D SQUADRONS	020713	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	33,300	33,300		30,000	30,000
147 FOLLOW-ON TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SYS	020721	85,800	91,100	15,300	62,800	72,200	55,800	62,800	7,000	7,000	
171 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		0	0	3,300	3,300	(248,800)	22,000	8,000	3,300	6,000	4,700
Defensewide Mission Support											
203 RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY		0	0	0	9,480	9,480	9,480	9,480	9,480	9,480	
207 TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	080580	423,828	398,828	423,828	398,828	411,328	401,513	401,513			2,887
217 MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES	030511	41,800	41,800	41,800	41,800	41,800	51,800	51,800		10,000	10,000
219 UPPER STAGE SPACE VEHICLES	030513	42,700	4,148	14,148	4,148	125,700	13,848	57,348		14,848	53,200
230 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	103,500	0	115,000	115,000	0	102,885	115,000	102,885	
232 DOMESTIC ACTIVITIES		0	17,500	0	17,500	17,500	0	17,500	17,500	17,500	
233 EXCIMER LASER		0	0	0	0	30,000	20,000	20,000		20,000	20,000
235 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE ROT&E		0	0	0	42,502	42,502	42,502	42,502	42,502	42,502	
245 EXCESSIVE PERSONNEL COSTS		0	0	0	(38,348)	0	(38,348)	(20,000)			38,348
260 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BENEFITS		0	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	1,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									278,315	338,898	217,047

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
RD&E, Defensewide											
Technology base											
001	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	080110	128,078	118,078	128,078	118,078	120,378	108,578	118,078		2,000
002	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH		0	8,275	0	4,323	2,323	4,323	4,323	4,323	
003	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	080110	89,908	181,909	108,909	186,909	161,909	208,359	325,359	89,000	136,400
008	US-JAPAN MANAGEMENT TRAINING		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	
007	SUPERCONDUCTIVE MAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE		0	50,000	0	0	50,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000
008	COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	080222	8,990	8,990	10,000	8,990	8,990	8,990	3,000	3,000	
010	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER		0	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
012	STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY	080230	377,100	307,100	377,100	397,100	397,100	262,027	372,827	20,000	
014	PARTICLE BEAM TECHNOLOGY		0	0	8,000	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000
015	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOG		0	75,000	0	0	100,000	0	180,000	180,000	180,000
016	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	080271	71,800	211,800	131,800	183,800	251,800	122,800	284,800	81,800	101,000
017	POST LAUNCH DESTRICT TECHNOLOGY		0	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	0	5,000	15,000	5,000
018	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	080271	408,957	399,957	372,957	372,957	382,957	382,804	389,757		28,800
137	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERS		0	0	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	
138	ADVANCED MATERIALS PARTNERSHIPS		0	0	30,000	30,000	0	0	30,000	30,000	
Advanced technology development											
024	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEV	080322	18,978	18,978	22,000	22,000	18,978	18,978	18,978	3,024	
-025	MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY	080322									
10	EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAJOR INNOV	080322	270,887	241,148	268,887	250,528	250,528	232,087	268,287		17,738
20	ELECTRIC VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY		0	0	0	0	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
30	NATURAL GAS VEHICLES		0	0	0	0	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
027	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM		0	0	200,000	200,000	0	0	200,000	200,000	
-028	DUAL USE PARTNERSHIPS										
10	DUAL USE CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIP		0	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
20	COMMERCIAL-MILITARY INTEGRATION PARTNERS		0	0	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
30	DUAL USE EXTENSION ASST PROGRAM		0	0	200,000	200,000	0	100,000	200,000	100,000	100,000
40	REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY ALLIANCES		0	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
50	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		0	28,000	0	0	29,000	0	85,000	85,000	85,000
60	ADVANCED MANUFACTURING PARTNERSHIPS		0	0	0	25,000	0	30,000	25,000	30,000	5,000
035	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM		0	0	0	15,500	200,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
036	EICHER LASER TECHNOLOGY		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	0	10,000		
038	COMPUTER AIDED LOGISTICS SUPPORT	080373	11,218	11,218	18,218	11,218	18,218	11,218	18,218	5,000	5,000
040	BALANCED TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE	080373	172,340	85,340	178,340	190,000	162,540	150,540			540
041	COOPERATIVE DODVA MEDICAL RESEARCH		0	20,000	0	20,000	30,000	0	30,000	20,000	10,000
-042	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	080373									
10	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	080373	295,400	180,400	122,000	127,000	180,400	121,800	213,775		88,775
20	FOCUS HOPE		0	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
043	CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE	080373	8,019	34,019	18,519	34,019	34,019	9,019	34,019	25,000	25,000
044	SEMATECH		0	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	100,000
048	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOP	118040	2,940	3,940	2,940	3,940	2,940	2,940	3,940	1,000	1,000
-140	DEFENSE ADVANCED MANUFACTURING TECH PART										
10	DEFENSE ADVANCED MANUFACTURING TECH PART		0	0	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	25,000	20,000	5,000

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: RDT&E
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Elem. #	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
20 MANUFACTURING EDUCATION PROGRAM		0	0	25,000	25,000	0	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	
30 MFG MANAGERS IN THE CLASSROOM		0	0	5,000	5,000	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	
40 MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PROGRAM		0	0	100,000	100,000	0	0	100,000	100,000	100,000	
141 NATIONAL GUARD SIMNET CENTER		0	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
145 CENTER FOR INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS		0	0	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	5,000		
148 UUV TECHNOLOGY		0	0	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	5,000		
150 ELECTRONIC MODULE TECHNOLOGY		0	0	75,000	75,000	0	0	0	75,000		
151 HIGH DEFINITION DISPLAY SYSTEMS		0	0	100,000	100,000	0	0	0	100,000		
152 ADVANCED LITHOGRAPHY		0	0	75,000	75,000	0	0	0	75,000		
153 HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION		0	0	43,000	20,000	0	43,000	0	20,000		
156 CENTER FOR DEFENSE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		0	0	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000		
157 NATIONAL GUARD/DARPA SIMULATION		0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000		20,000	20,000
Tactical programs											
063 NON-ACOUSTIC ASW	060371	30,000	30,000	45,000	45,000	55,000	30,000	46,000	15,000	16,000	1,000
065 MOBILE OFFSHORE BASE ANALYSIS		0	0	0	0	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	
072 GENERAL SUPPORT FOR BOLIC		0	0	2,000	1,500	0	0	0	1,500		
073 JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM	030514	129,056	144,056	60,856	144,056	147,056	136,256	136,256	15,000	10,200	
077 SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	116040	11,667	26,667	11,667	26,667	26,667	11,667	26,667	17,000	17,000	
078 SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	116040	73,661	21,661	73,661	42,461	73,161	73,661	73,661			31,200
Intelligence and communications											
060 DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITY	030515	55,835	55,835	55,835	55,835	55,835	55,835	63,335		7,500	7,500
067 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		0	0	0	0	54,130	36,600	63,066		63,066	63,066
Defensewide Mission Support											
102 DEFENSE MODELING/SIMULATION OFFICE		0	0	60,000	60,000	0	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	
116 DTS - JOINT PROJECT OFFICE		0	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000		15,000	15,000
126 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	060988	20,175	20,175	20,175	20,175	20,175	22,175	22,175		2,000	2,000
159 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		0	0	0	29,000	0	0	0	29,000		
164 LIDAR		0	0	11,600	11,600	0	0	0	11,600		
172 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		0	0	0	37,000	0	0	0	37,000		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*									1,780,247	1,675,361	606,091
TOTAL - RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVAL											
TOA		38,612,701	38,429,646	38,965,936	38,613,560	38,795,146	35,643,776	38,234,646	800,679		
Appropriations		38,612,701	38,429,646	38,965,936	38,613,560	38,795,146	35,643,776	38,234,646	800,679		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO RDT&E*									3,631,164	4,764,216	2,244,366

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. >	Amount Approp. >	Amount Approp. >
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION										
Military Construction, Army										
Major construction										
003 FORT WAINWRIGHT AK										
10 HANGAR	0	0	0	3,950	0	3,950	4,550	3,950	4,550	800
010 FORT MCCLELLAN AL										
20 AMMO STORAGE FACILITY	0	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	
30 GENERAL INSTRUCTION BUILDING	0	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	2,050	
40 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	1,350	0	1,350	1,350	0	1,350	1,350	1,350	
017 FORT GORDON GA										
10 CONSOLIDATED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	23,000	23,000	0	23,000	10,000	23,000	10,000	
018 FORT MCPHERSON GA										
10 BARRACKS & DINING HALL	0	0	10,200	10,200	0	10,200	10,200	10,200	10,200	
022 FITZSIMONS AMC CO										
10 CENTRAL ENERGY PLANT	0	18,400	0	18,400	18,400	0	18,400	18,400	18,400	
20 ENGINEER FACILITY	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	
023 FORT GILLEM GA										
10 WATER IMPROVEMENTS	0	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	
024 HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD GA										
10 TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	0	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	
025 SCHOFIELD BARRACKS HI										
20 ADAL SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY	0	0	17,500	17,500	0	17,500	17,500	17,500	17,500	
026 FORT RILEY KS										
10 RAIL HEAD	0	0	13,200	13,200	0	13,200	13,200	13,200	13,200	
027 FORT KNOX KY										
10 WATER STORAGE TANKS	0	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,350	0	4,350	4,350	4,350	
20 AIRFIELD REVITALIZATION	0	7,100	7,100	7,100	7,100	0	7,100	7,100	7,100	
30 ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION IMPROVEMENT PRO	0	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	0	4,150	4,150	4,150	
033 FORT MONMOUTH NJ										
10 CHILD CARE CENTER	0	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	3,550	
034 FORT DRUM NY										
10 MOUT	0	5,900	0	5,900	5,900	0	5,900	5,900	5,900	
20 GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE	0	8,900	0	8,900	8,900	0	8,900	8,900	8,900	
30 LIBRARY/EDUCATION CENTER	0	8,700	0	8,700	0	0	0	8,700		
036 FORT BRAGG NC										
10 HIGHWAY EXTENSION	0	8,700	0	8,700	8,700	0	8,700	8,700	8,700	
037 FORT BILL OK										
10 FIRE STATION	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
038 PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ										

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
10 ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	0	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	
20 PROPELLANT SURVEILLANCE LAB	0	0	2,250	2,250	2,250	0	2,250	2,250	2,250	
039 WHITE SANDS NM										
10 BARRACKS RENOVATIONS	0	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	
041 ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND MD										
10 FIRE/SECURITY STATION	0	0	3,400	3,400	0	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	
042 CORPUS CHRISTI ARMY DEPOT TX										
10 CONTROLLED-HUMIDITY WAREHOUSE	0	9,800	0	9,800	9,800	0	9,800	9,800	9,800	
20 METAL FINISHING & ELECTROPLATING FACILITY	0	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	0	11,800	11,800	11,800	
043 FORT BLISS TX										
10 BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	0	13,800	0	13,800	13,800	0	13,800	13,800	13,800	
20 BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	0	11,160	0	11,160	11,160	0	11,160	11,160	11,160	
060 FORT BELVOIR VA										
20 RAIL EXTENSION	0	0	1,200	1,200	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
070 VARIOUS CONUS LOCATIONS XV										
10 CLASSIFIED PROJECT	3,000	2,710	2,700	2,700	2,710	2,710	2,710	3,000	2,710	10
30 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	0	0	2,400	2,400	0	0	0	2,400		
Minor construction										
080 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
10 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	64,803	54,803	3,800	3,800	6,800	3,800	6,800	10,700	10,700	1,700
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS^d								223,310	201,610	2,310
Military Construction, Navy										
Major construction										
017 MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD CA										
10 HAZARDOUS MATERIAL STORAGE FACILITY	0	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	
018 MIRAMAR NAVAL AIR STATION CA										
10 FIXED POINT UTILITY SYSTEM	0	9,700	0	9,700	9,700	0	9,700	9,700	9,700	
045 ALBANY MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BGA										
20 UPGRADE HAZARDOUS STORAGE WAREHOUSE	0	0	2,700	2,700	0	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	
088 NAVAL SURFCE WARFARE CTR, CRANEN										
10 MICROWAVE COMPONENT CENTER	0	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	0	6,000	6,000	6,000	
071 NAVAL ORDINANCE STN, INDIANHD MD										
10 IMPROVE CADPAD FACILITY	0	5,300	5,800	5,800	5,300	5,800	5,300	5,800	5,300	
20 CHILD CARE FACILITY	0	2,280	0	2,280	2,280	0	2,280	2,280	2,280	
072 PATUGENT NAVAL AIR STATION MD										
10 ADV SYSTEMS INTEGRATION FAC (PHASE B)	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
073 U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY MD										
10 VISITOR'S CENTER	0	4,500	0	4,500	0	0	0	4,500		
20 PHYSICAL THERAPY COMPLEX	0	6,500	0	6,500	6,500	0	0	6,500		
074 NAS MERIDIAN MS										
10 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	1,100	0	1,100	1,100	0	1,100	1,100	1,100	
077 GULFPORT MS										
10 SEABEE WAREHOUSE	0	0	4,850	4,850	0	4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	
078 NEW RIVER NC										
10 PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	0	0	3,800	3,800	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	
079 MCAS CHERRY POINT NC										
10 OPERATIONS FACILITY	0	0	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
20 WAREHOUSE	0	0	1,880	1,880	0	1,000	1,880	1,880	1,880	
095 KINGSVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION TX										
20 ROTH R SITE PREPARATION	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
096 DANNECK VA										
10 APPLIED INSTRUCTION BLDG EXPANSION	0	13,727	13,727	13,727	13,727	13,727	13,727	13,727	13,727	
20 UPGRADE WATER SYSTEM	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
30 LAND ACQUISITION - 181 ACRES	0	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	0	4,500		
097 FORT STORY VA										
10 NAVY BOMB DISPOSAL TRAINING & EVALUATION	0	5,650	5,650	5,650	5,480	5,650	5,480	5,650	5,480	
098 LITTLE CREEK VA										
10 BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS FACILITY	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	
099 NAVAL AIR STATION NORFOLK VA										
10 MAGAZINE AREA PHYSICAL FACILITY	0	1,450	1,450	1,100	1,100	1,450	1,100	1,100	1,100	
20 RELOCATION OF ORDNANCE PAD	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
112 QUANTICO VA										
10 COMMAND & STAFF COLLEGE FACILITY	0	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000		
122 PUGET SOUND NAVAL STATION WA										
10 BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	0	13,300	0	13,300	13,300	0	13,300	13,300	13,300	
Planning										
157 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU										
20 PLANNING AND DESIGN	72,842	74,292	72,842	75,892	79,292	82,842	70,000	2,790		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								138,547	112,807	0

TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
Military Construction, Air Force										
Major construction										
007 MAXWELL AFB AL										
10 EXTENSION OF RUNWAY	0	10,700	0	10,700	10,700	0	0	10,700		
20 PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	0	0	9,900	9,900	0	0	0	9,900		
015 EIELSON AFB AK										
30 AIRCRAFT SHELTERS	0	0	27,000	27,000	0	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	
020 ELMENDORF AFB AK										
30 AIRCRAFT SHELTERS	0	0	18,000	18,000	0	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	
038 DAVIS MONTHAN AFB AZ										
10 DORMITORY	0	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	
042 LUKE AFB AZ										
10 BOQ	0	0	2,950	2,950	0	2,950	2,950	2,950	2,950	
043 NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT AZ										
10 MINUTEMAN-VARIOUS FACILITIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,900		3,900	3,900
050 BEALE AFB CA										
20 SECURITY POLICE OPS FACILITY	0	4,350	0	4,350	4,350	0	4,350	4,350	4,350	
065 MCCLELLAN AFB CA										
30 PLATING SHOP	0	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	0	7,000	7,000	7,000	
070 TRAVIS AFB CA										
20 DORM RENOVATION	0	10,800	0	10,800	10,800	0	10,800	10,800	10,800	
092 BOLLING AFB DC										
10 CIVIL ENGINEER COMPLEX	0	9,400	0	9,400	9,400	0	9,400	9,400	9,400	
100 EGLIN AFB FL										
30 CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER (PHASE B)	0	0	0	5,000	0	32,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
115 MOODY AFB GA										
20 FUEL CELL/NOSE DOCK (C-130)	0	0	3,800	3,800	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	
117 ROBINS AFB GA										
10 JSTARS RAMP AND HYDRANT SYSTEM	0	0	9,700	9,700	0	9,700	9,700	9,700	9,700	
20 JSTARS SECURITY IMPROVEMENT	0	0	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	
130 BARKSDALE AFB LA										
30 REPLACE APRON & HYDRANT SYSTEM	0	0	25,800	14,000	0	25,800	14,000	14,000	14,000	
137 HANSCOM AFB MA										
10 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	0	4,200	4,200	0	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	
140 KEESLER AFB MS										
20 ADD/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	0	2,850	0	2,850	2,850	0	2,850	2,850	2,850	
30 VISUAL INFORMATION TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	0	6,400	0	0	0	6,400		
40 TV SYSTEM TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	0	290	0	0	0	290		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
180 NELLIS AFB NV										
30 AIRCRAFT LOADING APRON	0	7,950	0	7,950	4,000	0	4,000	7,950	4,000	
40 ARMING PAD, PHASE I	0	0	4,000	0	0	4,000	4,000		4,000	4,000
188 CANNON AFB NM										
10 DORMITORY	0	2,800	0	2,800	2,800	0	2,800	2,800	2,800	
175 POPE AFB NC										
10 ADD/ALTER AIRCRAFT OPS & LOGISTICS COMP	1,800	1,800	2,300	2,300	1,800	1,800	2,300	900	500	
20 REPAIR APRON AND WIDEN RWY PAVEMENT	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,400	2,350	2,350	2,400	50	50	
40 ADD/ALTER AIRCRAFT OPS AND LOGISTICS COM	1,800	1,800	2,500	2,500	1,800	1,800	2,500	700	700	
84 AIRCRAFT PARTS WAREHOUSES	1,550	1,550	2,450	2,450	1,550	1,550	2,450	900	900	
86 BRIDGE/ROAD/UTILITIES	0	0	4,000	4,000	0	0	0	4,000		
185 MINOT AFB ND										
30 WATER SYSTEM	0	0	2,050	2,050	0	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	
202 ALTUS AFB OK										
10 CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT FACILITY	0	7,300	0	7,300	7,300	0	7,300	7,300	7,300	
207 VANCE AFB OK										
10 AIRFIELD REPAIR	0	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	3,300	2,350	2,350	2,350	
210 CHARLESTON AFB SC										
40 ADD/ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	0	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	
223 BROOKS AFB TX										
10 ACADEMIC COMPLEX	0	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	
228 GOODFELLOW AFB TX										
10 PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	0	0	3,250	3,250	0	3,250	3,250	3,250	3,250	
235 LACKLAND AFB TX										
20 HIGH SCHOOL/GRADE SCHOOL FACILITIES	0	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	0	8,000	8,000	8,000	
255 HILL AFB UT										
30 ENGINE TEST CELL SUPPORT FACILITY	0	850	0	850	850	0	850	850	850	
40 POWER UPGRADE	0	4,300	0	2,300	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	2,300	
260 LANGLEY AFB VA										
30 CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS	0	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	0	5,300		
265 CONUS VARIOUS XV										
30 GENERAL REDUCTION	0	0	0	(8,880)	0	0	0			8,880
288 ASCENSION ISLAND NI										
10 POWER/DESALINIZATION PLANT	0	0	22,000	22,000	0	0	0	22,000		
305 ANDERSEN AFB GU										
30 UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	0	4,550	0	4,550	4,550	0	0	4,550		
40 LANDFILL	0	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	
80 HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	0	1,500	0	1,500	900	0	0	1,500		
80 UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANK	0	4,100	0	4,100	4,100	0	0	4,100		

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
10 ARMORY	0	2,273	2,273	2,273	1,838	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	
009 UNION SPRINGS AL										
10 ARMORY	0	813	0	813	813	0	800	813	800	
012 W. ARMO AVIATION TNG SITE, MARIANAZ										
20 PICACHO PEAK STAGEFIELD	0	3,041	0	3,041	3,041	0	3,041	3,041	3,041	
014 FRESNO AVIATION DEPOT CA										
10 REPAIR & CONSTRUCTION OF HELICOPTER PAD	0	901	901	901	901	901	901	901	901	
018 LAKEPORT CA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,580	0	1,580	1,580	0	1,580	1,580	1,580	
018 LOS ALAMOS AFRC CA										
10 JP-4 FUEL TANK REPLACEMENTS	0	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	
022 CAMP BLANDING FL										
10 MOUT RANGE	0	2,400	2,452	2,452	2,400	2,452	2,450	2,452	2,450	
20 BACHELOR OFFICER/ENLISTED QUARTERS	0	958	958	958	958	958	958	958	958	
024 CEDAR HILLS FL										
10 ARMORY EXPANSION	0	1,457	0	1,457	1,457	0	1,480	1,457	1,480	23
040 CRAIG FIELD FL										
10 ARMORY EXPANSION	0	1,882	0	1,882	1,882	0	1,882	1,882	1,882	
20 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP EXPANS	0	388	0	388	388	0	388	388	388	
045 BARNESVILLE GA										
10 ARMORY ACQUISITION	0	0	300	300	0	300	300	300	300	
050 FORT WAYNE IN										
10 OMS	0	882	882	882	882	800	882	882	800	
20 ARMORY	0	3,383	3,383	3,383	2,732	3,838	3,400	3,383	3,400	7
055 GREAT BEND KS										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,570	1,570	0	1,570	1,800	1,570	1,800	30
058 OTTAWA KS										
10 ARMORY	0	0	387	387	0	387	387	387	387	
060 CAMP DODGE IA										
10 EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	2,887	0	2,887	2,887	0	2,887	2,887	2,887	
20 BU COMPLEX I	0	4,800	0	4,800	4,800	0	4,800	4,800	4,800	
061 ANITE LA										
10 ARMORY	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,300	1,300		1,300	1,300
063 INDEPENDENCE LA										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,300	1,300	0	0	0	1,300		
064 LAFAYETTE LA										
10 OMS	0	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	750	1,000	750	
065 CAMP RIPLEY MN										
10 COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	7,100	0	7,100	7,100	0	7,100	7,100	7,100	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
10 MOUT FACILITIES	0	1,954	0	1,954	1,954	0	1,954	1,954	1,954	
115 NORMAN OK	0									
10 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX PHASE I	0	8,629	0	7,629	7,629	0	7,629	7,629	7,629	
117 LA GRANDE OR	0									
10 ARMORY	0	0	4,279	3,049	750	3,049	3,049	3,049	3,049	
20 OMS	0	0	0	1,220	0	1,220	1,220	1,220	1,220	
118 SALEM OR	0									
10 AVIATION TAXWAY	0	0	0	0	1,200	0	1,200		1,200	1,200
119 CLACKAMAS OR	0									
10 RANGE	0	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	
120 FORT INDIANTOWN GAP PA	0									
10 AVIATION BRIGADE ARMORY (800 PM)	0	7,500	0	7,500	7,500	0	7,500	7,500	7,500	
125 INDIANA PA	0									
10 ARMORY	0	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	
128 N. KINGSTON RI	0									
10 ADAL ARMORY/AVIATION	0	0	4,200	3,300	0	4,200	3,300	3,300	3,300	
130 FOUNTAIN INN SC	0									
10 HAWK TRAINING PARK	0	748	748	748	748	748	748	748	748	
135 WARE SHOALS SC	0									
10 HAWK TRAINING PARK	0	578	578	578	578	578	578	578	578	
140 PICKENS SC	0									
10 HAWK TRAINING PARK	0	775	775	775	775	775	775	775	775	
142 GAFFNEY SC	0									
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,510	1,200	0	1,510	1,200	1,200	1,200	
145 FORT MEADE SD	0									
10 RENOVATE ADMIN. FACILITY	0	805	805	805	805	0	805	805	805	
150 MONTEAGLE TN	0									
10 ARMORY	0	950	0	790	950	0	790	790	790	
155 SMYRNA TN	0									
10 ADDALTER OPS. FACILITY	0	3,500	3,500	2,800	3,500	3,500	2,800	2,800	2,800	
20 CSM SHOP	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,400	5,500	5,400	
158 DUNLAP TN	0									
10 ARMORY	0	0	818	790	0	818	790	790	790	
157 ERIN TN	0									
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,088	890	0	1,088	890	890	890	
180 CAMP BOWIE, BROWNWOOD TX	0									
10 UNIT TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT SITE	0	1,319	0	1,319	1,319	0	1,319	1,319	1,319	
185 GREENVILLE TX	0									
10 ARMORY	0	1,338	0	1,200	1,338	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
170 KILGORE TX										
10 ARMORY	0	815	0	815	815	0	800	815	800	45
175 LUBBOCK TX										
10 JOINT ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	0	7,837	0	7,837	7,837	0	7,837	7,837	7,837	
20 ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	898	0	898	898	0	898	898	898	
180 MEXIA TX										
10 ARMORY RENOVATION	0	568	0	568	568	0	568	568	568	
185 SAN ANGELO TX										
10 ARMORY	0	1,787	0	1,787	1,787	0	1,787	1,787	1,787	
180 STEPHENVILLE TX										
10 ADD/ALTER ARMORY	0	581	0	581	581	0	580	581	580	
185 ST. GEORGE UT										
10 ARMORY	0	2,898	2,898	2,898	2,898	2,898	2,898	2,898	2,898	
20 ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE BHPYBUBSHC	0	701	701	562	701	701	562	562	562	
186 BLANDING UT										
10 ARMORY	0	0	1,290	1,150	0	1,290	1,150	1,150	1,150	
187 COMMUNITY COLLEGE, RICHLANDS VA										
10 ARMORY	0	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	2,137	
200 GRANDVIEW WA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,802	1,802	1,800	1,802	1,802	1,800	1,800	1,800	
205 BUCKLEY WA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,728	1,728	1,575	1,728	1,728	1,575	1,575	1,575	
210 MOSES LAKE WA										
10 ARMORY	0	1,804	1,804	1,875	1,804	1,804	1,875	1,875	1,875	
215 MARSHFIELD WI										
10 ARMORY	0	2,030	0	2,030	2,030	0	2,030	2,030	2,030	
20 VEHICLE STORAGE FACILITY	0	228	0	228	228	0	228	228	228	
220 FORT MCCOY WI										
10 TRAINING/EDUCATION FACILITY	0	15,000	0	10,712	10,712	0	10,712	10,712	10,712	
222 CLARKSBURG WV										
10 HANGAR	0	0	5,500	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	
223 CAMP GUERNSEY WY										
10 BARRACKS UPGRADE	0	0	4,447	1,108	0	4,447	1,108	1,108	1,108	
225 BARRIGADA GU										
10 USPFO AND WAREHOUSE	0	1,827	0	1,827	1,827	0	1,827	1,827	1,827	
Planning										
260 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU										
20 PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,100	4,485	3,380	5,000	4,175	3,100	5,000	1,900	1,800	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senete Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senete Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
20 CLINIC	0	0	1,600	1,600	0	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	
089 PHELPS COLLINS APT MI										
10 ALTER BARRACKS	0	0	3,800	3,800	0	0	3,800	3,800	3,800	
083 GULFPORT MS										
10 RAMP UPGRADE	0	0	10,800	10,800	0	10,800	10,800	10,800	10,800	
087 THOMPSON FIELD MS										
10 ADD/ALTER VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	
090 GREAT FALLS IAP MT										
40 ADD/ALTER WEAPONS RELEASE SHOP	0	0	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	
50 ARM/DEARM PADS	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
60 FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
093 FARGO ND										
10 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	2,800	2,800	0	0	2,800	2,800	2,800	
085 LINCOLN IAP NE										
20 FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE DOCK	0	0	4,875	4,875	0	4,875	4,875	4,875	4,875	
30 SQUADRON OPERATIONS	0	0	3,100	3,100	0	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	
40 ALTER SUPPLY & COMMUNICATIONS	0	0	2,400	2,400	0	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	
117 BADIN NC										
10 COMMUNICATION ELECTRONICS TRAINING FACI	0	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	
119 SPRINGFIELD OH										
10 ADAL ENGINE SHOP	0	0	1,700	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	
125 TOLEDO EXPRESS AIRPORT OH										
30 AIRCRAFT ENGINE SHOP	0	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	
40 ADD/ALTER AVONICS SHOP/ECM WEAPONS REL	0	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	880	
50 ADD/ALTER FUEL SYSTEMS & CORROSION CNT	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	
60 ADD/ALTER SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	
128 TULSA AIRPORT OK										
10 ADAL SQUADRON OPS	0	0	1,350	1,350	0	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	
20 ADAL OMS	0	0	430	430	0	430	430	430	430	
30 ADAL ENGINE SHOP	0	0	400	400	0	400	400	400	400	
130 KINGSLEY FIELD OR										
20 SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	0	0	2,575	2,575	0	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,575	
30 FIRE STATION	0	0	1,230	1,230	0	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,230	
135 PORTLAND IAP OR										
20 ADD/ALTER BASE CIVIL ENGINEER FACILITY	0	0	1,388	1,388	700	1,388	1,388	1,388	1,388	
30 HANGAR UPGRADE	0	0	5,051	5,051	0	5,051	6,151	5,051	6,151	1,100
40 SITE IMPROVEMENTS	0	0	1,100	1,100	0	0	0	1,100		
142 JOE FOSS FIELD, SIOUX FALLS SD										
10 MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. Request	Amount Approp. Request	Amount Approp. Auth.
10 UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,700	5,700	2,400	2,400	2,400	4,400	4,400			2,000
Planning										
007 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU										
20 PLANNING AND DESIGN	5,900	5,900	8,500	8,900	5,900	8,900	8,900	3,000	3,000	
Mil. Con., Naval Reserve										
Major construction										
003 DOBBINS AFB GA										
10 MAR CORPS RESERVE CENTER	0	0	5,500	5,500	0	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	
005 NAS GLENVIEW IL										
20 CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	0	1,800	1,800	0	1,800	0	1,800		
Mil. Con., Air Force Reserve										
Major construction										
008 DAVIS-MONTHAN AZ										
10 ADAL AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	
20 MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE & STORAGE	0	0	930	930	0	930	930	930	930	
011 PETERSON AFB CO										
10 AVIONICS FACILITY	0	0	1,300	1,300	0	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	
017 O'HARE IAP IL										
10 AGE SHOP/STORAGE	0	0	1,700	1,700	1,850	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	
020 NEW ORLEANS NAS LA										
50 AVIONICS	0	0	2,300	2,300	0	2,300	2,300	2,300	2,300	
030 SELFRIDGE ANG8 MI										
20 ADAL FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE HANGAR	0	0	2,400	1,050	0	2,400	2,400	1,050	2,400	1,350
30 ADAL FACILITIES FOR CONVERSION	0	0	1,500	2,400	0	1,500	1,050	2,400	1,050	
038 YOUNGSTOWN APT OH										
10 AERIAL SPRAY MAINTENANCE FACILITY	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
20 MAINTENANCE DOCK	0	0	0	0	4,500	0	4,500		4,500	4,500
047 HILL AFB UT										
10 AIRCRAFT CORROS CNTRL & FUEL SYS MAINT F.	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	
048 MITCHELL FIELD WI										
10 HANGAR ACQ	0	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	2,500	
Planning										
052 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU										
20 PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,300	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,800	2,500	2,800		300	300
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								421,881	413,258	24,812

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth. > Request	Amount Approp. > Request	Amount Approp. > Auth.
TOTAL - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	6,490,260	6,577,077	5,034,464	5,173,086	6,490,260	6,490,260	6,490,260			1,317,164
TOA	6,500,680	(245,800)	(245,800)	(245,800)	4,738,895	4,454,978	4,698,301			4,944,101
FAJ	(245,800)	6,331,277	4,788,664	4,927,286	(245,800)	(186,700)	(245,800)	5,173,086		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO MILITARY CONSTRUCTION*								698,688	786,265	32,822
FAMILY HOUSING										
Family Housing Construction, Army										
Construction of new housing										
003 HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD GA										
10 REPROGRAMMING ALLOWANCE	0	0	0	0	82	0	82		82	82
006 FORT CAMPBELL KY	0	0	8,200	8,200	0	0	0	8,200		
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (86)	0	0	0	0	0	8,200	8,200		8,200	8,200
007 FORT HOOD TX	0	26,000	0	25,000	0	0	0	25,000		
10 FAMILY HOUSING (227 UNITS)	0	0	0	0	25,000	0	25,000		25,000	25,000
008 FORT PICKETT VA	0	2,300	0	2,300	0	0	0	2,300		
10 FAMILY HOUSING UNITS (26 UNITS)	0	0	0	0	2,300	0	2,300		2,300	2,300
Post-Acquisition Construction										
010 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	143,660	143,660	155,660	82,800	143,660	143,660	143,660			51,660
Family Housing Operations & Debt, Army										
Operating expenses										
006 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	83,678	83,678	83,678	83,678	83,678	83,678	83,678			
10 MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	83,678	84,840	84,840	84,840	83,678	83,678	83,678			26,838
20 SERVICES ACCOUNT	84,840	313,736	313,736	313,736	84,840	84,840	84,840	248,898		
30 UTILITIES ACCOUNT	313,736	47,036	52,036	47,036	313,736	313,736	313,736			268,700
40 FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	52,036	1,973	1,973	1,973	47,036	52,036	47,036			45,063
Maintenance of real property										
006 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONSZU	495,836	495,836	495,836	464,016	495,836	495,836	495,836			11,820
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								284,398	35,562	439,063
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Mar										
Construction of new housing										
005 ADAK NAVAL AIR STATION AK	11,820	0	0	0	11,820	11,820	11,820			11,820
021 MILLER PARK HI	0	0	18,400	0	0	0	0			
10 FAMILY HOUSING (114)	0	0	0	0	0	18,400	18,800		18,800	18,800

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
 (thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
022 LYNCH PARK HI	0	0	7,000	0	0	0	0			
10 FAMILY HOUSING (42)	0	0	0	0	0	7,000	6,370		6,370	6,370
023 MCAS KANELOHE HI	0	0	66,900	0	0	0	0			
10 FAMILY HOUSING (220)	0	0	26,900	0	0	66,900	32,050		32,050	32,050
20 FAMILY HOUSING (60)	0	0	0	0	0	26,900	11,920		11,920	11,920
024 MOANA LUA HI	0	0	11,800	0	0	0	0			
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (100)	0	0	0	0	0	11,800	11,800		11,800	11,800
026 PEARL CITY PENINSULA HI	0	0	30,000	0	0	0	0			
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (132)	0	0	0	0	0	30,000	23,560		23,560	23,560
027 NAVAL COMPLEX OAHU HI	0	11,820	0	0	0	0	0			
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (100 UNITS)	0	0	0	117,180	11,820	0	0	117,180		
028 NAS BARBERS POINT HI	0	0	18,500	0	0	0	0			
10 NEW CONSTRUCTION (70)	0	0	0	0	0	18,500	14,650		14,650	14,650
10 DEMOLITION AND SITE PREPARATION	0	0	0	7,000	0	0	0	7,000		
037 KITSAP COUNTY WA	0	19,500	0	19,500	0	0	0	19,500		
10 FAMILY HOUSING (200 UNITS)	0	0	0	0	19,500	0	19,500		19,500	19,500
040 SUGAR GROVE NAVAL RADIO STATION WV	830	0	830	830	830	830	830			
042 GUAM BUDGET AMENDMENT	56,700	0	0	0	56,700	56,700	56,700			56,700
Post-Acquisition Construction										
045 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS BU	196,340	196,340	196,340	130,844	196,340	196,340	196,340			87,496
Family Housing Operations & Maint, Navy & Maintenance of real property										
008 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	262,840	262,840	262,840	227,808	262,840	262,840	262,840			34,831
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								143,680	136,680	307,627
Family Housing Construction, Air Force										
Construction of new housing										
005 BEALE AFB CA	308	0	308	308	308	308	308			
010 MARCH AFB CA	25,351	25,351	25,351	36,351	25,351	25,351	25,351	13,000		
10 FAMILY HOUSING (320 UNITS)	25,351	13,000	0	0	25,351	25,351	36,351		13,000	36,351
015 PATRICK AFB FL	18,000	18,000	22,500	22,500	18,000	18,000	18,000	6,500		
10 FAMILY HOUSING (250 UNITS)	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	22,500	22,500		6,500	6,500
020 MOODY AFB GA	280	0	280	280	280	280	280			
026 SCOTT AFB IL	0	0	20,000	20,000	0	0	0	20,000		
10 FAMILY HOUSING PHASE I (300)	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	20,000		20,000	20,000
030 BARKSDALE AFB LA	443	0	443	443	443	443	443			
035 CANNON AFB NM	480	0	480	480	480	480	480			

FY1993 CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO DOD REQUESTS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(thousands of dollars)

Program	Admin. Request	House Auth.	Senate Auth.	Enacted Auth.	House Approp.	Senate Approp.	Enacted Approp.	Amount Auth.> Request	Amount Approp.> Request	Amount Approp.> Auth.
10 HOUSING OFFICE	480	32,951	32,951	32,951	0	480	480	32,471		
040 MINOT AFB ND	268	0	268	268	268	268	268			
045 SHAW AFB SC	351	0	351	351	351	351	351			
Post Acquisition Construction										
060 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU	227,824	227,824	227,824	150,000	227,824	227,824	227,824			77,824
Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF										
Operating expenses										
008 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU	48,354	48,354	48,354	48,354	48,354	48,354	48,354			
10 MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	48,354	26,633	26,633	26,633	48,354	48,354	48,354			19,721
20 SERVICES ACCOUNT	26,633	261,052	261,052	261,052	26,633	26,633	26,633	234,418		
30 UTILITIES ACCOUNT	261,052	45,681	50,681	45,681	261,052	261,052	261,052			215,371
40 FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	50,681	9,755	9,755	9,755	45,681	50,681	45,681			35,926
Maintenance of real property										
008 UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS&ZU	398,943	398,943	398,943	367,566	398,943	398,943	398,943			9,347
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS*								308,360	36,500	423,040
TOTAL - FAMILY HOUSING	4,080,735	4,059,248	4,221,815	3,948,417	4,080,735	4,080,735	4,080,735			112,318
TOA	4,080,735	(4,873)	(4,873)	(4,873)	3,966,503	3,833,791	3,941,498			3,948,372
FAJ	(4,873)	4,054,376	4,216,742	3,943,544	(4,873)	(4,873)	(4,873)	3,948,417		
TOTAL OF CONGRESSIONAL ADDITIONS TO FAMILY HOUSING*								734,466	211,762	1,188,730

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I advise my colleagues of the possibility of an amendment on this issue prior to the completion of Senate action on the appropriations bill.

Again, I wish to also express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman and the ranking Republican member on the restraint they have shown in this particular Senate version of the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, while my colleague is present, I want the Senator from Arizona to know we appreciate the comments he has made. We are trying to work with those who have not been too happy with our process.

But I have the documents from the CRS report. Let me point out a few things. I think it is too bad we do not have charts made to show them.

Here, for instance, is operation and maintenance for 1993. The administration requests a whole series of items on that page. We are talking about disaster relief planning, et cetera, no administration requests at all, no House authorization, no Senate authorization. But guess what? In conference, after the authorization bills have passed both the House and the Senate, in conference the conferees authorized for Civilian Community Corps, \$30 million; National Community Service Program, \$30 million; a whole series of items here, college grants, Upward Reach projects, and guess what? No money in the House appropriations bill, no money in the Senate appropriations bill. But in the Senate conference, lo and behold, there is the money.

What I am telling the Senator from Arizona is that as we listen to the administration talk to us, I do not care whether it is Republican or Democrat, they say a congressional add-on is something that is not in the President's budget. The Senator from Arizona is talking about an appropriations add-on being something that was not in the authorization bill.

Now, the argument of the people who argue normally for the line-item veto is that the President can veto any change made by the Congress. The Senator is upset about the changes being made by the appropriators after the authorization bills have come through.

But as a matter of fact, if you want to examine the charts that the Senator has given to us, you will find that time after time, where these items originate—take, for instance, I have here procurement requests. The Senate, on the C-12J Program—this is the National Guard and Reserve equipment. No request from the President, no House authorization. The Senate authorized \$42 million. The House appropriations bill did not have any money in it. The Senate, at the request of the Senate authorization committee, put

in \$43.3 million, and the final appropriation was \$42.3 million.

A majority of the items we put in the appropriations bill in the Senate that are not in the authorization bill have come from contacts with the authorizers themselves who come to us and ask us to add in moneys. And we do because we find that they are needed.

Take, for instance, the C-26 aircraft, same situation—not quite but almost the same. No request from the President; no House authorization; the Senate had \$23 million. The House appropriations bill provided \$23 million. We zeroed it out in the Senate appropriations. But guess what? In conference there is the Senate authorization committee's \$23 million.

Is that an add on? Whose add on is that, if it is not in the President's budget? It is not in the bill that came to us from the House. We did not put it in. But it comes in in the conference.

I say to my friend, I understand the difference between the administration and the Congress. The President sends up a budget and it is zero. We change that and put it in another place. Then it suddenly becomes wrong. But I challenge the Senator from Arizona. You cannot find a bill where we have come in with more than the President requested. You cannot find a bill where we came in with more than the budget allowed us to pass. We have lived within the budget limits. We have lived within the budget limits. As a matter of fact, in this bill before us, we are some \$1.7 billion, as I recall, below the amount we were authorized to spend.

So what the Senator is talking about is that some of us—we are not all on the Senate authorization committee either. We are not all permitted to decide what becomes an authorized project under the Senator's concept.

As to the line items now, when I first started in the appropriations process, there was one basic item. It was procurement. It had a series of systems, and we fleshed that out. Now we get a line item budget that is, how many, 30,000 different line items? And if we shift money from one line item on the same airplane to another line item on that airplane, guess what. It is a congressional add on. We decided there would be a delay dealing with a gear and we would rather go ahead with another system, so we go ahead with the other system and take the money out for the gear. We are guilty of a congressional add on.

For people who know the budget process, that CRS report is not worth the money it cost to make it because it is not a study of earmarking. It is a study of changes in the appropriations process, the budget process. The President sets one set of goals. The House authorization committee sets another. The Senate authorization committee sets another. The conference committee sees it entirely differently. It then

comes to the appropriations process and we end up with appropriations that are entirely different in many items from what the President originally requested.

Mr. McCAIN. Will the Senator yield for 1 minute?

Mr. STEVENS. I wish to make this one comment.

The real problem is I do not see any reason why the CRS went to the detail it has here in breaking down each one of these items in a way that you cannot even understand unless you get the person who wrote it. As a practical matter, anything that is a congressional add on is a variance from the administration's request.

I will echo my friend from Arizona to say I did not spend now almost 25 years on the Senate Appropriations Committee to be entirely governed by the whims of the authorization committee as to how they line out the moneys within a particular portion of the budget. The President has one type of line. They come in and redefine it, and we are wrong if we fill in the President's item.

I think it has reached the point where the specificity is just getting entirely out of control in terms of the authorizers determining that they can, through the authorization process, totally limit the discretion of the appropriators and the Congress. You have to remember we do not do anything by ourselves. It takes a vote on the floor of the Senate, and I remind you again we are the only ones who are bound by the outlay limits. The bill that the authorizers have given us now with their individual line items requires \$3 billion more than we have to spend. And they criticize us for the way we have allocated money within the demands of the budget system because we have not followed their delineations.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, let me say, as I tried to make clear in my statement, there is a great deal of validity in what the Senator from Alaska says. There are many times when there are needed appropriations, where a disaster relief situation may arise, other extreme changes in priorities on the part of the Defense Department and they have to be put in the appropriations cycle.

The fact remains, though, that the process is rife with opportunity, if I may use that word, for abuse of it. Just a small example: In 1994, in the fiscal year 1994 there are \$236.5 million of conversion funds all of which are specifically allocated; \$2.3 million, as I mentioned, for solid cohesion molecule research; up to \$50 million to be spent for environmental cleanup of an abandoned mine; \$5 million for research on bridge overpass and highway structural integrity assessments using laser vibration technology to be done at Fort

Belvoir, VA; \$7 million for NDIS tele-imaging medical diagnostic program at Madigan Army Medical Center in Washington State; \$61 million of the strategic environmental research program for, among other things, the Consortium for International Earth Science Informational Network, global acoustic mapping of ocean temperatures, and a plasma disposal project at Fort Belvoir.

We do not know in the Senate version because they do not have a total for the \$2.5 million for a joint Air Force-Navy high-altitude aurora research program; \$5 million for the center for excellence for research in ocean sciences; \$4.5 million for the McMinnville, OR, Center for Advanced Technology and Training; an \$8 million grant to the Oregon State Higher Education System to establish an international job training program; and, \$750,000 for the University of North Iowa to establish a math teachers leadership project; \$1.5 million for the purchase and rehabilitation of LCU, landing craft utility ship, as a commercial cargo vessel to be transferred to the government of American Samoa; \$2 million to establish a marine environmental research facility at Astoria, OR. The Senator from Alaska is telling me that those projects that I just mentioned are more important than the weapons procurement that we will cut back on for the men and women we told had to get out of the military because we could not afford to keep them? I do not believe it.

I say to the Senator from Alaska, I do not believe it. I do not believe that these projects—of course I have never had a chance to examine them because they are put in the appropriations conference. But the fact is I do not believe that they are more important than the priorities that I just stated.

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator yield, as long as he is talking about my Alaska project?

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator would not yield to me when I asked him to yield, so I will finish my remarks.

Mr. STEVENS. All right.

Mr. MCCAIN. The fact is that these projects, in my view, may be justified, and the Senator from Alaska may be able to justify them. But it will be the first justification that I have heard. This is not the appropriate place in the process for that to take place, in all due respect. I will be more than happy to yield to my friend from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I hesitate to do that. The high altitude aurora research project is a project conducted by the Department of Defense. It is not the concept the Senator might have involved. But I find for instance, as I mentioned before, the attack helicopter, Apache helicopter was not in the budget.

Mr. MCCAIN. I did not request it. I say to the Senator from Alaska, I did not request it.

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator like to offer an amendment to delete it? It is the same concept that the Senator is talking about.

Mr. MCCAIN. Would the Senator like for me to—

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator introduce an amendment to delete—

Mr. MCCAIN. Offer an amendment to delete all the others?

Mr. STEVENS. I am happy to have the Senator offer an amendment to delete that if that is what he is suggesting. They are earmarking moneys that are here in this budget, the legitimate items for the expenditure of money within the category listed, just as the Apache is the legitimate item, required deleting other items of procurement to put it in there. But it is in there.

My point is, you have Members of the Senate on the authorization committee that have priorities. They are in the authorization bill. We have members of the Appropriations Committee that have priorities. They tend to come into the appropriations process. And we work it out with the House where you have the same thing, four different clientele, in terms of the defense activity.

I once made the suggestion that we ought to do away with the—not the Armed Services Committee—but with the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee so that in the Senate we would have one committee that dealt with defense matters, both authorizing and appropriators on the same.

Do you know what you end up with? You would end up with the priorities of those people in the one committee.

My point is we do tend to remember those projects that we are familiar with, the authorizers put in the projects they are familiar with. Most of them in this lineup that are in this book today were not authorized at all. They were not requested by the budget at all. Look at that page. I invite you to page 112. That whole list of items in the authorization bill was not in the budget at all. We funded most of them.

Mr. MCCAIN. Page 112 of what?

Mr. STEVENS. The report of this bill which is before the Senate right now.

The problem is to really follow through on the items that we are dealing with as far as I am concerned. I mention the ones I was dealing with were not in the budget request.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I say, Madam President, I appreciate the long and loyal and dedicated service that the Senator from Alaska has given, not only to this Nation, as well as the distinguished chairman, in a variety of ways. Between the two of them, they have far more experience in this body than I do. I understand that they do the very best job that they can. I do not in any way impugn the performance of two of the most outstanding Members of this body. What I do attack here, and attack vociferously, is a process, a process that in my view needs to be fixed.

In the view of the Senator from Alaska, I am sure, in the view of the Senator from Hawaii, they do not believe it needs to be fixed. I would also suggest that they have made certain reforms in the way they have been doing business over the past few years. But I think it is important for me to separate the issue here and the results of a process with the efforts of two outstanding Members in this body, two of the most outstanding Members of this body, who share with me the deepest concern and commitment to our national security.

I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I thank you very much.

First, I would like to commend my friend from Arizona for bringing this matter to our attention. I believe fervently that he is deserving of answers that he feels he has not received. We felt that the committee reported items of explanation, but apparently it has not.

I would like to, in a general way, mention first, in the last 5 years—this is a period that I served as chairman—the bill that we have reported to the Senate has always been within the 602(b) allocation, always below that. It has never exceeded the 602(b) allocation.

In fact, the Senator from Arizona mentions that between fiscal year 1990 and 1993 we were \$28.7 billion more than authorized. Actually, between fiscal year 1990 and 1993, according to the CBO—not us, but the CBO—Congress appropriated \$2.9 billion less than that authorized for national defense.

Second, at this moment, the House of Representatives has not—I repeat has not—appointed conferees to the conference on the armed services bill.

So we find ourselves once again, as we have on many other occasions, acting on an appropriations bill without an authorization. But at the same time we are confronted with a continuing resolution that will expire. We are told by one and all, leaders, committee chairmen, please get this over with.

We have been sitting here patiently trying to get this thing over with. So we have to deal with items that have not been officially authorized and signed by the President of the United States. But in each case whatever appears in the bill has been authorized either by the House or the Senate in their separate bills. But when they meet in conference, it could be rejected.

It would be fine if we waited until the authorization process was completed, but obviously if that were the case, we would begin our appropriations process long after the beginning of the fiscal year. Let us keep in mind that we are considering fiscal year 1994 measures.

and the fiscal year began on October 1. That was a couple of weeks ago.

Now, if I may, I would like to go over each item that my friend from Arizona brought up.

First he mentioned the C-20 aircraft for the Coast Guard, \$25 million. He wanted to know what the Coast Guard was doing in the defense bill. I am certain all of us agree that the Coast Guard does have peacetime responsibilities and activities and wartime responsibilities and activities. At this very moment, the Coast Guard is off the shore of Bosnia for sanction purposes. The Coast Guard was heavily involved in Desert Storm, risking lives. They were the prime agency in charge of enforcing sanctions against Saddam Hussein. That is war activity. And so understandably, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has been called upon to provide funds for the Coast Guard.

In this case, the C-20 aircraft was requested by the Commandant of the Coast Guard because he wanted to replace his aging aircraft. The Coast Guard is no longer just east coast and west coast; he has to be out in the Mediterranean, or in the Persian Gulf, in the far reaches of the Pacific. He needs a command and control aircraft. This aircraft was approved by the House in fiscal year 1992. But at that time, we could not help the Commandant because funds were not available. So in fiscal year 1993, the Commandant came forward and said, "We will reprogram funds from the following activities to pay for this C-20." At that point, the Congress balked and disagreed with him. So once again, the Coast Guard found itself without a command and control plane.

Finally, we decided to go through this in fiscal year 1993, and that is how we came up with this C-20.

There was nothing hidden about this. It was widely discussed. I felt that most people knew about this.

The next item on the cost overrun of \$40 million. In the fiscal year 1993 House-passed bill, the House approved an appropriation of \$75 million to be used to cover cost overruns in the construction of two ocean survey ships. The contractor had experienced significant losses on the construction contract and, because of this, the contractor sought congressional relief. We rejected the House amendment. But in conference, we found ourselves in a position where we had to compromise, and we restored \$40 million of the \$75 million to pay claims on the contract. And to say that this emerged out of the appropriations conference committee, obviously, is in error, because we rejected that.

As we all must concede, a conference committee is a conference. The Senate does not get its way; neither does the House get its way. We disagree. Otherwise, there is no need for a conference.

And oftentimes, for the national good or for mutual interests, or otherwise, we find ourselves compromising or agreeing with the other party, or receding from our position.

So, Madam President, this did not emerge from the Appropriations Committee. The purchase of 1,502 acres from the Coast Oyster Co. in Washington State for \$5 million was done at the request of the House. And the conferees did include a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to spend up to \$5 million, which was made available to the Department of Defense to purchase these acres of tidelands.

First of all, this is not an earmark. Since the Secretary was permitted to spend up to \$5 million, it is understood that, as the Department has done on many, many occasions, he could spend nothing. If the Secretary wanted to, he could have spent just \$1 and have been done with it.

Second, since the Department appropriation was well below the authorization, funds could be allocated to this effort without exceeding the authorized funding level. Furthermore, this involves treaty agreements with 17 Indian tribes, who have, over the ages, had treaty rights, fishing rights on these tidelands. So it was not arbitrarily done by the Appropriations Committee. This originated with the House. But as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee—I will say so publicly—I was pleased to recede to the House position and concur with this purchase of 1,502 acres. I did urge the Secretary to make such a purchase. But the Secretary may or may not spend this.

On the matter of cleanup of the industry in Eau Claire, WI, the National Presto Industries produced artillery rounds for the Army since the 1950's and throughout the Vietnam conflict. Today, we find many parts of our land dangerously polluted. In the measure before us, we have an item of \$2.2 billion to begin the cleanup of bases that we have just closed. And that is just the beginning, Madam President, \$2.2 billion. We estimate conservatively that by the time these bases are finally closed, it will exceed \$25 billion.

In addition to that, there is an item of \$2.1 billion for environmental cleanup of bases in operation in order to stem the damage before we go any further. In this appropriation, we raise no objection to this fund because this cleanup had to be done. It was our responsibility whether it is done in fiscal year 1993 or fiscal year 1994, we were expected to clean this up.

On the matter of the multiple launch rocket system for the Army National Guard, \$80.7 million, Madam President, I must say that contrary to the press release and the claim by the Congressional Research Service, the multiple launch rocket system was fully authorized in fiscal year 1993. I have no idea how this ever got into the report. The

fiscal year 1993 Authorization Act provided specific authorization for 73 MLRS launchers and 30,000 rockets for the U.S. Army. The Appropriations Act provided the appropriate funding for the authorized 73 launchers, that is, \$248.6 million and 15,000 rounds for \$109.7 million.

We directed that 29 of these launchers and 6,000 of these rockets be provided to the Army National Guard. The Defense Department approved this. Out of that total program which was authorized specifically and appropriated specifically, we took out 29 launchers for the National Guard.

On the natural gas vehicle technology research, that is \$10 million. Here again, contrary to the press release, the natural gas vehicle technology research was both authorized and did not emerge out of the appropriations conference committee.

The natural gas vehicle funding was highlighted in authorizations and Appropriations Committee reports and also the authorization conference report. The House Armed Services Committee recommended \$1 million for natural gas evaluations and \$25 million for geographically disbursed electric vehicle demonstration pilot projects.

The selection criteria discussed in the House Armed Services Committee report clearly favored particular locations. This did not emerge from our committee, but it was authorized. And we felt that since this was part of the national defense authorization for fiscal year 1993 which clearly authorized a total of \$38 million, not \$10 million, we felt it was appropriate.

The LCU for American Samoa. American Samoa is a possession of the United States, and up until World War II, it was under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy; it was a U.S. Navy coaling station.

The Senate Appropriations Committee in response to a critical need of health and safety equipment directed the Navy to take possession from the GSA at no cost an excess LCU which was designated for American Samoa. It was already designated for American Samoa, but we asked the Navy to participate in this because, first of all, we had to overhaul this ship and, second, we could not tell the Samoans, who have no money, come and pick it up. Someone had to drag it across the Pacific. That cost a few dollars. So we did this.

It was not specifically authorized, but I would hope that the United States would live up to its obligation as the master and owner of American Samoa to maintain the health, welfare, and educational needs of the inhabitants. That is \$1.5 million.

McMinnville, OR, Center for Aviation Technology and Training.

This found its way in the report language, that \$4.5 million be provided to the State of Oregon to pursue the development of this aviation training center.

This is an important defense conversion program of the Pacific Northwest, an area affected very significantly by the defense drawdown. Yes, we find defense conversion projects throughout this bill, and that is what we have been debating all this time. What are we to do with men and women who have been building tanks all these decades, building cannons all these decades?

The State of California, the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer, I believe will experience in excess of 300,000 new unemployed men and women on the unemployment list as a result of defense drawdown. Are we to close our ears to their pleas? There is general authorization for conversion.

The Presiding Officer has an amendment, which I have assured her I will take into conference, and I will do my utmost to see that her amendment be carried out and become law of the land. What does it do? As part of the military drawdown from 2.9 million men and women in uniform, we are going to come down to 1.4 million. That is a major slash. And there are thousands of men and women who decided to make the military their career suddenly receiving the pink slip. Some of the men just got back from Desert Storm or Somalia and are getting the pink slip. That is their reward.

What the Presiding Officer is trying to do is to convert some of these military police officers to become civil police officers. And if there is a place that needs police assistance, it is California. It is that simple.

Are we to tell the Californians that project is not specifically authorized? Not me.

Grant to the Oregon State Higher Education System to establish an international job training program.

Here again this is report language that provides funds to establish an international job training program. The goal of this program is to further dual use technology for economic growth and thus national security through linking students with foreign and domestic defense and other industries.

It is to promote better international technical schools for U.S. students so they may better compete in the global market.

It is a program similar to the United States-Japan training program supported by Senator BINGAMAN and authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The marine environmental research facility at Astoria, OR, \$2 million. We have funds to establish this facility in Astoria. This is the former site that

was planned to serve as a home port for Navy mine countermeasure ships. The Navy constructed a number of these facilities in the process of establishing the home port. We have already spent this money. We have already built these facilities—facilities that were authorized; funds were appropriated.

We had a choice. We could just leave it alone and let it rot, or we could use it. With the request from the Navy and with a full report, we said, "Let us use it. The facilities are there. Let us use it." This center will eventually provide information which will be useful to Navy planners designing weapons systems or tactical operational strategies.

This conversion of home port facilities was not specifically authorized. But, here again, it was a choice. As I said, do we let it rot or do we make use of the moneys that we have already spent? And we decided to do so.

I hope that my colleagues will not disagree with that.

Joint Air Force-Navy High-Altitude Auroral Research Program, HAARP. This is a continuation of a program that began 4 years ago to investigate improvements to the Navy's capabilities to communicate at long ranges with strategic ballistic missile nuclear submarines and Air Force's long-range communications facilities.

As everyone knows, it is very difficult to communicate with a ship that is below surface. It is technology that everyone wants to achieve. Dolphins can do it, but we have not found a way yet.

This will become the backbone of our nuclear deterrent. And although it was not specifically authorized, it has never been challenged in the last 4 years by any of the authorization committees.

The Center for Excellence for Research on Ocean Sciences, \$5 million. The fiscal year 1994 Senate appropriations bill includes \$5 million to continue—we just did not start this—to continue ocean sciences research programs which began in fiscal year 1992, 2 years ago. The Advanced Research Projects Agency, ARPA, participated in establishing the center and selecting the initial research programs and projects.

This is not a new project. It was already started in 1992. It was not a secret matter. We did not hide this from the Senate. It was openly done. It is included in our committee report. The defense agency, ARPA, not only approved this but has already participated for the last 2 years. And from that, one must conclude that everyone is for it. Accordingly, although it did

not find its way through the authorizing process each year, we felt that since it was approved 2 years ago, no one would complain.

In fiscal year 1993, the committee approved the construction of a visitor's center at the Naval Academy to accommodate the thousands of visitors which visit that is in effect a national landmark. In this case, the committee appropriated the money in the form of a loan, which is highly unusual. Since the visitor's center will generate a positive cash-flow over the years, from the sale of items and food, the money will be returned on a 50-50 basis annually, 50 percent to the Treasury each year of all net revenues, until the money is fully paid back. The other 50 percent goes to fund midshipmen extracurricular activities. The facility was authorized by the authorization committees in fiscal year 1993.

So, in the long run, the Academy gets a sorely needed facility, the flood of visitors has a decent place to learn about the Academy, midshipmen activities are enhanced, and the money is fully recouped by the Treasury—quite a bargain.

So, Madam President, although it would seem that we have been violating the rules and violating the laws of this land, that is according to the news release, I hope that the brief commentary on these specific projects that were brought up in this report will suffice to my colleagues.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain tables prepared by the Congressional Budget Office. These tables are entitled "Final Appropriations" and "Authorization Actions Compared to the Budget Request." The tables show that the Appropriations Committee has been below authorization: Fiscal year 1989, \$327 million below; fiscal year 1990, \$2.135 billion below; fiscal year 1992, \$209 million below; and fiscal year 1993, \$690 million below.

These appropriations are below, not above, authorization.

Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table prepared by the Senate Budget Committee which shows that for fiscal year 1994, the authorization procurement and R&D accounts are \$2.876 billion above—above—the administration's request. This is the authorization bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR 1989

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee/Bill	Request		Appropriations		Authorizations		Request less appropriations		Request less authorizations		Appropriations less authorizations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense:												
Milpers	78,453	78,311	78,340	78,201	78,459	78,317	113	110	-6	-6	-119	-116
O&M	85,649	83,078	85,294	82,810	85,498	82,964	355	268	151	114	-204	-154
Procurement	79,798	80,711	79,942	80,381	79,745	80,552	-144	330	53	159	197	-171
RDT&E	38,157	35,574	37,834	35,319	37,970	35,483	523	255	187	91	-336	-164
Stock Funds	764	1,281	689	1,224	689	1,224	76	57	75	57	-1	
CIA Retirement	145	148	145	148	145	148						
Intel Com. Staff	24	23	24	23	24	23						
Dev-Bacon, Drug Inter	(310)	(196)	496	275	210	156	-806	-471	-520	-352	286	119
BB Trans. Auth./Other	(1)	2	(150)	(59)		(575)	150	61	-1	577	-150	516
Subtotal—Defense	282,679	278,932	282,412	278,321	282,740	278,292	267	611	-61	640	-327	29
MilCon Bill:												
MilCon	5,743	5,052	5,751	5,071	5,702	5,063	-8	-19	41	-11	49	8
Family Housing	3,269	3,021	3,260	3,017	3,291	3,031	9	4	-22	-10	-31	-14
Subtotal—Milcon	9,012	8,073	9,011	8,088	8,993	8,094	1	-15	19	-21	18	-6
Energy	8,100	7,945	8,100	7,944	8,135	7,967		1	-35	-22	-35	-23
HUD	366	348	361	345	354	351	5	3	12	-3	7	-6
TreasPost		(90)	30	(20)	0	(50)	-30	-70	0	-40	30	30
Foreign Ops	111	54	126	67	111	54	-15	-13	0	0	15	13
Enacted Pre-January	(739)	(727)	(739)	(727)	(739)	(727)						
Total National Defense	299,529	294,535	299,301	294,019	299,594	293,981	228	516	-65	554	-293	38

FINAL APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR 1990

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee Bill	Request		Appropriations		Authorizations		Appropriations less request		Authorizations less request		Appropriations less authorizations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense:												
Military Personnel	79,185	79,141	78,720	78,693	78,781	78,754	-465	-448	-404	-387	-61	-61
D&M	89,699	88,468	86,712	86,165	86,211	85,514	-2,986	-2,303	-3,488	-2,954	501	651
Procurement	78,754	80,134	84,042	80,512	84,487	80,539	5,288	378	5,733	405	-445	-27
RDT&E	39,645	36,994	37,109	35,689	38,227	36,274	-2,536	-1,305	-1,418	-720	-1,118	-585
Stock Funds	774	1,265	-1,178	-293	245	863	-1,952	-1,558	-529	-402	-1,423	-1,156
CIA Retirement	155	156	155	156	155	156						
Intel Com. Staff	24	24	28	27	24	24	4	3	0	0	4	3
Contingencies/Other	-257	-239	-44	-2	0	1	213	237	257	240	-44	-3
Drug Interdiction	0	53	450	219	0	53	450	166	0	0	450	166
Subtotal Defense	287,980	285,996	285,995	281,165	288,130	282,178	-1,984	-4,831	150	-3,818	-2,135	-1,013
MilCon Bill:												
Military Construction	5,323	5,458	5,270	5,363	4,694	5,253	-53	-95	-629	-205	576	110
Family Housing	3,232	3,157	3,220	3,151	3,277	3,183	-12	-6	45	26	-57	-32
Subtotal Milcon	8,555	8,615	8,490	8,514	7,971	8,436	-65	-101	-584	-179	519	78
Energy	9,387	8,773	9,663	8,946	9,663	8,944	276	173	276	171	0	2
HUD	342	344	342	344	342	344						
TreasPost	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Commerce-Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Other	-755	-743	-755	-743	-755	-743						
Total (Senate Scoring)	305,508	302,985	303,735	298,226	305,351	299,159	-1,773	-4,759	-157	-3,826	-1,616	-933
Transfers	0	0	0	1,398	0	1,264		1,398		1,264		134
Outlay Limitation	0	0	0	-419	0	-1,223		-424		-1,223		799
Total (House Scoring)	305,508	302,985	303,735	299,205	305,351	299,200	-1,773	-3,785	-157	-3,785	-1,616	0

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE CBO BASELINE FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR 1991 APPROPRIATIONS

[Bills through conference, in millions of dollars]

Appropriation Subcommittee bill	CBO baseline		Appropriations		Authorizations		Appropriations less baseline		Authorizations less baseline		Appropriations less authorizations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense:												
Military Personnel	81,527	81,084	78,245	78,019	78,385	78,157	-3281	-3065	-3142	-2927	-140	-138
D&M	90,421	88,927	86,342	85,643	85,675	84,727	-4079	-3284	-4746	-4200	667	916
Procurement	85,238	80,522	66,678	78,432	67,186	78,759	-18567	-2090	-18052	-1763	-515	-327
RDT&E	37,923	37,361	35,975	36,013	36,196	36,147	-1948	1348	-1727	-1214	-221	-134
Stock Funds	220	205	1984	700	1,484	544	1764	495	1264	339	500	156
CIA Retirement	165	165	165	165	165	165						
Intel Com. Staff	30	29	29	28	29	28	1		1			
Contingencies/Other			-202	-141			-202	-141			-202	-141
1990 Supplemental				(50)		(50)		50		50		
Subtotal—Defense	295,523	288,293	269,209	278,809	269,120	278,477	-26,314	9,483	-26,403	-9,816	90	332
MilCon Bill												
Military Construction	5,311	5,460	5,068	5,272	5,309	5,398	-244	-188	-2	-62	-241	-126
Family Housing	3,271	3,301	3,295	3,412	3,381	3,428	24	111	110	127	-86	-16

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE CBO BASELINE FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR 1991 APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

(Bills through conference, in millions of dollars)

Appropriation Subcommittee bill	CBD baseline		Appropriations		Authorizations		Appropriations less base-line		Authorizations less base-line		Appropriations less au-thorizations	
	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays
Subtotal-Milcon	8,582	8,761	8,362	8,684	8,690	8,826	-219	-217	108	65	-328	-142
Energy	10,044	9,800	10,925	10,374	10,927	10,375	861	574	883	575	-2	-1
VA-HUD	353	354	341	345	336	342	-12	-0	-17	-12	5	3
Commerce-Justice	93	97	225	166	225	166	132	69	132	69		
Other Bills			6	65			6	65			6	65
Offsetting Receipts, etc.	-804	-852	-804	-848	-804	-848		4		4		
Total National Defense	313,790	306,454	288,265	297,596	288,494	297,338	-25,526	-8,857	-25,297	-9,115	-229	258

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR 1992

(Bills through conference, in millions of dollars)

Appropriation Subcommittee Bill	Request		Appropriations		Authorizations		Appropriations less request		Authorizations less request		Appropriations less au-thorizations	
	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays
Defense:												
Military Personnel	78,017	77,848	78,266	78,079	78,468	78,278	249	231	451	430	-202	-199
O&M	86,432	85,704	85,498	85,364	84,341	84,065	-934	-340	-2,091	-1,639	1,157	1,299
Procurement	63,239	74,327	64,652	74,910	64,575	74,489	1,413	583	1,336	162	77	421
RD&E	49,083	37,933	38,073	37,098	39,366	37,531	-2,010	-835	-717	-402	-1,293	-433
Stock Funds	3,400	2,209	3,184	2,125	3,400	2,209	-216	-84			-216	-84
CIA Retirement	164	164	164	164	164	164						
Intel Con. Staff	31	30	29	29	31	30	-2	-1			2	1
Contingencies/Other	-336	197	120	348	-150	376	456	150	186	178	270	-28
Dire Supplemental				33		33		33		33		
Subtotal—Defense	271,030	278,413	269,986	278,150	270,195	277,175	-1,044	-263	-835	-1,238	-209	975
MilCon Bill:												
Military Construction	4,537	4,948	4,918	5,025	5,232	5,037	381	77	695	89	-314	-12
Family Housing	3,606	3,419	3,645	3,409	3,654	3,419	39	-9	48		-9	-10
Subtotal—Milcon	9,143	8,366	8,563	8,434	8,886	8,456	420	68	783	90	-323	-22
Energy	11,780	11,591	11,980	11,717	11,980	11,718	200	126	200	127	-1	-1
VA-HUD	337	339	337	338	332	336		-1	-5	-3	5	2
Commerce-Justice	225	177	234	187	225	177	9	10			9	10
Other Bills			(38)	18			-38	18			-38	18
Offsetting Receipts, etc	-684	-684	-687	-684	-687	-684						
Resolution Plug		-2,937		-2,937		-2,937						
Total National Defense	290,829	295,266	290,375	295,223	290,932	294,241	-454	-42	103	-1,023	-557	982

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION ACTION COMPARED TO THE BUDGET REQUEST FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FOR 1993

(Bills through conference, in millions of dollars)

Appropriation's Subcommittee Bill	Request		Appropriations		Authorizations		Appropriations less request		Authorizations less request		Appropriations less au-thorizations	
	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays	Budget au-thority	Outlays
Defense:												
Military Personnel	77,080	76,952	76,275	76,177	76,511	76,409	-805	-775	-569	-542	-236	-233
O&M	88,266	87,996	85,745	85,930	84,137	84,897	-2,521	-2,057	-4,129	-3,099	1,608	1,043
Procurement	54,416	69,118	54,135	68,574	53,072	68,549	-281	-544	-1,343	-568	25	25
RD&E	38,921	38,334	38,292	38,006	39,614	38,714	-630	-328	692	380	-1,322	-708
Stock Funds	2,164	311	-1,929	-3,353	495	-663	-4,093	-3,665	-1,669	-974	-2,424	-2,691
CIA Retirement & ICS	200	199	247	231	256	237	47	32	56	38	-9	-6
Coast Guard	203	186	303	278	203	186	100	92	0	0	100	92
Econ Conversion/Other	-110	-3	595	593	63	228	705	596	173	231	532	365
Frank Burdesharing Cut												
Subtotal—Defense	261,140	273,093	253,662	266,444	254,351	268,558	-7,479	-6,649	-6,789	-4,535	-690	-2,114
Military Construction:												
Military Construction	4,274	5,810	4,453	5,819	4,441	5,828	179	9	167	19	11	-9
Family Housing	3,999	3,647	3,936	3,597	3,943	3,608	-63	-51	-56	-39	-7	-12
Subtotal—Milcon	8,273	9,457	8,389	9,416	8,385	9,437	116	-42	112	-21	4	-21
Energy	12,132	11,901	12,132	11,856	11,935	11,719	-0	-44	-197	-182	196	137
VA-HUD	322	328	372	350	372	350	50	22	50	22		
Commerce-Justice	487	466	796	626	796	626	309	160	309	160		
Stockpile Sales (non-add)	(-612)	(-612)	(-612)	(-612)	(-612)	(-612)						
1992 Supp's & Rescissions		-1,641		-739		-739		1,235		1,235		
Offsetting Receipts, etc.	-787	-739	-787	-739	-787	-739						
Other Bills			624	511	624	511	624	511	624	511		
Resolution Plus		-1,291		-1,291		-1,291						
Total National Defense	281,568	291,574	275,187	286,766	275,676	288,763	-6,381	-4,808	-5,892	-2,811	-489	-1,997

SASC ADD-ONS & PLUS UPS

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Administra-tion request	SASC au-thorized	Difference
Army, procurement:			
AH-64	17.6	177.6	+160.0
TOW 2 System	25.3	65.3	+40.0

SASC ADD-ONS & PLUS UPS—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Administra-tion request	SASC au-thorized	Difference
MLRS System	9.8	69.8	+60.0
M-1 Abrams Tank	26.1	48.1	+22.0
Carrier, Mod	5.5	77.5	+72.0
Abrams, Upgrade	79.7	167.7	+88.0

SASC ADD-ONS & PLUS UPS—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Administra-tion request	SASC au-thorized	Difference
Abrams, Adv Proc		17.0	+17.0
Granade Launcher	20.7	35.7	+15.0
EAC Communicatns	10.2	45.4	+35.2

SASC ADD-ONS & PLUS UPS—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Administra- tion request	SASC au- thorized	Difference
Navy, procurement:			
F-14	116.2	291.2	+175.0
Trid II, Adv Proc	145.2	170.0	+24.8
Wpns Industy Facil	22.1	37.6	+15.5
Expedinary Airflts	2.3	8.0	+5.7
Night Vision Eqpmnt	12.4	25.0	+12.6
Training Devices	11.0	21.0	+10.0
Air Force, procurement:			
Civil Air Patrol	2.5	2.7	+0.2
E-8B	281.8	476.8	+195.0
Intell Produc Actv	51.4	52.6	+1.2
Defensewide, procurement:			
Remotely Piloted Veh	69.3	89.3	+20.0
Def Spt Activ, DLA	3.4	6.2	+2.8
Items-<\$2m, DCAA		4.3	+4.3
Coalitn Commun Eqpmnt		20.0	+20.0
Classfd Prog, C3I		336.2	+336.2
High Perf Computing		122.8	+122.8
Mentor-Protge Prog		50.0	+50.0
R,D,T&E, Army:			
Materials Tech	11.3	15.3	+4.0
Modeling & Simulatn		10.0	+10.0
Environ Quality Tech	21.2	36.6	+15.4
Project Plowshares		5.0	+5.0
Landmine Warfare	10.0	20.0	+10.0
Tractor Tread		12.0	+12.0
Singcars, Adv Dev		10.0	+10.0
SADARM	41.0	98.7	+57.7
Army Virtual Brig		34.0	+34.0
UH-1 SLEP Evaluatn		5.0	+5.0
Surv/Lethality Anal	33.2	52.9	+19.7
Hi Energy Laser Test	4.8	24.8	+20.0
Manufa Science & Tech		20.0	+20.0
R,D,T&E, Navy:			
Surf/Aerospace Surv	67.3	92.3	+25.0
Ship Concept Adv Des	18.8	21.8	+3.0
Adv Techno Transnt	63.4	67.4	+4.0
SSBN Secur/Survi Pro	27.8	50.3	+22.5
Nex Generatn Fightr		50.0	+50.0
Marine Cor Asslt Veh	24.3	29.4	+5.1
Manufa Science & Tech		50.0	+50.0
R,D,T&E, Air Force:			
Rocket/Propulsion	40.0	50.0	+10.0
Advanced Weapons	33.0	50.0	+17.0
Training Syst Devel	30.0	45.0	+15.0
Manufa Science & Tech		60.0	+60.0
Space Launch Modern		30.0	+30.0
AFSCN Modernization		78.0	+78.0
R,D,T&E, Defensewide:			
Defense Research Ser	2.0	22.0	+20.0
Univ Support Init		42.6	+42.6
U.S.-Japan Mngmt Trng		10.0	+10.0
Hist Black Colleges		15.0	+15.0
Cmptg Syst Comm Tech	368.6	376.1	+7.5
Integ Comm&Control Eq	57.2	107.2	+50.0
Matrils & Elec Tech	198.5	235.0	+36.5
Natl Guard/ARPA		17.9	+17.9
Project Compass		14.7	+14.7
Fuel Cell Technology		4.0	+4.0
ASTOWL		6.0	+6.0
Dual Use Partnershs	324.0	605.0	+281.0
Manu Science & Tech	147.7	171.0	+23.3
Strat Environmtl Rese	98.0	200.0	+102.0
Medical Research		10.5	+10.5
Focus Hope		15.0	+15.0
Manufactg Technology	299.6	306.6	+7.0
Jt Wargmg Simul/Mngmt	67.2	86.2	+19.0
Classified Programs		10.0	+10.0
Arch Project		7.2	+7.2
Intell-Communi Class	1,280.7	1,318.0	+37.3
Jt Simul Doctrine Ctr		6.5	+6.5
Peace Enfront Doct Dev		5.0	+5.0
Ctr Prolif Initiative		28.0	+28.0
Total—75 Programs 43 Plus Ups, 32 Not re- quested			+2,873.7

Mr. INOUE. There are 75 programs on this table. Thirty-two were not requested by the administration and 43 are authorized at funding levels above the administration's request.

I hope that with this, the RECORD will be clarified.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1051

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, I was presiding earlier when our colleague from Oklahoma, Senator NICKLES, offered an amendment that I think is a bad piece of legislation. I spoke very briefly, after I came down from the chair, against that amendment that we will be voting on later.

The Senator's amendment basically says U.S. troops cannot serve under the command of someone from another nation. That has a certain amount of appeal initially to us as Americans. But what if every nation took that attitude and said you cannot do it unless it is authorized by the congress or parliament of that nation?

The reality is, the United Nations would be paralyzed. It is one of those things that has a visceral appeal, but just is not wise.

We are in a situation where, candidly, the President of the United States is new to foreign policy, and so there is a little feeling of uneasiness. There is a feeling, while he gets his sea legs, so to speak, in foreign policy, we recognize there is a kind of a vacuum and the temptation is for us to move into the vacuum and micromanage. And it is a great mistake. I understand there may be a substitute amendment to the Nickles amendment. From what I have heard of the substitute amendment, that is not good legislation, though I may vote for it rather than the Nickles amendment, which is draconian in terms of what it would do.

But, when I got back to my office, my office mentioned the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Acting Chairman Admiral Jeremiah, sent a letter to Senator MITCHELL that I assume was distributed to all Members. I ask unanimous consent for that full letter to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, October 14, 1993.
Hon. GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: I have a number of concerns about the proposed Cochran-Nickles Amendment to the FY 1994 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, H.R. 3116. The legislation would deny funds for United States combat forces under foreign command in United Nations operations or as part of any standing international armed force, unless authorized by Congress.

Certainly, I support the concept that United States forces must serve under the best commanders, with clear and effective command and control arrangements in place. However, I would disagree with any suggestion that foreign commanders cannot command American forces when the President decides it is appropriate to do so. The NATO command structure, for example, is a proven success, as were the coalition command arrangements in Desert Storm. Our American forces routinely serve under the command of foreign officers in NATO, and they accomplish their missions in an exemplary manner.

It is important for the President, as commander-in-chief, to retain flexibility in the use of American forces. Whether United States forces should serve under a foreign commander must depend on individual case circumstances, and the executive branch is best suited to make such determinations. Factors will include the robustness of command and control arrangements, the type of mission, and the competency of a particular

commander to lead our forces. The proposed legislation would involve Congress in the detailed execution of military contingency planning, in an all-but-unprecedented manner. Such a degree of micromanagement of military forces would be overly broad, impractical, unwieldy, and unwise.

The legislation would make it difficult for this nation to function effectively in any United Nations, NATO or other multinational command and control situation. It could lead to an "all or nothing" approach, causing the United States to shoulder the entire burden even when a multinational approach would be effective and in our best interests.

The provision in the proposed legislation that would deny funding for forces that are part of standing international armed forces is duplicative. Such forces are deployed only under treaty commitments, which would of course have already been endorsed by the Senate. It is not necessary to add an additional layer of congressional approval.

Finally, the proposed legislation would have the President seek Congressional authorization before instructing the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations on a vote of a resolution. That procedure would infringe on the President's foreign policy prerogatives and would be unworkable in practice.

I appreciate Congressional concerns about these sensitive issues. The Congress has many vehicles for expressing its views and seeking changes in foreign policy, and we will continue to work with you on all matters of concern. However, I believe the proposed Cochran-Nickles Amendment would prove detrimental to the national interests.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JEREMIAH,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Let me read just two paragraphs of that letter from Admiral Jeremiah.

It is important for the President, as commander-in-chief, to retain flexibility in the use of American forces. Whether United States forces should serve under a foreign commander must depend on individual case circumstances, and the executive branch is best suited to make such determinations. Factors will include the robustness of command and control arrangements, the type of mission, and the competency of a particular commander to lead our forces. The proposed legislation would involve Congress in the detailed execution of military contingency planning, in an all-but-unprecedented manner. Such a degree of micromanagement of military forces would be overly broad, impractical, unwieldy, and unwise.

This is the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff speaking.

The legislation would make it difficult for this Nation to function effectively in any United Nations, NATO or other multinational command and control situation. It could lead to an "all or nothing" approach, causing the United States to shoulder the entire burden even when a multinational approach would be effective and in our best interests.

I hope we have the good sense not to adopt this amendment. I served in the Army after World War II, from 1951 to 1953, in Germany. But the floor manager of this legislation, the senior Senator from Hawaii, Senator INOUE, was

one of our heroes in World War II. In World War II there were times when we had, for example, General Montgomery, leading not only British troops but our troops. And it was true also in the Pacific from time to time, we had different people from different nations leading our troops. Let us not go back to a day when we say we have to have Americans here.

I reiterate the other point I mentioned earlier, how many times we hear on the floor of the Senate, and we have heard it whether we are in Washington or Illinois, people say, "We cannot become the policemen of the world." If we are unwilling to work with other nations, it is inevitable, as the world's only superpower, that is precisely the role we will have to undertake.

Yes, we should be careful about committing American troops. But there will be, from time to time, an occasion where American troops may be under the command of someone who is British or French or German, or who knows from what country they may come? If we are unwilling to work with other countries, then inevitably we are going to take on a huge burden. I think we should listen to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who says this legislation is not in the interests of our country, not in the interests of an effective military.

I hope we will reject the Nickles amendment.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I had not intended to speak on this matter, but I have had the privilege of sitting through the presentation of this amendment by Senator NICKLES, and I believe the Senator made it very clear that it does not apply to troop activities such as we find in Korea or in the NATO command. Neither would it apply to Haiti at this time, because the amendment is very clear, if the troops are for logistics, for health, for public safety, they are not covered. Combat forces are covered. It says rather clearly that, if combat forces are covered, it would need the authorization of the Congress, unless the President certifies that this is in the national security and therefore is required.

But I rise, not because I support the Nickles-Cochran amendment. I am not prepared to vote for or against it at this time. But I rise because I find this letter from the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated October 14, to be, oh, shall I say, not in the best tradition of good executive/legislative relations. I hope that this statement, "the executive branch is best suited to make such determinations," will be crossed out. Unless the Acting Chairman is suggesting that the Congress, for some reason, is inferior in its intellect, inferior in its knowledge and background to that of the Executive in

making such determinations. After all, the Constitution says the Congress shall make war. We are the ones who declare war. It is not the President of the United States; it is the Congress. I hope the Executive Office keeps that in mind.

Second, to suggest that an amendment which says simply you must get congressional approval is micromanagement, I do not see where the micromanagement comes in. We are just saying, if you are going to send combat forces, let us come to Congress and have a discussion. Tell us what you intend to use the forces for. Where are the forces going to be sent and how many? It does not involve the Congress in detailed execution of military contingency planning, in an all-but-unprecedented manner. Does a simple authorization of use of combat forces involve Congress in detailed execution of military contingency planning, in an all-but-unprecedented manner?

I very much regret receiving this letter. I hope the administration will take another look at this and possibly come forth with an amended version.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, I have great respect for my colleague from Hawaii. I had respect for him before I served on the Select Committee on Indian affairs, but I have come to have infinitely greater respect for him because of what he has done to help Native Americans. He has spent a huge amount of time on this. If he picks up 15 votes in Hawaii for doing that, I will be amazed. It is just a great public service, and he is a great public servant.

But I have to say I think the letter of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is right on target. I would simply point out to my colleagues the case had this been in effect in terms of the Somalia situation. Here we were in November, where the President of the United States had to make a decision whether to go under U.N. auspices. We were not in session. We would not be in session until January. And the President had to make a decision.

The President consulted with Members of Congress and then made a decision. That President was not a President of my party, George Bush, but he made the right decision. But under this legislation that could not have been done. I think we would make a great mistake if we tied the hands of our military in this manner. I think the points made by Admiral Jeremiah are in order. I think it is micromanagement and it would make it very, very difficult.

I mentioned this earlier. When our forces were in North Africa we had them then under—and let us say it was United Nations, and they would designate the counterpart of the then-current General Montgomery.

I do not think we should have to come back to Congress and say is it OK for General Montgomery to lead our Armed Forces there.

I think this is not good legislation. I think it is micromanaging. I think we are better off not going down this road. So I respectfully, at least in part, disagree with my distinguished colleague from Hawaii.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and if no one seeks the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I would like to respond to my good friend, Senator SIMON from Illinois, as to some of the comments that were made concerning the amendment that I have offered on behalf of myself, Senator COCHRAN and, I think, ten other Senators.

The letter that the Senator from Illinois was quoting, which was written by the acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, raised several concerns which I believe we have addressed in our amendment. The Joint Chiefs of Staff was working off an old, outdated version of the amendment.

We modified our amendment. Actually, we were working and addressed those concerns which were raised. I tell my friend and colleague from Illinois, that on Friday the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee raised some of those same issues—such as Korea and NATO—and because we did not want, in our amendment, to unduly hamper or hinder any of our alliances that have proven to be quite successful and quite effective.

The entire purpose of the amendment was to try to restrict and make sure that we did not have United States combat forces under a U.N. operational control under a foreign commander without Congress having any say so, but not to undo or undermine NATO, not to undo or undermine Korea or any of the successful alliances that we have had.

So I will tell my friend and colleague, we have addressed both those issues. We put in our amendment language and it says:

*** any part of any prospective standing U.N. international armed force.

I say that to my colleague because there are considerations made by this administration, and certainly by the Secretary General of the United Nations, that we would like to have a standing U.N. international armed force to be able to put out fires, as we might say, across the world. I am concerned about having a standing international armed force. So that is part of

my amendment, to prohibit U.S. combat troops from participating in such a force.

I will also say, concerning other statements that were made, we put in language to make sure there would be no ambiguities concerning NATO, to make sure there is no confusion or question concerning Korea. Also, I might mention, I have heard some people say, "Well, what about micro-management," and so on?

I think we have given the President some flexibility. If the President believes that we have a situation where our forces should be serving under U.N. command, under the command of a foreign officer, he can say so. He can make the request. He can say national security interests justify such a waiver, and continue operating. He would have to get congressional approval in 30 days.

If his request were legitimate, or her request were legitimate—whatever the case may be—I am sure that would be granted. The President would also have the right to make an emergency declaration, again if he or she felt like that was the proper thing to do.

So we tried not to tie the President's hands but maybe even to strengthen the President's hands by reaffirming the President's constitutional role, and that is as Commander in Chief, and not to delegate that to the Secretary General of the United Nations. So that is the purpose of our amendment.

Again, I will just say I have a note from the Joint Chiefs of Staff Office of the Chairman, legal counsel. It says the concerns they addressed were contained in proposed legislation that has since been modified. I have that to share with the Senator, if he would like that for his information.

Also, I might mention, I know the Senator from Illinois raised the question: What about World War I where we did have U.S. forces under foreign command? That was not a U.N. operation. In World War II, it was not a U.N. operation, and the supreme commander was an American citizen. But in neither case would they apply because they were not U.N. operations.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague will yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SIMON. We are in a very different situation from World War II. But in World War II, we would know if this were the situation. We would be under the United Nations and a General Montgomery who commanded in North Africa British forces as well as American forces. Under your legislation, as I read it, it would take a special act of Congress—

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, that is incorrect, because if you look on page 3 where it says U.N. operation or tactical control, look down to line 23. It says:

*** the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct mission-related activities of the units comprising such force.

Clearly, in World War II, we had General Eisenhower as the supreme commander, and you are talking about the supreme commander; you are talking about General Schwarzkopf in the Persian Gulf. It would not have impacted or reduced our ability to conduct the operation in the Persian Gulf. It would not have limited or hindered the ability to conduct operations in World War II or in Korea.

Mr. SIMON. I suggest, first of all, when you say the leader of a military force, there is no question General Montgomery was a leader of a military force. He clearly was in command. The overall commander was General Eisenhower, but clearly General Montgomery was in charge of American troops in North Africa.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield further, Senator WARNER raised the same question, and the point that I have made and I believe is very clear in our language, it says "*** the power of command usually given to the leader." We are talking about the supreme leader or commander of the force. Granted, both in World War II and in the Persian Gulf, we had leaders of units and divisions and so on of other countries—that is appropriate—where you had the United States as the supreme commander. Again, let me repeat, World War II was not a U.N. function. The Persian Gulf did have a U.N. resolution, but it did have a U.S. commander in operational control.

Mr. SIMON. Let me also suggest that in the Somali situation, let us say that the United Nations and the United States, after consultation, felt that under United Nations auspices the best person to lead the Somali situation would have been an Italian general because of Italy's background there. We were not in session. We would not have been in session until January when we came in just for a day or two when we were sworn in, and then we did not come back in until the end of January. The President could not do that under your resolution.

I think we have to give the President of the United States flexibility. Bill Clinton is not always going to be President of the United States. But whether it is Bill Clinton or George Bush or whoever it is, I think we have to give the President of the United States some flexibility in these situations.

Second, I say to my friend from Oklahoma, we have to assume that if we are going to do this, other nations are going to take the same attitude, and that makes it almost impossible for the United Nations to have any kind of a military operation. They will not want to come under an American commander. Right now we have 27 nations

in Somalia. We cannot have 27 military commanders in Somalia.

Mr. McCAIN. On Somalia, if the Senator will read my amendment, it deals with combat troops. We exempt those troops that are engaged in medical, logistics—I might mention the majority of our troops in Somalia are in logistics—communications, humanitarian, training, temporary observer, or liaison activities. So our amendment is defined to say we want to reserve putting U.S. combat forces under U.N. control, under a foreign commander unless authorized by Congress.

Take the example the Senator from Illinois raised concerning Somalia. We had 20,000-some troops. They were under U.S. command. When that command force was reduced from 20,000-some to 4,000, all logistics, et cetera, were under U.N. command, but the United States kept control and command of our combat forces.

So this amendment by myself and Senator COCHRAN and others would not have stopped at Somalia. Because actually technically the U.S. combat forces were always under U.S. command.

I might also mention, the President of the United States, when he sent in several thousand additional U.S. combat troops, clearly emphasized that they would be under U.S. control.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague will yield, I do not want to carry this on indefinitely, and I have great respect for the Senator's motivation.

The second part of the resolution on page 2, when we are talking about a U.N. force, there I think Congress has not examined that issue and the Senator is properly looking at that.

But as to the Somalia situation, let me assure the Senator, as one who has consulted and who was involved in the meeting in the White House when the decision was made to go ahead, we were prepared for combat. We did not know what kind of a reception we were going to get when we went into Somalia. If at that point the President of the United States had felt it was prudent because of the background of Somalia to have an Italian leader, that would have been impossible under the resolution. It would have been impossible except for the President having a 30-day waiver, and then he would have had to call a special session of Congress and we would have had to debate this thing.

There is no question this takes away serious management responsibilities from the President of the United States. Sometimes we have to do that. But I think in general we ought to be very cautious in doing that.

So I am going to, with all due respect to my colleague from Oklahoma, be voting against his amendment when it comes up.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate the comments of the Senator.

I just wanted to make sure we had some clarification because I had heard

statements that this would mess up NATO. It will not. I had heard some statements this might undermine Korea, some of the existing alliances, and clearly that is not the case.

Plus I might just mention to my colleague we have never had a President, to my knowledge, who has sought to delegate his authority to the United Nations. That is a concern of mine.

I do not know if my friend from Illinois heard many of the quotes that I read earlier today from both the President and the U.N. representative, Madeleine Albright, talking about increased role and function of U.N. peacekeeping activities which went well beyond peacekeeping but into peace-making and peace enforcing.

Also, I might tell my colleague, I do not know if he heard this but the number and the size of peacekeeping forces in the United Nations in the last 3 years has grown from 10,000 to 80,000. This is an astronomical increase in the number of troops. Also, I inform my colleagues that in peacekeeping operations in the first 40 years of the United Nations, we had 13 peacekeeping operations. In the last 8 years of the United Nations, we have had 14 peacekeeping operations.

So the role of peacekeeping has grown dramatically. And now we have a Secretary General of the United Nations who would like to see that role expanded dramatically, including a standing U.N. international armed force. I have serious reservations about that. Congress has not approved that. We are talking about not with a mission defined for a specific region or a specific country. We are talking about a blank check mission with an international army looking for the next fire to put out.

When you consider some of the conflicts that are ongoing—and many are very serious—some are enormously dangerous. I am thinking of some of the Soviet Republics—in Georgia, where all of us know individuals who are engaged in that civil war, unfortunately; the potential in Russia; the potential in Kazakhstan and some of the other Republics, not to mention in Yugoslavia where this administration has been talking about committing 25,000 troops.

This is significant. My amendment would allow that if it is done under NATO control, but if it is done under United Nations control, this amendment would apply. And yes, it might entail some encumbrance on the President, but I would think the President as Commander in Chief would not want to be assigning that kind of responsibility over to the Secretary General.

I might mention, just thinking out loud on Bosnia, when some actions were contemplated in Bosnia, we had the United Nations Secretary General basically making decisions about, or saying that he would make the final

decisions on where the air strikes would hit and what kind of response.

That again concerns this Senator. I think we have to be very careful before we delegate U.S. combat, warmaking authority to the United Nations or to the U.N. Secretary General. I think that is the purpose of this amendment.

So this amendment says the President can do whatever he wants in the international peacekeeping force. But if you are talking about combat, if you are talking about combat under U.N. auspices, under foreign control, the President is going to have to give authority. We do not want to give a blank check to an international army; we do not want to give a blank check to the U.N. Secretary General to commit U.S. combat troops, men and women, without the President either taking control of the situation and asserting his authority or likewise if he wishes and he deems it in the national interest to put those troops under foreign command under U.N. auspices or operation and control, then he would have to get congressional authorization within 20 days.

I thank my friend.

Mr. SIMON. The issue the Senator brings up of how we shape the United Nations in terms of how it provides some stability in the world I think is a very important issue. I have had some discussions about this with the Senator's senior colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. BOREN, and with a few of my other colleagues. I do not find the 80,000 U.N. troops an astronomical number when you think we have 2 million in our Armed Forces alone. But the great threat in the world for the coming decades is instability, and the United Nations is going to have to be part of giving us some stability. What our role should be there I think is something that we have to look at very carefully.

While I will vote against the amendment of my colleague from Oklahoma, I think Senator NICKLES has made a contribution in helping us to focus on where we are going in the future because we really do not know. And that point, the second point in the amendment on page 2 is one we do have to examine. I agree with him completely on that, even though I oppose his amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I would like to insert in the RECORD a memorandum submitted by the legal counsel for office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs, which basically says their letter, which Senator SIMON had referred to earlier, addresses earlier legislation.

I think the legislation that we have introduced today solves most of the concerns that were raised by that previous letter.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, October 14, 1993.

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

The Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff wrote to two Senators about the proposed Cochran-Nickles Amendment to the FY 1994 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, H.R. 3116, earlier today. That letter addressed concerns contained in the only proposed legislation we had received as of the time the letter was signed this morning. The proposed legislation followed a "Dear Colleague" letter signed by Senators Cochran and Nickles on October 8, 1993.

JAMES P. TERRY,

Colonel, USMC, Legal Counsel.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, on behalf of Senator FEINSTEIN, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's relevant amendment be deleted from the list of amendments in order.

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

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. NICKLES pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 152 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set-aside for the purpose of offering an amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] proposes an amendment numbered 1056.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, the Secretary of the Navy shall obligate the funds appropriated for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the USH-42 Mission Recorder program within the A-6 aircraft program: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy verifies that a mission recorder is required in the future for Navy attack aircraft for peacetime training and bomb damage assessment in combat:

Provided further, That the Secretary shall make this verification within 60 days of this act becoming law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall obligate such funds within 60 days of this verification that a mission recorder is required in Navy attack aircraft for peacetime training and bomb damage assessment in combat.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I have discussed this amendment with both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican Member of the subcommittee. In essence, what this amendment does is simply say that the Secretary of the Navy shall obligate the funds already authorized and appropriated in fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the USH-42 mission recorder program within the A-6 aircraft program, and that it be carried out.

The legislation that I am offering is simply an amendment that says that the Navy shall verify that this mission recorder is required in the future for Navy attack aircraft for peacetime training and bomb damage assessment in combat, and that the secretary shall make this verification within 60 days, and the secretary shall then obligate the funds within 60 days of his verification that such a mission recorder is required.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I have had the occasion to study this amendment, and I find no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1056) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BREAUX. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I rise to make an observation.

We have been on this bill since 10:30 this morning, 6½ hours ago. During the past 6½ hours we have adopted three amendments.

The current continuing resolution expires at midnight on Thursday, this Thursday. Assuming that we work day and night, without time off to sleep or to dine, there are 79 hours remaining.

Madam President, we have before us a list of amendments which we have declared to be in order. There are 52 amendments which will have to be resolved in 79 hours nonstop. They represent a variety of issues, but many of them are listed only as relevant, whatever that means. There are 22 of those relevant amendments.

So, if I may, Madam President, respectfully call upon my colleagues to come forward to present their amendments, otherwise, I will have no choice but to recommend to the leadership that we stay in session all night, if such is necessary, because a few hours ago the Speaker of the House, Mr. FOLEY, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, issued a joint statement advising the Congress and the Senate, in particular, that there will be no extension of the continuing resolution and if this matter is not resolved by Thursday midnight, and by that I mean passing the measure, going into conference, coming forth with a conference report, and having a conference report adopted and signed by the President by midnight Thursday, the Defense Department will come to a screeching halt. I suppose there are some who will applaud this, to put a stop to the Defense Department.

But I would hope that Senators would take this responsibility seriously, come forward, present their amendments because if we are to continue as we have in the past 6½ hours we have problems ahead of us.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1057

(Purpose: To require the publication of the figure for total intelligence spending.)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I rise for a purpose which has formed in my mind for some years now, concerning the secrecy of the Nation's intelligence budget. This is a very large budget. It is at once a secret to the American people and a matter of commonplace knowledge to persons who read periodicals in this field. They need not be very exotic periodicals.

Just the other day on the floor our distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas proposed cutting the budget by \$400 million. His effort was tabled, but in the course of it, with his wonderfully animated advocacy, he used a table which listed the total defense budgets of a number of NATO countries in descending order of size, and the reported intelligence budget of the United States, we find, is larger than the defense budgets of half of our NATO allies.

This has come about largely because this budget is, and remains, secret. During the 1980's just the force of budgetary constraints required that the military defense buildup that began under President Carter and accelerated somewhat under President Reagan had to halt by mid-decade and then begin to decline. It has been declining ever since. That is the defense budget, an open budget. Not all the activities are open but the aggregate number is well known and is debated on this floor. Indeed. Is this moment being debated on this floor. However, not only was the intelligence budget rising in the beginning of the last decade and the decade before, but it never turned down. It contained to rise and to rise.

Indeed, on April 15 this year, a not insignificant date, we learned in the New York Times—because these things are published—that the administration had proposed a secret increase in the secret budget of a very large amount of money. As chairman of the Finance Committee, responsible for the larger portion of the budget reconciliation bill, I found myself taking money away from research hospitals in New York and Chicago in order to pass them on to some secret, undefined and inaccessible mission of the intelligence community.

Any Member of the body can learn anything they like about it by simply meeting in our special room for this purpose. But once you are given the information you are sworn to keep it secret. And half the time you will not know whether you learned it in that secret room in the Hart Building—I hope that is not a secret. I am sure it is not—or whether you learned it in

this morning's edition of the Chicago Tribune. This can cause cognitive dissonance. You open your mouth to say something, and silence emerges for fear of breaking your oath.

I have framed this amendment with reference to article I, section 9, clause 7, of the Constitution, which states that:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

I have simply suggested that during the cold war the United States did not provide the American people a regular statement and account of the expenditures for intelligence activities.

That this should continue prevents the polity from participating in an informed democratic decision concerning an appropriate level for such expenditures. The amendment simply provides that there be a separate, unclassified statement of the aggregate amount of budget outlays for the prior fiscal year for national and tactical intelligence activities. This figure shall include, without limitation, outlays for activities carried out under the Department of Defense budget to collect, analyze, produce, disseminate, or support the collection of intelligence.

Madam President, I send this amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] proposes an amendment numbered 1057.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PUBLICATION OF FIGURE FOR TOTAL INTELLIGENCE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution states that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

(2) During the Cold War the United States did not provide to the American people a "regular Statement and Account of the * * * Expenditures" for Intelligence activities.

(3) The failure to provide to the American people a statement of the total amount of expenditures on intelligence activities prevents them from participating in an informed, democratic decision concerning the appropriate level for such expenditures.

(b) PUBLICATION OF FIGURE FOR TOTAL INTELLIGENCE SPENDING.—Section 1105(a) of title 31 of the United States Code is amended to add at the end thereof—"(27) a separate,

unclassified statement of the aggregate amount of budget outlays for the prior fiscal year for national and tactical intelligence activities. This figure shall include, without limitation, outlays for activities carried out under the Department of Defense budget to collect, analyze, produce, disseminate or support the collection of intelligence."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, in the matter of the statement and account clause, I wish to acknowledge that from the beginning of the Republic, there have been secret accounts and they have not been made public at any time. During the Revolution, George Washington paid for much intelligence out of his own pocket. Afterwards, he presented a bill for reimbursement of some \$17,617. No small sum.

During the Revolution, under the Articles of Confederation, the Continental Congress had established a Committee of Secret Correspondence to correspond with our friends in Great Britain, Ireland and other parts of the world. Congress provided funds for espionage activities and confidential exchanges.

The provision in the Constitution rose in the final week of the convention at Philadelphia. It was a matter of some concern just how much to disclose and how often. Under the Articles of Confederation, accounts had to be settled every 6 months. In the absence of any but a very rudimentary Postal Service and no fax machines whatever, they ended up not being settled at all.

Madison, with that wonderful clarity that comes from knowledge of the real world, said that to require too much would mean that "the difficulty will beget a habit of doing nothing." But they settled on an accounting from time to time. In actual practice, once a year. They knew how important this was. They knew that it was a characteristic of tyrannical governments to have resources in the executive of which the legislature was not privy, of which the people did not know, and which had consequences for the nation.

We wished a very different society, which was not to say we did not recognize the need for secrecy in certain circumstances. The need for espionage, the threat of espionage were real things. They were just as real in the 18th century as they are today.

But some measure of scrutiny is in order. Part of the problem, Madam President, is that you can get into a world in which fantasies and fears abound because facts are not known.

Some years ago, in the 1950's, Edward A. Shils of the University of Chicago wrote his classic book, "The Torment of Secrecy." He spoke about the fear of the Freemasons, who laid the foundation, the cornerstone of our Capitol—and to this day we cannot find it.

I ask, Madam President, why? There will be days when people will ask, where did the Freemasons take that cornerstone? Are they keeping it?

Fears of conspiracy. If you would take a moment, as I am sure you have done, to look at the Washington Monument, you will find that about one-quarter of the way up, the stone changes color. And for good reason.

The monument was being built by the Washington Monument Association, a private group with States, foreign nations, and individuals giving gifts. In the 1850's, the Pope gave a gift of a block of marble. The word went out that the installation of the Pope's block of marble—inside as you walk up, you see these inscriptions—would be the signal for the Papist uprising.

One night, a group of "patriotic" citizens, who understood the secrets, burst into the offices of the Washington Monument Association, voted out the officers, voted in themselves. The Pope's block of marble is somewhere on the bottom of the Potomac River to this day. It should be looked for, actually. It may be the cornerstone of the Capitol will be found, too.

There was much scandal. Construction ceased. And, finally, as the centennial of the Republic came about, Congress said we better get this thing done. And in the 1880's, moneys were appropriated and the monument was built. The stone, as you can see, was a different color, but the Papist revolutionary conspiracy had been thwarted.

But others followed. Edward Shils wrote:

The exfoliation and intertwinement of the various patterns of belief that the world is dominated by unseen circles of conspirators, operating behind our backs, is one of the characteristic features of modern society. It is radical in its fundamental distrust of the dominant institutions and authorities of modern society.

The instruments of evil come and go. It can be the British foreign office, the Kremlin, or the Freemasons. We ought not to encourage it by embedding the torment of secrecy in our own Government.

The Senator from Arkansas spoke so well to this point the other evening. This is an argument you could not have made while the cold war raged, but that is over, Madam President. Can we not see that? Indeed, one of the things that you have to be concerned about is—and I will use the word—the absolute failure of this enormous intelligence apparatus to foresee the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war. It is as if it had an institutional interest in not doing so. Any effort to say that the Soviet Union was not working, that beliefs had died, that the totalitarian structure was going to be succeeded by ethnic assertions, got nowhere. Received no response.

If I may explore this for just one moment. I was one of the observers to the START talks in Geneva. Just after the failure of SALT II the judgment was made that if a number of Senators were to go to Geneva from time to time, sit

with the negotiators, learn what they were doing, what problems they had solved, then when and if a treaty were consummated, when it came to the Senate, there would be persons on either side of the aisle who would say: "We know how this got in and why that is," and hopefully, vouch for the product. I recall in the mid-1980's sitting in Geneva with Ambassador Max Kampelman, that most distinguished public servant, saying to the negotiators, "Gentlemen, when you have finished with the mind-numbing details of this treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, what makes you think there will be a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?"

Well, they had thought of every conceivable contingency as it affected the national security, but the one thing that never occurred to them was that. Such was the nature of the intelligence.

And when the START treaty came to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I said to our negotiators at a June 1992 hearing, "This is a treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but there is no Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. So who is this treaty with?" And I was promptly assured, "Oh, it is with four other countries." I asked, "How do we know that?" "We exchanged letters in Lisbon."

Indeed, we did, and that all is very well. But we did not get much value out of the intelligence product in that regard, did we?

As a matter of fact, Madam President, no one has spoken more plainly to this matter than Adm. Stansfield Turner, who was Director of Central Intelligence under President Carter. In an article titled "Intelligence for a New World Order" in the fall 1991 issue of foreign Affairs, Admiral Turner spoke as a man who has lived with a code of honor in the military. Rocks and shoals: If your ship goes aground, you are accountable before a court-martial. He said: "We should not gloss over the enormity of this failure to forecast the magnitude of the Soviet crisis." He went on to say that—

We know now that there were many Soviet academics, economists, and political thinkers, other than those officially presented to us by the Soviet Government, who understood long before 1980 that the Soviet economic system was broken and it was only a matter of time before someone had to try to repair it, as had Khrushchev. Yet I never heard a suggestion from the CIA, or the intelligence arms of the Departments of Defense or State, that numerous Soviets recognized a growing, systemic economic problem.

Never heard a suggestion. He said:

Today, we hear some revisionist rumblings that the CIA did in fact see the Soviet collapse emerging after all. If some individual CIA analysts were more prescient that the corporate view, their ideas were filtered out

in the bureaucratic process; and it is the corporate view that counts because that is what reaches the President and his advisers. On this one, the corporate view missed by a mile.

Why were so many of us insensitive to the inevitable?

Madam President, I will give you one thought. Secrecy is a disease. It causes hardening of arteries of the mind. A secrecy system can never correct itself. I do not want to make too much of it, but in 1986, Madam President, the Central Intelligence Agency estimated that the per capita gross domestic product in East Germany was higher than in West Germany.

Now, any taxi drive in Berlin could have told you that is not so. But our computers told us differently. It is coherent, but it is mad. And, as Admiral Turner said, the corporate view missed the reality entirely.

Madam President secrecy can be a way of life. In an editorial of September 19, 1993 the New York Times put it so very well:

Secrecy is not just a way of life of spy agencies; it is a state religion.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, we do not want that to happen to us. I can remember some of the early discussions in the 1960's with MIT professors with whom I had some acquaintance. Jack Ruina, for instance, who had been head of Defense Advance Research Projects Agency under President Kennedy, said they had been going over to the Soviet Union, and they could see that the place was not working. And then they found out something that only highly trained physicists and engineers would know.

They would say, one of their problems is that they do not know who their best people are. If anybody gets a good, young physicist inside Russia, they lock him in a room and they do not let anybody find out about him in Moscow or Omsk or Tomsk. And so they do not bring their best together, as we do in a free-flowing system where people publish immediately and word gets around. You know about some young person down in Springfield of whom it is said, "They ought to be at the Argonne laboratories. Let's look him or her up." Openness of information is what makes for great and effective science.

In 1970, the President established a task force headed by Fredrick Seitz, the then president of Rockefeller University, on this whole subject. In its report it reached the following conclusion:

The task force noted that more might be gained than lost if our Nation were to

adopt—unilaterally, if necessary—a policy of complete openness in all areas of information.

These were great scientists, the people who built the machines, built the weapons. They said: The way you work is publish everything. We will move so quickly ahead if we open up the system that it is to our advantage to do so. We did not. The cold war was too hot at that time, you might say. But that is what the scientists said.

There are two advantages to a policy of complete openness.

One, is that new ideas move quickly—where they are needed. But, two, mistakes get corrected. Mistakes get corrected.

We are living in a situation of protracted budgetary crisis in this Nation. We recently went through the torment of the budget reconciliation measure. We will go through it next year. We will try to find resources for this or that and find we cannot scrape them up anymore.

In no small measure, Madam President, that came about by the failure of our intelligence community—honorable failure, but structural, inevitable failure—to tell the succeeding Presidents of the United States that we were not facing an enemy of ever-growing strength, but, rather, we had to ask the question, what do we do if the place falls apart? Had that scenario, that possibility, made its way into the Oval Office, we would be a different Nation today. I find disappointing this administration's continuing in the pattern that proved so damaging to its predecessors, Madam President. There is nothing we can do about it except to continue to point it out in good faith and try to make the case. I doubt very much that anything I have said will be heard in the administration. They have already opted for secrecy. It is a great thrill to know something that says Top Secret. No; I am sorry, Madam President. It is no thrill to know something called Top Secret. As a matter of fact, I might conclude on this note, because it tells you where we are as a nation.

I am sure that my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Hawaii knows this, because he knows all of these issues so very well. We put out an annual report on the number of secrets created each year. It is produced by an organization in the General Services Administration, called the Information Security Oversight Office. It will tell you that last year we created 6,349,532 secrets. But the secret, sir, is that those are not the real secrets. They only go up to Top Secret. The real secrets have classifications much higher than Top Secret, but those classifications are secret so we cannot talk about them.

The secrecy world is a wonderland, a world of mirrors in which what you think to be the truth is reflected back at you and you can be profoundly misled.

Mr. INOUE. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INOUE. I realize my distinguished friend from New York intends to withdraw this amendment. But when he does, and I hope he will, introduce this as a bill, I want to be his co-sponsor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is extraordinary. Madam President, that is extraordinary. That is the best news we have had in a decade.

Mr. INOUE. Because I find it extremely difficult for anyone to argue against telling the people of the United States how much we intend to spend in the aggregate for intelligence purposes. We are not saying, so much for satellites, so much for spies, and so much for black bags. We are saying, so much for the whole package. I think the taxpayers of the United States are entitled to know how much of their tax dollars are going toward that end.

So when the bill is introduced—and I hope we will come forth with a major debate on this—I want to be there to join the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Senator.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1993]

THE SECRET WAR OVER SECRECY

The Central Intelligence Agency, it is said, has decided to release edited versions of secret documents about major covert operations from 1950 to 1963. Thus much more may be learned about the 1953 coup that reenthroned the Shah of Iran, the 1954 overthrow of an elected leftist president in Guatemala and Bay of Pigs debacle in 1961.

But it speaks volumes about old habits of secrecy and the timidity of reformers that this policy of openness was heralded by unnamed sources who spoke on condition of anonymity. The backstage struggle over secrecy is not over. And that's because the main reason for secrecy is less to protect U.S. security than to preserve the tattered myth of omniscient clandestine services.

It will be past time if the C.I.A. truly delivers. Also promised are secret estimates of Soviet strength from 1950 to 1983, and open publication of "Studies in Intelligence," the agency's in-house journal. But the proof will be in performance; skeptics remember that in 1991 the agency with much ado formed an "Openness Task Force"—whose report was promptly classified.

Secrecy is not just a way of life at spy agencies; it is a state religion. The National Archives is steward to 325 million classified documents, including still-secret files dating to World War I. When documents are declassified, key passages are often blacked out, on the pretext of protecting sources and methods. But keepers of these secrets are equally protective of evidence of gross misjudgments and abuse of power.

No doubt many lurid tales about the C.I.A. are unfounded, and many of the agency's successes are unsung. But that is the price all intelligence agencies pay for secrecy and lack of accountability. During the cold war, many Americans were willing to give their spy services the benefit of the doubt. But as the Soviet empire fell, so did the old justification for maintaining a huge secret bureaucracy in an otherwise open society.

There are good signs. R. James Woolsey, the new Director of Central Intelligence, seems to understand the need for opening windows at Langley. Anthony Lake, the national security adviser, has had firsthand experience as an author in dealing with the sludge-slow Freedom of Information Act bureaucracy; his requests took years to process, and then he was denied documents for his book about the fall of the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua. And President Clinton has ordered a review of all secrecy, to be completed by Nov. 30.

What bodes badly is that Mr. Clinton's task force is composed of the very agencies that create and protect secrets, notably the Pentagon, the C.I.A. and the State Department.

"The intelligence community is the problem," says Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who should know, since he once chaired the intelligence oversight committee. "Nothing personal, but they live off secrecy. Secrecy keeps the mistakes secret."

Hence the fear that the task force may balk at en masse declassification of millions of ancient documents, and instead recommend yet another review. Under existing rules, it will take 19 years for the National Archives just to review State Department records for the 1960's. It's up to Bill Clinton, that reinventor of government, to assure the removal of this incredible, outdated wall of paper between citizens and their supposed servants.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, on that hugely encouraging note from a gallant Senator, the senior Senator from Hawaii, I ask that I might withdraw the amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 1057) was withdrawn.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1058

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Nuclear Non-proliferation Technology Initiative)

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I send to the desk in behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. MACK, proposes an amendment numbered 1058.

On page 45, line 15, before the period, add the following: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$10,500,000 shall be available only for the ARPA Nuclear Nonproliferation Technology Initiative".

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I have had the opportunity to study this amendment. I find no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further discussion?

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment is agreeable. We ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1058) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1054, AS MODIFIED

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, in behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], I send to the desk a modification of his amendment relating to cargo preference, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 1054) is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1054), as modified, is as follows:

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report containing information on the cost to the United States of transporting supplies for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by sea on United States-flag commercial vessels pursuant to the cargo preference laws of the United States, including the amount of the cost savings that could have been realized if such supplies had been transported at competitive international shipping rates available from non-cargo-preference vessels, the subsidization of foreign-flag vessels, and the impact on the viability of the United States merchant marine if the cargo preference requirements were ended. The annual report shall cover a cargo preference year which shall be a 12-month period defined by the Secretary.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, this modified amendment has been circulated to all interested parties. There are no objections, so I ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further discussion, the question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment (No. 1054), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside so that I can send an amendment to the desk which I understand has been cleared by both sides.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1059

(Purpose: To set aside funds for a Joint Simulation Center for Warfighting Concepts and Doctrine Development and a Peace Enforcement Doctrine Development Center)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1059.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 45, line 15, before the period at the end, insert the following: "Provided, further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$6,500,000 shall be available for the establishment and operation of a Joint Simulation Center for Warfighting Concepts and Doctrine Development: Provided, further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the establishment of a Peace Enforcement Doctrine Development Center".

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the Senate-passed DOD authorization bill contained \$6.5 million to establish the Joint Simulation Center for Warfighting Concepts and Doctrine Development. This amendment would provide appropriations for that authorized project. Two years ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS] determined that they needed a simulation center to help develop doctrine for joint warfighting operations among the services. After identifying this need in testimony, Congress directed the JCS to establish a simulation center to develop doctrine for joint operations.

JCS spent last year developing the details for this center, developed a master plan this spring, and got General Powell's authorization this summer, after the time the President's budget was submitted to Congress. The Senate Armed Services Committee has taken the lead in authorizing this important Powell initiative.

The Senate-passed DOD authorization bill contained \$5 billion to establish a peace enforcement doctrine development center. This amendment would provide appropriations for that authorized project.

Recent events in Somalia and elsewhere have poignantly underscored the need for the United States to develop and exercise command and control procedures and doctrine for joint oper-

ations with military forces of other nations. These tools need to be developed and experimented with in advance, not tested on the ground where lives are on the line.

The Armed Services Committee added \$5 million to establish a center which could make use of the U.S. military's sophisticated simulation systems for working out operating concepts and procedures for integrated multinational peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions. This would enable U.S. military personnel to simulate and test doctrine, operational concepts, procedures, and command and control arrangements in a laboratory in advance of any deployments. This work could be overseen by the commander in chief of the Atlantic Command, who now has all responsibility for peacekeeping contingency planning, although this amendment does not so designate.

Madam President, this amendment would appropriate from available funds \$6½ million for the establishment and operation of the Joint Simulation Center for Warfighting Concepts and Doctrine Development. That center is already in operation, but there are no funds in the 1994 appropriations bill for it to continue. It was just begun July 1 with the approval of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

In addition, this would provide \$5 million from available funds for the establishment of a peace enforcement doctrine development center. This would be the place where we would try to come up with the doctrine for multinational enforcement which we are having so much difficulty with in Somalia and other parts of the world.

Madam President, I understand that the amendment has been cleared by both sides. Both of these funds have been authorized by the Armed Services Committee following substantial and significant hearings into the entire area of multinational peace enforcement.

In fact, I think Congress will be getting into that issue a great deal. We have had significant hearings, and this is part of the outcome. The funds have been authorized.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, the managers are pleased to advise the Senate that we agree with the amendment and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment (No. 1059) was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I thank the managers of the bill. These are some important new concepts

which we are moving into because of the changes in the world. They are difficult for all of us, I think, to easily embrace or describe or to put into a 30-second sound bite. I think it is very critical that we have both of these centers created inside the Department of Defense, and I think the Department of Defense will welcome both.

I thank the managers for their support.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1060

(Purpose: To ensure that progress payments for the C-17 aircraft program are made in compliance with existing law)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], for himself and Mr. D'AMATO, proposes an amendment numbered 1060.

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 by this Act may be used for making any progress payment under the C-17 aircraft program that is not consistent with the requirements of section 2307(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I had the amendment read in its entirety because I think it is very self-explanatory.

I have already had some discussions with the majority and Republican managers of the bill and they said that they would accept it.

Madam President, this amendment makes C-17 progress payments match up with the work performed and quality standards set in contracts.

Senator D'AMATO is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Madam President, let me make one point crystal clear at the outset.

My purpose is not to sabotage the C-17 program.

We need to modernize our fleet of transport aircraft, but if we stay on the present course, there will be no C-17 fleet. The C-17 will self-destruct under the sheer weight of mounting costs and mismanagement.

If we continue down this road much further, we will end up short on strategic airlift.

Mr. President, we need to get back to basics.

It is like returning to fundamentals in football practice. Let us practice blocking and tackling instead of trying fancy new plays.

Complicated acquisition reform legislation is not the answer.

All we need to do is follow the rules on the books. That is the purpose of my amendment today.

Our amendment would attempt to enforce current law—but a law that the Department of Defense [DOD] Inspector General [IG] charges has been violated on C-17 contracts.

The law needs to be re-energized. It needs to be brought back to life.

Our amendment would impose sanctions where there are none. It would put some teeth in the law. It would bring fiscal penalties for noncompliance.

Our amendment would prohibit the use of fiscal year 1994 C-17 procurement funds for making progress payments that are not consistent with section 2307 of title 10 of the United States Code.

Now, what exactly does section 2307 say. It says and I quote:

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that any payment for work in progress (including materials, labor, and other items) under a defense contract that provides for such payments is commensurate with the work, which meets standards of quality established under the contract, that has been accomplished.

Now, Madam President, what does this really mean?

It means: first, payments must be equal in value to the work performed minus standard holdback; and second, the work performed must meet quality standards established in the contract.

Madam President, this law is supposed to bring some measure of discipline to defense contracting.

It is very compact yet far-reaching. In just a few words, it covers a lot of important territory.

To get paid, under the law, the contractor must perform work on time and within cost that meets standards of quality set in the contract. If the contractor fails at that, payments are either withheld or reduced according to the seriousness of the deficiency.

Madam President, careful study of the DOD IG's report on the C-17 convinced us of the need to enforce this law.

The problems giving rise to that need are carefully and thoroughly documented in the DOD IG's report concerning financial mismanagement on C-17 contracts dated January 14, 1993.

The IG report is all about illegal or improper progress payments to McDonnell Douglas.

An emerging \$1.5 billion cost overrun on C-17 fixed-price contracts precipitated a financial crisis that led to the improper payments.

The contractor, McDonnell Douglas, is threatened with major financial losses and may soon file claims.

To soften the blow, senior Air Force officials devised various schemes to coverup mounting schedule delays and

the burgeoning cost overrun—all to maintain a uninterrupted flow of money to the company.

This was a backdoor bailout operation.

First, there was the cost mischarging scheme.

When all fiscal year 1990 R&D money for the C-17 was exhausted and there were still big R&D bills to pay, Air Force officials arbitrarily shifted R&D costs to the production contract that was "fat" on cash.

This procedure—known as the infamous journal voucher transfer operation—violated several statutes.

Yet it continues even today.

Eventually \$500 to \$600 million in R&D expenses will have to be shifted back to the R&D contract where they belong. Sadly, there is no R&D money to cover those expenses. The ceiling on the R&D contract has been breached, and the Anti-Deficiency Act has been violated.

McDonnell Douglas will have to pick up at least part of the tab.

The journal voucher transfer operation temporarily prevented a cost overrun on the R&D contract and made McDonnell Douglas appear to be performing efficiently. It hid the cost overrun and made McDonnell Douglas look good.

The deception facilitated a steady flow of money and the award of follow-on contracts.

Had the true costs been known up front, the payments might have stopped.

But payments continued. The cost mischarging scheme then contributed to the second problem—premature progress payments to McDonnell Douglas.

The IG says improper or illegal progress payments totaled \$349 million. Clearly, these payments constituted potential violations of section 2307 of title 10 of the U.S. Code.

Madam President, the new Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, disciplined four of the five senior Air Force officials who engineered illegal C-17 payments.

This was a courageous move. It sends the right signal to the rest of the weapons purchasing community: zero tolerance for dishonesty and mismanagement.

Admittedly, Madam President, the misconduct that precipitated reprimands dished out by Secretary Aspin occurred between July 1, 1990, and December 31, 1990.

That was 3 years ago. But there has been no let up. These problems are continuing right up to the present time.

Madam President, I would like to quote from the House Armed Services Committee Report No. 103-200, dated July 30, 1993.

The very same problems persist today.

I quote from page 77:

After an extensive set of hearings, the committee learned that the C-17 remains a

seriously troubled program with contractual and program issues intertwined in a way that has defied remedy: (1) full scale development is still not complete, and flight testing will not be complete until 1995 at the earliest; (2) the contractor may be in default on the full-scale development contract and plans to seek \$1.2 billion in claims against the government; and (3) lax management by the Air Force may be signaling that the government has no intention of enforcing the contract terms or terminating the program.

Madam President, that is a devastating assessment. It is an indictment of the C-17 program.

The Senate Armed Services Committee Report No. 103-112, dated July 27, 1993, is almost as critical of the C-17 program as its House counterpart.

This is what the Senate Armed Services Committee says about the C-17. I quote from page 40:

The Committee is at the limit of its patience with the C-17 program, due to serious mismanagement by the Air Force and the contractor, and is approaching the point of advocating program termination.

Madam President, we have serious criticism about the C-17 coming from both Armed Services Committees. That is reason for concern. That is a red warning flag. We need to pay attention. That criticism is based on extensive knowledge.

Madam President, my concerns flow from two related developments.

First, C-17 aircraft delivered to date do not meet important contract specifications like the aircraft range and cargo-carrying capacity. Nor has the C-17 demonstrated the ability to carry cargo into short, 3000-foot runways as required by contract.

Official Air Force and DOD documents, such as the DD-250—or Material Inspection and Receiving Report—clearly indicate that C-17 aircraft delivered to date have significant contract deficiencies.

Madam President, I am not talking about mickey mouse problems, either.

The C-17 does not meet range/payload specifications or specs as they are called. The C-17 cannot carry cargo into a short, 3,000-foot runway.

That's not rinky dink stuff. We're talking about the primary justification for the C-17.

Second, DOD is developing an unsatisfactory solution for the problem.

The plan is outlined in a memo from the new DOD acquisition czar, Mr. John M. Deutch, to the Secretary of the Air Force. It is dated May 11, 1993.

Mr. Deutch has essentially told the Air Force to revise the C-17 specs as the service sees fit.

That is a license to steal.

The Deutch memo gives credence to the House Armed Services Committee's warning that the "government has no intention of enforcing the terms of the contract."

The Deutch plan will help the contractor and the airplane meet the specs. The specs will be lowered.

This is contractor nourishment at its worst.

The specs will meet the airplane rather than having the airplane meet the specs. This is one way to achieve harmony on contracts. It is also a waste of money.

We paid McDonnell Douglas top dollar to meet much more stringent specs.

More stringent specs are more expensive because they involve greater risk. They may not be feasible.

If the C-17 cannot meet the more stringent specs, then the McDonnell Douglas must either correct the problem or repay the Government a reasonable sum of money for lost performance.

Otherwise, Madam President, the contract should be terminated for default.

Madam President, that is not going to happen. The contract will be modified to meet the airplane.

We are headed down that road—again.

News reports suggests that the deed is done.

The C-17's range/payload specifications have been adjusted downward on three different occasions—November 1985, March 1990, July 1991. They are about to take another dive.

Each time we paid for higher specs but end up with lower ones and still pay full price and more.

This is just one more example of the "rubber baseline."

The practice of harmonizing contract specs to match product performance makes a mockery of defense contracting.

Madam President, if contracts are constantly modified to meet product performance, what value do contracts have?

Madam President, the Armed Services Committee has attempted to grapple with the problem.

Section 124 of the defense authorization bill would withhold all future funds until certain, specific program milestones are met.

The committee drew a line in the sand on a long list of important performance requirements.

The Armed Services Committee's proposal is an attempt to impose some discipline on the C-17 program and to prevent further erosion of critical aircraft performance specifications.

Madam President, our amendment would buttress the section 124 of the fiscal year 1994 defense authorization bill. It would dovetail with section 124.

It would attempt to draw a line on contract specifications.

It would remind DOD to follow the law of the land.

It would help to reinforce and reinvigorate section 2307 of title 10, which the DOD IG says is being ignored and abused.

Lastly, Madam President, our amendment would hopefully help to en-

sure: First, that progress payments on fiscal year 1994 contracts are commensurate with the work performed; and, second, that the work performed meets the quality standards established in those contracts.

If fiscal year 1994 C-17 aircraft are on schedule, within cost, and meet contract specifications, then the money will flow as planned. If not, then there's a problem—as there should be.

What is the bottom line?

I want to send a clear signal to the Air Force: Obey the law when making progress payments on C-17 contracts. And that is it.

Madam President, I hope the committee will give my amendment all due consideration.

If you support the C-17 program but want better management, then vote for my amendment.

Madam President, I have spoken on the problems before. I have relied very heavily upon statements by inspectors general and the General Accounting Office on problems with this program.

I want to make it very clear that I am not against the C-17 program. But there has been some money that the inspector general has said has not been spent according to law. This amendment merely adds to the appropriations bill a restriction that no progress payments can be made unless it is according to what the law says.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, the managers have had an occasion to study this and we find no objection to its adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. I concur with the Senator from Hawaii. I am pleased to join in support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

The amendment (No. 1060) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, the matter I discussed at length with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Georgia concerning the level of support for the new Russian ICBM's

with multiple nuclear re-entry warheads has reached the position now, I think, that we could agree on a substitute or complete revision of my amendment.

Let me again suggest the absence of a quorum, though, for a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1062, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, the discussion that we had, I hope, has highlighted to the Senate the fact that there are a number of very well-informed people in our community here who deal with arms control matters, who have information that would lead us to believe that the Russians are continuing to modernize their strategic missile forces—not only modernize them, but modernize them to the extent of having under way, the report is, a new ICBM that has multiple nuclear re-entry vehicle capability and is highly maneuverable, of a different trajectory, as outlined by the editor of the Russian publication Today.

That has been unconfirmed, as I told the Senate earlier, by the CIA. But there still is some question as to whether or not it is true because even the CIA has told us that the Soviets, prior to the START agreements and prior to the disintegration of the Soviet Union, had under way research on development of a series of new ICBM's.

Madam President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask it be stated so there is no misunderstanding about it.

I ask my amendment be amended to this form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself, Mr. INOUE, and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 1052, as modified.

On page 22 of the bill, at line 18, before the period, add the following new proviso: "Provided further, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall report to the President and the Congressional defense and intelligence committees on the current status of intercontinental ballistic missile development and production in states eligible for assistance under this heading: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be expended or transferred to an otherwise eligible recipient state if the President concludes, and notifies the Congressional defense and intelligence committees in written report, that the potential recipient is currently engaged in the production of a new road mobile or fixed-site land based intercontinental ballistic missile armed with multiple nuclear reentry vehicles."

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bring before the body now the amendment of mine that was previously set aside so that I might modify that with this language.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask that my amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for the amendment which I think is a pretty good one and addresses a concern that many have had in this regard. The amendment by the Senator from Alaska is a very positive and constructive one.

I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I am pleased to support this amendment. I support its immediate adoption.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1052), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, is it my understanding that the Nickles amendment has been temporarily set aside?

AMENDMENT NO. 1051

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Nickles amendment is the pending question.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I just briefly would like to address myself to that.

The Nickles amendment, as I understand it, provides that before U.S. troops could be placed under a foreign or U.N. command while participating in peacekeeping missions, it would be required that the President report to the relevant committees of the Congress detailing the role and mission of U.S. combat forces, the estimated cost

of supporting our force, the size of the deployment, and probable duration. The relevant committees would have 30 days to consider this and review the deployment. Then a joint resolution would have to be enacted to allow the deployment. There are some escape clauses.

Madam President, I would like to say that I think this is an unfortunate amendment. It seems to me that what we are going to be faced with many times as we go into the balance of this century and the first part of the next century is not major conflicts of the types we have been preparing for over so many years, namely with the Soviet Union. There are going to be a whole series of operations in unknown sections of the world dealing with unknown individuals.

I believe very strongly, Madam President, somebody has to be in charge, in this case the President of the United States. I think we have to leave with the President the authority to have our troops serve in conjunction with other United Nations forces should that be his decision. Sometimes the United Nations commander will be a U.S. commander and sometimes it will be otherwise.

If there is one thing I have discovered in hearing discussion about our troops going into foreign places, the argument is made:

Well, we do not want to go it alone. There is a serious problem there. We recognize that. But do not have the United States do it alone. Let us see that the other countries pick up their share of the burden.

This cry is heard incessantly, and rightfully so. But, Madam President, if we are going to have a situation where everybody who participates—and, indeed, these involve combat troops frequently—is going to insist that their troops be under their commander, just as the United States insists that our troops be under our commander, it seems to me a formula for chaos.

I can understand the motives of the distinguished sponsor of this legislation, but I think it would be very unfortunate. We have a President of the United States. He is elected by the people. We have to give him some leeway.

There are 535 Members of Congress. If you took a secret poll, I suspect every one of them would feel he or she was fit to be President, and indeed probably better than the existing President or existing past Presidents. Humility is not a banner of those in Congress. However, the fact is that we have not been elected President. Neither I nor any other Members of this body nor Members of the other body are President. We have a President. If we are going to let him make decisions, crisp decisions that have to be made, we have to give him some leeway.

Now, Madam President, if things go wrong, the Congress has the power of the purse. It can always step in and cut

off every nickel and dime that is sponsoring that undertaking, whether our forces are under the command of another nation's U.N. commander or whether they are under our own command.

Madam President, I hope that the Nickles amendment does not prevail.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. CHAFEE. Sure.

Mr. STEVENS. How many times since the Senator and I have been in the Senate has the Congress stepped in as the Senator would say? How many times have we exerted this power? How many times have we told Presidents not to commit us to war?

Mr. CHAFEE. I have only been here 18 years so—

Mr. STEVENS. How many times in that 18 years?

Mr. CHAFEE. How many times has the President gotten us to the verge of war? Since I have been here, we have had Desert Storm, we have had Panama, we have had troops in Grenada, we have had troops in—

Mr. STEVENS. In Lebanon.

Mr. CHAFEE. In Lebanon.

Mr. STEVENS. We had a boat off of North Korea.

Mr. FORD. Panama.

Mr. CHAFEE. I mentioned Panama.

Mr. STEVENS. I wonder if the Senator is really serious that we should not interfere with the exercise of the President's authority and state to the world and to the public that the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war really means that we have the functional duty of declaring we are at war rather than we should go to war?

Mr. CHAFEE. I am not sure that the point is the Senator is trying to make. Is he saying we are at war in Panama? I would not quite label that "at war."

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. Sure, I am glad to yield.

Mr. NICKLES. I heard my colleague's comments. I hope he will withhold judgment because I do not think his interpretation of the amendment is quite correct.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in our amendment we exempt medical, we exempt logistics, we exempt communication, we exempt humanitarian, training, temporary observer, liaison activities? This amendment really just applies to U.S. combat forces under the United Nations, under foreign commander.

Frankly, I just looked at all the commitments we have had in U.N. peacekeeping operations going all the way back to 1945, and our amendment would not have restricted any of the 27 different U.N. peacekeeping operations since 1945.

So it is not so Draconian. It allows peacekeeping operations. It allows

logistical situations. It allows humanitarian efforts. It does say—and I agree with the opening comment of the Senator from Rhode Island that we want to know who is in charge. It does say that if we have U.S. combat forces, they should be under the President's charge. He is Commander in Chief, and he should not delegate that authority to the U.N. Secretary General.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, I am glad the sponsor of the amendment is in the Chamber because it seems to me we have to make a real decision on these matters. That is the point I was trying to make previously.

We all agree that we do not want to go it alone, that we want to participate and want the others to bear their share. At the same time if every nation who participates just as we want them to participate will only play under their command it seems to me we truly do have a formula for chaos. If there is one thing that every military student agrees upon, somebody has to be in charge. When everybody is in charge it is clear that nobody is in charge.

I believe if we are going to have to ensure the maximum safety of our troops that somebody has to be in charge. Plenty of times it will be the American commander in charge. Quite frequently we contribute most of the troops, and indeed that occasion calls for the American to be in charge, but not always.

I am prepared to be corrected. But as I read the Senator's amendment when it is combat troops—no matter how many we have—always they must be under United States command. I presume that the U.N. commander, or the British who might be in charge, or the German, or the French, or whoever it may be, the Pakistani, Indian, the sole person that the United States troops respond to is the American commander.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I want the Senator to be aware of the fact that we have exempted NATO. I want the Senator to be aware of the fact—

Mr. CHAFEE. That is not such a big exemption since the United States has always been in command of NATO since it was founded.

Mr. NICKLES. I understand. Other Senators have alluded to the fact we are denying the ability of the French to lead. I want to make sure the Senator is aware of the fact that we have exempted NATO, we have exempted Korea, we made this prospective as far as international standing armies. But we are specific. We say that we do not want to have U.S. combat forces committed to an international U.N. combat force, kind of a standing army that will be looking for a fire to put out.

That has been proposed by the United Nations Secretary General. It has been supported at different times by President Clinton and some of his advisers.

So I am trying to say, wait a minute, let us not do that. We have not done that in the 48 years of U.N. history. We have not committed to a U.N. international peacekeeping force looking for a problem to solve.

I will agree with the Senator from Rhode Island. There are a lot of problems out there. But I am saying we can have a commitment of troops. The President has that flexibility. But when you are talking about combat troops, that commitment is made, he should keep control of the troops which would solve the problem. That is what we have always done when we have United Nations involvement, that is, the Persian Gulf, that is, Korea. When we have had U.S. troops involved with NATO in combat situations, we have had United States control.

I might even mention to the Senator, in Somalia, as I understand the Rangers are under U.S. Armed Forces control not under the United Nations control. The President has seen that.

I also remember the President when he said he was going to send several thousand additional combat troops into Somalia that those would be under United States control not United Nations control.

So I would like to tell the Senator, my colleague and friend from Rhode Island, this amendment would not affect any of the past alliances that we have created. It would not even deter if the President wanted to send troops to Haiti, if they are in a noncombat role or mission, it would not impact that.

This amendment was drafted before Somalia, before Haiti. It was drafted with the intention of trying to keep the U.S. Armed Forces out of combat situations when you do not have U.S. control, when you do not have that chain of command, and also to keep us out of an international peacekeeping force which seems to be advocated by some supporters of the United Nations, which I think is not well thought out.

We should reassert the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief. And also keep the authority vested in Congress; that is, the power not only of the purse but also the power to declare war, and not allow ourselves to be drawn into conflicts internationally.

Mr. CHAFEE. I want to thank the Senator for that statement. But I would point out that clearly the instances where he has pointed out, Korea, and Desert Storm, the United States had the overwhelming majority of the troops and rightfully so. The Americans were in charge.

Also, the threat or the suggestion that there is going to be some U.N. standing army set up that we had better be careful of that, it seems to me that is something that is not going to happen overnight. In responding to the question of the Senator from Alaska, clearly the U.S. Congress could step in

with the power of the purse and deal with that situation.

But what I worry about and I suppose the Senator's argument cuts both ways, he is saying that in the X number, I have forgotten how many, the illustration, whenever it backs U.N. peacekeeping missions, the U.S. forces always should be under American command. Well, if that is true, why do we bother having the amendment? That argument it seems to me cuts both ways.

What worries me is that there are situations that are going to occur. Just as nobody had ever heard, or rarely heard about the problems in Desert Storm that emerged, and few people knew who Saddam Hussein was, and just as problems have come up in Bosnia, and other sections in the world where we have never heard the names before, so they do occur in other parts.

I believe we have to leave some flexibility with the President of the United States. He is not going to go off on some wild tangent of his own. He recognizes that he has to have the support of the people. But if we bind him by law, and this is very, very strict, this law, that no U.S. forces can serve anywhere in the world in a U.N. force except with the clear designation that they shall be completely under the control of the U.S. command, I think, we are taking an unfortunate step.

I want to thank the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, again I appreciate my colleague's statement. I hope that he would understand the thrust of this amendment. This amendment is not as far-reaching I think as he envisions.

I might respond also to his question. Say, why have this amendment? The President is not going to go off on half track and make commitments to the U.N. for U.S. combat forces to be serving all across the world. I will tell my colleagues, that a lot of statements have been made by this President that leave very much open the possibility of committing U.S. combat forces worldwide.

I will point to my colleague's information. A couple of articles in the Washington Post, talking about U.S. plans wider role in U.N. peacekeeping administration, drafting new criteria. This new criteria is envisioning—I will read a couple of paragraphs:

The administration is drafting a new set of criteria for U.S. involvement in U.S. peacekeeping operations that would provide for a much wider role for U.S. military personnel, according to senior defense and diplomatic officials.

I could go in. It talks about a pretty assertive U.N. peacekeeping effort which I might mention and apprise my colleague, U.N. peacekeeping efforts have ballooned in the last several years. In 1990, we had about 10,000 U.N. peacekeeping forces. Today it is over 80,000. So this number has grown and grown substantially.

Now we have the U.S. representatives to the United Nations talking about expanding our role not just for peacekeeping but peacemaking and peace enforcing.

The President as recently as September 27 says U.N. peacekeeping holds the promise to resolve many of this area's conflicts. But the strength is in our security to protect our interests, to ensure among the nations the cost and effort of pursuing peace.

President Clinton:

We support the creation of a genuine U.N. peacekeeping headquarters with planning staff and access to timely intelligence with the logistics units that can be deployed on a minute's notice and a modern operations center with global communications.

Concerning Bosnia, if the parties to that conflict in Bosnia take the hard steps needed to make the real peace, the international community including the United States must be ready to help in its effective implementation.

The President and others have talked about committing 50,000 troops to the Bosnian peacekeeping efforts, 25,000 of those troops being United States forces.

So I just mention to my colleague, here is a comment made by Madelein Albright, September 23. The President's comments were all made September 27, less than a month ago. Ambassador Albright says the end of the cold war has opened up another avenue for multilateral cooperation that has long been limited by the United States-Soviet rivalry, and that is United Nations peacekeeping.

Mr. FEINGOLD assumed the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES. Again, peacekeeping is now being expanded into peace, not only peacekeeping, but peacemaking and peace enforcing.

I will just mention one other comment, and this is again a Washington Post article talking about this new enthusiasm for an expanded, wider U.N. role, police role that has been reported in the paper. This is not something I have dreamed up. I think this administration, going back to the President's comments in his book, written in November 1992, which says they promise the Clinton administration would support the more recent active role in the United Nations in troubled spots around the world and pursue an establishment of a voluntary U.N. rapid deployment force to deter aggression, provide humanitarian relief, and combat terrorism and drug trafficking.

This is a big expansion in the U.N. role that has already grown by leaps and bounds. To go from 10,000 troops in 1990 to over 80,000 in 1993 shows a very expanded U.N. role. And this President and the President's Ambassador to the United Nations has been talking about expanding that role even further.

The U.N. Secretary General talked about the desire for a standing international combat force. This amend-

ment would prohibit that. I do not think it would tie the President's hands. It would basically reassert the President's constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief and say that in combat rolls, it should not be delegated to the United Nations.

The Secretary General of the United Nations was not elected to anything in the United States, and the Constitution clearly specifies that the President is Commander in Chief. If the President wants to send logistics, humanitarian, or medical aid, he can do so. When you are talking about combat rolls, then the President would; first, have to keep it under U.S. command or second, he would have to ask or request Congress for a waiver and receive that within 30 days.

So I think it is a reassertion of the President's responsibility. It basically says it should not be delegated to the United Nations.

One final comment. Does that mean that if our allies took a similar course of action, we would have no effective response in multilateral or multinational efforts? I say totally not. Our allies responded in a vigorous way in probably the most successful multinational effort, in the Persian Gulf, and clearly this amendment would not have violated or prohibited a Persian Gulf-type effort. You had the United States taking the role and the lead with U.S. leaders and commanders. And clearly they did not have other nations saying, no, we do not want to participate because we want to have our individuals as commanders of these forces. It did not prohibit our efforts in Korea and this amendment would not. Nor, likewise, would it prohibit our NATO alliance.

So it would do nothing to deter the successful alliances that we have had in the past. It would do nothing to deter an alliance, a multilateral or multinational alliance, a bilateral effort. This could be done. The U.N. operational control. One of the reasons for that is the U.N. operational control—managing these 80,000 peacekeeping forces are about 80-some people. I read earlier in the RECORD—and I will not repeat it—where the commander in the U.N. forces, peacekeeping forces, in Yugoslavia is saying, if you have business to do, you better contact them before 5 o'clock on Friday. They are not there on weekends. It is really chaotic.

If you want to talk about chaos, it is the lack of leadership that we now have under the United Nations because, frankly, they have 80,000 troops. They are involved in 14 missions throughout the world today, and they only have 80 people, 45 of which are military. So they are already stretched too thin and not very well managed, in my opinion. And certainly, before we talk about committing the lives of U.S. men and women to combat, I think we would be better served if we say they should

stay under the operational control of the United States, if you are talking about combat. Yes, we can allow logistics and peacekeeping efforts to go forward, and the President can delegate that, but when you talk about combat, it should not be delegated in what I would say is a less-serious manner.

So let us make sure that the President, if he wishes to delegate that, would come to Congress and request a waiver, or that he would give Congress the right to authorize that before we commit the lives of young men and women into combat around the world. I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague from Oklahoma would yield for a question or two, without my losing the right to the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. EXON. I have heard through the amendment you are offering, and I have heard the concerns raised by our colleague who has just addressed this matter. Let me first ask the Senator from Oklahoma how well, in his opinion, does he believe that "combat role" is defined in his amendment?

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to respond to my friend and colleague from Nebraska. We state that U.N. operational or tactical control means exercising in the U.N. Security Council or Secretary General the power of command usually given to the leader of the military force, such as the authority to coordinate direct mission-related activities of the units compromising such force. So really we are talking about the supreme commander over such operations—the person that controls, directs, dictates the military operation in whatever theater you are talking about.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend. Let me further press him for an answer. After your explanation of a combat role—it was exactly what I suspected would be the answer when I read the amendment. I would just like to add that I would hope that at times in the future, as outlined by the Senator from Rhode Island, that we could take and expect our allies and other members of the United Nations to take on the role to carry out U.N. mandates, other than always calling on the United States being the police force of action. Unfortunately, we seem to be falling into that role, and I have had concerns about that.

However, let us assume for a moment that at some time in the future, the United Nations decides to take some appropriate action at some place in the world; that at this particular time, for reasons that have been worked out, a British commander and British troops primarily would be involved in a specific action of some type; as under the auspices of the United Nations, hopefully, without the United States playing a role that in my opinion it all too often does now, to be the police force.

Let us suppose that Brit command—Great Britain is a military ally of the United States of America, a key player in the United Nations. Let us suppose that that particular British commander—who under the definition just outlined by the Senator from Oklahoma would indeed be the commander in that area—should find it necessary to carry out a strategic move of some kind, either a selective aircraft attack of a stealthy nature, or the supply or resupply of ammunition to a British force somewhere in the world; and let us assume that for whatever reason, the United States of America would be the only nation that would have the wherewithal at that particular time to assist our British allies, with no American troops on the ground; would the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma prevent the President of the United States from even authorizing an airstrike, one airstrike, or the delivery of ammunition by plane or by boat someplace, to assist the Brit commander and the British troops that are on the ground in that particular area, carrying out the will of the United Nations? Would the amendment offered by the Senator prevent that? I suspect it would.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it can be done under two circumstances: The President could ask for a waiver and do it, or he could put the forces under U.S. control.

You mentioned we were the only power that had the ability to do it. Then it might be logical to have it under U.S. control. Then this amendment would not apply.

If that did apply, he could request a waiver. He could do it. He could declare an emergency. He could say it is in the national interest to do so and do it. Congress would have 30 days to review that request.

But the President would not be able to make long-term commitments of U.S. combat forces to serve under the U.N. auspices under foreign command indefinitely without Congress getting involved.

Mr. EXON. Where does it say in the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma that it could not be a long-term commitment? Is that so described in his amendment?

Mr. NICKLES. Yes. If the Senator would just look at the amendment, it says the prohibition described in section A shall not apply if the President determined the national security interests justify a waiver of such prohibition and the President declares an emergency exists and informs Congress of his action. Then Congress has 30 days to respond.

So we allow a Presidential waiver or exemption for an emergency. So they could respond if the President determined it was in the national interest to do so.

Mr. EXON. I am not sure that is responsive to the question the Senator from Nebraska is trying to get at.

Certainly, I recognize and realize that the Senator clearly has defined in the amendment, if the President wants to do this, he comes to us and we have 30 days to act.

My question goes back, I think, to the basic principle of what could be done on an emergency basis if it is necessary to help the British troops under the scenario that I outlined. I would not think it would be particularly advisable for use to wait 30 days or it might be too late.

The point I try to bring home to the Senator from Oklahoma is I do not believe, under the amendment, if the President felt it was necessary or advisable to assist our British allies who were really at risk for one strike or one delivery of action—I believe that the amendment, as offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, would prevent that unless the President came to us and sought approval, and we have 30 days to do that.

Likewise, if the President would maintain the command over that one airplane that went in, seemingly the Senator was trying to describe the situation to the Senate that that would not apply. Yet, I think it would be clear that that might be very fuzzy, if not hazy, under the Senator's amendment, because I still believe the Brit I outlined in the scenario would be a foreign commander in charge at least of directing the mission as I outlined in the scenario.

Mr. President, I would like to, if I could, yield, without my losing the right to the floor, to the Senator from Oklahoma for an answer to my question.

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to respond to my friend from Nebraska. I have a couple of comments.

The United States can enter into bilateral efforts if we want to. This amendment only restricts United Nations as operational control. If we had a bilateral effort with the British, that could be allowed. That would be possible. That would not be prohibited.

The only thing that would be prohibited in this is when we have U.S. combat forces under a foreign commander under U.N. operations. So I mention that to my colleague.

I also mention to my colleague that we have exempted NATO, which has proven to be an effective alliance in command. We also exempted Korea.

Mr. EXON. I understand that.

Mr. NICKLES. I want to make sure colleagues are aware of that.

I hope my colleague is aware of the fact we have not prohibited even U.S. or U.N. efforts in noncombat missions, and I have looked at almost all the U.N. peacekeeping efforts going all the way back to 1945, almost none of which would have been restricted by this

amendment. I do not believe any of those efforts would have, because either they were under U.S. control or they were authorized by Congress.

So this amendment is not as restrictive, I think, as some people would want, maybe not even as much as I would want. It does give the President some flexibility. It does not tie his hands. I think it reasserts his control basically as Commander in Chief.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island would like to make further comments. I would be glad to yield 2 minutes to him for any appropriate remarks he would like to make.

The series of questions I have posed to the Senator from Oklahoma, notwithstanding what I think is a well-intentioned amendment, I am very fearful that other nations around the world might view this as a unilateral action by the United States directing the President of the United States that the United States of America is either going to go it alone on every type of action that the United Nations takes in the future or we are not going to be involved.

I believe that that is a rather mischievous type of amendment, one that we may find ourselves to regret if we go on down the road. I simply say that I believe I understand what the Senator from Oklahoma is trying to do. I am not sure, though, that there are sufficient protections in the amendment as it has been offered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this is not a mischievous amendment. This amendment is not one that came up because of the tragedy that happened in Somalia. Frankly, this amendment was drafted well before that.

This amendment was drafted in light of the fact that we read where we are talking about in the United Nations having a multinational combat force, and I would like to prohibit that as a force looking for action, not with the defined mission but a force that is out there at the discretion or guidance of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

I would also tell my friend and colleague from Nebraska the amendment is written because I have some concern about what may happen in Yugoslavia, because I have seen this President and others talking about committing 25,000 troops, United States troops, out of a total force of 50,000, talking about committing 25,000 troops into Yugoslavia, particularly into Bosnia, and at the same time listening to the United Nations Secretary General talking about he would make the decisions where the air strikes would be involved. I see that as chaos. I see that as confusion.

One final comment, and that pertains to, well, if we do this, is not this the

United States going it alone? No, this would not prohibit the United States from putting together the forces such as we did in the Persian Gulf. That effort would not be prohibited under this amendment in any way, shape, or form. So I mention in the cases where we have found it to our interests to leave the United Nations, and we have had remarkable success in working with other countries and even getting other countries to participate, with men and women and military personnel, but also the financial costs of it, so we have had some real successes through that operation that would not be prohibited in any way, shape, or form by this amendment.

What we would prohibit would be an international standing army under the United Nations, and we would prohibit U.S. combat forces from being committed to a combat role under United Nations operations under a foreign commander. We think the President of the United States should be making that decision. That is constitutional.

We also think there is a constitutional role for Congress as well, both in the power to declare war and in the power of the purse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRAIG be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I also ask unanimous consent that Senator THURMOND be added as a cosponsor.

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

IMPACT AID PROVISIONS

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I commend and thank my colleague from Hawaii for his leadership on the fiscal year 1994 Department of Defense appropriations bill, particularly for including appropriations for the impact aid program.

Impact aid compensates local school districts that educate students connected with a Federal activity—such as a military base—but are not able to tax the Federal Government to raise the funds to cover the costs of educating them. But impact aid generally covers only one-third of the costs of educating military children. This leaves taxpayers with most of the burden—but without the tax base to pay for it. Not only does our Federal activity reduce revenue from local property taxes, but it can substantially increase the number of students that local schools must educate.

By not adequately reimbursing local schools for this cost, the Federal Government is shortchanging these districts—and in many areas local taxpayers are taking up the slack. For example, the people of north Chicago, IL have made every effort to provide a quality education for their students, including passing a referendum to raise property taxes to one of the highest

rates in Illinois. Despite their effort, they are losing up to \$4,000 per year per child because of the impact aid shortfall. Last year's budget shortfall forced them to cut 45 of 140 teachers. Other school districts throughout the country face similar problems. Our students deserve better.

Last year, former Senator Alan Dixon and I passed an amendment enabling the Secretary of Defense to make payments to local school districts to mitigate the financial impact of Department of Defense dependents on these districts. North Chicago and other Illinois districts have received additional Federal funding as a result of this bill. I am pleased that a similar provision is included in this year's bill and that additional Federal funding will be available for schools that need it.

DEBATE ON SOMALIA AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3116

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the debate about whether to keep United States forces in Somalia has taken some strange turns.

With all due respect, it is not about supporting the President. Whether we agree or disagree with the President's announced policy, we do so with a commitment to vote for what is right for our country.

However, let me make clear that I do not side with any who seize the Somalia debate as an occasion to embarrass or criticize President Clinton. The President is doing his utmost to manage a military intervention that he inherited upon assuming office.

As U.S. Senators, our first obligation must be exercising our constitutional responsibility under article I on the issue of United States military forces in Somalia. As Senator BYRD has wisely reminded us, we must decide whether to continue our present policy for several months or to begin the orderly withdrawal of those troops.

This debate does not turn on using U.S. military force to establish peace and order in the world. It rests instead on whether we have a sound policy in Somalia. In my view, we do not. Because we have slipped away from our original humanitarian mission, we now find ourselves in the quagmire of civil unrest in the Third World.

Nor is the debate about cutting and running—by pulling our troops out of Somalia. The test is whether we place American men and women in continued peril without a clear mission and without a compelling national interest.

QUESTIONS OF NATIONAL INTEREST

In fact, the burden of proof for keeping United States troops in Somalia is whether it makes sense to do so. Let me ask my colleagues to examine this question with me.

First, do we have a vital national interest at stake in Somalia? I find that we do not. No strategic interest, no economic lifeline, no concern about democracy compels our military presence in Mogadishu and other Somali cities.

Second, no clear humanitarian interest remains over which we have control. We came to keep thousands of people from starving. We succeeded in that mission. Our early mission under Operation Provide Hope in Somalia provides a model of how military intervention can serve humanitarian goals.

But our troops no longer pursue clear humanitarian goals. They have become the targets of ambushes and the agents of pursuing what are nonhumanitarian goals. Our mission has become contorted into the vague and dangerous pursuits of nation building or hunting down Somali warlords.

Third, if we were to pursue nation building with the prerequisite of rooting out hostile guerrillas the likes General Aided, then we would have to commit overwhelming military forces. Neither the President, the Congress, nor the American people are prepared to do so. Nor is the United Nations or the rest of the world, which waited until the United States took the initiative to keep Somalia from starving to death.

I have no quarrel with restoring civil order in Somalia. In fact, I authored a law last year which provided resources and guidelines for recovery in the Horn of Africa. But that law contemplated political conflict resolution and economic development, not combat missions by heavily armed troops.

We do have an interest in promoting peace, order, and development. But we will have to rely on the power of diplomacy and economic resources, not the forces of arms, to achieve those worthy goals. And where force is needed as a last resort, it must be organized as a genuinely multinational effort with clear objectives and methods.

In conclusion, this debate boils down to making the right choice. The two effective choices are deploying a much larger United States force in Somalia to pacify the country, or arranging a prompt, orderly withdrawal.

Unfortunately, the leadership consensus resolution proposes neither: It amounts to an unsuccessful compromise that brings no order to Somalia nor any assurance of safety for American troops.

We could have decided to follow Gen. Colin Powell's advice to never commit American forces in hostile zones unless we employ overwhelming forces. We did not and will not do so. That option is not before us tonight.

THE RIGHT COURSE

That leaves us with the third and remaining option: the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN. The amendment simply limits funding to a prompt and orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces. It allows U.S. forces to protect American lives and secure the return of American prisoners of war or any personnel missing in action. It prevents our government from keeping forces abroad when their mission has ended.

I say to my colleagues that, lacking a clear and compelling mission for United States forces in Somalia, we should remove them from harm's way and bring them home. Let the strategic policy quarterbacks puzzle over global pursuits with their computers rather than gamble with American lives. Our mission is over. Let's leave.

And last, let us husband our national wealth here to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to promote the general welfare, and to secure liberty for future generations, even as we play a constructive role in the world in promoting peace and development. That would provide the best way to exercise leadership in the international community.

To that end, I join in voting for the amendment to secure a prompt and orderly withdrawal of United States forces from Somalia.

DEFENSE CONVERSION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, in a colloquy regarding some important defense conversion programs.

As the chairman well knows, reductions in defense spending and military base closures have hit California especially hard. More than 250,000 defense related jobs have been lost in California in just the past 2 years, and by 1998, California's job loss due to defense downsizing and base closures is expected to reach 650,000. From this latest base closure round alone, California will lose over 70,000 direct and indirect jobs, with the vast majority of the loss being born by the San Francisco Bay Area.

I would like to thank the chairman for his good work in drafting a comprehensive Defense appropriations bill. In particular, I would like to thank the chairman for addressing many issues that are important to California and the entire Nation. At a time when defense downsizing is being felt by communities and individuals across the country, many of the programs, especially the defense conversion programs, are very much welcomed.

One issue I would like to address regarding defense conversion programs involves action by the House of Representatives. The House has appropriated nearly \$69 million under operations and maintenance—defense-wide, for a number of important defense conversion projects in California. Unfortunately, due to budget constraints, the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was unable to fund many worthy projects. Specifically, the House provided funds for the following:

California State University system at Fort Ord: As one of the largest bases in California, Fort Ord's closure will have a devastating impact on the Monterey area. The reuse and redevelop-

ment plans call for the conversion of Fort Ord into a university research institution. The House provided \$25 million for the renovation of buildings at Fort Ord. To ensure the successful reuse of Fort Ord, I believe these renovation funds are absolutely necessary.

Monterey Institute Center for International Trade at Fort Ord: This proposed center will integrate business training with language skills, knowledge of foreign business cultures and foreign trade policy, and negotiating skills. The center will also build on the resources of the Monterey Institute of International Studies and the Defense Language Institute. This crucial funding will be used to hire additional staff and supplement facilities already existing at the Monterey Institute. Again, with the adverse impact of Fort Ord's closure, I believe this is an ideal defense conversion program for the area.

California statewide economic development network: This network will vastly improve communications between city colleges and businesses. Increased communication is critical both for businesses that are having trouble finding workers, and for workers who are having trouble finding gainful employment. This innovative program will allow displaced defense workers to tie into this network and provide them with useful information on retraining and employment opportunities.

San Diego statewide economic development network: This center would retain displaced defense workers for jobs in California's emerging biomedical, environmental, and public health technologies. As the entire State of California—and southern California in particular—continues to feel the affects of defense downsizing, this worker retraining program will help former defense and aerospace workers find jobs in a growing industry.

San Francisco State University California economic recovery and environmental restoration project: This project will train displaced defense workers and disadvantaged youth in environmental restoration at closed military bases. Displaced workers will be given the skills needed for new jobs and environmental cleanup will proceed quickly and effectively. As the San Francisco Bay Area stands to lose six major military bases, this proposal could not have come at a better time.

Mare Island and Charleston Naval Shipyards conversion/reuse studies: These studies will determine the feasibility of converting these shipyards from military to commercial work. This ideal defense conversion program will help transition these shipyards and their workers to commercial work which could provide employment to many of the workers who would otherwise lose their jobs.

Workers retraining for environmental restoration at Mare Island Naval Shipyard: Under this program,

displaced workers will be retrained for the environmental cleanup which will be undertaken at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Again, two purposes will be served. Displaced workers will be given the skills needed for new jobs, and environmental cleanup at a dangerously polluted site will proceed on course.

I believe it is imperative that we, as a nation, do not leave those who helped us win the cold war out in the cold. That is why I believe it is vital to fund these important defense conversion programs.

Therefore, I would like to request that the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee considers adopting the House position which provides \$68.5 million for these defense conversion programs in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. INOUE. I fully understand the concerns of the senior Senator from California and her interest in defense conversion programs. The committee received numerous requests from Senators to fund specific defense conversion programs. But, as the Senator knows, the fiscal constraints facing the subcommittee precluded it from funding many worthy programs. There simply is not enough money to go around.

In our bill the subcommittee promotes competition as the best mechanism for identifying and funding the most meritorious defense conversion programs, while recognizing that conversion funds should be targeted to areas most adversely affected by defense downsizing. We have done this in part because of the fiscal constraints we face, but only because this is perhaps the fairest way to assure that the Government receives the best return on its defense conversion dollars.

Yes, the House added funds for a number of defense conversion programs, including those mentioned by the distinguished Senator from California, but it did so by failing to reasonably meet the outlay funding targets prescribed in the budget resolution. My subcommittee's bill meets those outlay targets in a responsible manner.

The senior Senator from California is certainly aware of my concern for those in her State and throughout this Nation who will experience hardship due to the defense draw down. I can assure her that, as the House and Senate meet in conference on this bill, I will do the best I can to make sure sufficient funds are provided for the most deserving of conversion program proposals.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDER TRAINING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, in a colloquy regarding an important program that, I believe, is a win-win for the Nation.

I would like to request that the chairman consider adopting the House position which provides \$50 million for

the Department of Defense's proposed Law Enforcement and Health Care Provider Training Program, better known as troops to cops.

I believe this is an innovative and beneficial defense conversion pilot program. As the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee report states, this program is designed to ease the impact of defense downsizing while strengthening local law enforcement health care efforts. It will help phase-down the military, and phase-up local police and health care efforts.

Troops to cops will encourage military police officers and others with military law enforcement experience, as well as those individuals who perform health care tasks, to work for State and local police departments and health care agencies after completion of military service. This program would help pay the salaries of police officers and nurses—50 percent in the first year, 40 percent in the second year, and eventually reducing the Federal share to zero over 5 years. Localities would still be responsible for supplementing the salary and providing the necessary training and equipment.

This program will help put more cops on the street and more nurses in the hospital. And, it will help ease the impact of defense downsizing on those individuals who served our country in the Armed Forces.

The House of Representatives authorized the Law Enforcement and Health Care Provider Training Program in section 1332 of their version of the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act. Though the Senate version did not contain a similar provision, I am hopeful that after conference, the final version of the Defense Authorization Act will contain the House language. I further believe, and I understand that Chairman DELLUMS concurs, that if this program is successful, it should be expanded to include all military personnel who qualify.

The House of Representatives also provided \$50 million in fiscal year 1994 for the program in its version of the Defense appropriations bill. Unfortunately, due to budget constraints on the Senate Appropriations Committee, no funds were provided for the program in its version of the Defense appropriations bill.

Mr. INOUE. I understand the concerns of the senior Senator from California regarding the Law Enforcement and Health Care Provider Training Program. The subcommittee believes this important program could ease the transition of certain military personnel to civilian employment. But, as the Senator from California stated, the committee faced especially difficult constraints this year and was unable to fund many worthy projects.

I assure the Senator, however, that I will give every consideration to her re-

quest when we conduct negotiations with the House and will work to secure a funding level for this important program consistent with that authorized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished chairman very much.

COUNTERNARCOTICS DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, in reviewing the subcommittee's report, I was particularly concerned with the section entitled "Counternarcotics Drug Interdiction Overview," wherein the subcommittee expresses concern over the efficiency and effectiveness of Department of Defense counternarcotics efforts. The subcommittee further notes that DOD is conducting a bottom up review of its activities in this area and expresses a willingness to reduce funding if the review so recommends.

While I understand the subcommittee's desire to respond to the needs and recommendations of the Department of Defense, I am concerned about the problems which might arise if the DOD review suggests a decrease in funding and the subcommittee responds in kind, for I fear that such a reduction would be deeply harmful to the war against drugs.

I have every confidence that the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee understand the concerns which my State of Florida and other coastal and border States would have if Federal support for ongoing interdiction efforts were suddenly reduced. And I ask them, should DOD recommend a reduction in their interdiction effort, will the committee hold hearings and receive testimony during fiscal year 1994 about the impact such reductions might have on ongoing efforts to control the flood of narcotics into the United States, and the impact of such changes on relevant agencies, State and local law enforcement officials, and DOD representatives.

Mr. INOUE. I understand the concerns of the Senator from Florida, and express to him my willingness to hold a hearing in the coming year on the role of DOD in their counternarcotics mission, including their coordination with relevant agencies, as well as State and local law enforcement officials.

Mr. STEVENS. My colleague, Senator MACK, raises a legitimate concern. Clearly, our coastal and border communities deserve due consideration as they would bear the brunt of any reduction in counternarcotics efforts. The committee has held hearings on this matter in the past and is certainly willing to work with him on any future hearings.

Mr. MACK. I have seen persuasive information indicating that DOD interdiction efforts have been successful in the past, including testimony from DOD to the Armed Services Committee while I was a member of that committee. I look forward to working with the chairman, the ranking member, and

the subcommittee in the coming year, to ensure that this information is given full consideration when the vital matter of DOD's involvement in counternarcotics operations is taken up for fiscal year 1995.

I thank the managers for their willingness to work with America's coastal and border States as they struggle to control the urban plague drugs have wrought upon our inner cities.

F-14 AIR-TO-GROUND UPGRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the portion of the defense appropriations bill which reduces RDT&E funding for the F-14 air-to-ground upgrade program. In August of 1991, during debate of the Defense authorization bill, I addressed the issue of the future of naval aviation before this body. At that time, I supported the Navy's need to sustain its medium attack capability in the face of a rapidly declining Defense budget, but criticized the Navy's decision to terminate the best fighter aircraft in its inventory: the F-14D.

Since April 1991, two decisions by the Department of Defense have fundamentally changed the future of naval aviation: cancellation of the A-X, and the decision to retire the A-6 early. In so doing, the Navy has chosen to place the future of naval aviation on the shoulders of the F/A—18E/F. My views on the F/A-18 are well known, and I will not reiterate them here; however, our experience in Desert Storm clearly illustrates why we must continue to field survivable, capable, and long-range strike aircraft. While the Navy can terminate programs, it cannot terminate requirements. The simple act of canceling the A-X and retiring the A-6 early did not make the long-range, precision, all-weather medium attack requirement go away. And those same capabilities are essential for any aircraft which is to replace the A-6.

In testimony before the House Armed Services Committee just 2 years ago, Chief of Naval Operations Frank Kelso said:

The ability to strike at night and in all types of weather, when the enemy's defensive systems are least effective, is essential to operate against the difficult and highly sophisticated air defenses which are proliferating to many countries around the world. * * * Additionally, any follow-on to the A-6 has to carefully balance the requirement for extended operational range with the need for maximum payload. Longer ranges provide the ability to launch sooner, achieve tactical surprise, capitalize on the mobility of the battle group, hold more targets at risk, and strike deeper into enemy territory.

The admiral clearly stated that range, payload, and survivability are the cornerstones of power projection, which allow us to proceed with as few political restraints as possible. So, what has changed in the past 2 years to make this requirement disappear? I submit

that current events in Bosnia and Somalia only serve to further demonstrate the continued need for our Navy to be able to project credible military power from the sea in all kinds of weather.

Although the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee rightly addressed the issue of the early retirement of the A-6E, and endorsed the need to upgrade the F-14 with air-to-ground capability, I am gravely concerned that the subcommittee appears to believe that upgrading the F-14 with a robust, precision, all-weather attack capability, which we currently possess in the A-6E, is militarily unjustified. If we are to retire the A-6E early, and the Navy agrees that all-weather attack capability is still required, why not upgrade the F-14 with such capability until the next generation strike aircraft is available?

It is instructive to note that the other body wants to give the F-14 such precision, all-weather capability based on the F-14D aircraft. I hope that during conference negotiations, my colleagues in the Senate will see the wisdom of giving the F-14 this capability, which is remarkably similar to the F-15E Strike Eagle's, which proved so valuable in Desert Storm. To that end, when conference begins, I would ask my colleagues to reconsider their decision to cut F-14 RDT&E development funding and instruct the Navy to upgrade existing F-14's with precision, all-weather, strike capability.

This decision is not a trivial. For as the defense budget continues to decline, we must make optimum use of every defense dollar. The F-14 upgrade represents such wisdom.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 2518

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 7:30 p.m. this evening the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report on H.R. 2518, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill; that the yeas and nays be ordered on the conference report; that a vote on the conference report occur at 7:35 p.m. this evening; that upon the disposition of the conference report the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the Senate, without any intervening action or debate, concur en bloc in the House amendments to the Senate amendments; that the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc; and that any statements thereon appear in the appropriate place in the RECORD as though read.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE-
MENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 2446

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 19, the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446, the military construction appropriations bill; that upon disposition of the conference report, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; further that the Senate concur, en bloc, with the amendments of the House with the amendments of the Senate; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, with all of the above occurring without intervening action or debate; that various statements and colloquies regarding the conference report be placed in the RECORD at an appropriate place as if read.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask that it be in order to request the yeas and nays on adoption of the military construction appropriations conference report.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 19.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, under this schedule a vote will occur on the Labor-HHS conference report at 7:35 p.m. this evening; a vote will occur on the military constructions appropriations bill conference report at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, could I ask the distinguished majority leader if that will be the only vote tonight.

Mr. MITCHELL. That will be the only vote this evening.

I thank the colleagues for their cooperation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, you have a unanimous consent agreement, I believe, before the Senate for Labor-HHS at 7:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is correct.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND
EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1994—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the conference report on H.R. 2518. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2518) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 5, 1993.)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Members of the Senate that we have a very successful—and a very short—conference with the House. Not only were we able to preserve all the important funding initiatives of the Senate, as well as those of the administration, but we completed action on all 135 Senate amendments to the House bill in a record 2½ hours.

The conference agreement now before us is within our subcommittee's 602(b) ceiling and is well below the level requested by the President. The conference agreement totals \$261.1 billion. Of that total, \$67.2 billion is for discretionary budget authority under the direct control of the subcommittee. The remaining \$193.8 billion is for mandatory programs funded by our subcommittee.

I am particularly proud that the conferees have reached this agreement without resorting to any budgetary gimmicks. This report does not use any delayed obligations, nor does it impose an across-the-board cut of programs within our bill.

Mr. President, there are many important features of this bill, but for the sake of time, I would like to mention just a few highlights.

The conference agreement includes \$1.475 billion for the Low Income Home Energy Program, which represents a \$38 million increase over last year's level. This also includes advance funding for program year 1995, as was previously authorized.

For immunization, the conference report provides a \$187 million increase, for a total of \$528 million the conference agreement includes a \$550 million increase over fiscal year 1993 for Head Start.

This report includes a \$630 million, or 6.1 percent, increase for the National Institutes of Health, reflecting the conference's strong belief that the NIH is a vital investment program for our Nation.

For rural health, the conference recommended more than \$190 million for rural health programs, including the National Health Service Corps, rural health outreach, rural health research, rural hospital transition grants, and essential access community hospitals. In addition, \$663 million is provided for community and migrant health centers.

I am also pleased that the conference recommended a \$37 million increase for the substance abuse block grant, for a total of \$1.167 billion.

For the Department of Labor, the conference report provided an additional \$206 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program for the summer of 1994. This figure will assure that the Department has sufficient programs to maintain the same number of slots next summer as were provided for the summer of 1993. In addition, the conferees recommended \$100 million for the joint Department of Labor and Department of Education school-to-work transition initiative.

Finally, the conference report provided a total of \$225 million for the administration's education reform initiatives, including Goals 2000 and Safe Schools. For chapter I, the conferees recommended a \$211 million increase over fiscal year 1993 levels.

I also publicly thank Chairman NATCHER, my House counterpart, and his ranking member, Congressman PORTER, for their excellent cooperation this year. Their hard work and assistance was essential to completing this year's conference in record time. Congressman NATCHER is a true gentleman and a great appropriator, and I am proud to have had the opportunity to work so closely with him for the 4 years I have served as chairman of the Labor, HHS, and Education Subcommittee.

I now yield to Senator SPECTER, my ranking member, for any comments he may wish to make. I am deeply indebted to Senator SPECTER and his staff for his excellent advice and his assistance throughout this process. Senator SPECTER's counsel is reflected throughout the process, beginning with hearings earlier this year, committee markup, and now conference. I am most grateful for all his help and assistance in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, in supporting the conference report that is before the Senate today. I want to take this opportunity to thank Senator HARKIN as well as the other members of the subcommittee for bringing before the Senate such a comprehensive bill under very tight budget ceilings. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the conferees for their willingness to compromise to bring about a swift resolution to the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

The conference agreement before us today totals more than \$261.1 billion, including \$67.2 billion in discretionary spending and addresses programs that improve the public health, educate our children, and retrain this Nation's work force.

LIHEAP

For the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, which is of vital importance to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the conference agreement includes \$1,475,000,000. This is somewhat less than the Senate recommendation of \$1,507,408,000, but considerably above the funding level for the 1993 program. In addition, the President has the authority to request, on an emergency basis, \$600,000,000 to meet unforeseen energy needs. The House had not recommended any funds for this program and there was much debate during conference deliberations in order to come to agreement on this issue.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

The conference agreement contains \$10.9 billion for the National Institutes of Health, an increase of over \$600 million above the fiscal year 1993 appropriation. The increase provided will enable scientists to pursue the most promising avenues of research into such dreaded diseases as AIDS, cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, mental disorders, and other illnesses that continue to plague the citizens of this Nation.

BREAST CANCER

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women, surpassed only by lung cancer. The conference agreement provides for an expanded breast cancer research program in fiscal year 1994. The amount recommended includes a total of \$78 million for grants to States to develop comprehensive screening and education programs.

LOW-BIRTHWEIGHT BABIES

It is a human tragedy for a child to be born weighing 16 ounces with attendant problems which last a lifetime. I first saw a 1-pound baby in 1984 and it was an amazing thing for me to see a child of this size—about as big as my hand. Each year, about 7 percent, or 287,000, of the 4,100,000 babies born in the United States are of low birthweight and therefore, at far greater risk of death or disability.

It is generally recognized that prenatal care that begins in the first weeks of pregnancy and is appropriate to the mother's level of health risk can effectively prevent low birthweight births and improve birth outcomes. To address this issue, the conference agreement contains \$1.6 billion, an increase of \$104 million over the fiscal year 1993 level, for programs which support education, counseling, and prenatal services for pregnant women and women of child-bearing age who are at risk for poor birth outcomes.

FAMILY VIOLENCE

It is estimated that three to four million American women are battered each year; battering is the single largest cause of injury to women. The conference agreement includes \$27.6 million, an increase of \$3 billion over last year's appropriation, to provide immediate shelter for these women and their children. In addition, \$9.8 million has been provided to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to implement a national program to prevent violence against women.

EDUCATION

To strengthen this Nation's educational system, the conference agreement includes \$28.7 billion, including \$8 billion for student aid programs. The agreement also has restored campus-based aid programs to the fiscal year 1993 funding levels, and provides for a maximum Pell grant award of \$2,300.

For education for disadvantaged children, the agreement provides \$6.9 billion, an increase of \$215.5 million over the fiscal year 1993 level. Capital Expenses for private schools has increased to \$41.4 million and the Even Start Program, funded as \$89.1 million has increased to \$91.3 million.

The agreement also includes \$146.3 million for library programs, which restores \$31.3 million in funding cuts proposed by the administration.

BLACK LUNG COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE

For those in this country who have been disabled by black lung disease or their survivors, the conference agreement exempts these beneficiaries from the freeze on the cost-of-living adjustments for next year. This language will permit a 2.2-percent pay increase to take effect in January of 1994.

JOB TRAINING

A total of \$5 billion is included in the conference agreement for training and employment programs for this country's adults and youth. The title III program to retrain dislocated workers is increased from \$566 million to over \$1.1 billion, and title II-B Summer Youth Employment Program is expanded modestly to afford this Nation's youth employment opportunities.

HEALTH CARE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

On Thursday of last week I spoke briefly on the Senate floor about the administrative aspects of President Clinton's proposed health care reform program. At the time, I stated that I share the objective of President Clinton to provide comprehensive health care for all Americans, but expressed reservations about the size of the bureaucracy and the cost of administration of the President's reform proposal. As the Senate considers the conference report accompanying H.R. 2418, the Labor, HHS, and Education and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994, I want to reiterate those concerns. For I fear, that much of the administrative costs associated with the

plan will be borne by the Appropriations Committee generally, and more specifically, the Labor, HHS, and Education subcommittee.

The conference agreement before the Senate today includes over \$5.6 billion to help cover the State, local and Federal administrative costs of the Medicaid and Medicare Programs. In fiscal year 1993, over \$18.3 billion was appropriated in the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations bill for administrative costs, \$14.3 billion of which was for the administrative expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services. Increasingly, the subcommittee is finding it difficult to meet both the service demands and the administrative costs of federally supported programs within the limited funding available.

With funding for discretionary programs frozen over the next 4 years, it is essential that the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress, understand clearly the costs the committee would be forced to bear under the President's reform proposal. So I asked my staff to make a list of the new and expanded administrative agencies and costs associated with the plan. I was surprised, Mr. President, to find that the plan includes 77 new entities, agencies, commissions, councils, and advisory groups, and at least 54 existing entities will have new or expanded responsibilities or other functional changes.

Under the President's plan there would be a national health board overseeing the entire program with enormous powers, which have yet to be fully delineated. There is a very complicated system of regional, State, and corporate health alliances. The plan expands the programmatic, administrative, enforcement, and regulatory responsibilities of the Secretaries of Labor and Health and Human Services as well increases the role of the Secretary of Education in comprehensive health education.

Chairman HARKIN and I currently face great difficulty in allocating the limited funds to the existing programs, such as medical research at the National Institutes of Health, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, job training for disadvantaged youth and dislocated workers, elementary and secondary education programs, and student financial assistance. In reviewing these programs and responsibilities and looking over the work of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Subcommittee, I am concerned about how we will pay for the agencies, advisory commissions, and expanded administrative responsibilities that the health reform plan would set up.

We do want to be sure that the 37 million Americans now not covered are covered. We want to be sure that when a man or woman changes jobs, that that person will be able to have health

coverage in his or her new job regardless of health status and regardless of this change in employment.

We want to be sure that the escalating costs of care are reduced. But we have to be certain in this whole process that we do not unduly impact or harm the existing health care system which does cover 86 percent of the American people and which delivers the finest health care in the world. We also need to be sure that this process does not cripple the Appropriations Committee's ability to provide support for the broad array of existing education, training and human service programs which deliver services to our most vulnerable citizens. It, therefore, is my intention to request the Government Accounting Office to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Federal administrative costs associated with the President's health care reform plan once it is submitted to the Congress in legislative form.

In closing, Mr. President, I again want to thank Senator HARKIN and his staff and the other Senators on the subcommittee for their cooperation in a very tough budget year.

Mr. President, this is an extraordinarily difficult subcommittee. Of the 13, I think none is harder than perhaps this, and perhaps this is the hardest in trying to allocate funds among health and human services with the National Institutes of Health and the various diseases, education, and labor and safety.

But we have made the allocations as best we could, and we have gone through a conference with the House, ironing out a great many differences of opinion. We are pleased to submit it to the full membership for a vote at this time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I wanted to engage in a brief colloquy with the managers of the legislation before us. I wish to call attention to the need to improve coordination and collaboration among Federal departments and agencies of social services programs. This is not my idea alone by a longshot. Last year this body passed provisions in H.R. 11 to require a cooperative analysis of AFDC, Medicaid, and food stamps rules, and the Vice President's Report of the National Performance Review, "Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less," suggests the same.

In this regard, I hope that the Department of Health and Human Services will cooperate with the Department of Agriculture on an analysis of these programs that shows how their rules differ; what benefits might result from eliminating differences; which rules require statutory action to achieve uniformity; and which rules could be made more uniform without statutory amendment. The analysis should evaluate program rules related to administrative procedures, defini-

tions of countable income, definitions of income disregards and exemptions, quality control sanctions and incentives to combat fraud, work and training requirements and programs, and the child support enforcement program. I would hope that the Departments could provide this report to the committee prior to next year's hearings.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for raising this issue and agree with his statements on this point. An analysis of overlapping rules in these programs will provide a basis for streamlining administration and improving services. A timely report would be very helpful to this committee and to others.

Mr. SPECTER. I also thank the distinguished Senator and the Chairman for their interest in cutting redtape and improving services. I think this is something we all can agree on and look forward to receiving this review.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, in supporting the conference report that is before the Senate today. I commend Senators HARKIN and SPECTER, as well as the other members of the subcommittee, for crafting such a well balanced bill in a very difficult budget year.

This agreement contains \$261.1 billion, including \$67.2 billion in discretionary spending, and encompasses a wide range of programs which will improve job opportunities, increase education excellence, and expand medical research.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

The conference agreement before us today contains \$10.9 billion to continue the support of the National Institutes of Health. This is an increase of over \$600 million from the fiscal year 1993 appropriated level and \$288 million above the President's budget. This increase of 6 percent will expand medical research into the causes, treatment, and cures of the vast array of diseases and illnesses that are only beginning to be understood. Maintaining a strong commitment to medical research must be a central mechanism in any strategy to contain the escalating costs of health care in this country and I am pleased the conference agreement reflects that commitment.

Specific increases have been provided to continue research on Alzheimer's disease, a disease that affects 4 million Americans. Funding for research on AIDS is expected to be \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1994, an increase of \$227 million. In addition, high priority has been placed on expanding support for research on breast, ovarian and prostate cancers, on heart disease, on mental health, on skin and muscle diseases, and on the development of better hearing aids for the millions of Americans afflicted with poor hearing. The agreement also contains first time funding

for a National Center for Sleep Disorders Research which will work closely with other sleep-related research currently being undertaken by a variety of institutes at the NIH.

COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH

Mr. President, the conference agreement contains \$1.8 million to fund the Commission on Social Security Notch. There is a great deal of concern among many Social Security beneficiaries in Oregon, and throughout the country, regarding inequities in benefit levels. Action needs to be taken to answer these concerns and resolve this matter. This special Commission will examine the notch controversy; whether inequities exist in the treatment of Social Security beneficiaries born in different years; if legislative action should be taken to correct any inequities; and the effect of any such legislation on the Social Security trust fund.

DISLOCATED WORKERS

The agreement contains \$1.1 billion to assist States in retraining dislocated workers. This \$551.3 million increase will provide much needed assistance to dislocated workers in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. These additional funds combined with increases contained in the fiscal year 1993 appropriations bill will help promote a rapid extension of services for disabled timber workers throughout the Northwest.

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Battering is the single largest cause of injury to women and the medical costs associated with family violence totals over \$3.5 billion annually. The agreement before us today, includes \$27.6 million, a \$3 million increase above last year's amount. These funds will support grants to centers to provide immediate shelter for battered women and their children. In addition, \$9.8 million has been appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to implement a national program to prevent violence against women.

EDUCATION

Mr. President, by far the most direct, rewarding, and important investment in our youth is education. The conference agreement provides \$28.7 billion for education programs. I am also pleased to report that funding for Eisenhower math and science programs has been increased to \$251 million. Also included, at my urging, is \$13.9 million for math and science consortia and \$5.4 million for clearinghouse activities. Funding for campus-based aid programs has been restored to the fiscal year 1993 appropriation's level, and the Pell grant award will continue at the fiscal year 1993 maximum of \$2,300. Again, this year, the bill provides \$146.3 million for library services and construction, career training and literacy programs, an increase of \$31.5 million above the amount requested by the administration. For preschool children,

the agreement provides \$3.3 billion for Head Start programs, an increase of \$550 million over fiscal year 1993.

URBAN GRANTS

Finally, Mr. President, urban universities in this Nation play an important role in meeting the needs and addressing the priorities of the cities in which they are located. The conference agreement includes \$9.4 million to provide grants to urban universities to stimulate community involvement, improve education and health, reduce crime, and enhance economic development.

Again Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Senators HARKIN and SPECTER, for their work.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference agreement to H.R. 2518, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993.

The conference agreement provides \$223.5 billion in budget authority and \$183 billion in new outlays for programs of the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and related agencies for fiscal year 1994. When adjustments are made for prior-year outlays and other completed actions, the bill as adjusted totals \$263.4 billion in budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 1994.

On the whole this is a good bill. I am pleased that the conference agreement stays below its 602(b) allocation and that budget gimmickry has been kept to a minimum.

I share the President's concern about a \$600 million contingency fund for LIHEAP that must be designated as emergency spending to be released. These are expenses that can be anticipated and should be funded through the regular appropriations process.

I am pleased that an amendment I had adopted during the Senate consideration of the bill to direct funding to the Pell grant shortfall was retained in conference. As I said, at that time, if education reform legislation is not enacted, there is no better use for those funds than to meet our previous obligations under the Pell grant program.

I am pleased however, that language was dropped from the bill, which would have denied Social Security disability payments to individuals confined in asylums as a result of court proceedings where in some cases, the individuals were found innocent by reason of insanity.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

The conference report provides \$613.4 million in funding for the NIMH, a 5.2 percent increase over fiscal year 1993 funding. This increase will allow the institute to continue its many worthwhile research initiatives, providing hope and promise to millions of individuals and their families in this country and around the world.

I am disappointed that the \$15 million increase in the discretionary fund

of the Director of NIH was not accommodated in the conference report. The Senate recommended that \$12 million of this amount be devoted to the high priority research initiative known as the "Decade of the Brain." Instead, \$7.5 million was provided with no specific directive to support the "Decade of the Brain" activities.

It is my hope that the "Decade of the Brain" will receive recognition and support by the Director, and that the NIMH will be recognized for the significant role it plays as one of the two lead institutes in this effort.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE HOMELESS

The conference report provides \$63 million for Health Care for the Homeless. This is \$3 million higher than the Senate-passed bill and \$5 million higher than the fiscal year 1993 appropriation. I am encouraged by the support for this program which provides primary health care to homeless individuals, many of whom are mentally ill.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

While lower than the Senate-passed level of \$10 million, I am pleased that the conference report provides a \$7.5 million increase for infectious disease research at the CDC.

This past May, the Four Corners area of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Utah experienced an outbreak of an unusual respiratory illness associated with a previously unrecognized hantavirus. Seventy-five percent of those who have contracted this illness have died. I know that these funds will provide great assistance in the response to and hopeful eradication of this illness.

NATIONAL YOUTH SPORTS

Finally, I cosponsored an amendment during Senate floor consideration of H.R. 2518 to increase funding for the National Youth Sports Program to \$12 million. I am pleased that the conferees retained this language and included a 29-percent matching requirement and competitive bidding. This will result in more and stronger programs for our young people.

It is my belief that providing recreational opportunities for young people will help build their self-esteem and discourage them from involvements in unsafe and unhealthy behavior such as drug and alcohol use and gang involvement.

I thank the conferees for their support for many important initiatives and urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fate of two amendments that I offered during consideration of the Treasury-Postal and Labor-HHS appropriations bills. My amendments, PRO-FEDS, which would have made all Federal buildings smokefree and PRO-KIDS, which would have made all federally funded children's programs smokefree, were both

adopted by the Senate but unfortunately both were dropped by the respective conferees. I take the floor today to express my displeasure with these developments and to let my colleagues know that I will be back again to offer these amendments to the next appropriate legislative vehicles.

Mr. President, this is not a threat. It is a promise.

Before I explain what happened to both of these amendments. I want to first remind my colleagues about the contents of an EPA report that was released on January 7, 1993. This report concluded the following:

Secondhand smoke is a group A carcinogen, in the same class as benzene, asbestos, and arsenic.

Secondhand smoke causes 3,000 lung cancer deaths per year.

Secondhand smoke adversely affects children and is associated with thousands of lower respiratory infections, hospitalizations, and asthmatic exacerbations each year among our youth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following EPA brochure entitled "Secondhand Smoke," which details these findings, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Now I would like to take my colleagues through what has happened to my amendments to protect adults and children from secondhand smoke. First, during Senate consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill I offered an amendment to make all Federal buildings smokefree, including congressional buildings.

I wanted our policy in Federal buildings to be consistent. Right now, all HHS, EPA, Veterans Affairs and Postal Service buildings are smokefree. It is no surprise to me that the public health officials at HHS and EPA urged their respective agencies to be smoke free.

Mr. President, when I offered this amendment, I entered into a time agreement of 1 hour. In return for this time agreement, I agreed not to ask for a rollcall vote. I felt compelled to do this because there were threats of a filibuster against my amendment, which would have delayed action on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill indefinitely.

At the end of debate on my amendment, the Senate adopted my amendment by a voice vote on August 3, 1993. Even though there was not a rollcall vote, I believe that there is overwhelming support for this amendment in the Senate.

In September, the Treasury-Postal conferees convened to work out the differences between the House and Senate bills. My amendment to make Federal buildings smokefree was not included

in the House bill, therefore it was a so-called conferenceable item.

On September 9, 1993, I wrote to Senator DECONCINI asking him to retain my amendment in the final conference report. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Just prior to this, Congressman RICHARD DURBIN and 36 other House Members wrote to Congressman HOYER, chairman of the House Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, asking him to accept the Lautenberg amendment.

I want to point out to my colleagues that the distinguished Senator from Arizona, chairman of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, supported my amendment and he fought for it in conference. I want to publicly commend him for these efforts.

Unfortunately, the House conferees insisted on their position and my amendment was dropped. At this point I would like to read from an August 4, 1993 article in the Louisville-Courier Post, where a reporter wrote:

(Senator) Ford's strategy was to let the amendment go through with relatively little stir, and then try to kill it in the upcoming House-Senate conference where he will have an influential ally in Rep. William Natcher D-Bowling Green, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 3.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I was not a conferee on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, so I cannot confirm or substantiate this account of what was going to happen to my PRO-FEDS amendment. However, when I read the conference report language regarding my amendment I noticed some inconsistency. After the amendment that eliminated my provision, the conferees stated the following:

The conferees have agreed to eliminate this Senate provision which established a nonsmoking policy for federal buildings. The language proposed by the Senate is legislative in nature and is currently under consideration by the appropriate legislative Committees.

Mr. President, I read this to mean that the conferees did not want to attach a legislative provision to an appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I have heard this objection many times. Members of Congress often say that a certain provision doesn't belong in an appropriations bill because it is legislative in nature. But in this case, Mr. President, I believe that my PRO-FEDS amendment was dropped because of substantive objections.

If the conferees dropped every provision in this Treasury-Postal con-

ference report that was legislation, there would not be much of a bill left. The Treasury-Postal conference report contains numerous legislative provisions that were agreed to by the conferees. There is even an entire title of authorizing legislation regarding the revenue foregone program. This provision, eight pages in length, makes permanent statutory changes to title 39 of the United States Code.

Therefore, it appears that those conferees who objected to my amendment because it was legislation on an appropriations bill also agreed to a whole host of other legislative provisions.

The fate of my PRO-KIDS amendment was strikingly similar. My PRO-KIDS amendment, which would have made all federally funded children's programs smoke free, was also dropped by the Labor-HHS conferees.

Mr. President, on September 28, 1993, the Senate passed my PRO-KIDS amendment to the fiscal year 1994 Labor-HHS appropriations bill by an overwhelming vote of 95 to 3. Even the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority whip, who controlled time in opposition to my amendment and expressed some concerns about my proposal on the floor, voted for my amendment.

Mr. President, following the adoption of my amendment and the passage of the Labor-HHS bill, I wrote to Senator HARKIN and the other Senate conferees urging them to retain the PRO-KIDS amendment in the final conference report. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Senator HARKIN be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I want to commend the Senator from Iowa, the distinguished chairman of the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee for his efforts to retain my amendment in conference. He not only voted for this amendment but he is also an original cosponsor of the PRO-KIDS bill that I introduced in January of this year. He has also been a leader in the fight against the tobacco companies pushing their products on our Nation's children.

Despite the overwhelming support for my amendment, the conferees dropped PRO-KIDS. I am not certain why it was dropped. Once again, like the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, the Labor-HHS conference report contains numerous legislative provisions including the so-called Hyde amendment which the Senate Parliamentarian has confirmed is legislation on an appropriations bill. Thus, the argument that PRO-KIDS was dropped because it is legislative in nature does not adequately explain its ultimate fate in this instance.

Mr. President, I feel that it is fair to deduce that these amendments were

dropped because some Members of Congress object to their substance. Therefore, I say to my House and Senate colleagues, if you object to my actions to protect nonsmokers, let's debate the merits and not get into procedural matters that are clearly meaningless in this cases.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I would like to summarize my remarks. First, I believe that both my PRO-FEDS and PRO-KIDS amendments were dropped for substantive reasons and not procedural reasons, despite what I feel is overwhelming support for both of them in the Senate. Second, I want to let all of my colleagues know that I will soon return to the Senate floor to offer both of these amendments to appropriate vehicles and I ask for a rollcall vote on both of them. I make this statement so that none of my colleagues will be surprised to see me on the floor trying to protect our children and Federal workers and visitors from the deadly carcinogen called secondhand smoke.

EXHIBIT 1

SECONDHAND SMOKE; WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT SECONDHAND SMOKE AS PARENTS, DECISIONMAKERS, AND BUILDING OCCUPANTS PROTECTING YOUR HEALTH

In the home

Don't smoke in your house or permit others to do so.

If a family member insists on smoking indoors, increase ventilation in the area where smoking takes place. Open windows or use exhaust fans.

Do not smoke if children are present, particularly infants and toddlers. They are particularly susceptible to the effects of passive smoking.

Don't allow baby-sitters or others who work in your home to smoke in the house or near your children.

Where children spend time

EPA recommends that every organization dealing with children have a smoking policy that effectively protects children from exposure to environmental tobacco smoke.

Find out about the smoking policies of the day care providers, pre-schools, schools, and other care-givers for your children.

Help other parents understand the serious health risks to children from secondhand smoke. Work with parent/teacher associations, your school board and school administrators, community leaders, and other concerned citizens to make your child's environment smoke free.

In the workplace

EPA recommends that every company have a smoking policy that effectively protects nonsmokers from involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke. Many businesses and organizations already have smoking policies in place but these policies vary in their effectiveness.

If your company does not have a smoking policy that effectively controls secondhand smoke, work with appropriate management and labor organizations to establish one.

Simply separating smokers and nonsmokers within the same area, such as a cafeteria, may reduce exposure, but nonsmokers will still be exposed to recirculated smoke or smoke drifting into nonsmoking areas.

Prohibiting smoking indoors or limiting smoking to rooms that have been specially

designed to prevent smoke from escaping to other areas of the building are the two options that will effectively protect nonsmokers. The costs associated with establishing properly designed smoking rooms vary from building to building, and are likely to be greater than simply eliminating smoking entirely.

If smoking is permitted indoors, it should be in a room that meets several conditions:

Air from the smoking room should be directly exhausted to the outside by an exhaust fan. Air from the smoking room should not be recirculated to other parts of the building. More air should be exhausted from the room than is supplied to it to make sure ETS doesn't drift to surrounding spaces.

The ventilation system should provide the smoking room with 60 cubic feet per minute (CFM) of supply air per smoker. This air is often supplied by air transferred from other parts of the building, such as corridors.

Nonsmokers should not have to use the smoking room for any purpose. It should be located in a non-work area where no one, as part of his or her work responsibilities, is required to enter.

Employer-supported smoking cessation programs are an important part of any smoking policy. Approximately 25 percent of American adults still smoke. Many smokers would like to quit, but cigarette smoking is physically and psychologically addictive, and quitting is not easy. While working in a smoke-free building may encourage some smokers to quit, a goal of any smoking policy should be to actively support smokers who want to kick the habit.

If there are designated outdoor smoking areas, smoking should not be permitted right outside the doors (or near building ventilation system air intakes) where nonsmokers may have to pass through smoke from smokers congregated near doorways. Some employers have set up outdoor areas equipped with shelters and ashtrays to accommodate smokers.

In restaurants and bars

Know the law concerning smoking in your community. Some communities have banned smoking in places such as restaurants entirely. Others require separate smoking areas in restaurants, although most rely on simply separating smokers and nonsmokers within the same space, which may reduce but not eliminate involuntary exposure to ETS.

If smoking is permitted, placement of smoking areas should be determined with some knowledge of the ventilation characteristics of the space to minimize nonsmoker exposure. For example, nonsmoking areas should be near air supply ducts while smoking areas should be near return registers or exhausts.

Ask to be seated in nonsmoking areas as far from smokers as possible.

If your community does not have a smoking control ordinance, urge that one be enacted. If your local ordinances are not sufficiently protective, urge your local government officials to take action.

Few restrictions have been imposed in bars where drinking and smoking seem to go together. In the absence of state or local laws restricting smoking in bars, encourage the proprietor to consider his or her nonsmoking clientele, and frequent places that do so.

In other indoor spaces

Does your state or community have laws addressing smoking in public spaces? Many states have laws prohibiting smoking in public facilities such as schools, hospitals, air-

ports, bus terminals, and other public buildings. Know the law. Take advantage of laws designed to protect you. Federal laws now prohibit smoking on all airline flights of six hours or less within the U.S. and on all interstate bus travel.

A special message for smokers

This is a difficult time to be a smoker. As the public becomes more aware that smoking is not only a hazard to you but also to others, nonsmokers are becoming more outspoken and smokers are finding themselves a beleaguered group.

If you choose to smoke, here are some things you can do to help protect the people close to you:

Don't smoke around children. Their lungs are very susceptible to smoke. If you are expecting a child, quit smoking.

Take an active role in the development of your company's smoking policy. Encourage the offering of smoking cessation programs for those who want them.

Keep your home smoke free. Nonsmokers can get lung cancer from exposure to your smoke. Because smoke lingers in the air, people may be exposed even if they are not present while you smoke. If you must smoke inside, limit smoking to a room where you can open windows for cross-ventilation. Be sure the room in which you smoke has a working smoke detector to lessen the risk of fire.

Test your home for radon. Radon contamination in combination with smoking is a much greater health risk than either one individually.

Don't smoke in an automobile with the windows closed if passengers are present. The high concentration of smoke in a small, closed compartment substantially increases the exposure of other passengers.

More than two million people quit smoking every year, most of them on their own, without the aid of a program or medication. If you want to quit smoking, assistance is available. Smoking cessation programs can help. Your employer may offer programs, or ask your doctor for advice.

WHAT IS SECONDHAND SMOKE?

What is secondhand smoke?

Secondhand smoke is a mixture of the smoke given off by the burning end of a cigarette, pipe, or cigar, and the smoke exhaled from the lungs of smokers.

This mixture contains more than 4,000 substances, more than 40 of which are known to cause cancer in humans or animals and many of which are strong irritants.

Secondhand smoke is also called environmental tobacco smoke (ETS); exposure to secondhand smoke is called involuntary smoking, or passive smoking.

Secondhand smoke can cause lung cancer in nonsmokers

Secondhand smoke has been classified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a known cause of lung cancer in humans (Group A carcinogen).

Passive smoking is estimated by EPA to cause approximately 3,000 lung cancer deaths in nonsmokers each year.

Secondhand smoke is a serious health risk to children

The developing lungs of young children are also affected by exposure to secondhand smoke.

Infants and young children whose parents smoke are among the most seriously affected by exposure to secondhand smoke, being at increased risk of lower respiratory tract infections such as pneumonia and bronchitis.

EPA estimates that passive smoking is responsible for between 150,000 and 300,000 lower respiratory tract infections in infants and children under 18 months of age annually, resulting in between 7,500 and 15,000 hospitalizations each year.

Children exposed to secondhand smoke are also more likely to have reduced lung function and symptoms of respiratory irritation like cough, excess phlegm, and wheeze.

Passive smoking can lead to a buildup of fluid in the middle ear, the most common cause of hospitalization of children for an operation.

Asthmatic children are especially at risk. EPA estimates that exposure to secondhand smoke increases the number of episodes and severity of symptoms in hundreds of thousands of asthmatic children. EPA estimates that between 200,000 and 1,000,000 asthmatic children have their condition made worse by exposure to secondhand smoke. Passive smoking may also cause thousands of non-asthmatic children to develop the condition each year.

Other health implications

Exposure to secondhand smoke causes irritation of the eye, nose, and throat.

Passive smoking can also irritate the lungs, leading to coughing, excess phlegm, chest discomfort, and reduced lung function.

Secondhand smoke may affect the cardiovascular system, and some studies have linked exposure to secondhand smoke with the onset of chest pain.

For more information

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Indoor Air Quality Information Clearinghouse (IAQ INFO), P.O. Box 37133, Washington, DC 20013-7133, 1-800-438-4318.

Office on Smoking and Health/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Mail Stop K-50, 4770 Buford Highway, N.E., Atlanta, GA 30341-3724, 404-488-5705.

National Cancer Institute, Building 31, Room 10A24, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20892, 1-800-4-CANCER.

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Information Center, P.O. Box 30105, Bethesda, MD 20824-0105, 301-951-3260.

National Institute for Occupation Safety and Health, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Cincinnati, OH 45226-1998, 1-800-35-NIOSH.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 9, 1993.

Hon. DENNIS DECONCINI,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR DENNIS: As Chairman of this Subcommittee, you will play a pivotal role in the Conference Committee deliberations on the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill. This is why I am writing to urge you to retain a provision that I authored in the Senate passed Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill that would prohibit smoking in Federal buildings except in designated areas that are separately ventilated to the outside. Your leadership will be critical to whether or not this provision is included in the final Conference report.

My amendment is based on legislation I introduced earlier this year called PRO-FEDS (S. 262). PRO-FEDS will prohibit smoking in all Federal buildings by expanding the current policy that exists at the Department of Health and Human Services, EPA, the Postal Service and the Veterans Administration to all other Federal agencies, including Con-

gress and the White House. It would exclude living quarters and Veterans Administration hospitals.

In cases where unusual extenuating circumstances prevent total compliance, Federal agencies could apply for a partial waiver from this provision if they protect people from exposure to secondhand smoke to the extent possible. My amendment also allows the smoke free policy to be adopted through collective bargaining, if appropriate.

It is time to protect people who work or visit Federal buildings from the killer called environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) or secondhand smoke which the EPA has classified as a Group A carcinogen similar to arsenic, benzene and asbestos. ETS causes 3,000 lung cancer deaths per year and thousands more deaths from Heart disease. It also exacerbates asthma in 200,000 to 1,000,000 children per year and sends 7,500 to 15,000 kids to the hospital with respiratory diseases.

Despite this classification and all of this evidence, secondhand smoke is still prevalent in many of our Federal buildings. So it is now time for the entire Federal government to follow the lead of the Department of Health and Human Services, the EPA, the Veterans Administration, the Postal Service, the White House, and go smoke free unless the buildings have smoking rooms that are separately ventilated to the outside.

Why do our country's Department of Health and Environmental Protection Agency have smoke free policies in their buildings? Because the health experts within these agencies know that tobacco smoke kills those who breathe it as well as those who smoke.

Now that the scientific data is in, we need to take action to protect Americans from this deadly carcinogen. The Congress has acted to rid our airplanes of secondhand smoke and in 1990, the Congress pass the Clean Air Act to regulate 189 hazardous air pollutants which were estimated to cause 1,500 deaths per year. Now we must act to protect all our people who visit and work in our Federal buildings from an air pollutant which causes at least 3,000 deaths per year. I urge you to retain my amendment in the final Conference Report so that we can provide a smoke free environment for millions of Americans.

If you have any question about this provision please feel free to call me or Sander Lurie 4-6822 on my staff.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG.

EXHIBIT 3

WASHINGTON.—In an unmistakable sign of the tobacco industry's political weakness, the Senate yesterday agreed to restrict smoking in all federal buildings, including the U.S. Capitol.

Sen. Wendell Ford argued strenuously against the measure but, bowing to what he later conceded was an inevitable outcome, allowed it to be attached to an appropriations bill on a voice vote in a nearly empty Senate chamber.

Usually a Senator fighting an amendment will demand a roll-call vote and seek to marshal support for his cause as members troop to the floor. The Kentucky Democrat said in an interview, however, that if he had done that, even some senators who agreed with him privately would have backed the amendment.

"The imagery of voting for tobacco is pretty tough," he said.

Instead, Ford's strategy was to let the amendment go through with relatively little

stir, and then try to kill it in the upcoming House-Senate conference where he will have an influential ally in Rep. William Natcher, D-Bowling Green, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

The amendment, which was sponsored by New Jersey Democrat Frank Lautenberg, would ban smoking inside all federal buildings except in spaces that are separately ventilated. Ford said that as a practical matter it would be a complete ban because the government would not go to the "tremendous" expense of installing separate ventilation.

A House committee has approved similar legislation, and an executive order restricting smoking has been pending in the White House for months. But yesterday's Senate action is the first time either house of Congress has voted to impose a no-smoking policy on federal workers, according to American Heart Association spokesman Scott Ballin.

Lautenberg, a longtime tobacco foe, attached his amendment to a bill appropriating funds for the Treasury Department, Postal Service and several other agencies. The comparable House-passed bill includes no such provision, and so its fate will be up to the group of House and Senate negotiators.

Arizona Democrat Dennis DeConcini, chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee responsible for the bill and thus the key Senate member of this conference, said in an interview that he supports Lautenberg's amendment. However, he also said Natcher opposes it "big time," and "my guess is we will have a hard time keeping" the amendment in the final bill because of Natcher's position.

Natcher's district extends into the Louisville suburbs but includes numerous tobacco farmers in south-central Kentucky. He did not return a phone inquiry about the matter.

Lautenberg, who sponsored the airline-smoking ban in 1987, said he thinks there is a good chance the amendment will be retained by the conference. But if not, he vowed to continue offering the measure on the floor until it does become law.

In his floor speech, Ford, a heavy smoker, said he is not opposed to smoking restrictions as part of a comprehensive policy to improve indoor air quality. But, he argued, addressing the problem on "a product-by-product basis" will lead to a morass of regulation.

Eventually, he said, federal inspectors might stop Senate personnel from eating lunch at their desks because of the smell of onions.

Lautenberg disagreed.

"I think the evidence is irrefutable that tobacco smoke is different from smelly onions," said Lautenberg, who referred to the recent Environmental Protection Agency report classifying secondhand smoke as a cause of lung cancer.

EXHIBIT 4

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 4, 1993.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,

Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM: Last week, I offered an amendment to the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill that would protect children from secondhand smoke while they are participating in programs such as Head Start, WIC, Chapter 1, health care and child care. This amendment will require Federally funded programs to establish a non-smoking policy if they provide

health services to children under the age 18 or provide other social services primarily to children under the age of 18, including elementary and secondary education.

The amendment passed overwhelming, 95 to 3. As the Conference Committee convenes, I strongly urge you to support the Senate position on this amendment and include my amendment in the final conference report.

As you may know, an EPA report released during the Bush Administration and supported by the Clinton Administration, concluded what we already know, secondhand smoke kills. The EPA has labeled it a Group A carcinogen, the same category used for benzene, arsenic and asbestos. Consider what the EPA Report finds:

Secondhand smoke causes:
3,000 lung cancer deaths per year in non-smokers.

But the affects of secondhand smoke especially harm our kids. Consider the toll it takes on innocent children in our country:

Secondhand smoke causes more than 200,000 lower respiratory tract infections in young children annually including bronchitis and pneumonia, resulting in 7,500 to 15,000 hospitalizations.

Secondhand smoke exacerbates asthmatic symptoms in children and is associated with 8,000 to 26,000 new asthma cases in children.

In cases where unusual extenuating circumstances prevent total compliance, programs could apply for a partial waiver from this provision if they protect people from exposure to secondhand smoke to the extent possible. This amendment also allows the nonsmoking policy to be adopted through collective bargaining, if appropriate.

Now that the scientific data is in, we need to take action to protect our children from this deadly carcinogen. The Congress has acted to rid our airplanes of secondhand smoke and the Department of Health and Human Services, Postal Service, VA and the EPA have acted to protect their workers. In 1990, the Congress passed the Clean Air Act to regulate 189 hazardous air pollutants which were estimated to cause 1,500 deaths per year. Now we must act to protect our children from an air pollutant which causes at least 3,000 deaths per year.

Once again, I strongly urge you to retain my amendment in the final conference agreement. If you have any questions please call me or Sander Lurie of my staff at 4-6822.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. LAUTENBERG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], would vote "yea".

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 315 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Akaka	Exon	McCain
Baucus	Feingold	McConnell
Bennett	Feinstein	Metzenbaum
Bingaman	Ford	Mikulski
Bond	Glenn	Mitchell
Boren	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Grassley	Murkowski
Breaux	Harkin	Murray
Bryan	Hatch	Nickles
Bumpers	Hatfield	Nunn
Burns	Hollings	Packwood
Byrd	Inouye	Pell
Campbell	Jeffords	Reid
Chafee	Johnston	Riegle
Coats	Kassebaum	Robb
Cochran	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kerry	Shelby
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Simon
Danforth	Leahy	Simpson
Daschle	Levin	Specter
DeConcini	Lieberman	Stevens
Dodd	Lott	Thurmond
Dole	Lugar	Wellstone
Domenici	Mack	Wofford
Dorgan	Mathews	

NAYS—15

Brown	Gregg	Kohl
Conrad	Heflin	Pressler
Craig	Helms	Roth
Faircloth	Hutchinson	Smith
Gramm	Kempthorne	Warner

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Pryor	Wallop
Durenberger	Sasser	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Senate concurred in House amendments to Senate amendment Nos. 6, 11, 15, 23, 24, 34, 441, 49, 54, 57, 58, 65, 68, 69, 74, 92, 104, 108, 111, 117, 123, 124, 129, and 133, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$206,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$3,376,617,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain and spend in the name of the Department of Labor all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992)".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

For expenses necessary during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and each fiscal year thereafter, for the maintenance and operation of a comprehensive program of

centralized services which the Secretary of Labor may prescribe and deem appropriate and advantageous to provide on a reimbursable basis under the provisions of the Economy Act (subject to prior notice to OMB) in the national office and field: *Provided*, That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to agencies, bureaus, and offices for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full cost of operations including services obtained through cooperative administrative services units under the Economy Act, including reserves for accrued annual leave, worker's compensation, depreciation of capitalized equipment, and amortization of ADP software and systems (either acquired or donated): *Provided further*, That funds received for services rendered to any entity or person for use of Departmental facilities, including associated utilities and security services, shall be credited to and merged with this fund.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 102. None of the funds in the Employees' Compensation Fund under 5 U.S.C. 8147 shall be expended for payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses to any individual convicted of a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1920, or of any felony fraud related to the application for or receipt of benefits under subchapters I or III of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$7,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,125,178,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$20,183,775,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided; That reimbursement to the Trust Funds under this heading for administrative expenses to carry out sections 9704 and 9706 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be made, with interest, not later than September 30, 1996) *Provided further*, That not more than \$1,800,000 is available until September 30, 1995 for expenses necessary for the Commission on the Social Security "Notch" Issue, established by section 635 of Public law 102-393 as amended".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$1,475,000,000 to be available for obligation in the period October 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995.

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, an additional \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That all of the funds available under this paragraph are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$464,224,000, of which \$42,940,000 shall be for carrying out section 681(a) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, including \$12,000,000 which shall be for carrying out the National Youth Sports Program: *Provided*, That payments from such amount to the grantee and subgrantee administering the National Youth Sports Program may not exceed the aggregate amount contributed in cash or in kind by the grantee and subgrantee: *Provided further*, That amounts in excess of \$9,400,000 of such amount may not be made available to the grantee and subgrantees administering the National Youth Sports Program unless the grantee agrees to provide contributions in cash over and above the preceding year's cash contribution to such program in an amount that equals 29 percent of such excess amount."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$94,431,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "1911(d) and section 1503".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 207. For the purpose of carrying out subparts II and III of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.) for fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall obligate \$7,532,065 from the amounts made available pursuant to section 1935(b) of that Act for fiscal year 1994 to those States and Indian tribes or tribal organizations for which the amounts specified in the award statement issued by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration under those subparts on November 2, 1992, was greater than the amount specified in the award statement issued on August 6, 1993, in the amounts equal to those differentials.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "For carrying out education reform activities authorized in law including activities authorized by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, \$155,000,000, of which \$5,000,000, under section 402 of the Perkins Act, shall be used by the Secretary for activities, including peer review of applications, related to school-to-work transition, and \$45,000,000 shall be used under section 420A of the Perkins Act for State grants and subgrants to initiate activities in States and localities related to school-to-work transition: *Provided*, That \$105,000,000 of the funds provided shall be for carrying out activities authorized by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, or similar legislation, if enacted into law by April 1, 1994, of which \$5,000,000 shall be used for "State Planning for Improving Student Achievement Through Integration of Technology Into the Curriculum"; and that if such legislation is not enacted by that date, the \$105,000,000 shall be transferred to "Student Financial Assistance" to be used to alleviate the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this account shall become available on July 1, 1994 and remain available through September 30, 1995."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "": *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, \$20,000,000 shall be used for Department of Education activities authorized under the Safe Schools Act, or similar legislation, if such legislation is enacted by April 1, 1994, except that if such legislation is not enacted by that date, this amount shall be transferred to "Student Financial Assistance" to be used to alleviate the funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "including \$3,000,000 for model community education and employment centers".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$2,300; *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 401(g) of the Act, as amended, if the Secretary determines, prior to publication of the payment schedule for award year 1994-1995, that the \$6,303,566,000 included within this appro-

priation for Pell Grant awards for award year 1994-1995 is insufficient to satisfy fully all such awards for which students are eligible, as calculated under section 401(b) of the Act, the amount paid for each such award shall be reduced by either a fixed or variable percentage, or by a fixed dollar amount, as determined in accordance with a schedule of reductions established by the Secretary for this purpose".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$893,688,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$292,592,000: *Provided*, That \$31,000,000 shall be for research centers, including funds to extend the existing award for a research center on the education of disadvantaged students for up to one year; \$38,032,000 shall be for regional laboratories, including \$9,508,000 for rural initiatives; \$32,500,000 shall be for activities under the Fund for Innovation in Education; \$4,462,000 shall be for civic education activities under section 4609; \$5,396,000 shall be for Grants for Schools and Teachers under subpart 1 and \$3,687,000 shall be for Family School Partnerships under subpart 2 of part B of title III of Public Law 100-297; \$16,072,000 shall be for national programs under section 2012, including not less than \$5,472,000 for the National Clearinghouse for Science and Mathematics under section 2012(d); and \$13,871,000 shall be for regional consortia under subpart 2 of part A of title II; \$25,944,000 shall be for star schools, of which \$4,000,000 shall be awarded competitively for a demonstration of a statewide, two-way interactive fiber optic telecommunications network, carrying voice, video, and data transmissions, and housing a point of presence in every county; and \$3,212,000 shall be for the National Writing Project".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$146,309,000, of which \$17,792,000 shall be used to carry out the provisions of title II of the Library Services and Construction Act and shall remain available until expended, and \$4,960,000 shall be for section 222 and \$2,802,000 shall be for section 223 of the Higher Education Act, of which \$2,500,000 shall be for demonstration of on-line and dial-in access to a statewide, multitype library bibliographic data base through a statewide fiber optic network housing a point of presence in every county, connecting library services in every municipality, to be awarded competitively".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$312,000,000, of which \$7,000,000 shall be for Ready to Learn activities consistent with the purpose outlined in P.L. 102-545".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert "508".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Under the previous order, the Senate concurs en bloc in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. FORD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for no longer than 7 minutes as in morning business.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM AND ILLEGAL ALIENS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I recently read with interest and great disappointment an item taken from an article of the San Antonio Express News of September 26 concerning the Clinton administration's proposition on health care reform and illegal aliens. The article left the impression that the administration will consider the verification of one's legal status before obtaining eligibility for health care to be a low priority.

Even though the new health care plan did not generally contain coverage for illegal aliens, I have every concern that those here illegally could easily work their way into coverage under the plan.

As Members of this body know, I have introduced a bill in this Senate for several years to prohibit the payment of Federal benefits to illegal aliens. I have long felt that we must have a clear, unequivocal, and uniform policy in this regard. I will continue to work toward that goal.

But as we begin the important and necessary task of health care reform, I think it is the appropriate time to clarify that all reasonable efforts should and will be made to ensure that our carefully crafted nationwide health plan, in fact, excludes those here illegally.

There is a serious danger that the real or perceived availability of health care benefits to illegal aliens will create a further magnet for illegal immigration. I am not advocating a hardheart position. I simply state the fact that we have limited resources to implement health care coverage for all Americans. The budget dollars which go to illegal aliens will necessarily be taken away from everyone else. The

emergency medical services should and will be provided to all who need them, as is the case under the current law, and no one will be turned away during a life-threatening condition. But we must guard against illegal aliens taking advantage of emergency hospital facilities for routine health care.

I simply say that illegal aliens should not be included in the health care plan coverage period. Furthermore, and more importantly, we should take explicit measures to enforce that exclusion. At a minimum, the administration should check on the legal status of individuals before issuing the health care plan card.

I feel that the implementation of universal coverage and the issuance of individual cards provides a prime opportunity for the verification of legal status. The Congress embraced this concept in 1986 when it passed, as part of the Immigration Reform Act, the SAVE Program. SAVE, the Systematic Alien Verification of Entitlements Program, establishes a method to ensure that entitlement benefits do not go to illegal aliens. The problem has been somewhat unclear, and the Federal policy on entitlement eligibility, along with expansive court decisions, have made this program less successful than it could be or should be.

We already require employers to make a good-faith effort to verify the legal status of their employees upon their hiring through a review of their documentation. An employer certainly has a stake in his employee's health care plan, and I would think that it would be to the benefit of the employer to verify employees' legal status. By doing so we may thus screen out those ineligible that could draw benefits from the plan which would normally go to our own citizens.

Before we implement a new health care plan, we should take this opportunity to sharpen the distinction between citizens and resident aliens entitled to universal coverage and those who have no legal right to be in this country. Illegal aliens should rightfully be excluded from that coverage.

If one's initial entry into the plan is through an employer, the employer already has responsibility to verify one's legal status. If one's entry into the plan is through an alliance, then the same obligation should apply to the alliance. In any event, the U.S. Congress should clearly state a policy against providing benefits to those who are in this country illegally and should get very serious about enforcing that policy.

In our enthusiasm to craft a plan that fits all of our citizens, we should be careful and not create yet another incentive for people to come here illegally.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the newspaper article referenced in my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Sept. 26, 1993]

UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS WON'T BE SEARCHED OUT

SAN ANTONIO, TX.—Some undocumented workers may receive health care under President Clinton's health-reform plan, and the administration will not aggressively attempt to root them out, according to the president's top health adviser.

"We're not also going to set up some kind of a policing system that links the health-security system to immigration systems," said Ira Magaziner, director of the administration's health-care task force.

Magaziner, who spoke to reporters last week through a satellite teleconference, said the administration would not "take away from people what is available for them today."

"So, for example, if an undocumented person is working—and may be not even doing so legally—we're not going to ask a whole separate set of questions about their immigration status if they receive a health-security card through their employers."

Although the plan is designed to exclude undocumented immigrants from comprehensive health coverage, the administration has set aside funds to reimburse hospitals that care for them.

"Undocumented people today are eligible for emergency services, pregnancy-related services, and are serviced by community-health centers and hospitals. That system will continue," Magaziner said.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

I withhold the request.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have a period of morning business for Senators to speak therein.

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

NOTIFICATION TO AMEND THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I would like to give notice of my intention to amend the Standing Rules of Senate with the following:

S. RES. 25

Resolved, That rule VIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the "." at the end of paragraph 2 and inserting the following: "; except those motions to proceed made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, on which there shall be a time limitation for debate of two hours equally divided between the Majority and the Minority Leaders, or their designees. Provided that any motion to proceed, by the Majority Leader, or any other Senator, to any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall be debatable."

S. RES. 26

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking

the "." at the end of paragraph 3 of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", such appeals shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn—except on a measure or motion to amend the Senate rules, in which case the necessary affirmative vote shall be two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

S. RES. 27

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end of paragraph 3 of section 2 the following:

In the case of a measure that has been reported by a committee that contains recommended committee amendments, such amendments shall be considered germane.

S. RES. 28

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the "." after speaks in paragraph 3 of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", with the time consumed by quorum calls being charged to the Senator who requested the call of the quorum."

S. RES. 29

Resolved, That rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding the following:

6. That whenever the Senate has in its possession a measure that has been passed by both Houses it shall be in order, once the measure has been placed before the Senate, to make one non-divisible motion that contains the following: to insist on the Senate amendment(s), or disagree to the House amendment(s); to request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, or agree to the request of the House for the same; and that the Presiding Officer be authorized to appoint the Senate conferees.

S. RES. 30

Resolved, That rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking "and shall be determined without debate." in paragraph 1. and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "notwithstanding a request for the reading of the conference report, and shall be determined without debate."

S. RES. 31

Resolved, That rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: "6. (a) At any time following the second day of consideration of a measure, regardless of the pendency, it shall twice be in order during a calendar day to move that no amendment, other than the reported committee amendments, which is not relevant to the subject matter of the measure or to the subject matter of an amendment proposed by the committee which reported the measure, shall thereafter be in order. The motion shall be privileged and shall be decided after two hours of debate, without any intervening action, to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority and the Minority leaders or their designees.

"(b) If a motion made under subparagraph (a) is agreed to by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, no amendment not already agreed to (except amendments proposed by the committee which reported the measure) which is not relevant to the subject matter of the measure, or the subject matter of an

amendment proposed by the committee which reported the measure, shall be in order.

"(c) When a motion made under subparagraph (a) has been agreed to as provided in subparagraph (b) with respect to a measure, points of order with respect to questions of relevancy of amendments shall be decided without debate, except that the Presiding Officer may entertain debate for his own guidance prior to ruling on the point of order. Appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer on such points of order shall be decided without debate.

"(d) Whenever an appeal is taken from a decision of the Presiding Officer on the question of relevancy of an amendment, or whenever the Presiding Officer submits the question of relevancy of an amendment to the Senate, the vote necessary to overturn the decision of the Presiding Officer or hold the amendment relevant shall be three-fifths of the Senators voting, a quorum being present. No amendment proposing sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress language that does not directly relate to the measure or matter before the Senate shall be considered relevant.

S. RES. 32

Resolved, That rule VIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the "." at the end of paragraph 2 and inserting the following: "; except those motions to proceed made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, on which there shall be a time limitation for debate of two hours equally divided between the Majority and the Minority Leaders, or their designees. Provided that any motion to proceed, by the Majority Leader, or any other Senator, to any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall be debatable."

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the "." at the end of paragraph 3 of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", such appeals shall require an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn—except on a measure or motion to amend the Senate rules, in which case the necessary affirmative vote shall be two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end of paragraph 3 of section 2 the following:

In the case of a measure that has been reported by a committee that contains recommended committee amendments, such amendments shall be considered germane.

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the "." after speaks in paragraph 3 of section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", with the time consumed by quorum calls being charged to the senator who requested the call of the quorum."

That rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding the following:

6. that whenever the Senate has in its possession a measure that has been passed by both Houses it shall be in order, once the measure has been placed before the Senate, to make one non-divisible motion that contains the following: to insist on the Senate amendment(s), or designee to the House amendment(s); to request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, or agree to the request of the House for the same; and that the Presiding Officer be authorized to appoint the Senate conferees.

That rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking "and shall

be determined without debate." in paragraph 1. and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "notwithstanding a request for the reading of the conference report, and shall be determined without debate."

The rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"6. (a) At any time following the second day of consideration of a measure, regardless of its pendency, it shall twice be in order during a calendar day to move that no amendment, other than the reported committee amendments, which is not relevant to the subject matter of the measure or to the subject matter of an amendment proposed by the committee which reported the measure, shall thereafter be in order. The motion shall be privileged and shall be decided after two hours of debate, without any intervening action, to be equally divided and controlled by the Majority and the Minority leaders or their designees.

"(b) If a motion made under subparagraph (a) is agreed to by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, no amendment not already agreed to (except amendments proposed by the committee which reported the measure) which is not relevant to the subject matter of the measure, or the subject matter of an amendment proposed by the committee which reported the measure, shall be in order.

"(c) When a motion made under subparagraph (a) has been agreed to as provided in subparagraph (b) with respect to a measure, points of order with respect to questions of relevancy of amendments shall be decided without debate, except that the Presiding Officer may entertain debate for his own guidance prior to ruling on the point of order. Appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer on such points of order shall be decided without debate.

"(d) Whenever an appeal is taken from a decision of the Presiding Officer on the question of relevancy of an amendment, or whenever the Presiding Officer submits the question of relevancy of an amendment to the Senate, the vote necessary to overturn the decision of the Presiding Officer or hold the amendment relevant shall be three-fifths of the Senators voting, a quorum being present. No amendment proposing sense of the Senate or sense of the Congress language that does not directly relate to the measure or matter before the Senate shall be considered relevant.

RECOGNITION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this year the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program is celebrating its 20th anniversary, which is an occasion as significant for the U.S. Congress as it is for the 500 scientists who have participated in the program.

It has been my privilege to have several congressional fellows work in my office, so I can personally attest to the valuable contributions that these highly trained scientists and engineers make, by bringing their expertise to

bear on a wide range of complicated and highly technical issues confronting the Congress.

In 1973, the fledgling program had seven scientists and engineers, who were placed in both the House and the Senate, on personal and committee staffs. The program grew quickly, as word spread about the quality of the fellows, with a total of some 500 serving over the two decades. Many of the program's alumni have stayed on the Hill, with several currently serving in senior staff positions, including three who are now the staff directors of science-focused committees in the House and Senate.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science coordinates the program for the 20 national scientific and engineering societies who participate each year. Each society competitively selects one or more congressional fellows, who are available without charge to serve on the personal staffs of Members of Congress or on committee and subcommittee staffs.

Congressional science and engineering fellows serve as free agents, working for offices of their own choosing, on issues that will allow them to contribute to policymaking, while learning about the legislative process. AAAS prepares them for working in the Congress through an intensive orientation program and an ongoing series of seminars.

Dr. Debra Dunivin is an American Psychological Association congressional fellow who began working on my staff last year. She has contributed her professional skills on a variety of social policy issues, and with such success that I've asked her to stay on for an additional year. She is an invaluable member of my staff.

I would suggest that my Senate colleagues who have not availed themselves of the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellowship Program should take advantage of this program, which provides an opportunity to strengthen their staff with highly knowledgeable and competent professionals. AAAS hosted a symposium and reception on September 30, in the Senate Caucus Room, to mark this occasion for congressional staff as well as former fellows. It was an occasion worth noting.

A TRIBUTE TO HAROLD HALFPENNY

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, last month, Illinois lost a longstanding civic and legal leader, Harold T. Halfpenny. Born and raised in Streator, IL, Mr. Halfpenny put himself through both undergraduate and law school at the University of Illinois.

In 1930, he founded the Chicago law firm of Halfpenny, Hahn, Roche & Mar-chese, a firm he led until his retirement in 1992. The firm now also has of-

fices in Washington. Mr. Halfpenny was one of Chicago's leading antitrust and tax attorneys. He also became one of the country's leading specialists in the formation and representation of trade associations. Mr. Halfpenny was no stranger to Washington; he often appeared as an expert witness on issues affecting small business.

Mr. Halfpenny brought an equal amount of enthusiasm and creativity to his other activities. He was active in a number of associations and charities and served as the assistant State treasurer early in his career.

Throughout his long and distinguished life, Mr. Halfpenny was a source of strength and commitment. I join many in Illinois in paying tribute to him.

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt stood at \$4,401,817,309,864.52 as of the close of business Friday, October 15. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a part of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$17,137.10.

THE 1954 WOOL ACT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today disappointed by what this body has done. Late last Thursday night, this body approved a measure which will phase out the 1954 Wool Act during the next 2 years. Over the last several months, we have voted to kill the wool program on several different occasions. This misguided action will prove very detrimental—to Montana, to the American West, and to the Nation. The compromise we passed will ease the pain felt by sheep producers. But make no mistake about it, even this gradual elimination of the Wool Act will hurt a lot of good, hard-working people.

We can already see this taking place. The sheep industry, an industry of 350,000 people, is in total chaos. One Wyoming report indicates that 40,000 ewes were consigned for sale during just 1 week. In this fire sale atmosphere prices have plummeted, bankers and county officials have become nervous, and producers have been confused.

For no good reason the wool program has become a whipping boy. Yet, ironically, this program is sound policy which is free of cost to the taxpayers of this country. Revenue to pay for this program is raised from a tariff on foreign wool and woolen products. As we import two-thirds of the wool used in America, we let wool importers pay to support a sheep industry in America.

The sheep industry in my State, and in the West, faces numerous obstacles. This year alone, they have faced the specter of increased grazing fees for those who graze on public land. They have had control of coyotes and other

predators by the USDA shut down, due to the inability of bureaucrats to complete environmental impact statements. Low prices have plagued them much of the year.

Yet, as the summer and fall offered improved prices, the foundation of their wool price has crumbled. They have now had the rug yanked out from under them by the U.S. Senate.

We have heard that this program is unnecessary. We have heard that it serves very few people. We have heard that it benefits the rich, not the family farmer we want to help out. Mr. President, I disagree. In Garfield County, MT, this program provides \$1.5 million in payments to a county with \$32.5 million in annual farm income. This county of 1,600 people has no other industry of this size. While this directly hits the farmers it will indirectly hit the cafe, the grocery store, the gas stations, the saddlery, and the bars in Jordan, the only town in the county. They cannot go to work in the next town—it is 65 miles away and the economic outlook is the same.

My point is this: Elimination of this program does not square with the President's commitment to create jobs. While we injure the existing economy of towns like Jordan and Ekalaka, MT, we create more costs than we eliminate. I mentioned that Garfield County receives \$1.5 million for 1,600 residents. This is a county of 4,500 square miles that \$937 per person which keeps the county economy operating or replaced with any job creation efforts or welfare at that price—I think not. I have heard people claim that the program benefits only the wealthy. That, somehow, this program puts people in nice houses and Lincolns in their garages. That is just not the case. I encourage you to travel out and take a look at how people live in Jordan, MT. You will find hard-working people living modestly. You will meet people who are frugal because they have to be.

The media has had a field day with this program. This whipping boy for farm programs has repeatedly endured calls for its elimination. I have even heard that well-known rancher Sam Donaldson received payments from this program. He claims he does not need the program—thereof it must be unnecessary. Mr. Donaldson may not need these payments but thousands of hard-working sheep ranchers do. I doubt they will take this phaseout as lightly as Mr. Donaldson.

THE 1954 WOOL ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last Thursday, the Senate passed S. 1548, legislation to phase out the Wool and Mohair Program, known as the Wool Act, over the next 2 years. Beginning in 1996, incentive payments that have been available since the program's inception in 1954 will be prohibited. I

note this bill had to pass the Senate before the Senate would take final action on the fiscal year 1994 Department of Agriculture appropriations bill containing funding for the 1993 incentive payments. This situation, unfortunately, demonstrates the political reality surrounding the Wool and Mohair Program. Misconceptions were rampant about the program, starting with Vice President GORE's office and proceeding on down through the halls of Congress.

The Wool Act will be effectively terminated in 2 years time. This raises several questions.

What will this action mean to the domestic sheep industry? No one seems to know.

Will domestic producers provide sufficient wool to satisfy the demands of our Nation's textile industry? No one has the answer.

How will the industry's foreign competitors, which receive government subsidies, react to the program's demise? No one has asked them.

Do we need to continue the tariff assessed on imported wool that has generated more than \$7 billion during the past 30 years, funneling 30 percent of that amount to domestic producers? No one has been forthcoming with a proposed plan.

One would think from the considerable rhetoric that floated around this Chamber in recent months that the answer to our deficit problems is elimination of the Wool Act. Certainly, every Federal program should be carefully scrutinized and proper changes instituted that will reduce Government spending. But, if we are serious about reducing the deficit by phasing out or eliminating agricultural programs, then let us not pick and choose between the various programs. Instead, such action warrants consideration of proposals that scrutinize all programs across-the-board, especially those that can be classified as providing subsidies to specific groups.

Last month, when this issue was first raised, I mentioned the importance of agriculture to Utah's overall economy and that elimination of the Wool Act would devastate a key segment of this economy.

There are approximately 2,300 Utah families involved in the sheep and wool industry who regularly receive incentive payments under the Wool and Mohair Incentive Program. These are families, not large corporations, who are working hard to maintain this rural lifestyle. The incentive payments are not a luxury, but are basic to preserving the livelihoods of these families.

I would like to state three basic reasons why I supported continuation of the Wool Act.

First, the program has been helpful in stabilizing rural communities. Most sheep operations are located in regions where few, if any, replacement jobs

exist. I know this is the case in Utah, where the large majority of sheep operations are located outside of the Wasatch Front, or in rural Utah. These are the most heavily affected communities, and they are among the lowest income levels in the Nation. The loss of the industry in these areas would increase the burden of U.S. taxpayers through lost tax revenues, user fees, and unemployment costs. Helping to maintain the U.S. sheep industry is far less costly than the potential loss of irreplaceable rural American jobs.

The effect of the Wool Act goes beyond the direct payment provided to woolgrowers, since these funds are primarily invested back into the sheep operation or items directly related to the operation. For example, hay for sheep is purchased from local farmers, grazing land is in some cases rented from local private landowners, and transportation must be secured from local companies to transport sheep between locations. As in most items involving rural areas, the wool incentive payment is intricately intertwined in the success, or failure, and progress of rural economies.

Second, it compensated for wool imports from foreign countries that have encouraged surplus production and provided subsidies for such production. Without the Wool Act, it is possible that U.S. producers could be put at a comparative disadvantage. The Wool Act provided price stabilization for America's wool producers that enabled them to be more competitive in their operations.

And, third, it encouraged the production and marketing of high quality wool in America. We have heard considerable discussion in recent years about "Made in the U.S.A.," and how U.S. consumers should seek items that contain this label. Without the Wool Act in place, there will be, more than likely, fewer wool products available in U.S. stores that can claim they are "Made in the U.S.A."

As my colleagues know, the Wool Act provided supplemental income to farm and ranch families vital to the continuation of domestic wool and mohair industry, at no direct cost to the taxpayer. The program was funded entirely by tariffs on imported wool and wool products and put more dollars into the U.S. Treasury than growers received in payments. The program used less than half the funds available—it was entitled to 70 percent of tariffs by law—since its inception in 1954. The lifetime earnings of the program totaled \$7.4 billion; payments over the program's 39-year history totaled just over \$2.3 billion. The remaining amount—over \$5 billion—remained in taxpayer pockets to support other Government programs.

In addition, many members of the Navajo nation raise sheep as an important part of Navajo culture and as a

main source of income. Elimination of the Wool Act will be disastrous to many economically disadvantaged Navajo families who live on the Utah portion of the Navajo Reservation.

For these reasons, I opposed efforts to eliminate the Wool Act, and I hope a reasonable wool program can be developed soon that is fair, affordable, and has the support of Congress.

I also must say that I was dismayed that during consideration of S. 1548, there was discussion as to which side—those supporting elimination of the National Wool Act and those of us opposing such action—won on this issue. Our concern should center more on those who are the real losers in this debate: the thousands of Americans throughout the Midwest and West engaged in the domestic sheep industry. The large majority of them are second, third, and fourth generation sheep producers. They are not wealthy landlords, and most are in the business because of nonmonetary reasons rather than purely financial interests. They are good stewards of the land and, to remove them from the land, which will happen in the near future, is not in the best interests of this country. Their livelihoods are being imperiled by actions we are taking.

So, before we begin beating our own chests in the name of some legislative victory, we should consider the rippling effects of our action as well as those who will ultimately lose by it.

TRIBUTE TO DR. PHILLIP ALLEN SHARP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I take this opportunity to honor Dr. Phillip Allen Sharp. As my colleagues may know, Dr. Sharp recently received the 1993 Noble Prize for Medicine for his research on the composition of deoxyribonucleic acid [DNA].

Dr. Sharp is a native of Falmouth, KY, and attended Union College in Barbourville for his undergraduate studies in chemistry and mathematics. He completed his doctoral work at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and currently serves as director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's [MIT] Center for Cancer Research.

From his classroom days at Union College to the leadership of one of America's finest research institutes, Dr. Sharp has maintained his patient, dedicated quest for scientific knowledge and community integrity. Dr. Sharp has devoted close to 20 years of his career to genetic research, and his revolutionary discoveries have enhanced significantly the development of biotechnology, and particularly genetic engineering.

Above all his accomplishments, Dr. Sharp values most his role as a guide

in his student's challenging exploration of biological science. His fundamental dedication as an educator is clearly exemplified by his choice in 1990 not to seek the prestige of MIT's presidency, so he could remain with his students in active research.

Mr. President, we often hear on the floor of the Senate fearful predictions about our Nation's future because of the failures in our education system and the demise of initiative and discipline among America's youth. Today, however, I present to my colleagues the notable success Dr. Sharp has derived from his determined faith in research and education an example of the potential American ingenuity and principle still hold.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Phillip Sharp on the great rewards his work has brought to the scientific world and our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY E. MODER

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Harvey E. Moder, a man who has dedicated much of his life to the pursuit of answers to seemingly unanswerable questions regarding our American prisoners of war and Americans missing in action.

More than 88,000 United States service personnel are still listed as missing from World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and other conflicts. As Americans we must do everything possible to ensure that these Americans are not forgotten, and that every reasonable step is taken to find and fully account for our POW/MIA's. Harvey Moder has distinguished himself as an American who has not forgotten.

The POW/MIA issue is a matter of the highest national priority. American soldiers throughout history have been selfless and courageous individuals proudly representing the United States. The fact that even one American soldier remains unaccounted for is unacceptable and intolerable. These brave Americans left their families and friends to defend the United States and protect democracy. These soldiers are heroes in the hearts of us all. Harvey E. Moder is a soldier, a leader, and an inspiration to us all. But most of all, Harvey E. Moder is a real life American hero.

Nothing has done more to keep this issue alive than the unwavering dedication of friends, family members, and concerned Americans who simply refuse to abandon the hope that answers might be found regarding our missing service men and women. Harvey Moder has shown that unwavering dedication.

As a former member of the U.S. Navy and an active leader in the American Legion, Harvey Moder, has personified the commitment to the issue of POW/MIA's. In Washington, DC, he helped organize a rally in front of the White

House. In New York he stood in front of the United Nations in the freezing cold to bring attention to this issue. I salute Harvey Moder as a patriotic American.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, all the requests I am about to make to the chair have been cleared by the Republican leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: calendar 405, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469 and 470. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominees be confirmed en bloc; that any statements appear in the RECORD as if read; that upon confirmation of nominees the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George Munoz, of Illinois, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury.

THE JUDICIARY

Pierre N. Leval, of New York, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Deborah K. Chasanow, of Maryland, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Peter J. Messitte, of Maryland, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Leonie M. Brinkema, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Paul Edward Coggins, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Texas for the term of 4 years.

Henry Lawrence Solano, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Colorado for the term of 4 years.

Jon Ernest DeGulio, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

Christopher Drone, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

Peggy A. Lautenschlager, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Thomas Paul Schneider, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Emily Margaret Sweeney, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

Michael Rankin Stiles, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

George Munoz, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

STATEMENT ON THE NOMINATION OF LEONIE M. BRINKEMA TO BE U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to strongly support the nomination of Mrs. Leonie M. Brinkema of Fairfax County, VA, who has been nominated by the President of the United States to be U.S. district court judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Since 1985 Leonie Brinkema has served as U.S. magistrate judge at the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia—Alexandria division. Mrs. Brinkema also served as an adjunct faculty member at the Northern Virginia Community College during the 1985 academic year. She had a solo practice in Alexandria, VA, during the years 1984-85. Mrs. Brinkema's practice concentrated on defending criminal cases in both State and Federal court. During the time she worked in private practice, Mrs. Brinkema was also a part-time instructor in criminal law at the Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy.

Mrs. Brinkema served as a trial attorney in the Criminal Division's Office of International Affairs at the U.S. Department of Justice during the years 1983-84. She served as a Federal prosecutor as an assistant U.S. attorney at the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Virginia during the years 1977-83.

Mrs. Brinkema is a member of the Virginia, American, and the District of Columbia Bar Associations. Mediation and participating as a lecturer in legal education programs are two important activities Mrs. Brinkema is involved in while serving in her present position.

Mrs. Brinkema received a B.A. degree with honors from Douglass College in 1966. She received a master of library science degree from Rutgers Graduate School of Library and Information Service in 1970. Mrs. Brinkema received her J.D. degree with honors from the Cornell Law School in 1976.

Mr. President, Leonie Brinkema's experiences thus far in the legal profession have allowed her to gain the knowledge and legal tools necessary to perform in an exemplary manner as a U.S. district court judge.

I wish Mrs. Brinkema much success in her new position as a U.S. district court judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

REPORT ON THE FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT (PELLY AMENDMENT) CONCERNING PANAMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS—PM 54

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate on October 15, 1993, received the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1978(b)), generally known as the Pelly Amendment, I am notifying you that on August 18, 1993, in accordance with section 101(a) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the Secretary of Commerce certified to me that a ban on the importation of yellowfin tuna and yellowfin tuna products from Panama has been in effect since December 22, 1992. This ban is the result of a finding by the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, that Panama's marine mammal program was not comparable to that of the United States, as required by the MMPA.

By the terms of the MMPA, such certification is deemed to be a certification for the purposes of the Pelly Amendment, which requires that I consider and, at my discretion, order the prohibition of imports into the United States of any products from the certified country to the extent that such prohibition is sanctioned by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Pelly Amendment also requires that I report to the Congress any actions taken under this subsection and, if no import prohibitions have been ordered, the reasons for this action.

After thorough review, I have determined that additional sanctions against Panama will not be imposed at this time. The Government of Panama is currently engaged in developing a marine mammal program that is comparable to that of the United States. The results of these efforts should be evident in an anticipated annual report and request for a finding of comparability for 1994 from Panama.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 15, 1993.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was 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 a mes-

sage from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF PERSONS OBSTRUCTING DEMOCRATIZATION IN HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 55

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1703(b), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1631, I hereby report that I have again exercised my statutory authority to issue an Executive order with respect to Haiti that, effective 11:59 p.m., e.d.t., Monday, October 18, 1993, that:

(a) Blocks all property in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, of persons:

(1) who have contributed to the obstruction of the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873, the Governor's Island Agreement of July 3, 1993, or the activities of the United Nations Mission in Haiti;

(2) who have perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or

(3) who have materially or financially supported any of the foregoing; and

(b) Prohibits any transaction subject to U.S. jurisdiction that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions in the new order, or in Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, or 12853, except to the extent now authorized pursuant to the relevant Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

The new Executive order is necessary to further the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement by reaching persons who are supporting the groups fomenting violence and opposing the restoration of constitutional government in Haiti. The new Executive order is to be implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1993.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 15, 1993, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

H.R. 2399. An act to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Catawba Indian Tribe of Indians in the State of South Carolina and the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2493. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to designate the month of October as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month."

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994 each as "World Food Day."

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed on October 15, 1993, during the recess of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:53 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill without amendment:

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair products receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 1804. An act to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes.

H.R. 2351. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Museum Services Act.

H.R. 2739. An act to amend the National Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3167. An act to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times, by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2739. An act to amend the National Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times, by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1804. An act to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1652. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities—Program for Children and Youth with Serious Emotional Disturbance; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1653. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "National Estimates on the Number of Boarder Babies, the Cost of Their Care, and the Number of Abandoned Infants"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1654. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the implementation of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention Act of 1990; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1655. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Walker River Paiute Tribe Judgment Funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 843. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve reemployment

rights and benefits of veterans and other benefits of employment of certain members of the uniformed services (Rept. No. 103-158).

By Mr. MOYNIHAN, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 110. A joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Romania (Rept. No. 103-159).

By Mr. BAUCUS, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 927. A bill to designate the Pittsburgh Aviary in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as the National Aviary in Pittsburgh.

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 469. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Vietnam Women's Memorial.

S. 1111. A bill to authorize the minting of coins to commemorate the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial in Washington, D.C.

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. SIMON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit additional remedies in certain unfair practice cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1554. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1555. A bill to clarify the treatment of the Centennial Bridge, Rock Island, Illinois, under title 23, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1556. A bill to require commercial television stations to maintain, and provide copies of, commercials and program promotions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to require that members of the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board be elected by milk producers and to prohibit bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in the election of the producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1558. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require producers of an agricultural commodity for which an acreage limitation program is in effect to pay certain costs as a condition of agricultural loans, purchases, and payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

S. 1559. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to submit a plan to Congress to

achieve full and fair payment for Bureau of Reclamation water used for agricultural purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1560. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a charitable contribution deduction for certain expenses incurred by whaling captains in support of Native Alaskan subsistence whaling; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 1562. A bill to terminate the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 1563. A bill to provide assistance to employees who are subject to a plant closing or mass layoff because their work is transferred to a foreign country that has low wages or unhealthy working conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1564. A bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to ensure that all persons who benefit from the dairy promotion and research program contribute to the cost of the program, to terminate the program on December 31, 1996, and to prohibit bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in connection with the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following Senate resolution was read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WALLOP):

S. Res. 152. A resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to prohibit the consideration of any retroactive tax increase unless three-fifths of all Senators duly chosen and sworn waive the prohibition by roll-call vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit additional remedies in certain unfair practice cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1554. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

LABOR RELATIONS LEGISLATION

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills to add to the series of labor law reform bills I introduced October 7, 1993.

The first bill, the Labor Relations Remedies Act of 1993, awards employees who have been unfairly discharged for union activities back pay equal to three times the employee's wage at the time of discharge. Further, employees will have the right to sue for compensatory and punitive damages in district or State court.

In addition, on behalf of myself and Senator WELLSTONE, I am introducing the Labor Relations First Contract Negotiations Act of 1993. This will facilitate the consummation of the first contract between an employer and the certified bargaining representative. Briefly, this bill requires selection of a mediator when a new labor representative and an employer are unable to settle first contract disputes within 60 days after the representatives has been certified. If the employer and representative have still not reached an agreement 30 days after a mediator has been chosen, either side may transfer matters for binding arbitration.

There has been a drastic decline in labor union membership during the past 20 years. I believe that the main reason for this decline is public policy which has frustrated efforts by employees to organize. The two bills I am introducing today along with the five bills I introduced last week are an attempt to remedy the inequities which plague current labor laws. We need to level the playing field. Employers and employees must have equal footing when negotiating and these bills go a long way toward ensuring fairness in the workplace. •

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1556. A bill to require commercial television stations to maintain, and provide copies of, commercials and program promotions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO VIOLENT COMMERCIALS ON TV

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to better enable parents and other citizens, offended by violent commercials aired during nonviolent, family programs, to register complaints with their local TV stations, cable companies, and/or the national networks.

For some time I have been troubled by the large number of violent commercials and promotional spots which air during family viewing hours, when viewers are supposed to be assured of nonviolent shows. These commercials can defeat parents' best efforts to protect their children from violence on television. While a parent can prevent

a child from watching a TV show which is known to be violent, it is impossible for a parent to prevent a child from watching a violent or offensive scene when it is part of a commercial tucked into an otherwise nonviolent, family-oriented show. A parent has no prior warning, and the entire commercial can be aired before a parent has time to react.

The commercials I'm talking about aren't subtle or indirect; they are commercials that contain graphic, violent acts. For example, a commercial for the movie "The Mobsters" shown during "The Cosby Show" depicted a man begging for his life in the face of a gun pointed at his head and then being killed in cold blood—all in less than 30 seconds. Another commercial, aired during a Sunday afternoon basketball game, showed and described a young teacher seducing her pupil and getting him to kill her husband. Another scene in that commercial showed a terror-stricken man with a large knife at his throat, begging for his life.

The problem of violent commercials has been gaining increasing attention. In fact, troubling TV commercials were the subject of a feature article in the February 1, 1993, issue of U.S. News and World Report. The staff of U.S. News, assisted by researchers who study violence on television, did an informal survey of 50 hours of television programming to gain a sense of the frequency of violent or inappropriate TV commercials. The staff and researchers identified a dozen commercials that were questionable, the majority of which were aired during the late afternoon and early evening—prime viewing hours for children.

In October 1991, I wrote to over 10 TV network and cable station executives urging them to keep violent commercials out of family programming. Some executives, including those working for the three major networks, replied that they had standards in place and indicated that they were seeking to take an active role in policing violence in their own programming; some indicated they had standards but it was unclear as to how actively they were enforcing them; and some never bothered to respond.

On January 30, 1992, I won passage of a resolution putting the Senate on record in support of cable and television networks and local television stations establishing and following "voluntary guidelines to keep commercials depicting acts or threats of violence out of family programming hours." And since that time, there appears to be some progress. For example, when the major networks issued their guidelines for the depiction of violence in TV programs in December 1992, two of the guidelines specifically addressed the issue of violent commercials during family viewing hours.

Standard No. 11 states:

Realistic portrayals of violence as well as scenes, images or events which are unduly frightening or distressing to children should not be included in any program specifically designed for that audience.

Standard No. 14 states:

The scheduling of any program, commercial or promotional material including those containing violent depictions, should take into consideration the nature of the program, its content and the likely composition of the intended audience.

These standards will be meaningless, however, if broadcasters do not follow them, and it is the viewers who are able to hold the broadcasters accountable. One way to accomplish this goal is for viewers to make their voices heard by filing specific complaints with their local stations and/or the networks regarding programming of violent commercials or promotional material during family viewing hours.

That sounds simple enough, but it is not an easy task as my own staff found out earlier this year. When they contacted a national network and local station to obtain a copy of a violent commercial which they had seen, they were simply unable to get it. Neither the national network nor the local station had a copy of the commercial. Each referred my staff to the other. Yet, obtaining a copy of the commercial is key to demonstrating such a commercial shouldn't have been run in the first place. In order to demonstrate and effectively complain about the inappropriateness of a commercial, it is important to show the network or station the actual commercial the complaint is about. But currently, TV stations and networks are under no obligation to make available copies of program promotions and commercials to the public. In effect, then, the viewers are denied the evidence upon which to base a complaint.

The legislation I am introducing today directs the FCC to require local stations, networks, and cable operators to maintain commercial spots for at least 30 days after they have been aired and to require that such materials be available for a reasonable fee. My proposal also requires that local stations, networks and cable operators maintain a record of the complaints they receive regarding violent commercial programming and make that information available to the public. The expectation is, of course, that increased attention to violent commercial programming will persuade broadcasters to take their promises and this issue seriously.

Excessive violence in all facets of the entertainment industry is a deeply disturbing trend. And there are now many documented studies which confirm that watching the graphic depiction of violence on television and in our movie theaters can increase the violence in ourselves.

Trying to restrict violence on TV through the Federal Government raises major constitutional issues. But those

concerns are not present when the mechanism for modernization is the public itself, through its direct response to the broadcasters. That's what this legislation is designed to facilitate. It makes it possible for the people to protest one facet of the violence that permeates the airwaves. I welcome the support of my colleagues and urge the swift passage of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1556

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MAINTENANCE OF COMMERCIALS AND PROGRAM PROMOTIONS.

The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe a regulation requiring each commercial television broadcast station licensee and cable operator—

(1) to maintain a copy of any commercial or program promotion for a period of 30 days following its broadcast or transmission;

(2) to provide to any person, upon timely request, a video copy of any commercial or program promotion, subject to the payment of a reasonable charge for the cost of duplication;

(3) to maintain a copy of each complaint, including any video which contains the subject of such complaint it receives, regarding violent commercials or program promotions for a period of 12 months following the receipt of such complaint;

(4) to compile and maintain a record of each such complaint referred to in paragraph (3) and the number of such complaints received during the preceding 12 months; and

(5) to make a copy of the material compiled pursuant to paragraphs (3) and available, upon a written request, to the public.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The regulation under section 1 shall be published for comment not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to require that members of the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board be elected by milk producers and to prohibit bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in the election of the producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

NATIONAL DAIRY PROMOTION REFORM ACT OF 1993

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this year we celebrate the 220th anniversary of the Boston Tea Party, an event which sticks in the mind of many Americans as a symbol of the hard-won democracy on which this Nation was founded. Yet for some in this Nation, taxation without representation is not a thing of the past. The dairy farmers of this Nation know all too well that taxation without representation continues today.

They live with that reality in their businesses every day.

Dairy farmers are required to pay a 15-cent tax, in the form of an assessment, on every 100 pounds of milk that they sell. This tax goes to fund dairy promotion activities, such as those conducted by the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board, commonly known as the National Dairy Board. Yet these same farmers that pay hundreds, or in some cases thousands, of dollars every year for these mandatory promotion activities have no direct say over who represents them on that Board.

This past summer, a national referendum was held giving daily producers the opportunity to vote on whether or not the National Dairy Board should continue. The referendum was held after 16,000 dairy producers, more than 10 percent of dairy farmers nationwide, signed a petition to the Secretary of Agriculture calling for the referendum.

Farmers signed this petition for a number of reasons. Some felt they could no longer afford the promotion assessment, others were frustrated with what they perceived to be a lack of clear benefits from the promotion activities, and still others were alarmed by certain promotion activities undertaken by the Board which they did not condone. But overriding all of these concerns was, and continues to be, the fact that dairy farmers have no direct power over the promotion activities which they fund from their own pocket.

Mr. President, last Friday Secretary Espy announced the outcome of the referendum on the National Dairy Board. Although 71 percent of the votes were cast in support of the National Dairy Board, I do not believe the issue has been put to rest. Because nearly 90 percent of all votes cast in favor of continuing the National Dairy Board were cast by bloc-voting cooperatives, there is skepticism among dairy farmers about the validity of the vote.

While I believe that dairy promotion activities are important for enhancing markets for dairy products, my opinions on this subject are of little consequence. I do not pay for these promotion activities. Nor does the Federal Government. Dairy farmers do.

It is for this reason that I rise today to introduce the National Dairy Promotion Reform Act of 1993. The intent of this legislation is not to rehash the referendum debate, which has been a contentious one. Instead, the intent is to look forward.

This bill would give dairy farmers a more direct role in the selection of their representatives on the National Dairy Board. Whereas current law requires that members of the National Dairy Board be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, this legislation would require that the Board be an elected body.

Further, although the legislation would continue the right of farmer cooperatives to nominate individual members to be on the ballot, bloc voting by cooperatives would be prohibited for the purposes of the election itself. There are many issues for which the cooperatives can and should represent their members. But on this issue, farmers ought to speak for themselves.

It is my hope that the legislation that I am introducing today will help restore the confidence of the U.S. dairy farmer in dairy promotion. To achieve that confidence, farmers need to know that they have direct power over their representatives on the Board. This bill gives them that power.

I welcome my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, as an original cosponsor of this bill. He will also be introducing important legislation today on the subject of dairy promotion reform, which I am pleased to be an original cosponsor, as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1557

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Dairy Promotion Reform Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. DAIRY VOTING REFORM.

Section 113(b) of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4504(b)) is amended—

(1) by designating the first and second sentences as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(2) by designating the third through fifth sentences as paragraph (3);

(3) by designating the sixth sentence as paragraph (4);

(4) by designating the seventh and eighth sentences as paragraph (5);

(5) by designating the ninth sentence as paragraph (6);

(6) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking "and appointment";

(7) by striking paragraph (2) (as so designated) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A)(i) Subject to clause (ii), members of the Board shall be milk producers nominated in accordance with subparagraph (B) and elected by a vote of producers through a process established by the Secretary.

"(ii) In carrying out clause (i), the Secretary shall not permit an organization certified under section 114 to vote on behalf of the members of the organization.

"(B) Nominations shall be submitted by organizations certified under section 114, or, if the Secretary determines that a substantial number of milk producers are not members of, or the interests of the producers are not represented by, a certified organization, from nominations submitted by the producers in the manner authorized by the Secretary. In submitting nominations, each certified organization shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the milk producers who are members of the organization have been fully consulted in the nomination process.";

(8) in the first sentence of paragraph (3) (as so designated), by striking "In making such appointments," and inserting "In establishing the process for the election of members of the Board,"; and

(9) in paragraph (4) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking "appointment" and inserting "election"; and

(B) by striking "appointments" and inserting "elections".

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1558. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require producers of an agricultural commodity for which an acreage limitation program is in effect to pay certain costs as a condition of agricultural loans, purchases, and payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

S. 1559. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to submit a plan to Congress to achieve full and fair payment for Bureau of Reclamation water used for agricultural purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

AGRICULTURAL IRRIGATION DEFICIT REDUCTION
LEGISLATION

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce two related pieces of legislation aimed at terminating western agricultural irrigation subsidies that cost the Federal taxpayers millions of dollars each year. The first bill, S. 1558, would amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require producers of an agricultural commodity for which an acreage limitation program is in effect to pay the full cost of water provided by the Federal Government. The second bill, S. 1559, would require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a plan for elimination of irrigation subsidies for agricultural producers in non-program crop areas.

I am pleased to be joined in introducing these measures by my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL. These bills are aimed at achieving deficit reduction by eliminating subsidies that can no longer be justified in light of our enormous annual deficit and national debt.

Mr. President, the first bill would eliminate an apparent contradiction in our law which provides Federal crop subsidies on the one hand to agricultural producers who are required to limit production of certain surplus crops and on the other hand provides federally subsidized water to the same producers to produce these crops. It provides simply that if an agricultural producer is receiving payments under a Federal program with acreage limitation requirements, that producer is not eligible to receive below-cost water from the Federal Government.

In this difficult time of high deficits, we have gradually reduced the size of the payments producers are allowed to receive under Federal commodity programs. It would be inconsistent to con-

tinue to allow this double subsidy for a small group of farmers when we have asked so many producers to sacrifice.

"Managing the Federal Government; A Decade of Decline," a December 1992 staff report to the House Committee on Government Operations listed \$66 million annually as a conservative estimate of irrigation subsidy costs for continuing this policy. This estimate was based on a 1990 Department of Interior inspector general report using 1986 Bureau of Reclamation figures. In 1988, the House Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations released a report entitled, "Department of Interior's Efforts to Estimate the Cost of Federal Irrigation Subsidies: A Record of Deceit," which criticized DOI's cost estimation techniques, and asserted that yearly irrigation subsidies to grow surplus crops were actually \$830 million. In either case, termination of the current policy will save millions and millions of dollars for the Federal treasury. This is clearly a subsidy that should be eliminated for both fiscal and policy reasons.

It should also be noted that currently somewhere between one-third and one-half of the subsidized Bureau of Reclamation water is used to grow surplus crops.

Mr. President, this is not a new problem. In fact, elimination of western agricultural water subsidies, particularly regarding surplus crops, has been proposed in a number of deficit reduction proposals and the conflicting policies of the Federal Government in this area are often cited as examples of Federal waste and abuse. Some have described this as a case where one Federal agency pays farmers not to grow a surplus crop while another agency provides federally subsidized water to grow the same crop. Obviously, the purposes behind the acreage limitation program are far more complex, but the public perception remains that the Federal Government is spending taxpayer funds in an irrational manner.

A very similar provision to eliminate the dual subsidies was included in legislation passed by the House of Representatives as part of the major reforms in the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992. Unfortunately, this provision did not survive conference committee.

This is not the only way to curb dual subsidies. Other approaches have been advanced in past years, and I would welcome a discussion of all alternatives.

What is clear, however, is the fact it is important that reforms be enacted to terminate the present policy of asking the Federal taxpayers to subsidize the cost of this water.

I am certain that some opponents of this legislation will call this an antifarmer bill. It is not. I believe the current contradictory Federal farm policy that benefits only a few, and

mostly a very rich few, undermines the credibility and public support for the average farmer enrolled in agriculture programs.

Eliminating the dual subsidy will also level the playing field for farmers who have to compete in the agricultural marketplace against farmers who receive input cost subsidies in the form of cheap irrigation.

Halting this particular abuse of taxpayer funds is a first, and obvious step: The second bill I am introducing today is based on a broader principle that reclamation water subsidies more generally are economically wasteful and environmentally harmful.

The second bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop a plan to phase out water subsidies and require full and fair payment for the costs of delivery of Bureau of Reclamation water for agricultural purposes.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that since 1902, irrigation subsidies have cost our Government and our taxpayers between \$33.7 and \$70.3 billion.

This enormous expenditure to keep water prices artificially low has seriously devalued this precious natural resource. It has encouraged wasteful practices and discouraged conservation and cost-efficient production practices.

Careless use of water has destroyed wetlands and other migratory bird habitats, diverted river and stream flows, and negatively impacted tourism and recreation. High concentrations of selenium, cadmium and arsenic in irrigation runoff are poisoning waterfowl. Yet, we continue to pour more and more money down this subsidy drain.

Nor is it just wildlife that has been adversely affected by these policies. During the worst years of the California drought, some city dwellers paid 50 to 100 times as much for their water as agricultural producers, while the producers consumed more than 80 percent of the State's water. In fact, water to irrigate just one crop—alfalfa—used more water in 1990 than all of the residential users in San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Francisco combined.

Last year Congress succeeded in reforming some of the worst water usage offenses. Those reforms were a tremendous and noteworthy step in the history of water subsidies. But we still have far to go, and both our conscience and our pocketbook demand that we act promptly.

Mr. President, as we look ahead to the 1995 farm bill, to Wetlands and Endangered Species Act reforms, and to future Federal budgets, we have the opportunity to improve policy in each area in a manner that could also save as much as \$2.2 billion in water subsidies per year. You do not get an opportunity like this every day.

Mr. President, I am committed to achieving deficit reduction, and that is what these two bills are designed to do.

The Bureau of Reclamation water program, at its inception, was viewed as a pay-as-you-go program. The beneficiaries were to bear full cost of water delivery. This, I believe, should be our goal once again.

Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to join me in developing a fiscally responsible plan to eliminate agricultural water subsidies more generally.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1558

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Irrigation and Deficit Reduction Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF CERTAIN COSTS UNDER ACREAGE LIMITATION PROGRAMS.

Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 116. PAYMENT OF CERTAIN COSTS UNDER ACREAGE LIMITATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—If an acreage limitation program is announced for a crop a commodity under this title, as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments for the crop under this title, the producers on a farm shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior an amount that is equal to the full cost incurred by the Federal Government of the delivery to the farm of water that is used in the production of the crop, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) APPLICATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the delivery of water pursuant to a contract that is entered into before January 1, 1995, under any provision of Federal reclamation law.

"(2) RENEWAL OR AMENDMENT.—If a contract described in paragraph (1) is renewed or amended on or after January 1, 1995, subsection (a) shall apply to the delivery of water beginning on the date of renewal or amendment."

S. 1559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall develop a plan for charging the recipient of water from a water reclamation project conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation the full and fair value of water received that is used for agricultural purposes.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 1994, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit the plan developed under subsection (a) to the Congress.●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1560. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

**SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 1993**

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to remove the Social Security Administration from the Department of Health and Human Services and reestablish it as an independent agency of the executive branch of the Government. I do so with my distinguished colleagues and cosponsors, Senators PACKWOOD, MITCHELL, PRYOR, GRASSLEY, BRADLEY, RIEGLE, ROCKEFELLER, HATFIELD, JEFFORDS, and MIKULSKI. With this proposal, we hope to increase public confidence in Social Security by giving the agency more visibility and accountability, by improving administrative efficiency, and by insulating the agency from partisan politics.

Making Social Security an independent agency is not a new notion. The Social Security program was originally administered by an independent agency in the 1930's. By the late 1970's, there were proposals to return the agency to this status. In 1980, the National Commission on Social Security recommended it. In 1993, the National Commission on Social Security Reform, the so-called Greenspan Commission, on which I served with the distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE, repeated the call to make SSA an independent agency. In the Social Security Amendments of 1983, Congress empaneled a study group to report on the best way to implement the proposal. This study panel, headed by the distinguished former Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer Staats, reported its findings and recommendations in 1984. Our bill is based on those recommendations.

Under this legislation, the Social Security Administration will be led by a Commissioner, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commissioner will serve a 4-year term that coincides with that of the President. In addition, the bill establishes a seven-member, bipartisan, part-time advisory board, to make recommendations to the Commissioner on policy issues concerning Social Security.

Proposals to make SSA an independent agency have the support of nearly every organization with an interest in the administration of the Social Security program, including the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the AFL-CIO. The proposal enjoys broad-based support for a number of reasons. First, the sheer size of the agency argues for independence. SSA employs 64,000 workers in a national network of 1,300 offices. This is more than twice the number of employees at the State Department and three times

the number of workers employed by the Department of Labor. And with a budget of more than \$300 billion, SSA will spend more this year than the Department of Defense and nearly 10 times as much as the Department of Education. In fact, SSA's outlays this year will be larger than the combined outlays of 11 Federal departments. It simply defies common sense for an agency this large to be included under an umbrella bureaucracy.

Next is the matter of public confidence in Social Security. While the Social Security program is our most successful domestic program, public opinion surveys consistently show that a majority of nonretired adults are not confident that the program will be there for them when they need it. I believe one reason for this is that you send in your FICA contributions every week, but you never hear back from SSA. A few years ago I got a provision enacted into law that will require SSA to start sending out annual statements to all workers by the end of the decade. This should help. But it cannot help for SSA to be buried in the Department of Health and Human Services. An agency that directly serves virtually every American that administers a program as important as Social Security, that maintains earnings records for 132 million workers and sends benefits to 42 million recipients—that agency should be visible and accountable to inspire the public confidence that the program needs and deserves.

Good administration is at the heart of the public trust in any program, and unfortunately, the administration of Social Security has not been up to the standards of quality we learned in times past to expect from this great public institution. During the past decade, the staff has been reduced by more than 20 percent, with little regard for how this reduction affects public service. The disability program has grown rapidly in recent years, for reasons that no one can explain. Large backlogs of disability claims are pending in the State disability determination services—over 700,000 and rising, we are told, to 1.3 million by the end of fiscal year 1994. The length of time required to make a determination on a person's disability claim currently averages 97 days and is projected to increase to 185 days in 1994. A similar situation prevails in SSA's hearings offices. Some 500,000 hearing requests were filed in 1993—almost 200,000 more than were filed in 1990—and it took, on average, 265 days—almost 9 months—for a claimant to receive a decision from an administrative law judge on his Social Security application. Further, it is expected that by 1995, it will take 420 days—more than a year—for an ALJ to decide a case.

To make matters worse, SSA has failed in recent years to conduct required periodic reviews to determine

the continuing eligibility of those on the disability rolls. This is extremely shortsighted budgeting, since for every dollar the agency spends conducting these reviews, it saves over \$3 in benefits that otherwise are paid erroneously to people who are no longer eligible for disability benefits.

Compounding these management problems is instability of leadership. In my 17 years on the Finance Committee, there have been 12 Commissioners, of whom 5 have been acting Commissioners. The position of Commissioner was vacant for a year before we received a nomination, whereupon the nominee was promptly confirmed on October 7. This turmoil at the top must end. This bill provides for a strong Commissioner, with a 4-year term of office, to provide the vigorous, stable leadership that Social Security must have.

Another important feature of this proposal is the creation of a bipartisan advisory board, to provide advice to the Commissioner concerning Social Security policy. A bipartisan advisory board will produce a more deliberative decisionmaking process on important issues of Social Security policy, and help to maintain stability and integrity in the administration of the Social Security program. It will also help future leaders of the program avoid serious policy errors, such as we experienced some years ago in the disability program, when Congress ultimately had to step in to assure that beneficiaries were not unjustly deprived of benefits.

Finally, Mr. President, I would make the point that this bill will enhance the capacity of the Department of Health and Human Services to deal with the enormous task before it. In recent years the principal focus of the Department has been on health. This focus stemmed in part from the interest of the two previous Secretaries, both of whom were medical doctors. But it also stems from the importance of the issue. And as we focus on how best to restructure the health care system—which comprises some 14 percent of our domestic economy—it is essential that the leadership of the Department of HHS has the time and energy this undertaking requires. Removing SSA from the Department will facilitate the Secretary's participation in this important task.

Mr. President, it is time to take action on this important matter. This bill will soon be marked up by the Committee on Finance, and will then come before this body for consideration by the full Senate. Legislation to make SSA an independent agency has been passed by the House of Representatives on three occasions with substantial bipartisan majorities. The Finance Committee has twice before favorably reported an independent agency bill. I hope this legislation will receive the

favorable consideration of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Social Security Administration Independence Act of 1993".

(b) **AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; amendment of Social Security Act; table of contents.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Sec. 101. Establishment of Social Security Administration as a separate, independent agency.

Sec. 102. Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Social Security.

Sec. 103. Social Security Advisory Board.

Sec. 104. Personnel; budgetary matters; seal of office.

Sec. 105. Transfers to the new Social Security Administration.

Sec. 106. Transitional rules.

Sec. 107. Effective dates.

TITLE II—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 201. Amendments to titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act.

Sec. 202. Other amendments.

Sec. 203. Rules of construction.

Sec. 204. Effective dates.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW INDEPENDENT AGENCY

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AS A SEPARATE, INDEPENDENT AGENCY.

Section 701 (42 U.S.C. 901) is amended to read as follows:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 701. There is hereby established, as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, a Social Security Administration (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Administration'). It shall be the duty of the Administration to administer the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II and the supplemental security income program under title XVI."

SEC. 102. COMMISSIONER AND DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.

Section 702 (42 U.S.C. 902) is amended to read as follows:

"COMMISSIONER AND DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

"Commissioner of Social Security

"SEC. 702. (a)(1) There shall be in the Administration a Commissioner of Social Security (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Commissioner') who shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(2) The Commissioner shall be compensated at the rate provided for level I of the Executive Schedule.

"(3) The Commissioner shall be appointed for a term of 4 years coincident with the term of the President, or until the appointment of a qualified successor.

"(4) The Commissioner shall be responsible for the exercise of all powers and the discharge of all duties of the Administration, and shall have authority and control over all personnel and activities thereof.

"(5) The Commissioner may prescribe such rules and regulations as the Commissioner determines necessary or appropriate to carry out the functions of the Administration. The regulations prescribed by the Commissioner shall be subject to the rulemaking procedures established under section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

"(6) The Commissioner may establish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue such organizational units or components within the Administration as the Commissioner considers necessary or appropriate, except that this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any unit, component, or provision provided for by this Act.

"(7) The Commissioner may assign duties, and delegate, or authorize successive redelegations of, authority to act and to render decisions, to such officers and employees of the Administration as the Commissioner may find necessary. Within the limitations of such delegations, redelegations, or assignments, all official acts and decisions of such officers and employees shall have the same force and effect as though performed or rendered by the Commissioner.

"(8) The Commissioner and the Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary') shall consult, on an ongoing basis, to ensure—

"(A) the coordination of the programs administered by the Commissioner, as described in section 701, with the programs administered by the Secretary under titles XVIII and XIX of this Act; and

"(B) that adequate information concerning benefits under such titles XVIII and XIX shall be available to the public.

"Deputy Commissioner of Social Security

"(b)(1) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Commissioner of Social Security (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'Deputy Commissioner') who shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(2) The Deputy Commissioner shall be appointed for a term of 4 years coincident with the term of the Commissioner, or until the appointment of a qualified successor.

"(3) The Deputy Commissioner shall be compensated at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule.

"(4) The Deputy Commissioner shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Commissioner shall from time to time assign or delegate. The Deputy Commissioner shall be Acting Commissioner of the Administration during the absence or disability of the Commissioner and, unless the President designates another officer of the Government as Acting Commissioner, in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Commissioner."

SEC. 103. SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD.

Section 703 (42 U.S.C. 903) is amended to read as follows:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

"Establishment of Board

"SEC. 703. (a) There shall be established a Social Security Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board').

"Functions of the Board

"(b) The Board shall advise the Commissioner on policies related to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II and the supplemental security income program under title XVI. Specific functions of the Board shall include—

"(1) analyzing the Nation's retirement and disability systems and making recommendations with respect to how the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the supplemental security income program, supported by other public and private systems, can most effectively assure economic security;

"(2) studying and making recommendations relating to the coordination of programs that provide health security with programs described in paragraph (1);

"(3) making recommendations to the President and to the Congress with respect to policies that will ensure the solvency of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, both in the short-term and the long-term;

"(4) making recommendations to the President of candidates to consider in selecting nominees for the position of Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner;

"(5) reviewing and assessing the quality of service that the Administration provides to the public;

"(6) reviewing and making recommendations with respect to policies and regulations regarding the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the supplemental security income program;

"(7) increasing public understanding of the social security system;

"(8) in consultation with the Commissioner, reviewing the development and implementation of a long-range research and program evaluation plan for the Administration;

"(9) reviewing and assessing any major studies of social security as may come to the attention of the Board; and

"(10) conducting such other reviews and assessments that the Board determines to be appropriate.

"Structure and Membership of the Board

"(c) The Board shall be composed of 7 members who shall be appointed as follows:

"(1) 3 members shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than 2 of such members shall be from the same political party.

"(2) 2 members (each member from a different political party) shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate with the advice of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Senate Committee on Finance.

"(3) 2 members (each member from a different political party) shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the advice of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

"Terms of Appointment

"(d) Each member of the Board shall serve for a term of 6 years, except that—

"(1) a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which a predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

"(2) the terms of service of the members initially appointed under this section shall expire as follows:

"(A) The terms of service of the members initially appointed by the President shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, 1 each at the end of—

"(i) 2 years;

"(ii) 4 years; and

"(iii) 6 years.

"(B) The terms of service of members initially appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall expire as designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate at the time of nomination, 1 each at the end of—

"(i) 4 years; and

"(ii) 6 years.

"(C) The terms of service of members initially appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall expire as designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time of nomination, 1 each at the end of—

"(i) 3 years; and

"(ii) 5 years.

"Chairman

"(e) A member of the Board shall be designated by the President to serve as Chairman for a term of 4 years, coincident with the term of the President, or until the designation of a successor.

"Compensation

"(f) Members of the Board shall be compensated as follows:

"(1) Members shall be paid at a rate equal to 25 percent of the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule.

"(2) For days when the Board or any authorized subcommittee of the Board meets, members who attend meetings on such days (including travel time) shall receive additional compensation in an amount equal to the daily equivalent of the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule.

"(3) While serving on business of the Board away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government employed intermittently.

"(4) Service on the Board shall not be treated as Federal service or employment for purposes of receiving any benefits under chapters 83, 84, and 87 of title 5, United States Code.

"(5) A member of the Board may elect coverage of a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code. Such a member electing coverage shall have the applicable employee contributions under section 8906 of such title withheld from pay for service as a member of the Board. The Administration shall pay the applicable Government contributions under such section 8906 for such member. The Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations to apply the provisions of chapter 89 of such title to Board members electing coverage as provided under this paragraph.

"Meetings

"(g) The Board shall meet not less than 6 times each year to consider a specific agenda of issues, as determined by the Chairman in consultation with the other members of the Board.

"Federal Advisory Committee Act

"(h) The Board shall be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

"Personnel

"(i)(1) The Board shall, without regard to title 5, United States Code, appoint a Staff Director who shall be paid at a rate equivalent to a rat for the Senior Executive Service.

"(2) The Board is authorized, without regard to title 5, United States Code, to ap-

point and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as the Board determines to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board.

"(3) In fixing the compensation of additional personnel under paragraph (2), the Board shall not authorize that any individual appointed under such paragraph be compensated at a rate that is greater than the rate of compensation of the Staff Director described in paragraph (1)."

"Authorization of Appropriation

"(j) There are authorized to be made available for expenditure, out of the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, and the general fund in the Treasury, such sums as the Congress may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

SEC. 104. PERSONNEL; BUDGETARY MATTERS; SEAL OF OFFICE.

Section 704 is amended to read as follows:

"ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES OF THE COMMISSIONER

"Personnel

"SEC. 704. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall appoint such additional officers and employees as the Commissioner considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Administration under this Act. Except as otherwise provided in any other provision of law, such officers and employees shall be appointed, and their compensation shall be fixed, in accordance with title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Commissioner may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) Notwithstanding any requirements of section 3133 of title 5, United States Code, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall authorize for the Administration a total number of Senior Executive Service positions which is substantially greater than the number of such positions authorized in the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services as of immediately before the date of the enactment of the Social Security Administration Independence Act of 1993 to the extent that the greater number of such authorized positions is specified in the comprehensive work force plan as established and revised by the Commissioner under subsection (b)(1). The total number of such positions authorized for the Administration shall not at any time be less than the number of such authorized positions as of immediately before such date.

"Budgetary Matters

"(b)(1) Appropriations requests for staffing and personnel of the Administration shall be based upon a comprehensive work force plan, which shall be established and revised from time to time by the Commissioner.

"(2) Appropriations for administrative expenses of the Administration are authorized to be provided on a biennial basis.

"(3) Funds appropriated for the Administration to be available on a contingency basis shall be apportioned upon the occurrence of the stipulated contingency, as determined by the Commissioner and reported to the Congress.

"Employment Restriction

"(c) The number of positions in the Administration which may be excepted from the competitive service, on a temporary or permanent basis, because of the confidential or policy-determining character of such positions, may not exceed at any time the equivalent of 10 full-time positions.

"Seal of Office

"(d) The Commissioner shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Administration of such design as the Commissioner shall approve. Judicial notice shall be taken of such seal."

SEC. 105. TRANSFERS TO THE NEW SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **FUNCTIONS.**—There are transferred to the Social Security Administration all functions carried out by the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to the programs and activities the administration of which is vested in the Social Security Administration by reason of this title and the amendments made thereby. The Commissioner of Social Security shall allocate such functions in accordance with sections 701, 702, 703, and 704 of the Social Security Act (as amended by this title).

(b) **PERSONNEL, ASSETS, ETC.**—(1) There are transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Social Security Administration, for appropriate allocation by the Commissioner of Social Security in the Social Security Administration—

(A) the personnel employed in connection with the functions transferred by this title and the amendments made thereby; and

(B) the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balance of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, or used in connection with such functions, arising from such functions, or available, or to be made available, in connection with such functions.

(2) Unexpended funds transferred pursuant to this subsection shall be used only for the purposes for which the funds were originally authorized and appropriated.

(3) Any individual who is an employee of the Department and who was not employed on the date of the enactment of this title, in connection with functions transferred by this title to the Administration, but who was so employed on the day before the date established pursuant to section 107(a), may be transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Social Security Administration by the Commissioner under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, if the Commissioner determines such transfer to be appropriate.

(4) Any individual who is an employee of the Department and who was employed on the date of the enactment of this title, solely in connection with functions transferred by this title to the Administration, and who was so employed on the day before the date established pursuant to section 107(a), shall be transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Social Security Administration.

(c) **ABOLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—Effective upon the appointment of a Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to section 702 of the Social Security Act (as amended by this title)—

(1) the position of Commissioner of Social Security in the Department of Health and Human Services is abolished; and

(2) section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the following:

"Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health and Human Services."

SEC. 106. TRANSITIONAL RULES.

(a) **TRANSITION DIRECTOR.**—(1) Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a transition director shall be appointed by the President, who shall be selected on the basis of experience and knowledge of the operation of the Government.

(2) The transition director shall conduct activities necessary to ensure the transition of the Social Security Administration to the status of an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. In conducting such activities before the appointment of the Commissioner of Social Security, the transition director shall consult regularly with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Upon such appointment, the transition director shall conduct such activities at the direction of the Commissioner of Social Security.

(3) The transition director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

(4) Expenditures to carry out the purposes of this subsection shall be made out of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

(b) INTERIM AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—

(1) **APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER.**—Within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this title, the Commissioner of Social Security shall be appointed by the President pursuant to section 702 of the Social Security Act (as amended by this title). If the appointment is made pursuant to such section before the date established pursuant to section 107(a), the Commissioner of Social Security shall also perform the duties assigned to the Commissioner of Social Security in the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) **OTHER APPOINTMENTS.**—At any time on or after the date of the enactment of this title any of the other officers provided for in sections 702 and 703 of the Social Security Act (as amended by this title) may be nominated and appointed, as provided in such sections.

(3) **COMPENSATION.**—Funds available to any official or component of the Department of Health and Human Services, functions of which are transferred to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration by this title, may with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, be used to pay the compensation and expenses of any officer appointed pursuant to this subsection until such time as funds for that purpose are otherwise available.

(c) **CONTINUATION OF ORDERS, DETERMINATIONS, RULES, REGULATIONS, ETC.**—All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, contracts, collective bargaining agreements (and ongoing negotiations relating to such collective bargaining agreements), recognitions of labor organizations, certificates, licenses, and privileges—

(1) which have been issued, made, promulgated, granted, or allowed to become effective, in the exercise of functions (A) which were exercised by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (or the Secretary's delegate), and (B) which relate to functions which, by reason of this title, the amendments made thereby, and regulations prescribed thereunder, are vested in the Commissioner of Social Security; and

(2) which are in effect immediately before the date established pursuant to section 107(a),

shall (to the extent that they relate to functions described in paragraph (1)(B)) continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, suspended, set aside, or repealed by such Commissioner, except that any collective bargaining agreement shall remain in effect until the date of termination specified in such agreement.

(d) **CONTINUATION OF PROCEEDINGS.**—The provisions of this title (including the amend-

ments made thereby) shall not affect any proceeding pending before the Secretary of Health and Human Services immediately before the date established pursuant to section 107(a), with respect to functions vested (by reason of this title, the amendments made thereby, and regulations prescribed thereunder) in the Commissioner of Social Security, except that such proceedings, to the extent that such proceedings relate to such functions, shall continue before such Commissioner. Orders shall be issued under any such proceeding, appeals taken therefrom, and payments shall be made pursuant to such orders, in like manner as if this title had not been enacted, and orders issued in any such proceeding shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or repealed by such Commissioner, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(e) **CONTINUATION OF SUITS.**—Except as provided in this subsection—

(1) the provisions of this title shall not affect suits commenced before the date established pursuant to section 107(a); and

(2) in all such suits proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered, in the same manner and effect as if this title had not been enacted.

No cause of action, and no suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any officer in such officer's official capacity as an officer of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this title. Causes of action, suits, actions, or other proceedings may be asserted by or against the United States and the Social Security Administration, or such official of such Administration as may be appropriate, and, in any litigation pending immediately before the date established pursuant to section 107(a), the court may at any time, on the court's own motion or that of a party, enter an order which will give effect to the provisions of this subsection (including, where appropriate, an order for substitution of parties).

(f) **CONTINUATION OF PENALTIES.**—This title shall not have the effect of releasing or extinguishing any criminal prosecution, penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred as a result of any function which (by reason of this title, the amendments made thereby, and regulations prescribed thereunder) is vested in the Commissioner of Social Security.

(g) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Orders and actions of the Commissioner of Social Security in the exercise of functions vested in such Commissioner under this title (and the amendments made thereby) shall be subject to judicial review to the same extent and in the same manner as if such orders had been made and such actions had been taken by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in the exercise of such functions immediately before the date established pursuant to section 107(a). Any statutory requirements relating to notice, hearings, action upon the record, or administrative review that apply to any function so vested in such Commissioner shall continue to apply to the exercise of such function by such Commissioner.

(h) **EXERCISE OF FUNCTIONS.**—In the exercise of the functions vested in the Commissioner of Social Security under this title, the amendments made thereby, and regulations prescribed thereunder, such Commissioner shall have the same authority as that vested in the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to the exercise of such functions immediately preceding the vesting of such functions in such Commissioner, and actions of such Commissioner shall have the

same force and effect as when exercised by such Secretary.

(i) REPORT.—Within 120 days of the date of the enactment of this title, the transition director and the Commissioner of Social Security shall report to the Congress on the status of the transition to an independent Social Security Administration, and on any significant internal restructuring or management improvements that are proposed to be undertaken.

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this title, and the amendments made by such title shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date which is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(2) a date designated by the President.

(b) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—Section 106 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this title.

TITLE II—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO TITLES II AND XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) (other than section 201, section 218(d), section 231(c), section 226, and section 226A) and title XVI (42 U.S.C. 1382 et seq.) (other than sections 1614(f)(2)(B) and 1616(e)(3)) are each amended—

(1) by striking, wherever it appears therein, "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security";

(2) by striking, wherever it appears therein, "Department of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Social Security Administration";

(3) by striking, wherever it appears therein, "Department" (but only if it is not immediately succeeded by the words "of Health and Human Services", and only if it is used in reference to the Department of Health and Human Services) and inserting "Administration";

(4) by striking, wherever it appears therein, each of the following words (but, in the case of any such word only if such word refers to the Secretary of Health and Human Services): "Secretary", "Secretary's", "his", "him", "he", "her", and "she", and inserting (in the case of the word "Secretary") "Commissioner of Social Security", (in the case of the word "Secretary's") "Commissioner's", (in the case of the word "his") "the Commissioner's", (in the case of the word "him") "the Commissioner", (in the case of the word "her") "the Commissioner" or "the Commissioner's", as may be appropriate, and (in the case of the words "she" or "he") "the Commissioner"; and

(5) by striking, wherever it appears therein, "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 201.—(1)(A) Sections 201(a)(3), 201(a)(4), 201(b)(1), and 201(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 401(a)(3), 401(a)(4), 401(b)(1), and 401(b)(2), respectively) are each amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security"; and

(B) Sections 201(a)(3) and 201(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 401(a)(3) and 401(b)(1), respectively) are each amended by striking "such Secretary" and inserting "such Commissioner".

(2) Section 201(c) (42 U.S.C. 401(c)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "shall be composed of" and all that follows down through "ex officio" and inserting the following: "shall be composed of the Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of

the Treasury, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, all ex officio"; and

(B) in the fifth sentence, by striking "The Commissioner of Social Security" and inserting "The Deputy Commissioner of Social Security".

(3) Section 201(g)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 401(g)(1)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking "by him and the Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "by him, the Commissioner of Social Security, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services", and by striking "by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Treasury Department" and inserting "by the Social Security Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of the Treasury";

(B) in clause (ii), by striking "method prescribed by the Board of Trustees under paragraph (4)" and inserting "applicable method prescribed under paragraph (4)", by striking "the Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services", and by striking "the Department of Health and Human Services" and inserting "the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services"; and

(C) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: "There are hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure, out of any or all of the Trust Funds, such amounts as the Congress may deem appropriate to pay the costs of the part of the administration of this title and title XVI for which the Commissioner of Social Security is responsible, the costs of title XVIII for which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is responsible, and the costs of carrying out the functions of the Social Security Administration, specified in section 232, which relate to the administration of provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 other than those referred to in clause (i) of the first sentence of this subparagraph."

(4) Section 201(g)(1) (42 U.S.C. 401(g)(1)) is further amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) After the close of each fiscal year—

(i) the Commissioner of Social Security shall determine (I) the portion of the costs, incurred during such fiscal year, of administration of this title and title XVI and of carrying out the functions of the Social Security Administration, specified in section 232, which relate to the administration of provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (other than those referred to in clause (i) of the first sentence of subparagraph (A)), which should have been borne by the general fund in the Treasury, (II) the portion of such costs which should have been borne by the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, and (III) the portion of such costs which should have been borne by the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and

(ii) the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall determine (I) the portion of the costs, incurred during such fiscal year, of administration of title XVIII which should have been borne by the general fund in the Treasury, (II) the portion of such costs which should have been borne by the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, and (III) the portion of such costs which should have been borne by the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund,

except that the determination of the amounts to be borne by the general fund in

the Treasury with respect to expenditures incurred in carrying out such functions specified in section 232 shall be made pursuant to the applicable method prescribed under paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(C) After the determinations under subparagraph (B) have been made for any fiscal year, the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly certify to the Managing Trustee the amounts, if any, which should be transferred from one to any of the other of such Trust Funds and the amounts, if any, which should be transferred between the Trust Funds (or one of the Trust Funds) and the general fund in the Treasury, in order to ensure that each of the Trust Funds and the general fund in the Treasury have borne their proper share of the costs, incurred during such fiscal year, for (i) the part of the administration of this title and title XVI for which the Commissioner of Social Security is responsible, (ii) the part of the administration of this title and title XVIII for which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is responsible, and (iii) carrying out the functions of the Social Security Administration, specified in section 232, which relate to the administration of provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (other than those referred to in clause (i) of the first sentence of subparagraph (A)). The Managing Trustee shall transfer any such amounts in accordance with any certification so made."

(5) Section 201(g)(2) (42 U.S.C. 401(g)(2)) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking "established and maintained by the Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security", and by striking "Secretary shall furnish" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security shall furnish".

(6) Section 201(g)(4) (42 U.S.C. 401(g)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) The Commissioner of Social Security shall utilize the method prescribed pursuant to this paragraph, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of the Social Security Administration Independence Act of 1993 for determining the costs which should be borne by the general fund in the Treasury of carrying out the functions of the Social Security Administration, specified in section 232, which relate to the administration of provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (other than those referred to in clause (i) of the first sentence of paragraph (1)(A)). If at any time or times thereafter the Boards of Trustees of such Trust Funds consider such action advisable, such Boards may modify the method of determining such costs."

(7) Section 201(i)(1) (42 U.S.C. 401(i)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(i)(1) The Managing Trustee may accept on behalf of the United States money gifts and bequests made unconditionally to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, or the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund or to the Social Security Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services, or any part or officer thereof, for the benefit of any of such Funds or any activity financed through such Funds."

(8) Subsections (j) and (k) of section 201 (42 U.S.C. 401) are each amended by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(9) Section 201(l)(3)(B)(iii)(II) (42 U.S.C. 401(l)(3)(B)(iii)(II)) is amended by striking

"Secretary" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(10) Section 201(m)(3) (42 U.S.C. 401(m)(3)) is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(11) Section 201 (42 U.S.C. 401) is amended by striking "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" each place it appears and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(c) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 218.—Section 218(d) (42 U.S.C. 418(d)) is amended by striking "Secretary" each place it appears in paragraphs (3) and (7) and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(d) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 231.—Section 231(c) (42 U.S.C. 431(c)) is amended by striking "Secretary determines" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary jointly determine".

SEC. 202. OTHER AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VII.—(1) Title VII (42 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"DUTIES AND AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY

"SEC. 712. The Secretary shall perform the duties imposed upon the Secretary by this Act. The Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the functions of the Secretary under this Act."

(2) Section 706 (42 U.S.C. 907) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "Advisory Council on Social Security" and all that follows through "disability insurance program and" and inserting "Advisory Council on Hospital and Supplementary Medical Insurance for the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund in relation to the long-term commitments of";

(B) in subsection (d), by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and

(C) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

"ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HOSPITAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE"

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 709(b) (42 U.S.C. 910(b)) is amended by striking "(as estimated by the Secretary)" and inserting "(for amounts which will be paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, as estimated by the Commissioner, and for amounts which will be paid from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, as estimated by the Secretary)".

(4) Sections 709 and 710 (42 U.S.C. 910 and 911) are amended by striking "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" each place it appears and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XI.—(1) Section 1101(a) (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) The term 'Administration' means the Social Security Administration, except where the context requires otherwise."

(2) Section 1106(a) (42 U.S.C. 1306(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)";

(B) by striking "Department of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "applicable agency";

(C) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "head of the applicable agency"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) For purposes of this subsection and subsection (b), the term 'applicable agency' means—

"(A) the Social Security Administration, with respect to matter transmitted to or obtained by such Administration or matter disclosed by such Administration, or

"(B) the Department of Health and Human Services, with respect to matter transmitted to or obtained by such Department or matter disclosed by such Department."

(3) Section 1106(b) (42 U.S.C. 1306(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "head of the applicable agency"; and

(B) by striking "Department of Health and Human Services" and inserting "applicable agency".

(4) Section 1106(c) (42 U.S.C. 1306(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking "the Secretary" the first place it appears and inserting "the Commissioner of Social Security or the Secretary"; and

(B) by striking "the Secretary" each subsequent place it appears and inserting "such Commissioner or Secretary".

(5) Section 1107(b) (42 U.S.C. 1307(b)) is amended by striking "the Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "the Commissioner of Social Security or the Secretary".

(6) Section 1110 (42 U.S.C. 1310) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting "(or the Commissioner, with respect to any jointly financed cooperative agreement or grant concerning titles II or XVI)" after "Secretary";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner", and

(ii) by striking "the Secretary's" each place it appears and inserting "the Commissioner's"; and

(C) by striking "he", "his", "him", and "himself" each place they appear (except in subsection (b)(2)(A)) and inserting "the Commissioner", "the Commissioners", "the Commissioner", and "himself or herself", respectively.

(7) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 1127 (42 U.S.C. 1320a-6) are each amended by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(8) Section 1128(f) (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7(f)) is amended by inserting after "section 205(g)" the following: ", except that, in so applying such sections and section 205(1), any reference therein to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration shall be considered a reference to the Secretary or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively".

(9) Section 1131 (42 U.S.C. 1320b-1) is amended—

(A) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security";

(B) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by adding "or" at the end;

(C) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by striking "or" at the end;

(D) by striking subsection (a)(1)(C);

(E) by redesignating subsection (a)(2) as subsection (a)(3);

(F) by inserting after subsection (a)(1) the following new paragraph:

"(2) the Secretary makes a finding of fact and a decision as to the entitlement under section 226 of any individual to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII, or"; and

(G) by striking "he" in the matter in subsection (a) following paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) and inserting "the Commissioner of Social Security".

(10) Section 1155 (42 U.S.C. 1320c-4) is amended by striking "(to the same extent as is provided in section 205(b))" and all that follows and inserting "(to the same extent as beneficiaries under title II are entitled to a hearing by the Commissioner of Social Security under section 205(b)). For purposes of the preceding sentence, subsection (1) of section 205 shall apply, except that any reference in such subsection to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration shall be deemed a reference to the Secretary or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively. Where the amount in controversy is \$2,000 or more, such beneficiary shall be entitled to judicial review of any final decision relating to a reconsideration described in this subsection."

(11) Sections 1101, 1106, 1107, and 1137 (42 U.S.C. 1301, 1306, 1307, and 1320b-7, respectively) are amended by striking "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" each place it appears and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XVIII.—(1) Subsections (a) and (f) of section 1817 (42 U.S.C. 1395i) are amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(2) Section 1840(a) (42 U.S.C. 1395s(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security", and by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Such regulations shall be prescribed after consultation with the Secretary."; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(3) Section 1872 (42 U.S.C. 1395ii) is amended by inserting after "title II" the following: ", except that, in applying such provisions with respect to this title, any reference therein to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration shall be considered a reference to the Secretary or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively".

(4) Section 1869(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1395ff(b)(1)) and the last sentence of section 1876(c)(5)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(c)(5)(B)) are amended by inserting after "section 205(g)" the following: ", except that, in so applying such sections and section 205(1), any reference therein to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration shall be considered a reference to the Secretary or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively".

(5) Sections 1817, 1862, and 1886 (42 U.S.C. 1395i, 1395y, and 1395ww, respectively) are amended by striking "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" each place it appears and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(d) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XIX.—(1) Section 1905(q)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1396d(q)(2)) is amended by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(2) Section 1910(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1396i(b)(2)) is amended, in the first sentence, by inserting after "section 205(g)" the following: ", except that, in so applying such sections and section 205(1), any reference therein to the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration shall be considered a reference to the Secretary or the Department of Health and Human Services, respectively".

(e) AMENDMENT TO TITLE XX.—Section 2002(a)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1397a(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and inserting "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(f) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 5311 the following new item:

"Commissioner, Social Security Administration.";

(2) by adding at the end of section 5313 the following new item:

"Deputy Commissioner, Social Security Administration."; and

(3) by striking "Secretary of Health Education, and Welfare" each place it appears in section 8141 and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(g) AMENDMENTS TO FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1977.—(1) Sections 6(c)(3) and 8(e)(6) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(c)(3) and 2017(e)(6)) are each amended by inserting "the Commissioner of Social Security and" before "the Secretary of Health and Human Services".

(2) Sections 6(g), 11(j), and 16(e) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2015(g), 2020(j), and 2025(e)) are each amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(3) Section 11(i) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2020(i)) is amended by adding ", the Commissioner of Social Security" after "the Secretary".

(h) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 707(e)(3) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(i) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—(1) Subsections (c)(1), (c)(2)(E), (g)(1), (g)(2)(A), and (g)(2)(B) of section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 1402) are amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(2) Section 3121(b)(10)(B) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 3121(b)(10)(B)) is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(3) Section 3127 of such Code (26 U.S.C. 3127) is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(4) Section 6050F(c)(1)(A) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 6050F(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(5) Subsections (d) and (f) of section 6057 of such Code (26 U.S.C. 6057) are amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(6) Section 6103(1)(5) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 6103(1)(5)) is amended—

(A) by striking "Department of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Social Security Administration"; and

(B) by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(7) Subsections (d)(3)(C) and (e) of section 6402 of such Code (26 U.S.C. 6402) are amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(8) Section 6511(d)(5) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 6511(d)(5)) is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(j) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 3720A(f) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears in and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security".

(k) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "Secretary of Health and Human Services" each place it appears and inserting "Commissioner of Social Security"; and

(2) by striking the second sentence of subsection (b) and inserting the following new sentence: "A copy of each such application filed with either the Secretary or the Commissioner, together with any additional information and supporting documents (or certifications thereof) which may have been received by the Secretary or the Commissioner with such application, and which may be needed by the other official in connection therewith, shall be transmitted by the Secretary or the Commissioner receiving the application to the other official."

(l) AMENDMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 9(a)(1), by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (U), and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(V) of the Social Security Administration, the functions of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services relating to the administration of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act and of the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act; and"

(2) in section 11(1), by striking "or" after "Commission" and inserting a semicolon, and by inserting after "Board," the following: "or the Commissioner of Social Security"; and

(3) in section 11(2), by striking "or" after "Information Agency.", and by inserting after "Veterans Administration" the following: ", or the Social Security Administration";.

SEC. 203. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) REFERENCES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Whenever any reference is made in any provision of law (other than this Act or a provision of law amended by this Act), regulation, rule, record, or document to the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to such Department's functions under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act or the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act, such reference shall be considered a reference to the Social Security Administration.

(b) REFERENCES TO THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Whenever any reference is made in any provision of law (other than this Act or a provision of law amended by this Act), regulation, rule, record, or document to the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to such Secretary's functions under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act or the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act, such reference shall be considered a reference to the Commissioner of Social Security.

(c) REFERENCES TO OTHER OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—Whenever any reference is made in any provision of law (other than this Act or a provision of law amended by this Act), regulation, rule, record, or document to any other officer or employee of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to such officer or employee's functions under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act or the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act, such reference shall be considered a reference to the appropriate officer or employee of the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 204. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date established pursuant to section 107(a).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsections (f)(1), (f)(2), and (l) of section 202 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this title. •

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a charitable contribution deduction for certain expenses incurred by whaling captains in support of Native Alaskan subsistence whaling; to the Committee on Finance.

DEDUCTION FOR WHALING CAPTAINS

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would provide tax relief to Alaska Native whaling captains to help ensure that they are able to continue their centuries-old tradition of subsistence whaling. This bill would amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide a charitable deduction to those Native captains who organize and support traditional Native whaling activities for their communities.

For thousands of years the Inupiat and Siberian Yupik Eskimos from the coastal villages in northern and western Alaska have hunted the bowhead whale. The bowhead whale, and the activities related to the traditional subsistence hunt of the whale, are a vital part of the cultural and religious traditions of these Native Alaskan communities. The whale meat and muktuk, which is blubber and skin, from a successful hunt are distributed by the whaling captains to their communities to help ensure the survival of the village throughout the long winter months. In many instances, a successful hunt is the lifeline of these coastal villages.

By tradition, each whaling captain is required to pay all of the costs associated with the subsistence hunt out of his personal funds. This includes the cost of providing the boats, fuel, gear, weapons, ammunition, food, and special clothing for their crews, and storing the meat until it is used. The whaling captain incurs significant expenses in carrying out these activities—averaging \$2,500 to \$5,000 per captain per year. Even though the captain pays these expenses out of his personal

funds, tradition dictates that the captain must donate a substantial portion of the whale to the village in order to help the community to survive. Each captain retains a portion of the whale for personal consumption, but does not benefit financially from the capture of the whale.

In recent years, Native whaling captains have been treating their whaling expenses as a deduction against their personal Federal income tax because they donate the whale meat to their communities, and because their expenses have skyrocketed due to the increased cost of complying with Federal and international requirements for hunting bowhead whales. Unfortunately, the Internal Revenue Service [IRS] has ruled that the Native whaling captains are not entitled to deduct these expenses as charitable contributions on their personal income tax returns. This has caused an extreme financial burden to the whaling captains, whose average annual household income is less than \$45,000. Currently, five cases are in the appeals process.

The legislation that I am introducing today would amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow Native Alaskan subsistence whaling captains to deduct their expenses for whaling activities for the community. It would apply retroactively to currently pending tax refund claims and tax years for which the statute of limitations has not expired.

I believe this deduction is necessary and justified for a number of reasons. First, the whaling captains donate their personal funds to support an activity that is of immeasurable cultural, religious, and subsistence importance to the Inupiat and Siberian Yupik communities. Second, if the donations of the whaling captain were made to Inupiat community of the North Slope [ICAS], Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission [AEWC], or the communities' participating churches instead of directly in the form of food, gear, ammunition, and other essentials, they would be tax deductible. The ICAS, a federally recognized tribe, and the AEWC, a 501(c)(3) corporation, are the two organizations that are responsible for the preservation of Native Alaskan subsistence whaling. The effect of denying a tax deduction directly to the whaling captains penalizes these Native Alaskans for adhering to traditional religious and cultural requirements for the subsistence whale hunt.

I would note that the subsistence hunt is carefully regulated by the International Whaling Commission [IWC] and the U.S. Department of Commerce. Local regulation of the hunt is vested in the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission [AEWC] under a cooperative agreement with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Acknowledging that "whaling, more than any other activity, fundamentally

underlies the total lifeway of these communities," the IWC permits the Native communities to land up to 41 bowhead whales a year. The IWC has established this quota based on exhaustive documentation of the cultural and subsistence need of the whaling villages for each one of these whales.

The whaling community has a very good working relationship with these organizations, and provides the IWC and NOAA with annual detailed accounts of bowhead whale activity. The North Slope Borough of Alaska spends approximately \$500,000 to \$700,000 annually on bowhead whale and other Arctic marine research and programs in support of the IWC's efforts.

The legislation that I have introduced today will incur a very small revenue loss to the Treasury—the cost of this legislation based on the existence of 150 whaling captains is estimated at \$230,000 per year. I expect the cost will be significantly less because not every captain outfits a crew each year.

I thank the Senators for their attention and I welcome their support of this provision which will help to ensure that the Native whaling captains can continue to carry out the centuries-old traditional subsistence whaling hunt for the coastal villages of Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURKOWSKI be added as a cosponsor of this bill, and that a copy of the bill be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1561

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED IN SUPPORT OF NATIVE ALASKAN SUBSISTENCE WHALING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (n) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsection:

“(m) EXPENSES PAID BY CERTAIN WHALING CAPTAINS IN SUPPORT OF NATIVE ALASKAN SUBSISTENCE WHALING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is recognized by the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission as a whaling captain charged with the responsibility of maintaining and carrying out sanctioned whaling activities and who engages in such activities during the taxable year, the amount described in paragraph (2) (to the extent such amount does not exceed \$7,500 for the taxable year) shall be treated for purposes of this section as a charitable contribution.

“(2) AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—The amount described in this paragraph is the aggregate of the reasonable and necessary whaling expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in carrying out sanctioned whaling activities. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘whaling expenses’ includes expenses for—

“(A) the acquisition and maintenance of whaling boats, weapons, and gear used in sanctioned whaling activities.

“(B) the supplying of food for the crew and other provisions for carrying out such activities, and

“(C) storage and distribution of the catch from such activities.

“(3) SANCTIONED WHALING ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘sanctioned whaling activities’ means subsistence bowhead whale hunting activities conducted pursuant to the management plan of the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to all taxable years beginning before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of the bill introduced by my colleague from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, which would allow Native Alaskan whaling captains to deduct as a charitable deduction their expenses related to traditional whaling activities. Mr. President, this bill is an important step in saving a critical cultural activity of the Inupiat and Siberian Yupik Eskimos, and I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. President, there are few cultures remaining in the United States which are as tightly connected to their historical roots as those of the Inupiat and Siberian Yupik Eskimos. The whaling activities of the Native communities of northern and western Alaska have their roots in thousands of years of tradition, beginning well before the existence of this Nation or, indeed, the arrival of Europeans on this continent.

As practiced in these Native communities, whaling serves as a method to bring all of the people of a village together. Everyone in the village participates in the hunt in one way or another, and every individual receives a share of the whales landed both after the landing and later, at the festivals of Nalukataq and Qagruq, and at Thanksgiving and Christmas. In this way, whaling continues to serve as a cultural bridge spanning hundreds of generations, uniting elders and children of the villages together in a common effort.

Unfortunately, the increasing expenses of whaling are beginning to threaten the future viability of the tradition. Whaling captains, who by tradition are responsible for acquiring and maintaining the equipment necessary to carry out the traditional whaling activities, are beginning to question whether they can continue to bear the costs of whaling, which can approach several thousand dollars in a single year.

This bill, which would allow those captains the ability to deduct the expenses associated with whaling from their personal income tax returns as charitable deductions, will help assure that this centuries old tradition is not destroyed by the economic demands placed on it during the 20th century. The estimated annual cost of this bill is, I might add, only \$230,000.

I submit, Mr. President, that is a small price to pay to ensure the survival of a way of life thousands of years old, and I ask my colleagues for their support.●

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 1562. A bill to terminate the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TERMINATION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES
UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am today introducing S. 1562, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Termination and Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, legislation that will terminate the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS].

According to estimates provided by the Congressional Budget Office in its 1993 report on options for reducing the deficit, elimination of USUHS would result in savings of roughly \$300 million over 5 years.

Mr. President, USUHS is a medical school run by the Department of Defense. Along with the Health Professionals Scholarship Program and other sources, including volunteers, it provides new physicians for the military.

Created in 1972, USUHS was intended to supply the bulk of the military's physician requirements. Today, USUHS only accounts for a fraction of the Department's needs—less than 9 percent in 1991 according to the Congressional Budget Office.

In the report of the National Performance Review released last month, Vice President GORE called for the closing of USUHS as part of an overall effort to reinvent Government by making it work better and cost less. The report urged closing the facility and instead rely upon the other sources that currently supply the great majority of our military's need for new physicians.

Mr. President, here is an excellent opportunity for Congress to cut spending. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences is the most expensive source of physicians for the Department of Defense, costing \$562,000 per person, 4 times as much as physicians obtained under the scholarship program, and 10 to 40 times as much as physicians obtained from the Financial Assistance Program and the Volunteers Program.

As we ask farmers, veterans, and the elderly to sacrifice in order to attack our Federal deficit, we can hardly justify continuing a program when there are less expensive alternatives that get the job done.

This legislation would terminate USUHS with the graduation of the last class to enter the school after enactment. With no increase in any of the other alternative sources of new physicians, the measure would reduce the

supply of incoming Department of Defense physicians by less than 10 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office, a reduction that is entirely consistent with the reduction of our overall forces.

Mr. President, eliminating USUHS would make sense even if we were not facing a \$4 trillion Federal debt. Vice President GORE's report of the National Performance Review lists as its first priority eliminating obsolete and duplicative programs. USUHS certainly fits that description.

The rationale behind the creation of USUHS may have been well-intentioned 20 years ago, but a history of high costs compared to the alternative sources of new physicians no longer justifies continued support by the taxpayer.

Elimination of USUHS was part of the 82 point plan I developed during my campaign for U.S. Senate to eliminate the Federal deficit, as well as part of the recommendations of the Vice President's National Performance Review. It has been an annual item in the CBO report on options for reducing the Federal deficit. In 1990, the House of Representatives voted to phase the program out by 1995, but the provision unfortunately did not survive conference.

Again, this year, the House included language in the committee report of the Department of Defense appropriations bill directing the Department of Defense to submit a report by January 15, 1994 on the actions it will take, and the dollars saved, to close USUHS within 5 years.

Consistent with that directive, this legislation begins the process of closing USUHS. I look forward to reading the Department of Defense's report on how best to close down USUHS, and certainly will consider any of their recommendations that may need to be incorporated into this legislation.

An article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 30, 1991, entitled, "Military's Medical School Hangs on Despite High Cost," describes the waste of taxpayers' money resulting from continued operation of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks along with this article from the Los Angeles Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Termination and Deficit Reduction Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES.

(A) TERMINATION.—(1) The Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences is terminated.

(2)(A) Chapter 104 of the title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(B) The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A of such title, and at the beginning of part III of such subtitle, are each amended by striking out the item relating to chapter 104.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The termination referred to in subsection (a), and the amendments made by such subsection, shall take effect on the date of the graduation from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences of the last class of students that enrolled in such university on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 30, 1991]
MILITARY'S MEDICAL SCHOOL HANGS ON DESPITE HIGH COST; PENTAGON'S \$462,513 PER STUDENT IS ABOUT FOUR TIMES THE COST OF PRIVATE TRAINING

(By Harry Nelson)

How much money does it take to train a physician in America? About \$115,000 over four years, if the candidate attends one of the nation's 126 private medical schools. Or \$462,513 if he—or she—goes to the medical school that is run by the Pentagon.

At a time when there is no shortage of doctors—and when the federal government is desperate to save money anywhere it can—you would think that such excessive costs would make the military medical school a prime target for congressional budget cutters. Indeed, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in Bethesda, Md., for a time was slated to be closed.

Over the past several years, the \$72-million-a-year medical complex, created in 1972 ostensibly to provide physicians for the various armed services, has proved to be a nightmare of bureaucracy and cost overruns.

A study by the Pentagon disclosed "a host of unacceptable personnel and managerial practices" involving affirmative action problems and nepotism. A House subcommittee, angry over apparent abuses in an AIDS program, attempted to phase out the school by 1995.

But the university once again has been given a congressional reprieve and may be on the way to becoming Washington's most visible textbook example of a federal boondoggle that no one can eliminate.

"All of the evidence indicates that the university is fundamentally more expensive * * * and that (the Pentagon) has not been able to provide any compelling reason to keep the school open," says Rep. Martin Olav Sabo (D-Minn.), a member of the House defense appropriations panel.

Critics point out that, despite all the money that Congress has poured into the school, private medical colleges still are the Defense Department's biggest source of military physicians.

The military medical school graduates 150 to 160 physicians a year. In contrast, last year a Pentagon-sponsored scholarship program at civilian schools provided more than 1,100 physicians to the military, and, with a companion program, it has 4,085 more in training. The cost: \$114 million a year for both.

Defenders of the institution contend that the gap between per-student expenses for the military medical school and private medical schools may be less than published figures suggest.

In the first place, the figures covering private medical schools reflect only the tuition costs and do not include subsidies from other sources, including the federal government itself.

And they argue that the military medical school is the only medical school that provides training in the treatment of such specialties as chemical and biological warfare and on high-velocity missile injuries, combat stress and tropical medicine—all of which proved valuable in the Gulf War.

Even so, critics contend that the Pentagon's competing scholarship program, which sends students to private medical colleges, manages to educate military physicians at a far lower cost than the military school and could provide specialized training under contract.

With the military campus, "all the costs are real and all the benefits are theoretical," Sabo asserts.

But there is no secret why the Uniformed Services University has survived its first few years of operation. It was a favorite of the late F. Edward Hebert (D-La.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee during most of the 1970s. And what Hebert wanted, Hebert generally got. In fact, the military medical school itself is named after Hebert now.

And Hill-watchers say that last year the university was saved from oblivion when advice columnist Ann Landers published a laudatory letter about the school, written by its own public relations officer.

According to congressional staffers, the Landers column engendered thousands of letters to lawmakers, who then pushed to reverse the subcommittee's decision that would have phased out the institution.

In the meantime, the Pentagon has taken steps that it says are designed to cure the institution's ills, placing it directly under Defense Department control (rather than under the aegis of a separate board) and reorganizing its personnel practices.

But the \$462,513 cost per graduate remains unchanged.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 1563. A bill to provide assistance to employees who are subject to a plant closing or mass layoff because their work is transferred to a foreign country that has low wages or unhealthy working conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

AMERICAN JOBS PROTECTION ACT

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the American Jobs Protection Act of 1993. This legislation addresses the concern I share with many of my colleagues about American businesses moving their operations out of the country to capitalize on cheap labor. It is time to make these corporations take responsibility for the disastrous effects that such relocations have on their workers.

Let me outline the problem. American corporations are being lured out of the country with the promise of low-wage replacements for American labor. For example, we have already lost over 700,000 American jobs to Mexico—good manufacturing jobs. The Big Three auto companies—Ford, Chrysler, and GM—have over 70 plants in Mexico, and the list of corporations already operating down there is extensive.

There are those who endorse the practice of American firms exploiting a low wage labor force. They claim that the United States must encourage the transfer of labor-intensive production to low-wage countries if we are to remain competitive in the global economy. This claim is at the heart of our current economic debate over the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]—and is, I believe, fundamentally false.

America must make a choice. We must decide which is in our best interest—high skills or low wages. I believe that American corporations must invest in a high-skill, high-wage work force which produces innovative high-quality goods. This is how we maintain a strong position in the global market—not through the chimera of lower and lower wages and lower and lower standards of living.

NAFTA embodies this choice. While there are currently few obstacles that prevent United States firms from relocating in Mexico, enactment of the NAFTA would accelerate the shift of manufacturing to Mexico and lock us into the low-wage track.

Just look at the grave hourly wage disparities between the United States and Mexico. In 1992, the average hourly wage for United States manufacturing workers, including benefits, was \$16.17 an hour—the comparable figure for the Mexican worker was only \$2.35 an hour. In the maquiladora areas of Mexico, where there has been a massive buildup of companies that have left America and gone to Mexico, the average wage is actually lower. Wages in the maquiladora areas average \$1.65 an hour. Incredibly, while the minimum wage in America is \$4.35, in Mexico it is actually less than 60 cents an hour. By attempting to integrate these two economies with such disparate wage rates, NAFTA pushes the United States farther and farther down the low wage path.

I am introducing the American Jobs Protection Act to change the disastrous course we have been on for the past 12 years and stop the mass migration of American jobs to foreign countries, lured by low-wage labor. This legislation is similar to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleague from Michigan, WILLIAM FORD. Under this legislation, companies would face the full costs of their actions, which are currently shifted to the general taxpaying public. This would thereby lessen the incentives of shifting jobs outside of the United States.

The bill applies to any business with 25 or more employees that transfers at least 12 U.S. jobs to a foreign country where wages are less than 50 percent of the average wage in the United States. Specifically, the legislation requires employers to:

First, give at least 6 months advance notice of job loss to employees and affected State and local communities;

Second, pay severance equal to 4 weeks' pay for each year of employment with the employer;

Third, continue health care benefits previously provided to employees for 18 months;

Fourth, provide 5 years' credit of retirement benefits;

Fifth, pay up to \$10,000 reimbursement for retraining, job search, and relocation expenses;

Sixth, provide incentive payments equal to 25 percent of 1 weeks' wages for each week the employee is in a job training program; and

Seventh, reimburse the community for any tax abatements or other economic development incentives.

Under this legislation, employees, their representatives, State, and local communities or the Department of Labor could sue for enforcement. Injured parties could collect back pay, consequential damages, liquidated damages, and attorney fees. Injunctive relief would be available if requirements of the statute are not met. In addition, the Federal Government would be prohibited from contracting for goods or services produced abroad in violation of the statute.

Mr. President, I remain confident in the ability of the American work force to succeed in a competitive global marketplace. We must make certain that our workers are given the chance to continue competing effectively and efficiently. The American Jobs Protection Act will ensure that our workers are given that chance—not summarily dismissed in the mistaken flight toward lower wages. We owe it to our country and our fellow citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1563

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Jobs Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) During the last 2 decades, millions of jobs in the United States have been transferred by businesses to foreign countries to take advantage of the low wages and lack of labor standards in those countries.

(2) Millions of additional jobs in the United States are at risk of such a transfer during the 1990's, particularly if the North American Free Trade Agreement is approved by the Congress.

(3) The threat of the transfer of work to low-wage foreign countries suppresses wages and benefits to workers in the United States and thereby lessens the purchasing power of middle class families in the United States.

(4) The transfer of jobs to low-wage foreign countries imposes a severe burden upon the individual workers who are dislocated by such transfers and the communities that are affected by such transfers.

(5) The provision of income, continued health and pension benefits, and job training assistance to such dislocated workers would significantly ease the burdens caused by the transfer of jobs to low-wage foreign countries.

(6) The transfer of jobs to take advantage of the low wages and lack of labor standards in foreign countries is detrimental to the interests of the United States because such transfers are based on the incorrect premise that the employees of businesses constitute a cost to be lowered and not an asset that should be developed and utilized.

(7) The best chance for the United States to meet international competition in the future is to focus on a competitive strategy that emphasizes high-wage, high-skill employment as opposed to employment that competes internationally on the basis of low wages.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to discourage the transfer of work to low-wage foreign countries; and

(2) to require businesses that transfer work to low-wage foreign countries to mitigate the costs of the dislocation to workers and communities subject to that dislocation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) **AFFECTED EMPLOYEES.**—The term "affected employees" means employees who may reasonably be expected to experience an employment loss as a consequence of a proposed plant closing or mass layoff.

(2) **EMPLOYER.**—The term "employer" means any business enterprise that employs—

(A) 25 or more employees, excluding part-time employment; or

(B) 25 or more employees who in the aggregate work at least 1,000 hours per week.

Such term includes all business entities that have substantial ownership interest, substantial management authority or substantial control over the terms and conditions of employment of employees at a site of employment subject to an employment loss.

(3) **EMPLOYMENT LOSS.**—The term "employment loss" means—

(A) an employment termination, other than a discharge for cause, voluntary departure, or retirement;

(B) a layoff exceeding 6 months;

(C) a reduction in hours of work of more than 50 percent during each month of any 6-month period; or

(D) a reduction in salary of more than 33 percent during each month of any 6-month period.

(4) **GROUP HEALTH PLAN.**—The term "group health plan" means an employee welfare benefit plan providing medical care (as defined in section 213(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to participants or beneficiaries or dependents, directly or through insurance, reimbursement, or otherwise.

(5) **LOCATION ASSISTANCE.**—The term "location assistance" includes any subsidy, infrastructure development or improvement, tax relief, site preparation assistance, hiring and training assistance, or other economic benefit offered by a State or unit of local government to induce an employer to locate at, remain at, or expand its operations at a site of employment within the jurisdiction of such State or political subdivision.

(6) **MASS LAYOFF.**—The term "mass layoff" means a reduction in force that—

(A) is not the result of a plant closing; and
(B) results in an employment loss at a single site of employment, or one or more facilities or operating units within a single site of employment, during any 30-day period for at least 12 employees (excluding any part-time employees).

(7) **PART-TIME EMPLOYEE.**—The term "part-time employee" means an employee who is employed for an average of fewer than 20 hours per week or who has been employed for fewer than 6 of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required.

(8) **PLANT CLOSING.**—The term "plant closing" means the permanent or temporary shutdown of a single site of employment, or one or more facilities or operating units within a single site of employment, if the shutdown results in an employment loss at the single site of employment during any 30-day period for 12 or more employees, excluding part-time employees.

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(10) **SITE OF EMPLOYMENT.**—The term "site of employment" means any factory, mine, business office, facility, or other operating unit, or the functional equivalent thereof.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON WORK TRANSFER TO LOW-WAGE FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An employer may not implement a plant closing or mass layoff at a site of employment due to a transfer of work to a low-wage foreign country which occurs 1 year before or after such closing or mass layoff (as described in subsection (b)) unless the employer provides notice at least 180 days before such closing or mass layoff in accordance with section 5 and provides benefits to employees in accordance with section 6.

(b) **TRANSFER OF WORK DESCRIBED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), work shall be considered to be transferred to a low-wage foreign country for purposes of subsection (a) if the employer—

(A) increases the amount of work performed at one or more sites of employment in one or more low-wage foreign countries and such work is substantially similar to the work performed at the site of employment referred to in subsection (a); or

(B) increases the amount of products or services that are imported from one or more low-wage foreign countries and such products or services are substantially similar to the products or services produced or provided at the site of employment referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—If an employer who orders a plant closing or mass layoff at a site of employment referred to in subsection (a) proves that the increase in—

(A) work (described in paragraph (1)(A)) that is performed in a low-wage foreign country; or

(B) products or services (described in paragraph (1)(B)) that are imported to the United States from a low-wage foreign country,

is not related to the plant closing or mass layoff at such site of employment, the employer shall not be required to provide notice in accordance with section 5 or benefits to the employees in accordance with section 6.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), if an increase described in such paragraph is carried out by any person that owns at least 10 percent of an employer described in subsection (a) or by any person, 10 percent of which is owned by such employer, such employer shall be considered to have carried out such increase.

(c) **PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.**—The Secretary shall publish annually

in the Federal Register the name of each low-wage foreign country as defined in subsection (d), as determined under regulations developed by the Secretary.

(d) **LOW-WAGE FOREIGN COUNTRY DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term "low-wage foreign country" means—

(1) a country in which the average wage is less than 50 percent of the average wage in the United States, as determined by the Secretary; or

(2) a country in which the employment standards relating to the payment of overtime compensation, child labor, or employee safety and health that are in effect and enforced in such country are substantially less effective than the standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.), as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 5. NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **RECIPIENTS OF NOTICE.**—An employer who implements a plant closing or mass layoff subject to section 4 shall provide written notice of such closing or mass layoff—

(A) to each representative of the affected employees as of the time of the notice or, if there is no such representative at that time, to each affected employee; and

(B) to the State dislocated worker unit (designated or created under title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.)) and the chief elected official of the unit of local government within which such closing or layoff is to occur.

(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RECIPIENTS.**—If there is more than one such unit of local government, the unit of local government that the employer shall notify is the unit of local government to which the employer pays the highest taxes for the year preceding the year for which the determination is made.

(b) **CONTENTS OF NOTICE.**—The notice required under subsection (a) shall include a statement of—

(1) the nature of the site of employment at which the plant closing or mass layoff is to be undertaken;

(2) the reasons for undertaking such plant closing or mass layoff;

(3) any alternative to undertaking such plant closing or mass layoff;

(4) any request made by the employer to a State or unit of general local government for location assistance to avoid such plant closing or mass layoff with respect to such site of employment;

(5) the estimated extent of the employment loss within the employer that will result from such plant closing or mass layoff;

(6) any plan to minimize the effects of such plant closing or mass layoff on employees at such site of employment and on any unit of local government having jurisdiction over the geographical area in which the site of employment is located;

(7) the economic circumstances of such site of employment, including the level of profitability of operations at the site of employment, and any plans for future investment, employment, and production at the site of employment;

(8) the economic circumstances of the employer and the feasibility of transferring employees affected by such plant closing or mass layoff to other sites of employment of the employer; and

(9) the names and addresses of all employees who will suffer an employment loss as a result of such plant closing or mass layoff.

SEC. 6. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An employer shall provide the following benefits to each employee

who suffers an employment loss due to a plant closing or mass layoff subject to section 4:

(1) SEVERANCE PAY.—Severance pay equal to the product of—

(A) the amount equal to 4 weeks wages of the employee, calculated at the average wage that the employee received in the final 26 weeks of employment with the employer; and

(B) the number of years the employee was employed by the employer.

(2) HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.—Continuation of benefits under the same terms and conditions of a group health plan previously provided to the employee for the period ending 18 months after the date of the plant closing or mass layoff.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT FOR RETRAINING AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Reimbursement (not to exceed \$10,000) for retraining, job search, and relocation expenses incurred during the period ending 2 years after the date of the notice of the plant closing or mass layoff.

(4) TRAINING INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—Incentive payments equal to 25 percent of 1 week's wages of the employee (calculated in accordance with paragraph (1)(A)) for each week during which the employee participates in a job training program during the period ending 2 years after the date of the notice of the plant closing or mass layoff.

(5) RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—In any case in which, as of the date of the plant closing or mass layoff, the employee is a participant in an employee pension benefit plan (as defined in section 3(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(2))) and has attained an age that is at or above 5 years before early or normal retirement age (as defined in section 3(24) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1002(24))) under the plan, benefits that are the actuarial equivalent of benefit accruals that would occur under the plan if the employee had continued in full-time service under the plan for 5 years after such date at the same rate of pay and had made all required contributions for such period.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF EMPLOYEE ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employer who implements a plant closing or mass layoff subject to section 4 shall establish an employee benefit account into which the employer shall make payments sufficient to fund the amount of the benefits to be provided under subsection (a).

(2) MANAGEMENT OF ACCOUNT.—The account established under paragraph (1) shall be managed by 5 individuals, of whom—

(A) 2 individuals shall be selected by the employer;

(B) 2 individuals shall be selected by the affected employees; and

(C) 1 individual shall be selected by the 4 individuals referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations with respect to the establishment and management of accounts under this subsection.

SEC. 7. RESTRICTION ON EMPLOYER TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH THE UNITED STATES FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE OR BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an employer who implements a plant closing or mass layoff subject to section 4 and does not provide the notice or benefits in accordance with section 5 or 6, respectively, may not enter into a contract with the United States for the provision of products or services that were involved in the work transfer described in section 4 or

that are substantially similar to such products or services.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Secretary, in consultation with the head of the appropriate Federal agency to which the proposed contract relates, may waive the restriction described in subsection (a) with respect to an employer if the employer demonstrates that such restriction would threaten the national security of the United States.

SEC. 8. INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To ensure compliance with this Act, or any regulation issued under this Act, the Secretary, subject to subsection (c), shall have the investigative authority provided under section 11(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(a)).

(b) OBLIGATION TO KEEP AND PRESERVE RECORDS.—An employer shall keep and preserve records in accordance with section 11(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(c)) and in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

(c) SUBPOENA POWER.—For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this section, the Secretary shall have the subpoena authority provided for under section 9 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 209).

SEC. 9. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) CIVIL ACTION BY EMPLOYEES.—

(1) LIABILITY.—An employer who implements a plant closing or mass layoff in violation of section 4 shall be liable to each employee who suffers an employment loss due to such closing or mass layoff—

(A) for damages equal to—

(i) the amount of any wages, salary, employment benefits, or other compensation denied or lost to such employee by reason of the violation;

(ii) the interest on the amount described in clause (i) calculated at the prevailing rate; and

(iii) an additional amount as liquidated damages equal to the sum of the amount described in clause (i) and the interest described in clause (ii), except that if the employer proves to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission that violated section 4 was in good faith and that the employer had reasonable grounds for believing that the act or omission was not a violation of such section, such court may, in the discretion of the court, reduce the amount of the liability to the amount and interest determined under clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(B) for damages equal to any actual monetary loss sustained by the employee as a direct result of the violation, such as the cost of providing health care; and

(C) for such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion.

(2) STANDING.—An action to recover the damages or equitable relief described in paragraph (1) may be maintained against an employer in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees who suffer an employment loss due to the closing or mass layoff for and in behalf of—

(A) such employees; or

(B) such employees and other employees similarly situated under the provisions of rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(3) FEES AND COSTS.—The court in such an action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff, allow a reasonable attorney's fee, reasonable expert witness

fees, and other costs of the action to be paid by the defendant.

(b) ACTION BY STATE AND UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) LIABILITY.—An employer who implements a plant closing or mass layoff in violation of section 4 shall be liable to the State or unit of local government in which the employer is located for damages equal to the difference of—

(A) the location assistance provided to the employer by the State or unit of local government; and

(B) the amount of the benefit, if any, which the State or unit of local government will continue to receive as a result of the provision of such assistance to the employer.

(2) STANDING.—An action to recover the damages described in paragraph (1) may be maintained against any employer in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by the State or unit of local government described in paragraph (1).

(3) FEES AND COSTS.—The court in such an action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff, allow a reasonable attorney's fee, reasonable expert witness fees, and other costs of the action to be paid by the defendant.

(c) ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.—The Secretary shall receive, investigate, and attempt to resolve complaints of violations of section 4 in the same manner that the Secretary receives, investigates, and attempts to resolve complaints of violations of sections 6 and 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206 and 207).

(2) CIVIL ACTION.—The Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover the damages described in subsection (a)(1)(A) on behalf of each employee who suffers an employment loss due to a plant closing or mass layoff in violation of section 4.

(3) SUMS RECOVERED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any sums recovered by the Secretary on behalf of an employee under paragraph (2) shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to such employee.

(B) UNPAID SUMS.—Any such sums not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of 3 years from the date of recovery by the Secretary shall be credited as an offsetting collection to the appropriations account of the Secretary of Labor for expenses for the administration of this Act and shall remain available to the Secretary until expended.

(d) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An action may be brought under subsection (a), (b), or (c) not later than 3 years after the date of the last event constituting the alleged violation for which the action is brought.

(2) COMMENCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ACTION BY SECRETARY.—In determining when an action is commenced by the Secretary under subsection (c) for purposes of paragraph (1), such action shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed.

(e) ACTION FOR INJUNCTION BY SECRETARY.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, over an action brought by the Secretary to restrain violations of section 4, including actions to restrain the withholding of payment of wages, salary, employment benefits, or other compensation, plus interest, found by the court to be due to employees who suffer an employment loss due to a plant closing or mass layoff in violation of such section.

SEC. 10. PROCEDURES IN ADDITION TO OTHER RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.

The rights and remedies provided to employees under this Act are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other contractual or statutory rights and remedies of the employees, and are not intended to alter or affect such rights and remedies, except that the period of notification required by section 4(a) shall run concurrently with any period of notification required by contract or by any other law.

SEC. 11. REQUIREMENT OF POSTING OF NOTICE BY EMPLOYER AT SITE OF EMPLOYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each employer shall post and keep posted, in conspicuous places at the site of employment of the employer where notices to employees and applicants for employment are customarily posted, a notice, to be prepared or approved by the Secretary, setting forth excerpts from, or summaries of, the pertinent provisions of this Act and information pertaining to the filing of a charge.

(b) PENALTY.—Any employer that willfully violates the requirements described in subsection (a) may be assessed a civil money penalty not to exceed \$100 for each separate offense.

SEC. 12. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1564. A bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to ensure that all persons who benefit from the dairy promotion and research program contribute to the cost of the program, to terminate the program on December 31, 1996, and to prohibit bloc voting by cooperative associations of milk producers in connection with the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

DAIRY PROMOTION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which is designed to address some concerns regarding the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board in terms of its accountability and equity to dairy producers. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, who is also introducing legislation addressing similar aspects of the National Dairy Board which I am co-sponsoring. Together these measures will bring about important changes to the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board.

The National Dairy Board, which was created by dairy farmers and authorized by the Congress in 1983, is fully funded by mandatory assessments on each milk producer in the United States.

From its inception, the goals of the program have been admirable. Dairy farmers wished to take the frustrating trend of declining milk consumption and turn it around. The National Dairy Board was created to achieve that goal by promoting a wide variety of dairy

products. While farmers are assessed 15 cents per hundred pounds of milk for the promotion program, 5 cents must go to the National Dairy Board, which is headquartered just across the river in Arlington. The remaining 10 cents can be redirected to qualified State and regional promotion organizations. If it is undirected, the total 15 cents goes to the national organization. The National Board is funded by about \$78 million worth of dairy farmer dollars each year. It competes directly with the Beef Promotion Board for the distinction of the most highly funded producer promotion board in this country.

Even though this board was created by dairy farmers, somewhere along the line dairy farmers began to question some of the actions of the National Board. As a Wisconsin State senator I heard many concerns raised about the Dairy Board and as a U.S. Senator those concerns continue to be expressed to me by milk producers in my State and across the country.

Those concerns culminated in a petition signed by 16,000 dairy farmers calling for a producer referendum on whether or not the program should be continued. Soon after Secretary Espy took office he announced a referendum would be held in August.

Prior to and during the referendum, producers continued to be frustrated by the realities of cooperative bloc voting. While individual producers are free to cast votes contrary to that of their cooperative, they rightly charge that the process stacks the deck against any group seeking to reform the Board. Farmers who may not have voted under ordinary circumstances become automatic yes votes.

Dairy farmers have charged that it is not the role of the cooperative to make these types of decisions for dairy producers and further charged that cooperatives could not be objective since many receive research and promotion grants from the Board. From the looks of the results of the referendum released last Friday, these producers are right.

Seventy-eight thousand producer ballots were cast in the referendum with 63 percent of those cast en bloc. Virtually 100 percent of those bloc votes were cast as yes votes. Of the 28,000 producers who voted as individuals, over 75 percent voted to eliminate the Board. The Board was approved by a vote of 71 percent, nearly all bloc votes.

Given the disparity in the way in which individual producers voted versus the way their cooperatives voted, I believe that the practice of cooperative bloc voting is inappropriate for producer promotion boards. Of the 17 authorized promotion programs, none but the dairy program allow bloc voting.

To allow bloc voting is to say that individual producers cannot make their own decisions on the value of the pro-

motion program. I know that the dairy farmers are among the most well-informed constituents in my State and they are clearly capable of making this decision independent of their cooperative.

Mr. President, the producer referendum has been an exhausting process for all those involved, including the dairy farmers seeking reform, the cooperatives seeking to maintain the Dairy Board and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Many resources have been unnecessarily expended.

Bloc voting has resulted in a lawsuit brought by producers against the Secretary of Agriculture, costing both taxpayers and dairy farmers. That lawsuit has not yet been settled. Additional resources have been expended trying to solve some of the problems created by bloc voting. Because of the tremendous controversy surrounding this issue, Secretary Espy, in an effort to open up the referendum, did a series of public service announcements this summer encouraging each dairy producer to vote during the referendum. Bloc voting also prompted USDA to do a complete audit of the votes cast by cooperatives to be certain there was no duplication or fraud. This process took nearly 2 months.

I must commend the Secretary and his staff at the Department of Agriculture for their tremendous efforts on the referendum. The Department bent over backward to be sure that the referendum was as open and accountable as possible. However, the amount of dairy farmer and taxpayer dollars that has been expended to deal with the problem of bloc voting has been tremendous. This would have been unnecessary if the reforms I am proposing today were already in place. If we do not make these reforms now, we will continue to expend human and financial resources on this problem which is so easily rectified. Hopefully, this legislation will prevent further waste of public and private resources in the future.

The bill I am introducing does three things. First, it would eliminate the practice of cooperative bloc voting, a practice which allows cooperatives to cast votes for all of their producer-members. This practice not only outrages many dairy farmers, but it provides little incentive for the National Dairy Board to be accountable to the dairy farmers who pay for the program.

The elimination of bloc voting does not abrogate the right of the cooperative to provide advice to their members, nor does it prevent the cooperative's board of directors from passing a resolution on how producers should vote as members of the cooperative.

This provision is not intended in any way to suggest that bloc voting is inappropriate for producer referendums on the Federal Milk Marketing Order [FMMO] system. This bill addresses

bloc voting only for the promotion program. FMMO's are highly complicated and the changes in the order are many times highly technical. Any alteration of a Federal order directly impacts the ability of the cooperative to act as a marketing agent for the farmer-member. Cooperative bloc voting is appropriate for FFMO's and the day-to-day decisions should and will continue to be made by the cooperative. The same case cannot be made for cooperative bloc voting for a generic promotion order.

Generic promotion is a long-term marketing issue and does not directly impact the day-to-day marketing activities of the cooperative. Promotion does not direct the prices paid to farmers nor does it establish conditions for the orderly marketing of milk—those are the functions of Federal orders. Those short-run functions are essential to those in the business of buying and selling fluid milk and manufactured dairy products, practices with which cooperatives are intimately involved. In contrast, there is no reason why farmers should not be allowed to make the type of long-term policy decisions associated with promotion and research directly, without having their views diluted through the cooperative.

The second provision requires that the program be reauthorized by the Congress on a regular basis starting with the end of 1996. This provision, too, will provide for greater accountability. Just as each farm program deserves careful scrutiny during reauthorization of the farm bill to ensure that it continues to meet its original goals so should the dairy promotion program. Without regular reauthorization and elimination of bloc voting, the Board could continue into perpetuity simply because there is limited opportunity in current law for congressional oversight.

The third provision of this legislation, Mr. President, makes the program more equitable to domestic producers by assessing importers of dairy products for the benefits that accrue to them.

The reality of generic product promotion is that all producers and sellers of dairy products benefit from any increase in milk consumption generated by the program. Importers of dairy products benefit from this program and should have to pay their fair share. That is the case with 9 of the 17 commodity promotion programs, including beef, pork, cotton, honey, pecans, and potatoes.

The Dairy Board conducts not only promotion and advertising for milk and dairy products, but it also provides funding for research on the nutritional benefits of dairy products and on new technology and product development. The benefits of such research certainly accrue to importers of dairy products who account for about 4 percent of the

value of domestic milk production. Importers should not receive a free ride courtesy of domestic producers who are already having a hard time making it under current milk prices.

Mr. President, I am introducing this legislation because I have been asked to do so by dairy farmers who are concerned about how their money is being spent. The provisions of this bill are designed to make the Dairy Board more accountable and equitable to those farmers footing the bill. If enacted, it will result in a better, stronger and more effective National Dairy Board if producers choose to maintain it.

Mr. President, I want to mention briefly the legislation which the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, is introducing, which I am pleased to cosponsor. This bill establishes a process for producer election of National Dairy Board representatives who are currently selected through the political appointment process. This process provides for little accountability of Board members to dairy farmers. If the Directors of the Dairy Board must be elected by producers, they will likely be more responsive to their concerns. Reform of the Dairy Promotion Program would not be complete without this change.

I know the reforms contained in these two bills will not make everyone happy. Some will say I haven't gone far enough in reform. Others will maintain that no reform is needed for this program. It is my hope that, at a minimum, these bills achieve greater accountability of the National Dairy Board to dairy farmers.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dairy Promotion Program Improvement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FUNDING OF DAIRY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—The first sentence of section 110(b) of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4501(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "commercial use" the following: "and on imported dairy products"; and

(2) by striking "products produced in" and inserting "products produced in or imported into".

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 111 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 4502) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subsection (k);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subsection (l) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(m) the term 'imported dairy product' means—

"(1) any dairy product, including milk and cream and fresh and dried dairy products;

"(2) butter and butterfat mixtures;

"(3) cheese;

"(4) case in and mixtures; and

"(5) other dairy products,

that are imported into the United States; and

"(n) the term 'importer' means a person that imports an imported dairy product into the United States."

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) REPRESENTATION ON BOARD.—Section 113(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 4504(b)) is amended—

(A) by designating the first through ninth sentences as paragraphs (1) through (5) and paragraphs (7) through (10), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking "thirty-six" and inserting "38";

(C) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by striking "Members" and inserting "Of the members of the Board, 36 members"; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so designated) the following new paragraph:

"(6) Of the members of the Board, 2 members shall be representatives of importers of imported dairy products. The importer representatives shall be appointed by the Secretary from nominations submitted by importers under such procedures as the Secretary determines to be appropriate."

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Section 113(g) of such Act is amended—

(A) by designating the first through fifth sentences as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6)(A) The order shall provide that each importer of imported dairy products shall pay an assessment to the Board in the manner prescribed by the order.

"(B) The rate of assessment on imported dairy products shall be determined in the same manner as the rate of assessment per hundredweight or the equivalent of milk.

"(C) For the purpose of determining the assessment on imports under subparagraph (B), the value to be placed on imported dairy products shall be established by the Secretary in a fair and equitable manner."

(3) RECORDS.—The first sentence of section 113(k) of such Act is amended by striking "person receiving" and inserting "importer of imported dairy products, each person".

(4) REFERENDUM.—Section 116 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 4507) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) On the request of a representative group comprising 10 percent or more of the number of producers subject to the order, the Secretary shall—

"(A) conduct a referendum to determine whether the producers favor suspension of the application of the amendments made by section 2 of the Dairy Promotion Program Improvement Act of 1993; and

"(B) suspend the application of the amendments until the results of the referendum are known.

"(2) The Secretary shall continue the suspension of the application of the amendments made by section 2 only if the Secretary determines that suspension of the application of the amendments is favored by a majority of the producers voting in the referendum who, during a representative period (as determined by the Secretary), have been engaged in the production of milk for commercial use."

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF DAIRY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 116 of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4507) (as

amended by section 2(c)(4) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) On December 31, 1996, the Secretary shall terminate the order issued under this Act (including the collection of assessments under the order).

"(2) As soon as practicable after the date referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall terminate activities under the order in an orderly manner."

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON BLOC VOTING.

Section 117 of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4508) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "Secretary shall" and inserting "Secretary shall not"; and

(2) by striking the second through fifth sentences.*

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 181

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 181, a bill to prohibit the export of American black bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 421

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 421, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under such title for certain chiropractic services authorized to be performed under State law, and for other purposes.

S. 560

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 560, a bill to further the goals of the Paperwork Reduction Act to have Federal agencies become more responsible and publicly accountable for reducing the burden of Federal paperwork on the public, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for physician assistants, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1063

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1063, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the treatment of a qualified football coaches plan.

S. 1350

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1350, a bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program

of hazard mitigation and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and for other purposes.

S. 1425

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1425, a bill to establish a National Appeals Division of the Department of Agriculture to hear appeals of adverse decisions made by certain agencies of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding women and the human immunodeficiency virus, and for other purposes.

S. 1429

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs of research with respect to women and cases of information with the human immunodeficiency virus, and for other purposes.

S. 1443

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on luxury passenger vehicles.

S. 1460

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize programs of child abuse education and prevention, and to establish a demonstration project relating to child abuse education and prevention.

S. 1511

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1511, a bill to eliminate the crediting of "good time" for violent and repeat offenders in Federal and State prisons, authorize funding for boot camps and the conversion of military facilities to regional prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1514

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1514, a bill entitled the "Guaranteed Deficit Reduction Act of 1993."

S. 1524

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1524, a bill to repeal the retroactive application of the income, estate, and gift tax rates made by the Budget Reconciliation Act and reduce administrative expenses for agencies by \$3,000,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 55

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 55, a joint resolution to designate the periods commencing on November 28, 1993, and ending on December 4, 1993, and commencing on November 27, 1994, and ending on December 3, 1994, as "National Home Care Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 122

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 122, a joint resolution designating December 1993 as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Prevention Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 123, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning November 6, 1994, as "National Elevator and Escalator Safety Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 131

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 131, a joint resolution designating the week beginning November 14, 1993, and the week beginning November 13, 1994, each as "Geography Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 135

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 135, a joint resolution designating the week beginning October 25, 1993, as "World Population Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 140

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 140, a joint resolution to designate December 7, 1993, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 128

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 128, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the protection to be accorded United States copyright-based industries under agreements entered into pursuant to the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 152—RELATING TO RETROACTIVE TAX RULES CHANGES

Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. WALLOP) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 152

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLIII

"RETROACTIVE TAX INCREASES

"1. It shall not be in order to consider any material in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, conference report, or amendment between the Houses that increases a tax retroactively.

"2. Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against material in bill or joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases a tax retroactively, and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, the part of such title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be deemed stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

"3. (a) Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against material in any conference report or amendment between the Houses that increases a tax retroactively, and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, the part of such title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be deemed stricken from the conference report or amendment.

"(b) If such a point of order is sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with the further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amended, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable for 2 hours. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this paragraph, no further amendment shall be in order.

"4. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 may be waived only upon the affirmative vote of three-fifths

of all Senators duly chosen and sworn, and in every such case the vote shall be determined by the yeas and nays and entered on the journal. Each part of a title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be subject to a point of order. No motion for a general waiver shall be entertained.

"5. For purposes of this rule, the term 'increases a tax' shall be construed to include a change in any deduction, exemption, credit, or similar exclusion that will result in an obligation to pay a larger tax."

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, as best we can tell, most Americans oppose retroactive laws of every sort, but retroactive tax increases are especially detested. All retroactive laws offend the American sense of fair play; they change the rules after the game has begun—but retroactive tax increases add insult to injury by levying a financial penalty on those who played the game honestly and fairly under the former rules.

If a retroactive tax increase is particularly harsh and oppressive the Federal courts may declare it unconstitutional. Usually, however, the courts give considerable deference to Congress: It has been more than 50 years since the Supreme Court struck down a retroactive tax increase.

Congress has a history of passing retroactive tax increases, and the Federal courts have a history of upholding them, but the American people—and, we think, most Senators—now recognize that retroactivity casts a long, dark shadow across the promise of fair play. It is time, therefore, to change the Senate rules to conform to our newly enlarged understanding of fair play.

That is why I and my colleague, Senator SHELBY are introducing legislation to amend the Senate rules to forbid retroactive tax increases unless three-fifths of all Senators, duly chosen and sworn, vote to waive the prohibition. Our new rule would establish a presumption against retroactive taxes, but presumption that could be rebutted.

We will be joined by the following original cosponsors: Senator HUTCHISON, Senator COVERDELL, Senator MACK, Senator LOTT, Senator MCCAIN and Senator WALLOP.

Our approach has four strengths: First, retroactive tax increases will be presumed to be out-of-order. It should be more difficult to raise taxes retroactively than to raise taxes prospectively. Second, the rule against retroactivity can be waived whenever the national interest requires it. Waiver will require a vote of three-fifths of all Senators, which is the same proportion of the Senate that is required under the Congressional Budget Act to waive some 15 points of order. Third, every waiver will be done by roll call vote. Therefore, whenever the rule is waived the voters will be able to review the Senate's judgment to determine if the waiver was indeed necessary for the na-

tional interest. And fourth, this approach is both helpful and achievable this Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to look at this approach. I know that the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHINSON] will be introducing legislation to repeal the retroactive tax increase from the last tax bill. But this is a rules change. I hope that my colleagues will look at it and say that if in the future we should make it more difficult to pass retroactive tax increases, that if we do so, a point of order should lie against it. So it would take at least 60 votes in order to pass that.

It would not be impossible but it would be more difficult, just as we made several other provisions under the Budget Act more difficult, requiring a 60 vote point of order.

So, Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to look at the rules change and hopefully cosponsor it.

• Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, just a few months ago, this body not only gave the thumbs up to imposing a quarter of a trillion dollars in new taxes on the American people—it also said it was OK to raise some of these revenues retroactively. Mr. President, today, Senator NICKLES and I are here to make it more difficult to retroactively raise taxes again.

This legislation is necessary and important to regain the public trust, Mr. President. It is not enough that we tell the American people that retroactive taxes are a bad idea or that we agree that they are unfair—it is enough only if we take definitive steps to prevent it from happening again.

I believe this legislation is one such definitive step.

Mr. President, the resolution we are offering today would create a presumption against retroactive tax increases. It would change the standing rules of the Senate by making retroactive tax proposals subject to a point of order. Thus, the only way that the Senate could pass another retroactive tax would be if three-fifths of all Senators agreed to waive the point of order in a roll call vote.

Mr. President, it should be difficult to raise revenues through retroactive taxes. While the Supreme Court has ruled that retroactive taxes are not unconstitutional, they have not spoken to the wisdom of them—that is our job. And while there is no question that Congress has imposed retroactive tax increases on the American people in the past—that does not say anything about their propriety today. Again, that is this Congress' job.

Mr. President, this is about principles, not taxes. If we are going to ask American taxpayers to take on greater individual burdens, we should do so honestly and fairly. We should give them fair notice at the very least. Practical, financial reasons require it. Taxpayers need to be able to plan their

finances and budget their income without the threat of taxes on money they have already spent, already saved, or already invested. Mr. President, I submit that the American taxpayer deserves no less.

Again, Mr. President, this resolution does not prevent this body from raising taxes retroactively, it only makes it more difficult. If backdoor taxes are so required by necessity or emergency, this body can effectuate them. But the general rule will be that they are not in order.

If seems to me that is a pretty good balance. Our resolution, therefore, reinforces to the American people that raising taxes retroactively is a last resort and ensures that Congress will only use this tactic when it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, this is a reasonable measure and one that I hope all my colleagues will support. ●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

NICKLES (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 1051

Mr. NICKLES (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 3116) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the committee amendment on page 154, line 22, strike "stockpile." and insert the following: "stockpile;"

SEC. 8137A. RESTRICTION ON USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to support United States Armed Forces personnel, other than those engaged in medical, logistics, communications, humanitarian, training, temporary observer or liaison activities, after March 1, 1994, when such forces are:

(1) under United Nations operational or tactical control if such forces would be under the command, operational control, or tactical control of foreign officers, unless prior to that date (A) the President has submitted a report to Congress which specifies the role and mission of such forces, the estimated cost of supporting such forces for such mission, the probable maximum size of such force, and the probable duration of the commitment of such forces, to the appropriate congressional committees; (B) such committees have had 30 days thereafter to review the consequences of such a commitment of United States Armed Forces; (C) and a joint resolution authorizing the placing of such forces under foreign command has been enacted; or (2) a part of any prospective standing United Nations international armed force.

(b) The prohibition described in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the President determines that (1) national security interests justify a waiver of such prohibition; (2) the President declares that an emergency exists and immediately informs the Congress of his action and the reasons therefor; and (3) within 30 days of such declaration there is enacted a joint resolution authorizing such actions and declaring them to be in the national security interests of the United States.

(c) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should notify the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate when there is pending in the United Nations Security Council any resolution that might entail the commitment of United States military personnel, and should seek the advice of the chairman and ranking members of the appropriate congressional committees prior to instructing the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations regarding such a pending resolution.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—(1) For purposes of this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) For purposes of this section, "any prospective standing United Nations international armed force" means any armed military unit or units under United Nations operational control, not in existence as of the effective date of this Act, established for a permanent or indefinite duration, and without a mission defined by country or region. It is specifically recognized that all forces currently in existence with a country-specific or region-specific mission, such as those forces under the control of the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea, do not meet this definition.

(3) For purposes of this section, "United Nations operational or tactical control" means the exercise by the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Secretary General, or any other non-United States entity designated by the United Nations Security Council, or the United Nations Secretary General, with the exception of NATO, of the power of command usually given to the leader of a military force, such as the authority to coordinate and direct the mission-related activities of the units comprising such force. It is specifically recognized that overall statement of policy or mission authorization in resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, such as those relating to Korea beginning in 1950 or to Iraq beginning in 1990, do not meet this definition.

STEVENS (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 1052

Mr. STEVENS (for himself, Mr. INOUE, and Mr. EXON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

On page 22 of the bill, at line 18, before the period, add the following new proviso: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be expended or transferred to an eligible recipient state until fifteen days after the President certifies to the Congress that the proposed eligible recipient is not currently engaged in the

fabrication and construction of new road mobile or fixed-site land based intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with multiple nuclear reentry vehicles".

BROWN AMENDMENT NOS. 1053-1055

Mr. BROWN proposed three amendments to the bill H.R. 3116, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1053

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section—

"SEC. . (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the President should declare that service in Somalia during the period described in subsection (b) should be treated as service in a combat zone.

"(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is the period beginning on December 10, 1992, and ending on the date on which withdrawal from Somalia of all forces of the Armed Forces of the United States in Somalia has been completed, as declared in a proclamation issued by the President."

AMENDMENT No. 1054

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report containing information on the cost to the United States of transporting supplies for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps by sea on vessels of the United States or belonging to the United States pursuant to section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, including the amount of the cost savings that could have been realized if such supplies had been transported at competitive international shipping rates available from non-cargo-preference vessels. The annual report shall cover a cargo preference year which shall be a 12-month period defined by the Secretary.

AMENDMENT No. 1055

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section—

"SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON THE COMMITMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS IN SOMALIA AND HAITI.

(a) FINDINGS.—
(1) Public hearings are essential in ensuring broadbased understanding of and support for United States policies;

(2) Since United States troops were committed in Somalia, the original humanitarian mission has been significantly expanded to include nation-building, as evidenced in United Nations Security Council Resolution 814;

(3) Since the commitment of United States troops in Somalia, the Senate of the United States has received only update briefings or has held closed hearings on United States actions there and has held only one public hearing;

(4) To date, thirty United States troops have lost their lives since United States troops were committed in Somalia;

(5) Since the most recent disaster where 18 Americans lost their lives, 76 were wounded and 1 was captured, the President has announced his intention to commit several thousand additional United States troops;

(6) Six American warships sit off the coast of Haiti and six hundred Americans wait to be deployed as part of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) the appropriate committees of the Senate should hold public hearings at the earliest practical date with the Secretaries of State and Defense as witnesses on the commitment of United States troops in Somalia and Haiti as members of the United Nations peacekeeping force; and

(2) the appropriate committees should promptly hold investigative, public hearings on the October 3, 1993, incident in Mogadishu, Somalia in which 17 American soldiers were killed and at least 76 were wounded as part of the United Nations peacekeeping operation.

BREAUX AMENDMENT NO. 1056

Mr. BREAUX proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra, as follows:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, the Secretary of the Navy shall obligate the funds appropriated for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the USH-42 mission recorder program within the A-6 aircraft program: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy verifies that a mission recorder is required in the future for Navy attack aircraft for peacetime training and bomb damage assessment in combat: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make this verification within 60 days of this act becoming law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall obligate such funds within 60 days of this verification that a mission recorder is required in Navy attack aircraft for peacetime training and bomb damage assessment in combat.

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 1057

Mr. MOYNIHAN proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . PUBLICATION OF FIGURE FOR TOTAL INTELLIGENCE SPENDING.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
(1) Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution states that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

(2) During the cold war the United States did not provide to the American people a "regular Statement and Account of the * * * Expenditures" to intelligence activities.

(3) The failure to provide to the American people a statement of the total amount of expenditures on intelligence activities prevents them from participating in an informed, democratic decision concerning the appropriate level for such expenditures.

(b) PUBLICATION OF FIGURE FOR TOTAL INTELLIGENCE SPENDING.—Section 1105(a) of title of the United States Code is amended to add at the end thereof—"(27) a separate, unclassified statement of the aggregate amount of budget outlays for the prior fiscal year for national and tactical intelligence activities. This figure shall include, without limitation, outlays for activities carried out under the Department of Defense budget to collect, analyze, produce, disseminate or support the collection of intelligence."

MACK AMENDMENT NO. 1058

Mr. INOUE (for Mr. MACK) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra, as follows:

On page 45, line 15, before the period, add the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$10,500,000 shall be available only for the ARPA Nuclear Nonproliferation Technology Initiative".

LEVIN AMENDMENT NO. 1059

Mr. LEVIN proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra, as follows:

On page 45, line 15, before the period at the end, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$6,500,000 shall be available for the establishment and operation of a Joint Simulation Center for Warfighting Concepts and Doctrine Development: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the establishment of a Peace Enforcement Doctrine Development Center".

GRASSLEY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1060

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, supra, as follows:

On page 157, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 8142. None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 by this Act may be used for making any progress payment under the C-17 aircraft program that is not consistent with the requirements of section 2307(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet in SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building, on Thursday, October 28, 1993, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on the nomination of the Public Printer.

The committee also will meet to receive testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 143, appointment of Frank S. Shrontz as a Smithsonian citizen regent, and Senate Joint Resolution 144, appointment of Manuel L. Ibanez as a Smithsonian citizen regent.

For further information regarding these hearings, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on 202-224-0278.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 18, 1993, at 4:30 p.m. to receive a briefing from the administration on the situation in Haiti. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, in accordance with rule V of the Standing

Rules of the Senate, I would like to give notice of my intention to amend the Standing Rules of Senate by adding a new rule.

The new rule is as follows:

S. RES. 152

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLIII

"RETROACTIVE TAX INCREASES

"1. It shall not be in order to consider any material in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, conference report, or amendment between the Houses that increases a tax retroactively.

"2. Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against material in bill or joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases a tax retroactively, and the point of order being sustained by the Chair, the part of such title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be deemed stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

"3. (a) Upon a point of order being made by any Senator against material in any conference report or amendment between the Houses that increases a tax retroactively, and the point or order being sustained by the Chair, the part of such title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be deemed stricken from the conference report or amendment.

"(b) If such a point of order is sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be deemed stricken, and the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with the further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amended, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable for 2 hours. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this paragraph), no further amendment shall be in order.

"4. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 may be waived only upon the affirmative vote of three-fifths of all Senators duly chosen and sworn, and in every such case the vote shall be determined by the yeas and nays and entered on the journal. Each part of a title or provision that increases a tax retroactively shall be subject to a point of order. No motion for a general waiver shall be entertained.

"5. For purposes of this rule, the term 'increases a tax' shall be construed to include a change in any deduction, exemption, credit, or similar exclusion that will result in an obligation to pay a larger tax."

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A TRIBUTE TO ERMA BOMBECK

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to my constituent and friend, Erma Bombeck, who is being honored this week with the 1993 Arizona Heritage Award by the Arizona Chamber of Commerce.

Erma Bombeck is among the best-known women in America, foremost as a journalist, but as a television personality and best-selling author as well.

She can always find the humor in the simplest family situation frequently causing us to be reminded with affection similar instances in the lives of our own families.

There is another side to Erma Bombeck that is equally admirable. Generations of Americans have been influenced by her advocacy and leadership in enhancing the status of women and children. She has been a tireless writer and speaker, traveling the Nation to speak about issues close to her heart. Her best-selling book and audiocassette about and for children surviving cancer have no doubt helped to make everyday life a little easier for these children and their families. In addition, all proceeds from the sale of this book go to cancer research.

I have had the great pleasure of knowing Erma and her husband, Bill, for many years and have always found them to be generous with their time and talents on behalf of many professional, civic, and charitable causes. I count myself lucky to know them and I call them my friends. It is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to Erma Bombeck today. She is not only a treasured part of Arizona's heritage, she is truly an American treasure.●

TRIBUTE TO CENTRAL KENTUCKY YOUTH ORCHESTRA

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a talented and dedicated group of young people from my home State of Kentucky.

The Central Kentucky Youth Orchestra [CKYO] has won an invitation to perform at the 1993 Midwest International Band Clinic in Chicago. This is a special honor where ensembles representing the United States, Canada, Europe, Japan, and Australia will perform. I am very pleased that the CKYO Symphony Orchestra has been distinguished as an outstanding group.

This orchestra is composed of 85 high school students from 20 schools in 11 Kentucky counties. These talented individuals rehearse together weekly and perform over 10 concerts each season in Lexington. They receive special training from professional musicians, and students must audition to earn a place in the orchestra.

The Central Kentucky Youth Orchestra originated as an experiment by Howard Pence in 1947. The string group expanded to a full-sized orchestra and has since gained international recognition, performing throughout the years in such places as Carnegie Hall in New York City, the White House at the invitation of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and Europe, Romania, and Russia.

Mr. President, this fine group is continuing their tradition of excellence. Under the direction of Elizabeth Stoyanovich, a renowned and experienced conductor, CKYO is committed to the musical education of young peo-

ple. I am honored and proud that these young Kentuckians have yet again distinguished themselves as one of the finest youth orchestras in our country.●

CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3123

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 160, a concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of H.R. 3123 just received from the House; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 160) was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, may at any time proceed to the consideration of Calendar 185, Senate Joint Resolution 19, a joint resolution to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii; that there be 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that no amendments be in order; upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be advanced to third reading, and the Senate vote on passage, with no intervening action or debate, and that immediately upon the disposition of the joint resolution, if it is agreed to, the preamble be agreed to.

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

ORDER FOR AMENDMENTS TO BE ADDED TO LIST OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3116

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be added to the list of amendments in order to H.R. 3116: Senator HELMS on Haiti, and Senator GRAMHAM on Haiti.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—VOTE ON H.R. 2446

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446, the military construction appropriations bill, occur at 9:45 a.m. tomorrow—that is in lieu of the 9:30 request on Tuesday, October 19, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1993

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business, it stand in recess until 9:40 a.m., Tuesday, October 19; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that upon disposition of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2446, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 3116, the Department of Defense appropriations bill; and that on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. in order to accommodate respective party conferences.

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

RECESS UNTIL 9:40 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:08 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1993, at 9:40 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18, 1993:

THE JUDICIARY

RAFAEL DIAZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ROBERT A. SHUKER.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive Nominations Confirmed by the Senate October 18, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

GEORGE MUNOZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.
GEORGE MUNOZ, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

THE JUDICIARY

PIERRE N. LEVAL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT.
DEBORAH K. CHASANOW, OF MARYLAND, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

