

This year one of the most notable fundraising trends hits very close to home, or to the dome, as the case may be: Congressional campaign committees raised more than three times as much soft money during 1999 than they raised during 1995—\$62 million compared to \$19.4 million.

That's a huge increase, Mr. President.

It is three times as much soft money—much of it raised by Members of Congress. The latest reports show record-breaking soft money figures for the first quarter of the year 2000, as well.

How should the public view this?

What can we expect them to think as Members of Congress ask for these unlimited contributions from corporations, unions and wealthy individuals, and then turn around and vote on legislation that directly affects those donors?

Frankly Mr. President, it's all the more reason for Americans to question our integrity, whether those donations have an impact on our decisions or not.

But we can regain some of the public's trust by doing one simple thing—banning soft money.

On January 24, in its opinion in the *Shrink Missouri* case, the Supreme Court stated even more clearly to us that we may take that step today without the slightest offense to the First Amendment.

I'll continue the fight to ban soft money this year, and ask every one of my colleagues to join me.

The fight to ban soft money is a fight to regain the public's trust, and Mr. President, there's no fight in our democracy today more worthwhile than that.

I yield the floor and 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. SESSIONS. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION AWARD DINNER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, last night Senator JOHN WARNER, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was the recipient of the James Forrester Memorial Award at a gathering of 900 distinguished leading individuals involved in the industrial and military affairs of this Nation. It was awarded last night in Washington. The Forrester award has been given since 1954 to distinguished Americans who most effectively applied Secretary Forres-

ter's ideas of a close working relationship between the Government and the requirements of a strong national defense. Other recipients were George Bush, Sam Nunn, Scoop Jackson, John Tower, Barry Goldwater, John Stennis and, I believe, our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, TED STEVENS.

The award is given to a citizen of the United States who may be from the military services, government, or industry. Senator WARNER was honored last night with the Forrester award for his distinguished public service relating to national security and national defense in a wide range of responsibilities. All of us in the Senate know that Senator WARNER was a former Navy enlisted man in World War II, enlisting as a 17-year-old, then serving again in Korea as a marine officer. I have heard him say he has gone through two basic trainings, both Navy and Marine.

Later, during the cold war era, JOHN served his Nation as Secretary of the Navy. His service to the Nation in this body began in 1978, and he has been on the Senate Armed Services Committee ever since, a total of 21 years. I know that JOHN enjoyed being honored by 900 of his friends and companions who provide the equipment our soldiers and sailors, marines and airmen use every day to maintain a strong national defense.

JOHN's public thanks to those in industry and in the services is an expression of thanks from all of us in Congress. I associate myself with his remarks that he made so eloquently last evening.

There is no one in this body who cares more about the men and women in uniform, our military retirees, and our veterans than JOHN WARNER. There is no one more committed to the defense of this Nation. The markup of our committee's bill for defense will be undertaken next week, and the debate on this floor will show, without question, the depth of Senator JOHN WARNER's commitment to the Nation.

We owe men such as JOHN WARNER our gratitude for leading us in times of turmoil. There have been many in history who have provided this kind of essential leadership. We are part of JOHN's team. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am proud of him, his leadership and his friendship. Congratulations, JOHN, on being the recipient of the year 2000 James Forrester Memorial Award.

I have the honor of serving with Senator WARNER on the Armed Services Committee. He is a gentleman's gentleman, a patriot's patriot. He is proud of being able to preside this year over a budget that produced the first real increase in defense spending in 15 years, a 4.8-percent pay raise for our men and women in uniform. It was a real accomplishment.

I have been honored to serve with him. I share with this body my pride in his being selected for this prestigious award.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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. FEINGOLD. 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. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Alabama deals with the procedural matters I be recognized for 5 minutes and then Senator FEINSTEIN be recognized following me for 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### THE RETIREMENT OF DR. HERB CHEEVER

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, quite often on the floor of the Senate, we give speeches about extraordinary people who do extraordinary things. Today, I'd like to recognize someone whose name you won't see in the headlines, but who is truly extraordinary in every sense of the word. Earlier this year, my good friend Dr. Herb Cheever, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at South Dakota State University (SDSU), announced that he would retire.

Dr. Cheever grew up in Brookings, South Dakota and received his undergraduate degree from SDSU. After earning his doctorate from the University of Iowa and teaching in Kansas and Wisconsin, Dr. Cheever returned to his alma mater. He and his wife Sydna raised three boys in Brookings—Jason, Michael and Gene—and Herb and Sydna have long been tireless advocates of the arts in our state.

South Dakota State University is a wonderful school. Its reputation for academic excellence and cutting edge research is known across the country. Dr. Cheever is to be commended for the critical role he played in the development of the University, but he should also be recognized for his commitment to the things one can't measure by a standardized test.

Dean Cheever is a passionate believer in the importance of public service.

Throughout his teaching career, his commitment to serving others was something that was impressed upon all of his students. When I was an undergraduate at SDSU, Dean Cheever taught me more about the importance of public service than I could have imagined possible, and there is no doubt in my mind that he helped steer me down the career path that I eventually chose to follow.

The impact Dean Cheever had on me wasn't confined to his work as an educator. He was also instrumental in helping shape my interest in politics. Dr. Cheever and I volunteered together on George McGovern's race for the Senate in 1968. It was a true pleasure for me to work alongside him during that exciting time.

Later, Dean Cheever took leave from SDSU to help Dick Kneip remain governor, and to direct the South Dakota Democratic Party. Politically—and luckily for me—Herb Cheever has worked on behalf of the Democratic Party. However, as everyone who knows him can attest, that is the only venue in which he plays favorites. Dean Cheever's commitment to education and his community, and his passion for public service have made a deep and lasting impression on thousands of young people on SDSU's campus over the years, and I am pleased that I was fortunate enough to be among them.

I am proud to call Dean Herbert Cheever a friend, and I am pleased to join Sydna, their friends and family in wishing him the best as he begins the next important chapter of his life. While his colleagues and students will undoubtedly miss his daily presence in the classrooms of SDSU, I am confident that he will continue to touch many lives.

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, just a few days ago, the Congressional Budget Office released a paper entitled "Budgetary and Technical Implications of the Administration's Plan for National Missile Defense." I bring this paper to the Senate's attention because I believe it is misleading and confusing. It has given support to critics of the program who also have contributed to the confusion.

Some reporters and editors have characterized this study as a "budget estimate" of our National Missile Defense program which shows that the costs will be far higher than previously predicted. This is not so.

The paper is not a budgetary scoring of legislation that the CBO traditionally engages in. This is a paper of a kind the CBO occasionally produces in response to Congressional requests, providing it can spare analysts from their other duties. The request for this paper was recently made by members of the Senate and the CBO acknowledges that it had insufficient time to fully consider all of the questions it was asked to address.

The paper puts the total cost for a National Missile Defense system at \$49 billion. I say "a" National Missile Defense system because the CBO paper did not examine the program actually in place and for which we have received estimates in the past, but rather one that its analysts thought should be in place. Mr. Ken Bacon, the Defense Department spokesman, characterized the estimate as an "apples to gold apples" comparison.

The Defense Department has stated previously that acquisition and operation of a single site NMD system with 100 interceptors would cost \$25.6 billion through 2015. The CBO estimate of \$49 billion is for a dual site NMD system with 250 interceptors. Some news reports, such as one published in the Wall Street Journal on April 25th have erroneously reported a figure of \$60 billion for this year, which they arrive at by adding the cost of Space-Based Infrared Satellites. However, even the CBO paper correctly notes that those satellites will serve other missile defense programs, as well as other entirely different mission areas, and are not part of the cost of the NMD system.

Mr. President, I am convinced that a single interceptor site by itself will be insufficient to adequately protect the United States from missile attack, and additional capability will be needed. Whether that should be a second ground-based site, as the CBO paper assumes, one based at sea, or some other approach remains to be determined. But we should not confuse the CBO's "golden apple" estimate with the estimates we have received previously, which address a different, single site NMD system.

Even where the CBO paper tried to make a direct comparison, it still based its estimate on the program it thought should exist rather than the one that does. For example, the paper determined that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization should buy 75 percent more interceptor missiles than it plans to for testing and spares in the so-called "Capability 1" single site system. It made different assumptions about construction costs, using the 30 year old Safeguard system in North Dakota as its model. And it based its costs on 30 operational flight tests over the first five years of system operation, three times the number actually planned.

Projecting costs for a complex weapon system still under development is an uncertain enterprise, and different analysts can reasonably reach different conclusions about what assumptions are warranted. It would have been reasonable for CBO to present its conclusions to those who are actually building the NMD system and seek their views on whether the different assumptions were warranted. This, after all, is the procedure followed by the General Accounting Office when it produces such a study. It sends out a draft for comment by the relevant agencies and either incorporates the comments of

those agencies or explains why it does not agree. Unfortunately, we have been told by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization that, despite repeated offers to assess the CBO findings, CBO declined to present its conclusions before publishing this paper. That is unfortunate; had it done so, there might be less confusion about what this paper says.

I believe it is also important to note some costs that CBO did not consider in this study.

The study doesn't examine the potential costs to the United States of not having a missile defense system. We should keep in mind that the NMD program is not like a new tactical fighter or guided missile destroyer or armored vehicle, replacing an earlier generation. We have no defense against long-range ballistic missiles launched against our territory. That means that should the day come when some nation—for whatever reason—launches a missile at the United States, without a National Missile Defense system we will have no choice but to watch that missile strike its target. If that missile is equipped with a weapon of mass destruction, the results would be the most catastrophic event ever to take place in the United States. An assessment of these costs is nowhere to be found in the CBO report.

Nor is the cost to U.S. leadership of our continued vulnerability to missile attack. A missile doesn't have to be used to be useful in deterring actions by other nations, and we need only look at our own experience to confirm that. The United States has spent hundreds of billions of dollars on ballistic missiles over the last 40 years, none of which have ever been used. We did so because we believed those weapons would deter other nations from taking certain actions that would harm our interests.

The United States can be deterred, too, by the threat of missile attack. Our former colleague, Secretary of Defense Cohen, provided an example of how that can happen when he spoke to our Allies in Munich in February. He said,

If Saddam Hussein had five or ten or twenty ICBMs with nuclear warheads, and he said that, if you try to expel me from Kuwait, I'll put one in Berlin, one in Munich, one in New York, one in Washington, one in Los Angeles, etc., one in Rome—let's spread the wealth, one in England, London—how many would have been quite so eager to support the deployment of some five hundred thousand convention troops to expel him from Kuwait? We would have had a different calculation, asking, "What kind of a risk are we running?" . . .

We never want to be in the position of being blackmailed by anyone who will prevent us from carrying out our Article 5 obligations or responding to any threat to our national security interests."

There are significant costs to the ability of the United States to act in its national interests if it is vulnerable to missile attack. This report from the CBO doesn't place a dollar value on that.