

House and the Senate on it. If the House leadership does what it did last year, I say to them: Fair warning, I am going to be here on the floor of the Senate objecting to a whole series of things. We need to straighten this out now. This country, at this time, on this issue, says we will no longer use sanctions with respect to the shipment of food and medicine. It does not work, it is not a moral policy, and it ought to stop now.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is concluded.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:47 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

SENATE PHOTOGRAPH

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could ask our colleagues to take their seats, then we will begin a series of photographs. Please, stay in place until we are given the all-clear sign. If you can go ahead and be seated, we will be able to determine exactly which Senators may still be missing.

STEVE BENZA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as we prepare to have this photograph taken, I note that the Senate photographer, who has been with the Senate some 32 years, Steve Benza, is preparing to retire. Steve started out as a page. He worked in the Architect's Office. He worked in the Senate Post Office. He worked in the photo lab. And for years he has taken photographs of us in various and sundry places, some of which we would not like to recount but we will remember warmly.

I ask my colleagues, before we begin these series of photographs, to express our appreciation to Steve Benza for his 32 years of service to the institution.

[Applause.]

(Thereupon, the official Senate photograph was taken.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Chair kindly advise the Senate with regard to the pending business.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is consideration of the Defense authorization bill, S. 2549, which the clerk will report.

Mr. WARNER. I am ready to proceed. I ask my distinguished friend and colleague from Michigan if he is likewise ready to go.

Mr. LEVIN. We are indeed. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2549) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3173

(Purpose: To extend eligibility for medical care under CHAMPUS and TRICARE to persons over age 64)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I 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 Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 3173.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. 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:

Strike sections 701 through 704 and insert the following:

SEC. 701. CONDITIONS FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPUS UPON THE ATTAINMENT OF 65 YEARS OF AGE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF MEDICARE ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—Section 1086(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The prohibition contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to a person referred to in subsection (c) who—

“(A) is enrolled in the supplementary medical insurance program under part B of such title (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.); and

“(B) in the case of a person under 65 years of age, is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 226(b)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426(b)(2)) or section 226A(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426-1(a)).”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “paragraph (1) who satisfy only the criteria specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2), but not subparagraph (C) of such paragraph,” and inserting “subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) who do not satisfy the condition specified in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph”.

(b) EXTENSION OF TRICARE SENIOR PRIME DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Paragraph (4) of section 1896(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ggg(b)) is amended by striking “3-year period beginning on January 1, 1998” and inserting “period beginning on January 1, 1998, and ending on December 31, 2002”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2001.

(2) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WARNER. This is an amendment relating to the change in the existing

military medical program to, in the future, encompass retirees over age 65. I shall address this later, and I am sure the Senator from Michigan is aware I would like to have that as the first amendment up. That was my understanding.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will withhold on any unanimous consent request relative to that, I am trying to see if we have been informed of it. Of course, the Senator has a right to offer it.

Mr. WARNER. I am not able to hear my colleague.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder, is this the amendment to which the Senator made reference this morning?

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is there a unanimous consent request pending now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

Mr. LEVIN. I believe the only request either pending, or perhaps already granted, is to withhold reading of the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Is my understanding correct that this amendment will be set aside temporarily for opening statements to be given?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, that is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Does the Democratic whip desire to be recognized?

Mr. REID. No.

Mr. WARNER. This amendment was shared beforehand with my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I don't know of any understanding, but the chairman has a right, of course, to offer an amendment. We just understand that this amendment now is to be temporarily laid aside so the opening statements can be given. The Senator has a right to offer an amendment at any time he wishes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this is the amendment about which I spoke on the floor earlier this morning. I think colleagues have had an opportunity to inform themselves about it. It is my hope that a number will desire to be cosponsors. We have a number of cosponsors right now.

This amendment relates to the continuing work of the Armed Services Committee with regard to the necessity to provide a health care program for retirees over 65. As the Presiding Officer well knows, the committee has addressed this in several increments, and now with another amendment by the Senator from Virginia, which I offer on behalf of many. I want to recognize that this is a subject that has quite properly gained the attention of a number of colleagues. I know Senator MCCAIN, on our side of the aisle, and Senator HUTCHISON have worked on this subject of health care. In no way do I indicate that anyone—certainly not myself—has been the principal; we have all worked together as a team.

And at such appropriate time, I will return to this amendment.

I want to make some opening comments now regarding this very important piece of legislation. This bill contains the much-needed increases in defense funding and critical initiatives, including in the area of recruiting and retention. Retention is one of the most serious problems we have facing us today in our current military, as well as recruiting. This bill, in the collective judgment of the committee, goes a long way toward helping to alleviate the problems we have and to improve those critical areas in our defense.

It is most appropriate that we begin this discussion today, on June 6, the 56th anniversary of D-Day. Today, America recalls the heroic acts of bravery and valor demonstrated on the beaches of France and the many who paid the price in life and limb for liberty and freedom. And how proud we are, as the Senate, to have as the President pro tempore the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, among us. He, of course, crossed the beaches of D-Day 56 years ago. He addressed the Senate earlier today on that subject.

As we look to the future and the defense of this Nation, we must never forget what may be required, and indeed what was required, of so many—over 1,400 American servicemen, not to speak of our allies; they had casualties also. But 1,400 American servicemen died on June 6, 1944, on the beaches of France, and thousands more were wounded. They did it to restore freedom to so many nations and people all through Europe—freedom that had been taken away by Hitler and the Axis forces.

I begin by expressing my thanks to the ranking member, Senator LEVIN. We came to the Senate together 21 years ago. We have worked as partners on this bill and have produced a bipartisan product that will strengthen the security of the United States, in the collective judgment of all members of the Armed Services Committee, and improve the quality of life of our men and women in uniform and, most especially, for their families.

I also applaud our subcommittee chairmen, ranking members, and all members of the Committee for their fine work throughout this year. I will put in the RECORD elsewhere the volume of hearings, special meetings, the prolonged markup sessions that led to the work product for which we labored in the Senate today.

A special thanks to our committee staff. What a superb professional staff—not only this year and last year, but throughout the 22 years I have been privileged to be on this committee. Under many distinguished chairmen and ranking members, we have had the most nonpartisan and the hardest-working staff in the Senate. I salute Colonel Les Brownlee, David Lyles, and the personal staff of the committee members for their invaluable work which led to the creation of this bill.

I appeal to all Members to join us in our bipartisan effort to improve our security. The safety and well-being of our men and women in uniform, thousands of whom are deployed at this very moment in harm's way across this world, should not fall victim to any partisan debate and certainly no election year politics. We have done that in the past. I hope we will not do it on this bill and in the future.

We should keep in mind that Members of the Senate have always recognized the importance of the annual Defense authorization bill, and in the past we have put our partisan concerns aside for the good of the Nation. I remind colleagues that the Senate has passed a Defense authorization bill every year since the authorization process began in 1961, some nearly 40 years. The House this year had a strong, resounding vote of 353 yeas to 100-some-odd nays. So that is a clear indication of the strength of the House and the Senate bills and the need for these bills to be brought into law.

At this time of increased tension around the world, at this time of unprecedented deployments of U.S. military personnel around the globe, we must show our support for our troops. Accordingly, I urge all Members to abstain from offering nondefense-related amendments and to join in a bipartisan effort to pass this Defense authorization bill, to send a strong signal of support to our brave troops, wherever they are in the world, for risking their lives at the very moment we address this legislation, risking to safeguard freedom of our allies, our friends, and indeed those of us here at home. The problems and the threats facing the home front have increased to where they are greater today than I ever envisioned in my life.

The national security challenges that the United States will face in the new millennium are many and diverse—new adversaries, unknown adversaries, new weapons, and unknown weapons. A very complex threat faces us at home and our forces forward deployed. It is important that we remain vigilant, forward thinking, and prepared to address these challenges.

Just days ago the National Commission on Terrorism, established by Congress in 1998, issued its report, "Countering the Changing Threat of International Terrorism". I would like to quote from the Report's executive summary: "Today's terrorists seek to inflict mass casualties, and they are attempting to do so both overseas and on American soil. They are less dependent on state sponsorship and are, instead, forming loose, transnational affiliations based on religious or ideological—regrettably I have to use that word, "a common hatred"—affinity and a common hatred of the United States. This makes terrorist attacks more difficult to detect and prevent." We must be prepared to respond to this threat and I look forward to reviewing the numerous recommendations con-

tained within the report which we may address in the course of the deliberations on this bill.

While the Department of Defense (DOD) must plan and allocate resources to meet future threats, ongoing military operations and deployments from the Balkans to Southwest Asia to East Timor continue to demand significant resources in the short term and the foreseeable future.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 authorizes a total of \$309.8 billion for defense spending—\$4.5 billion above the President's request—and provides authority and guidance to the Defense Department to address the critical readiness, modernization, and recruiting and retention problems facing our military.

For over a decade, our defense budgets have been based on constrained funding, not on the threats facing the nation or the military strategy necessary to meet those threats. The result of this is evident today in continuing critical problems with recruiting and retention, declining readiness ratings, and aging equipment.

Last year, the Congress reversed the downward trend in defense spending by approving a defense authorization bill which, for the first time in 14 years, included a real increase in the authorized level of defense spending. This year, we continue that momentum with the bill before the Senate the second year of increased authorization levels. As I stated earlier, the authorized level of \$309.8 billion in this bill is \$4.5 billion above the President's request and consistent with this year's concurrent budget resolution. The fiscal year 2001 funding level also represents a *real increase* in defense spending of 4.4 percent from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level.

The funding we have provided is primarily going for modernization and readiness and for other benefits for the men and women of the military. The committee authorized \$63.28 billion in procurement funding, a \$3.0 billion increase over the President's budget. Operations and maintenance was funded at \$109.2 billion, with \$1.5 billion added to the primary readiness accounts. Research, development, test and evaluation was budgeted at \$39.31 billion, a \$1.45 billion increase over the President's budget request.

The committee's support for additional funding for defense is based on an in-depth analysis of the threats facing U.S. interests, and testimony from senior military leaders on the many shortfalls in the defense budget.

While the cold war has been over for nearly a decade, it is evident that the world remains a complex and violent place. The greatest threat to our national security today is instability; instability fueled by ethnic, religious, and racial animosities that have existed for centuries, but are now resulting in conflicts fought with the weapons of modern warfare. Many have turned to the United States, as the sole remaining superpower, to resolve the

many conflicts around the world and to ensure stability in the future. However, this military power does not ensure our security. As Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet told the committee in January, "The fact that we are arguably the world's most powerful nation does not bestow invulnerability; in fact, it may make us a larger target for those who don't share our interest, values, or beliefs."

U.S. military forces are involved in overseas deployments at an unprecedented rate. Currently, our troops are involved in over 10 contingency operations around the globe. Unfortunately, there appears to be no relief in sight for most of these operations. At an October 1999 hearing of the committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hugh Shelton, stated that, "Two factors that erode military readiness are the pace of operations and funding shortfalls. There is no doubt that the force is much smaller than it was a decade ago, and also much busier."

Over the past decade, our active duty manpower has been reduced by nearly a third, active Army divisions have been reduced by almost 50 percent, and the number of Navy ships has been reduced from 567 to 316. During this same period, our troops have been involved in 50 military operations worldwide. By comparison, from the end of the Vietnam war in 1975 until 1989, U.S. military forces were engaged in only 20 such military deployments.

This unprecedented rate of overseas deployments is one of the primary factors contributing to the severe problems we are having with recruiting and retaining quality personnel, and with maintaining adequate readiness of the existing force. We have tried to address these issues in the bill before the Senate.

It has also affected our readiness, as the Presiding Officer well knows as chairman of the subcommittee with the primary jurisdiction of readiness.

I want to pause for a moment and acknowledge the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Service Chiefs—the Chief of Naval Operations, the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Army Chief of Staff, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps—for their role in helping to reverse the decline in defense spending. I cannot think of one single factor that added greater emphasis not only this year but last year to the increase in defense spending—not one fact greater than their honest, forthright professional and personal assessments which were given this committee time and time in formalized hearings, and indeed in private consultations. I commend them. They have ably represented their troops.

There is no group of leaders more responsible for stopping this downward trend than the Chiefs.

On three separate occasions, October 6, 1998, January 5, 1999, and October 26, 1999, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Service Chiefs came

before the Armed Services Committee to tell us about the ever increasing challenges the armed forces were facing in carrying out their military missions. Simply put, they did not have enough money. Their individual observations were forthright and candid. Collectively, their reports to the Congress became the unimpeachable voice that made Americans sit up and take notice. The chiefs were heard across the land. Our nation echoed back: we believe you, you have the people's support.

The military service chiefs have testified that they have a remaining shortfall in funding of \$9.0 billion for fiscal year 2000, a requirement for an additional \$15.5 billion above the budget request to meet shortfalls in readiness and modernization for fiscal year 2001, and a requirement for an additional \$85.0 billion in the future years Defense Program.

This bill adds \$3.8 billion to the President's budget request to specifically pay for items identified by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Service chiefs as necessary requirements: necessary requirements that were not funded by the President's request.

As I said earlier, the high operations tempo of our armed forces is having a negative impact on recruiting and retention. Last year, the committee took action to provide a pay raise and a package of retirement reforms and retention incentives in an effort to recruit and retain highly qualified personnel. The committee has received testimony that these changes are having a positive impact on recruiting and retention efforts.

This year, the committee has focused its "quality of life" efforts on improving military health care for our active duty and retired personnel and their families.

Earlier this year, I announced my intention to join with the majority leader and others to tackle the long-standing problems with the military health care system.

I wish to acknowledge the full cooperation of my distinguished colleague, Mr. LEVIN, and the Members on his side of the aisle. It has truly been a bipartisan effort. We have heard increasing complaints, especially from over 56 retirement communities.

While the Congress was taking some steps in the past to try to improve the health care system, it was time for a major assault on this problem. And we have done more than establish a beachhead. I used that term months ago when I laid down the first piece of legislation with our distinguished majority leader, Mr. LOTT.

The bill before the Senate today is but the first step, I hope, in what will be a continuing process to fulfill our commitment of quality health care for all military personnel—active duty, retired, as well as their families.

The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the serv-

ice chiefs have all highlighted the many problems associated with implementing a user-friendly health care program for active duty service members, military retirees, and their families.

In this bill, the committee included initiatives that ensure our active duty personnel and their families receive quality health care and initiatives that fulfill our commitment to military retirees, including extending TriCare Prime to families of service members assigned to remote locations, eliminating copayments for service received under the TriCare Prime, and authorizing a comprehensive retail and national mail order pharmacy benefit for all eligible beneficiaries, including Medicare-eligible beneficiaries with no enrollment fee or deductible.

I will elaborate on the pharmacy benefit. Prescription medication is the major unmet need of the military retiree. I believe this bill meets that need. This bill for the first time provides an entitlement for a comprehensive drug benefit for all military beneficiaries, including those who are Medicare eligible.

Hopefully, I will add my amendment which will further enhance this whole package of retiree benefits, particularly for those over 65. At the appropriate time, I will ask to turn to that amendment.

Other quality-of-life initiatives of note in this bill are a 3.7-percent pay raise for military personnel effective January 1, 2001, and a provision that directs the Department to implement the Thrift Savings Plan for military personnel not later than 180 days after enactment of this act. We put similar provisions in last year's bill but gave the discretion to the Department. This year, we have been forthright and we direct action on that program.

Last year, NATO conducted its first large-scale offensive military operation with the 78-day air war campaign—and it was associated with other military operations and was not exclusive to air—on behalf of the beleaguered and persecuted peoples of Kosovo. The lessons learned from that operation addressed during a series of committee hearings highlighted not only shortfalls in weapon systems and intelligence programs but also the complexities of engaging in coalition operations.

As noted in the combined testimony of Operation Allied Force Commanders, Gen. Wesley Clark, Adm. James Ellis, and Lt. Gen. Mike Short, the Kosovo campaign:

... required [that] we adopt military doctrine and strategy to strike a balance between maintaining allied cohesion, striking key elements of the Yugoslav Armed Forces, minimizing losses of allied aircraft and crew, and containing collateral damage.

Of paramount concern to the committee this year was applying the lessons learned from the air campaign over Kosovo to our defense budget to ensure the future preparedness of the

U.S. Armed Forces for future military operations. Accordingly, the committee included over \$700 million for a program to include aircraft precision strike capability, aircraft survivability, and intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance assets based on lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict.

Over 38,000 combat sorties were conducted during the Kosovo air campaign—and I proudly say, for all nations that participated, some seven nations flew—with no combat casualties and some heroic rescue operations. While the committee understands that no military operation is without risk, limiting the risk to military personnel is an important goal. Every day, advances in technology such as computing and telecommunications are being integrated into warfighting equipment.

The committee believes the Defense Department must further pursue these technological advances in an effort to provide advanced warfighting capabilities, while at the same time limiting the risk to military personnel. To this end, this legislation directs the DOD to aggressively develop and field unmanned combat systems in the air and on the ground so that within 10 years one-third of our operation of these type aircraft would be unmanned, and within 15 years one-third of our ground combat vehicles would be unmanned. The committee also added \$246.3 million to accelerate technologies leading to the development and fielding of remotely controlled air combat vehicles and remotely controlled ground combat vehicles.

As demonstrated in Kosovo, our Armed Forces are the best prepared in the world. They can beat the enemy on any battlefield. I don't say that with arrogance. It is factual. Our enemies, certainly those that can be identified, know that. It is the ones that we can't identify—the growing number we cannot identify, that we cannot anticipate—that pose the greatest threat. Current and future potential adversaries must fully understand, however, our military capability. Many are now intent on carrying the battle right here at home in the continental limits of the United States of America either by ballistic missile attack or attacks with chemical or biological agents or through cyberterrorism. That is where we are soft, soft in the underbelly of this great Nation. Recently, retired Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre characterized domestic preparedness as “the mission of the decade.” I agree with that distinguished former public servant.

The military services play a critical and important role in domestic preparedness for such attacks. Should some madman or terrorist release a chemical biological agent on the civilian population at home—or, indeed, at a military base that could be a target—the Defense Department must be prepared to assist the first responders, whether they are volunteer firemen,

the police officers, or even citizens who instinctively try to come to the aid of those suffering, along with the health care professionals in our local communities. To deter and defeat the efforts of those intent on using weapons of mass destruction or mass disruption in the United States, this bill does the following:

It adds \$76.8 million for initiatives to address the threat of cyberattack, including establishment of an Information Security Scholarship Program to encourage recruitment and retention of Department of Defense personnel with computer network security skills. This is a program in which I have had a great deal of interest. I do hope the Members will work with me on this. We have this massive people program, maybe \$20 or \$30 million just to begin to give incentives for young people to go into cyberspace terrorism. What better evidence do we need than this love note that floated around, causing billions of dollars of loss to the economy in this country for the shutdown of computers.

Second, there is the creation of an institute for defense computer security and information protection to conduct research and critical technology development and to facilitate the exchange of information between the government and the private sector, and sharing of information to try and meet this common threat.

Further, we added \$418 million for ballistic missile defense programs, including \$129 million for National Missile Defense Risk Reduction, \$92.4 million for the Air Forces Airborne Laser Program, \$60 million for the Navy Theater-Wide Missile Defense Program, \$15 million for the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology Program, \$8 million for the Arrow System Improvement Program, \$15 million for the Tactical High Energy Laser Program, and \$30 million for the Space-Based Laser Program.

This is a serious threat to our homeland, the intercontinental ballistic missiles. We are forging ahead. I wish we could be stronger in our efforts.

I will, with others, try everlastingly to increase our strength to try to approach these things and solve these problems—because we are defenseless. Americans think we spent \$300.9 billion this year and \$300 billion previous years and that we have some defense. We do not. We are absolutely defenseless against these intercontinental ballistic missiles, particularly the ones that might be fired by a rogue state or terrorist state or, indeed, an accidental firing. It could decimate any of our great cities or, indeed, rural areas.

(Mr. HAGEL assumed the chair.)

Mr. WARNER. Last, we added \$25 million for five additional Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support teams formerly known as RAID teams. This will result in a total of 32 of these teams by the end of fiscal year 2001. It is the committee's intent to support the establishment of these teams for

each State and territory. I commend this committee, particularly the subcommittee that handles this under Senator ROBERTS, for their relentless initiative to drive and get these teams in place. The Department of Defense has not been as aggressive as has the Senate on this issue.

I would like to briefly highlight some of the other major funding initiatives and provisions of the bill.

First, we strengthen the Joint Strike Fighter Program by significantly increasing funding for the demonstration and validation phase of this program while removing funding for the engineering, manufacture, and development phase in the fiscal year 2001.

It increases the shipbuilding budget by \$603.2 million to over \$12 billion. I commend the chairman and ranking member of that committee, the Senator from Maine. This is a very essential investment, an increase in spending, if we are ever to hope to maintain just a 300-ship Navy.

It authorizes \$98.2 million for military space programs and technologies, \$22 million for strategic nuclear delivery vehicle modernization, and \$190 million for national and military intelligence programs.

We support the Army transformation initiative and we add additional resources that support research and development efforts designed to lead to the future development of that force.

Congress has to help the Army. They have some very bold initiatives, but the funding profile for these initiatives in the outyears has a degree of uncertainty which troubles this Senator. But we will try to do our best to work with the distinguished Chief of Staff, the Secretary, and others, in trying to move the Army along in its projected transformation program.

We included provisions supporting, under certain conditions, the agreement reached between the Department of Defense and the government of Puerto Rico that is intended to restore relations between the people of Vieques and the Navy and provide for the continuation of live fire training on this island. I commend the former Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oklahoma, for his unrelenting efforts, many visits down to that region to work on this problem.

We increased funding for military construction and family housing programs by \$430 million to \$8.46 billion.

We authorized \$1.27 billion for the environmental restoration accounts to enhance environmental cleanup of military facilities.

We required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to:

No. 1, develop long-range plans for the sustainment and modernization for U.S. strategic nuclear forces and;

No. 2, to conduct a comprehensive review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years.

That is an essential program. We must get that evaluation. We have not

done one since 1994. This was of great concern to me. While I commend the President—he did the best he could at the recent summit—it would have been advisable if this Nation had conducted one of these essential programs to make an analysis of the threat—what we have in our inventory, the inventories of the other nations of the world—and, therefore, have a better idea of exactly where this country stands today and what it faces in the future.

These are but a few of the highlights of the many initiatives included in this bill. The subcommittee chairmen are truly the architects of this bill. They will discuss in greater detail the provisions in their respective subcommittees. Each should be congratulated for their study and hard work, together with their ranking members.

I urge my colleagues to support rapid passage of this bill. We need to send a strong signal of support to our Armed Forces in the field, at sea, and those who have gone before them in the line of duty. We are trustees of this great Nation and we are given that trust by generation after generation after generation of Americans who have gone from the shores of our Nation to defend the cause of freedom in farflung places of the world. These are outstanding men and women now serving in uniform. We have an obligation to them as previous Congresses have had obligations to other generations, engaged in the preserving of our freedom.

I, once again, thank my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, for his work on this committee—indeed, nonpartisan hard work—and the wonderful staff. We put this bill together.

I thank the Senator and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in bringing the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 to the floor. The bill is the product of several months of bipartisan work on the part of our committee. I am, indeed, pleased to join with him in bringing this bill to the floor.

This year the President added \$12 billion in defense spending to last year's appropriated levels. The congressional budget resolution added an additional \$4.5 billion. For the most part, the committee chose to spend the money wisely. More than three-quarters of the money added by the budget resolution would be used to meet needs that are identified as priorities by the Joint Chiefs, or to accelerate items that are included in the future years' defense plan.

I may not agree with every provision in the bill—I do not—but S. 2549 overall is a sound bill that basically continues the bipartisan partnership between the Congress and the administration. This bill would build on the budget that was

presented by the Department of Defense to improve the quality of life for the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families, and to transform our military to ensure they are capable of meeting the threats to American security in the 21st century.

I am particularly pleased the bill would implement the administration's proposal to address shortcomings in the health care we provide for our military personnel and retirees. Indeed, the bill would go a step further than the administration proposed and provide a prescription drug benefit for military retirees.

I am appalled, and I hope most of us are appalled, by the rising cost of pharmaceuticals in this country and by the growing gap between the prices paid for drugs by our citizens and people who live in other countries. We have taken an important first step in this bill in agreeing to address the problem for military retirees. But it is my hope, perhaps during the course of this bill, and surely before the end of this Congress, we will be able to provide a similar benefit for Medicare beneficiaries whether they are military retirees or otherwise. All of our seniors—all of our seniors—should have an opportunity to purchase prescription drugs and not be precluded by an inability to pay the outrageous costs which prescription drugs now present to too many of our seniors.

The committee also made the right decision in supporting the Army transformation plan that was put forward by Secretary of the Army Caldera, and Army Chief of Staff General Shinseki. The committee concluded the Army needs to transform itself into a lighter, more lethal, survivable and tactically mobile force, and we approved all the funds that were requested by the Army for that purpose. In fact, we even added some research money that the Army said would help the long-term transformation process.

At the same time, we have instructed the Army to prepare a detailed roadmap for the transformation initiative, and to conduct appropriate testing and experimentation to ensure the transformation effort is successful.

The Department has made a strong commitment to the Joint Strike Fighter Program and the committee supports that effort. While our bill recognizes that slippage in the test schedule is virtually certain to result in a delay of the next milestone decision, we remain open to reprogramming of funds to enable the Department to make that decision in the year 2001, if it proves possible to meet a tighter schedule.

I am also pleased the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee provides full funding for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and the three ongoing Department of Energy cooperative programs with Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union. These programs serve as one of the cornerstones of our relationship with Russia and

play an important role in our national security by reducing the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction from Russia or from rogue nations with which Russia may otherwise be tempted to form closer ties in the absence of these programs.

While some restrictive language has been included in the bill, I am hopeful this language will not undermine the effectiveness of the programs. I am disappointed the committee chose not to provide \$100 million for a new, long-term Russian nonproliferation program at the Department of Energy.

This program would allow the Department of Energy to accelerate the closure of portions of Russian nuclear weapons complexes and secure additional nuclear materials. I am hopeful, with the help of other Senators, we can address this issue in the course of our debate on the Senate floor or perhaps in conference.

The committee bill would authorize \$85 million of military construction sought in fiscal year 2001 by the administration to begin construction of a national missile defense site. The President's budget explains this request as follows:

The budget includes sufficient funding so that if the administration decides in 2000 to proceed with deployment of a limited system, the resources will be available to quickly proceed toward a 2005 initial capability.

I emphasize the word "if." It is my understanding that this funding is provided consistent with the President's request in the event the President decides to proceed with the deployment of a limited national missile defense. As indicated in the President's budget, this decision will be based on an assessment of four factors: one, the assessment of the threat; two, the status of technology based on an initial series of flight tests and the proposed system's operational effectiveness; three, the cost of the system; and four, the implications of going forward with a national missile defense deployment in terms of the overall strategic environment and our arms control objectives, including efforts to achieve further reductions in strategic nuclear arms under START II and III.

As our chairman said, the committee spent a great deal of time addressing the status of training exercises by Navy and Marine Corps personnel on the island of Vieques. As we all know, training on Vieques was suspended last year after the tragic death of a security guard at the training range. The Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and others have testified before the committee that there is no adequate substitute for the live-fire training on the island of Vieques.

Earlier this year, the President entered into an agreement with the Governor of Puerto Rico which establishes an orderly process for what we all hope will be the resumption of such training. As of today, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has lived up to its obligations under the agreement. The Navy

training on Vieques has been cleared of protesters with the assistance of the government of Puerto Rico, and the Navy training exercises have now resumed on the island with the use of inert ordnance as provided in the agreement.

During the course of our markup, the committee considered proposed legislation which would have been inconsistent with this agreement. In my view, unilateral changes to or actions in violation of the terms of the agreement at a time when the government of Puerto Rico is living up to its obligations under the agreement would have sent exactly the wrong signal. Such changes would have offended many citizens of Vieques and others throughout Puerto Rico, undermining the efforts of the Navy and this committee to eventually resume live-fire training on Vieques.

In the end, the committee included legislation that would implement the provisions of the agreement that call for limited economic assistance and holding a referendum on the island of Vieques. With regard to the other element of the agreement—the transfer of specific land to Puerto Rico under certain circumstances—the legislation is silent, deferring congressional action until a later date.

While I would have preferred to fully implement the agreement between the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico at this time, avoiding unilateral changes to the terms of the agreement was the next best outcome. In light of the position taken on the floor of the House, I expect we will have an opportunity to further consider this issue in conference.

One area where I am very disappointed with the outcome of the markup is the organization of the Department of Energy. Last year, the National Defense Authorization Act contained provisions reorganizing the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex by creating a new "semi-autonomous" National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA, within the Department of Energy. These provisions, which were added in conference, were inconsistent with legislation passed in the Senate by a vote of 96-1 and went far beyond anything that was even considered by the House.

The Secretary of Energy dual-hatted a number of key NNSA employees, authorizing them to serve concurrently in both NNSA positions and DOE positions outside the NNSA. Although the provisions establishing the NNSA did not contain any provision prohibiting dual-hatting, many members of our committee believed this approach was inconsistent with the legislation.

This bill responds to that perceived violation of the statute with provisions that would, one, prohibit the Department of Energy from paying any NNSA officials who are dual-hatted and, two, prohibit the Secretary of Energy from changing the organization of the NNSA in any way. These are unprecedented

restrictions on the ability of a Cabinet Secretary to manage his own Department and undermine our ability to hold Secretary Richardson and his successors accountable for the activities of the Department of Energy.

Dual-hatting is commonplace throughout the Government and has been legally permissible since we repealed the Dual Office Holding Act of 1894 more than 35 years ago. Moreover, the Secretary provided our committee with a legal opinion which concluded that such dual-hatting is permissible.

In any case, the prohibition on reorganization is completely unnecessary in light of the express prohibition on dual-hatting. The reorganization prohibition would go far beyond its stated purpose of addressing dual-hatting, and it would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from even establishing, altering, or consolidating any organizational unit, component, or function of the NNSA regardless of demands of efficiency or accountability.

Last year, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board reported that the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex had become organizationally "dysfunctional." Much of this organization remains unchanged despite its transfer to the new NNSA. Yet the provision added in our committee would prohibit the Secretary from addressing that problem.

In short, the Department of Energy organization provisions not only fail to address the problems identified by its sponsors, which is the dual-hatting problem, but go way beyond that and thereby undermine the ability of the Secretary of Energy to address many of the concerns that led to the enactment of last year's legislation in the first place.

I am also disappointed that the bill does not contain a base closure provision. Last year, as this year, the top military and civilian leadership of the Department of Defense came to us and told us that more base closures are critical to saving billions of dollars needed to meet our future national security needs. Year after year, some Members express concerns about shortfalls in the defense budget and then reject the one measure that would do the most to help the Department address those shortfalls in the long term.

Secretary Cohen said recently his biggest disappointment as Secretary has been that the Department of Defense still has too much overhead and that he has not been able to persuade his former colleagues—meaning us—that they are going to have to have more base closures. Authorizing a new round of base closures is an issue of political will to meet our long-term security needs. In the course of our debate on this bill, Senator McCain and I plan to again offer an amendment to allow more base closures.

Finally, I will mention two other issues. First, the bill contains a provision that would replace the School of the Americas with a new Western

Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training which would provide a broad curriculum of studies, including human rights training, to both military and civilian leaders of democratic countries. I hope this step will allow us to put the controversial history of this institution behind us while we look instead to the future.

Second, the bill contains an amendment I offered to prohibit the Department of Defense from selling to the general public any armor-piercing ammunition or armor-piercing components that may have been declared excess to the Department's needs.

This prohibition was enacted on a 1-year basis in last year's Defense Appropriations Act, and Senator DURBIN has introduced a bill in the Senate to make the ban permanent. There is no possible justification for selling armor-piercing ammunition to the general public. I am pleased that we have taken this step toward enacting the ban into permanent law.

Again, I thank Senator WARNER for his work as chairman of the committee. There are a lot of provisions in the bill, and there will be, I am sure, a lot of amendments which will be offered in the course of our deliberations on the Senate floor. I think we all look forward to a full debate on all of the issues that will be presented to us.

I am wondering if Senator WARNER is on the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not amendment No. 3173, which is the pending amendment, is subject to a point of order and, if so, what point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment that the Senator inquires on violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

Mr. LEVIN. This amendment was presented to us this morning. I think we should make an effort to see if we can't bring this amendment somehow or other into compliance with the Budget Act so we can accomplish the important provisions that are in this amendment. This is a goal which has been sought on a bipartisan basis to try to improve the provision of health care services to our retirees.

I think it is in all of our interests to see if we can't find a way that we can make this come into compliance with the Budget Act. I am particularly sensitive to the Budget Act's provisions. I am not sure Senator DOMENICI is with us today. I believe he was absent during the picture, for reasons with which we are familiar. In that case, I am wondering whether or not, because of the Budget Act implications of this amendment, the Senator might be willing to set this aside so we can determine if there are ways of achieving these important goals consistent with the Budget Act.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, I will try to accommodate you on that because it is a very important amendment. I would like to

discuss with you just perhaps the following procedure: That we have the opportunity to have a colloquy and make some presentations about the amendment, and then at that time I will consider laying it aside. I would like to have that opportunity this afternoon. I would very much appreciate the comments of my colleague.

It had been my intention to give it to you a little earlier today, but I think it began to get to your people around 11 or 12 o'clock. It had been my intention to bring it up. That is not a fact in any way I wish to conceal. But anyway, that did not come to the attention of the Senator from Michigan.

So, yes, we will work on this because in fairness to our colleagues—and I anticipate an overwhelming majority of the Senate would like to support the objectives of this amendment—we should address what could be done to the amendment.

I acknowledge that a point of order does lie, and at the appropriate time I would ask for the waiver. Yes. The answer is, we will see what we can do. So I suggest as follows, that we allow other colleagues—the President pro tempore, a member of our committee, the former chairman wishes to address the bill, and the Senator from Colorado wishes to address the bill. There may be others.

So let us have some brief opening statements by our two colleagues, and I will adjust the procedure at the request of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. That procedure would be fine. I welcome hearing from our good friends, including our former chairman, and then perhaps we will lay this aside so we can try to make it in compliance, if possible, with the Budget Act. I welcome the comments of the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as the Senate begins consideration of the national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2001, I join my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in congratulating Chairman WARNER and the ranking member, Senator LEVIN, on their leadership in preparing a strong bipartisan defense bill, which passed the Committee by an overwhelming 19-1 vote.

The national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2001 ensures that our Armed Forces can continue to carry out their global responsibilities by focusing on readiness, future national security threats, and quality of life. I am especially pleased with the focus on the quality of life issues. Our military personnel and their families are expected to make great sacrifices and they deserve adequate compensation. Therefore, I strongly support the 3.7 percent pay raise, the significant improvements in military health care, especially those impacting our military retirees and their families. These are critical provisions, which when coupled with the additional family housing and barracks construction, will result in a

well-earned improvement in the standard of living for all our military personnel.

The defense bill before us continues the improvements in the readiness issues identified by our Service Chiefs. The committee added over \$700 million for programs identified as shortfalls during the Kosovo conflict. It increased key readiness programs such as ammunition, spare parts, base operations and training by more than \$1.5 billion. Although these are significant improvements, we cannot be satisfied with these increases and must ensure continued robust funding increases for these programs in future bills.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall our Nation has faced ever changing threats. Among these are the spread of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, and the ever increasing sophistication of weapons in the hands of countries throughout the world. To counter these threats the committee added \$78.8 million in the Emerging Threats Subcommittee accounts. These resources will fund critical research into new technology, while at the same time provide for the reduction and security of the nuclear and chemical arsenals of the former Soviet Union. It is money wisely spent and deserves our full support.

I have previously congratulated the chairman and ranking member for their work on this bill. Before closing, I want to congratulate each of the subcommittee chairmen—Senator INHOFE, Senator SNOWE, Senator SANTORUM, Senator ROBERTS, Senator ALLARD and Senator HUTCHINSON—and their ranking members for their contribution to this bill. Their leadership and work provided the foundation for this legislation. Finally, I believe it is important that we recognize Les Brownlee and David Lyles for their leadership of a very professional and bipartisan staff.

This national defense authorization bill is a strong and sound bill. I intend to support it and urge my colleagues to join me in showing our strong support for the bill and our men and women in uniform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I thank Chairman WARNER for allowing me the opportunity to speak in strong support of this essential bill for our men and women in the armed services. I believe it to be very fitting that we bring up S. 2549, the fiscal year 2001 Department of Defense Authorization Act, only 9 days after Memorial Day.

This bill should always be more than just a funding mechanism for today's military but a fitting tribute and to show our appreciation for those who served, are serving, and will serve in the future.

The Defense bill is entirely too important to be mired in politics. We must respect our military and provide them the best Defense authorization bill we can.

The fiscal year 2001 Defense Authorization Act is a bipartisan effort, and I believe we all did some essential heavy lifting in committee for our warfighters.

For the second year in a row, we have reversed the downward trend in defense spending by increasing this year's funding by \$4.5 billion over the President's request, for a funding level of \$309.8 billion. This results in a 4.4 percent increase in real growth from last year's appropriated level.

Last year as the Personnel Subcommittee chairman, I had the opportunity to oversee the first major pay raise for our military in almost 20 years. Now, I have the great privilege to serve as the chairman of the Strategic Subcommittee. While it is a tall order to fill the shoes of Senator BOB SMITH as subcommittee chair, I believe the subcommittee has had a very successful and productive session. Just like last year with Senator CLELAND, it is always rewarding to have a dedicated ranking member like Senator LANDRIEU. I want to thank her, as well as all the members of the subcommittee, for all the hard work they put into this bill.

The Strategic Subcommittee has oversight and program authority over the following areas: (1) ballistic and cruise missile defense; (2) national security space; (3) strategic nuclear delivery systems; (4) military intelligence; and (5) Department of energy (DOE) activities regarding the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear waste cleanup, and other defense activities.

During the last year, the subcommittee held four hearings.

The first was on our national and theater missile defense programs which showed that the DOD continues to have a funding-constrained ballistic missile defense (BMD) program. In this year's budget, the administration finally increased the funding for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, but we found that all of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's or BMDO's major acquisition programs remain underfunded. Plus, we were very concerned about the lack of funding for the research and development technology programs. That is why in this bill we recommend substantial increases in funding for ballistic missile defense programs and technologies.

We also had a hearing regarding our national security space issues where we identified a number of areas in which budget constraints have caused DOD to insufficiently fund key space programs and technologies and technology development. We also learned from our extensive post-Kosovo conflict hearings that intelligence processing and dissemination was insufficient to meet some of our warfighting requirements. That is why we recommended funding increases for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency to improve the imagery tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination process.

The Strategic Subcommittee also has oversight over two-thirds of the Department of Energy's budget, including the newly created and much needed National Nuclear Security Administration or the NNSA. The subcommittee also authorized funds for the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, an independent agency responsible for external oversight of safety at DOE defense nuclear facilities.

We held the first congressional hearing to assess the programs of the newly established National Nuclear Security Administration or the NNSA. We remain concerned about the science-based stockpile stewardship program and the fact that it could be 15 years before the DOE stockpile stewardship program can be evaluated as an acceptable substitute for underground nuclear testing. We are also concerned about the slow pace in re-establishing pit manufacturing and tritium production capabilities and any long-term requirements or plans for modernization of its aging weapon production plans.

The fourth hearing was in the area of environmental management. I am encouraged that DOE continues to make progress in focusing its resources on closure of a limited number of sites and facilities. However, just like in the area of space and missile defense, I am very concerned that funding requests for science and technology development continues to drop. DOE needs a vigorous research and development program in order to meet its accelerated cleanup and closure goals.

In response to these needs, the Strategic Subcommittee has a net budget authority increase of \$266.7 million above the President's budget. This includes an increase of \$530.3 million to the DOD account and a decrease of \$263.6 million to DOE accounts.

In the DOD accounts, there is a net increase of \$418.6 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense programs, an increase of \$98.2 million for advanced space technology, an increase of \$190.0 million for tactical and national intelligence programs, and an increase of approximately \$22 million for strategic forces.

There are two provisions which I would like to highlight which pertain to the future of our nuclear forces. First, we have a provision which requires the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct an updated nuclear posture review. It has been since 1994 since the last nuclear posture review. This is important piece of the puzzle when determining the future shape of our nuclear forces.

The second provision requires the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to develop a long range plan for the sustainment and modernization of the U.S. strategic nuclear forces. We are concerned that neither Department has a long term vision beyond their current modernization efforts.

A few budget items I would like to highlight include: an increase of \$92.4

million for the Airborne Laser program that requires the Air Force to stay on the budgetary path for a 2003 lethal demonstration and a 2007 initial operational capability; an increase of \$30 million for the Space Based Laser program; a \$129 million increase for NMD risk reduction; an increase of \$60 million for Navy Theater Wide; and extra \$8 million for the Arrow System Improvement Program; and for the Tactical High Energy Program an increase of \$15 million.

For the Department of Energy programs, the budget structure we have proposed for DOE is slightly different from the Administration's request. We recommend that all activities of the NNSA appear in a single budgetary provision, as required by section 3251 of the National Defense Authorization Act of FY 2000. The bill has an increase of \$87 million to the programs within the NNSA, which is an increase of \$331.0 million over last year.

In DOE's Environmental Management account, we decrease the authorization by \$132.0 million. However, I want to stress that this bill still increases the environmental management account by more than \$350 million over last year's appropriated amount. In addition, we decrease the other defense account by \$88.8 million and move the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program account to a non-defense account, reflecting a decrease of \$140 million. Finally, the bill also provides \$34 million to continue progress on restoring tritium production.

I would like to mention an important highlight of the Authorization bill outside of the Strategic Subcommittee.

I want to commend the new Personnel Subcommittee chairman, Senator HUTCHINSON, for his work on the comprehensive health care provisions in the bill. There are many significant improvements to the TRICARE program for active duty family members. The bill includes a comprehensive retail and national mail order pharmacy program for eligible beneficiaries, with no enrollment fees or deductible. This results in the first medical entitlement for the military Medicare eligible population. I am also very happy with the extensions and expansions of the Medicare subvention program to major medical centers and in the number of sites for the Federal Employees Health Benefit demonstration program.

Lastly, I would like to point out a few items specific to Colorado. The Defense Authorization Act fully funds Rocky Flats at \$673 million. Plus, we require that all safeguard and security activities to be managed by Rocky Flats, and not at DOE headquarter organization, in order to ensure that future savings will be used for additional Rocky Flats cleanup. There is also a provision asking for a report on, as well as encouraging the Secretary of Energy to use, the authority provided in last years DOD authorization bill which allowed him to use prior year

unobligated balances to accelerate cleanup at Rocky Flats. Lastly, we also provide employee incentives for retention and separation of federal employees at closure project facilities. These incentives are needed in order to mitigate the anticipated high attrition rate of certain federal employees with critical skills.

Also, the bill fully funds the Chemical Demilitarization Program at over \$1 billion, while fully funding the military construction for the Pueblo Chemical Depot at \$10.6 million. For Pueblo's destruction of their chemical agents, there is a provision which provides for the destruction of the chemical agents at Pueblo either by incineration or any technology through the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment on or before May 1, 2000. The provision is to expedite the destruction activities by using one of the technologies listed in the National Environmental Policy Act documents for the Pueblo Chemical Depot.

Plus, there are \$34 million for the procurement of precision targeting pods for the Air National Guard and I expect these funds to be used for such procurement.

Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman WARNER for the opportunity to point out some of the highlights in the bill which the Strategic Subcommittee has oversight and to congratulate him and Senator LEVIN in the bipartisan way this bill was developed and ask that all Senators strongly support S. 2549. I also want to thank Eric Thoemmes, Paul Longworth, Tom McKenzie, and Tom Moore of the Strategic Subcommittee, all the Armed Services Committee staff, and Doug Flanders of my staff for all their long hours and hard work they put into this important bill.

Finally, one of Congresses main responsibilities is to provide for the common defense of the United States and I am proud of what this bill provides for our men and women in uniform. We must not be blinded by political motives when it comes to our men and women in the Armed Services. I look forward to moving this bill through the Senate, out of conference and to the President in order to quickly provide the much needed and much deserved resources for our military. To our Armed Services, I say this bill is a tribute to your dedication and hard work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. It is a great pleasure to work with him. He has one of the toughest assignments as subcommittee chairman, and he does it very ably. I thank him.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support the speedy adoption of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001.

I join my colleagues on the committee in expressing my appreciation to Chairman WARNER for the outstanding job he has done in his work on this bill.

I commend Senator ALLARD for the great work he has done as chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, for the work he did on the Personnel Subcommittee prior to my ascension to that post, and for the assistance he has given me; I express my appreciation for that.

As chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee, I worked closely with Senator MAX CLELAND, our ranking member, to develop a package that is responsive to the manpower readiness needs of the military services, that supports the numerous quality of life improvements for our service men and women, their families, and their retirement communities, and that reflects the budget realities we have today and will face in the future.

The subcommittee focused on the challenges of recruiting and retention during each of our hearings this year. Even the health care hearing really focused on that area of recruitment and retention and the impact of what we do in the area of health care on our future retention and recruiting ability.

This bill will have a positive impact on both recruiting and retention as those who might serve and those who are serving see our commitment to provide the health care benefits promised to those who serve with a full military career.

I am very pleased with this bill. I am proud of this bill. I believe these initiatives will result in improved recruiting and retention within the military services.

The bill supports the administration's request for an active duty end strength of 1,381,600, and reserve strength of 847,436, more than this administration requested.

On military personnel policy, there are a number of recommendations intended to support the recruiting and retention and personnel management of the services. Among the most noteworthy is a provision, that would be effective July 1, 2002, requiring high schools to provide military recruiters the same access to the campus, to student directors, to student lists and information as they provide the colleges, universities, and private sector employers unless its governing body, the school board, decides by a majority vote to deny military recruiters access to the high school.

Currently, there are literally hundreds of high schools that have made decisions—usually on the basis of the superintendent or the principal—to deny access to military recruiters. For those school boards that do not vote to limit access to military recruiters, the proposed modification in the bill retains the original requirement that the services must send a general or flag officer to visit high schools within 120 days of the denial of access to military

recruiters. If the high school continues to deny equal access to military recruiters, the Secretary of Defense will then send a letter to the Governor notifying him of the denial and requesting assistance in obtaining access for military recruiters.

If, after the efforts of the Secretary of Defense and the Governor, the high school continues to deny access to military recruiters, the Secretary of Defense will notify the congressional delegation of the high school that has not complied with the statute we will enact with the passage of this bill. Of course, if the school board votes not to restrict access of military recruiters, the services and the Secretary of Defense will not be required to go through the procedures I just described.

I believe requiring school boards to take that affirmative vote and to do so publicly in the light of their constituencies will really eliminate this problem that has posed such an obstacle to our military recruiters. In our hearings, we heard from frontline military recruiters that the biggest obstacle they have is actually having access to be able to make their case to young people in our schools today.

Another initiative to support recruiting is a pilot program in which the Army could use motor sports to promote recruiting, implement a program of recruiting in conjunction with vocational schools and community colleges, and a pilot program using contract personnel to supplement active recruiters.

Another important recommendation in this mark is the expansion of JROTC programs. We have added \$12 million to expand the JROTC programs. We combine it with the funds in the budget request. This will maximize the services' ability to expand JROTC during fiscal year 2001.

I am proud to be able to support these important programs that teach responsibility, leadership, and ethics and assist the military in recruiting. In fact, it has been one of the most effective tools the military has in recruiting high school students.

Our major recommendations include a 3.7-percent pay raise for military personnel and a revision of the basic allowance for housing to permit the Secretary of Defense to pay 100 percent of the average local housing costs and ensure that housing allowance rates are not reduced while permitting increases that local housing costs dictate.

The bill directs the Secretary of Defense to implement the Thrift Savings Plan for active and reserve forces not later than 180 days after enactment. Making mandatory the provision of the Thrift Savings Plan will be a very positive recruiting and retention tool in assisting the military services in attracting highly qualified personnel and encouraging them to remain until retirement.

This year, the committee focused on improving health care for active, reserve, and retired military personnel and their families. In health care, there

are a number of key recommendations. The foremost of these provisions is the pharmacy benefit for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries to which Senator ALLARD alluded in his remarks. This is the first time Medicare-eligible military retirees have an entitlement to military health care.

In addition, prescription drugs represent the largest unmet need of Medicare-eligible beneficiaries. I will be speaking on the Warner-Hutchinson amendment, when that is offered, regarding health care and what we are doing for our men and women in uniform.

I am very proud of this bill and pleased with what the committee has put together. It will provide the resources the military services need to maximize their readiness and to improve the quality of life for active and retired military personnel and their families.

I express my gratitude to Charlie Abell, committee staff, for the outstanding work he has done in the past and for the service he has again performed to our country and to the committee. I appreciate his work, along with other members of the committee staff. I especially thank my personal staff, Michael Ralsky, for the work he has done not only on behalf of our country and our national security but for the State of Arkansas. This is a good bill worthy of the support of the Senate. I am pleased to be supporting it.

I again thank Chairman WARNER for his leadership in putting this bill together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his thoughtful remarks, most particularly the remarks directed at the staff and other members of the committee. He is a hard-working subcommittee chairman, and he is tackling the problem of recruiting and retention. We will hear further from the Senator as we proceed with this bill.

I ask unanimous consent we proceed briefly to discuss the pending amendment, and then we will proceed to an amendment to be offered by Senator MCCAIN on food stamps, if that is agreeable as procedure. I say to my colleague, we are moving expeditiously, with Senator ROBERT KERREY anxious to come to the floor.

I am not suggesting we will vote on the Warner amendment. We will discuss it, and when Senator MCCAIN comes to the floor, we will take up that amendment. My understanding is he desires less than half an hour. The Senator can indicate the time the other side desires, and then we will proceed to rollcall vote and possibly go to the Kerrey amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. That is fine.

AMENDMENT NO. 3173

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Michigan. He indicated to the Senator from Virginia that the pending

amendment, in our collective judgment, is subject to a budget point of order. I have shared with his senior staff that corrective measures were taken to try to bring that amendment within the strictures of the budget amendment so it would not be subject to a point of order. We will show immediately what we intend to do.

In the meantime, I will discuss the amendment until Senator McCain comes to the floor.

I have introduced this amendment today to change the existing military medical program to encompass in the future retirees over 65. This amendment provides uninterrupted access to both TRICARE and CHAMPUS for military retirees and their families without regard to age.

Let me use the term "retirees." Those following this debate might not fully understand. We are talking about men and women in the Armed Forces who put in the necessary number of years of active service or reserve service or guard service, whatever the case may be, to meet the criteria of the various frameworks of law to qualify them for a retirement for such services as they render. That is the class of individuals being referred to. It does not include persons, such as myself, who have short tours of military duties; it does not apply to me. When we use the term "retirees," it is only for those who, by virtue of their services, met the statutory requirements and are eligible to receive retirement benefits.

Beginning in World War II, promises were made to military members that they and their families would be provided health care if they served a full career. Of course, we certainly included active duty and to some limited extent the reserve and guard for military health care. We are talking about that category of persons I have just described.

Subsequent legislation was enacted which cut off medical benefits for those over age 65, leaving them to depend on the Medicare system, which, in their judgment and in the judgment of others, has proven insufficient, and in other ways it is a breach of promise.

So there are many underlying reasons for the legislation I am proposing and the most important is equity. The reputation of those in the military who gave the promise—not knowing there wasn't any statutory foundation—made promises concerning medical care to induce individuals to provide a minimum, say, 20 years of service in most instances, to enable them to have a career in the U.S. military.

Not meeting the commitment to provide medical care is a breach of promise made on behalf of our Nation. We have to correct it. These individuals devoted a significant portion of their lives, their careers, in service to our country. I recognize with profound sorrow how we broke the promise to these retirees, certainly when we passed legislation in the early 1960s. We rectify it today.

I have examined these issues. There is no statutory foundation providing for entitlement to military health care benefits. It simply does not exist, in my judgment. It is mythical in terms of a foundation law. But good-faith representations were made to these members. Who made the commitment is irrelevant.

I have some personal recollection. I was on active duty for a brief time toward the conclusion of World War II, and then I had a second tour of active duty during the Korean conflict—again, less than 2 years. Nevertheless, I was surrounded by military people. I remember well the inducements given at the conclusion of World War II when so many desired to return to civilian life, requests to stay on active duty; the same thing during the Korean conflict—stay on active duty; continue; give the military the opportunity to show you a career pattern. Part of those representations included the health care package.

Our committee has made a determination—and indeed it is a bipartisan decision—that we would fix the issue of health care for our retirees this year. We started with a series of bills, step by step by step. I have acknowledged my gratitude, and indeed other members of the committee acknowledge their gratitude, for what the military retirees did in bringing to our attention certain inadequacies of steps we had taken. Step by step, we have improved the benefits, in this particular phase of legislation, in this fiscal year. We are going to achieve a very significant improvement to the health care benefit, particularly if that amendment is adopted by the Senate.

The amendment I bring to the floor repeals the restriction barring 65 or older military retirees and their families from continued access to the military health care system. If included, this provision will provide an equal benefit for all military health care system beneficiaries, retirees, reservists, guardsmen, and their families. This puts all beneficiaries in the same class.

It is expensive, but I think it is essential we do this to keep the faith with military retirees. I have had many meetings with both active and retired military on the health care issue. I conducted town hall meetings, discussions with groups who have come to my office, and I have listened to those who have attended the Armed Services Committee hearings regarding their views. They filled the room on a number of occasions. They have come from all areas of the country to talk about this. They are not seeking it solely for themselves. They are seeking to preserve the image of the U.S. military so the young people today who are considering joining at the recruiting stations—going through our ROTC, NROTC, the AROTC, all of these programs—will consider a military career.

When they go back home they hear the oldtimers say: Watch out, they broke a promise to me on health care.

You are thinking about devoting 20 years of your life to this, or more—watch out.

We are going to get rid of the, "Watch out." That is what we are trying to do, get rid of it, because the military retirees are the most cost-effective recruiters that we have in America today. They do not cost us anything. Yet it is those ladies and gentlemen who served this Nation who go out and talk to the youngsters. The youngsters look up to them. The youngsters trust them. They look up to the veterans. They have been there. They have done it. They help tremendously helpful in recruiting. So there are many reasons for making these health care improvements.

The amendment is a quantum leap ahead of the provisions already in committee markup at the desk. While the markup includes the comprehensive drug benefit regardless of age, the amendment goes further and provides uninterrupted access to complete health care services. As a result of these initiatives, all military retirees, irrespective of age, will now enjoy the same health care benefits.

In town hall meetings, as I said, I listened carefully to the health care concerns of the military, particularly those over 65. We have all done that. The constant theme that runs through their requests is that once they have reached the point at which they are eligible for Medicare, they are no longer guaranteed care from the military health care system. This discriminatory characteristic of our current health care system has been in effect since 1964. It reduces retiree medical benefits and requires a significant change in the manner in which health care is obtained at a point in the lives of our older military retirees when stability and confidence and respect and indeed the love of the community is most needed. This is an amendment which in effect repeals the 1964 law.

In order to permit the Department of Defense to plan for restoring the health care benefit to all retirees, my provision would be effective on October 1, 2001. While some may advocate an earlier effective date, it is simply not feasible to expand the medical coverage to the 1.8 million Medicare-eligible retirees overnight.

The amendment eliminates the confusing and ineffective transfer of funds from Medicare to the Department of Defense. Military retirees will not be required to pay the high cost of additional basic or supplemental insurance premiums to ensure their health care needs. Military readiness will not be adversely impacted, and our commitment to those who serve their full career will be fulfilled.

What is apparent to me is that the will of the Congress, reflecting the will of the Nation, is that now is the time to act on this issue. Access to military health care has reached a crisis point. With the reduction in the number of military hospitals and with the growth

in the retiree population, addressing the health care needs of our older retirees has become increasingly difficult. These beneficiaries should be assured that their health care needs will be met.

I am well aware of the legislative alternatives that have been proposed to address military retiree health care needs. I have struggled to examine the most acute needs of these beneficiaries and have struggled to develop a plan that equally benefits all our retirees, not just those fortunate enough to live near a military medical facility, or those fortunate enough to be selected through some sort of lottery to be allowed to participate in the various pilot programs now underway. My goal is to provide health care through a means that is available to all beneficiaries, in an equitable and complete manner.

As I have made it clear throughout the year, improving the military health care has been the Committee's top quality of life initiative this year. We have listened. We have, with bipartisan support, enhanced our earlier legislation to include full pharmacy benefits. The amendment now before the Congress complements those earlier efforts and provides an equitable medical benefit, one that is not based on age. It is time to act.

At the suggestion of my distinguished colleague, to avoid a point of order, I am looking at not changing the fundamental provisions in the amendment but limiting it to two or possibly three fiscal years. That will bring us within the constraints of the budget resolution. That is an important step. I appreciate my colleague bringing this to our attention.

It will have another effect. It will enable the Congress, and initially our committee, to go in, in depth, and study this amendment because it is going to have a very significant impact on the existing infrastructure that is caring for the existing active duty and military retirees under 65. We cannot fully calculate, no matter how hard we look into this, what that impact would be. In my own judgment, it will require the Congress to step forward and provide funds, maybe some legislation, to help the existing infrastructure absorb the over-65 retirees as they return to what was justly promised them when they signed up.

So this amendment has the advantages of laying it out, giving a reasonable period of time for the Department and for the Congress to examine it and determine what we have to give by way of additional support.

Also—I say this with no political motive whatsoever—it should become and will become, in my judgment, an issue in the Presidential campaign. I am quite certain the retirees will say to both candidates: Look here, the Senate of the United States included this provision. It went over to the conference with the House. It survived. It was signed into law by the President. But it

ends. It ends in, say, 2003. I want to hear what the Presidential candidate has to say about this program and whether he will support it, support it in the sense of extending it beyond 2003, support it in the budget requests to provide the additional funds and whatever is necessary to make the infrastructure of our military able to support this program.

That is what we are working on. Momentarily I will ask my amendment be modified. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, it is my intention to speak for about 10 minutes in reference to the National Defense Authorization Act. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER, for his outstanding leadership in the past year. I also thank the distinguished ranking member, Senator LEVIN, for his leadership as well.

This is a good, solid, and positive effort in behalf of our national defense. As a subcommittee chairman, I am particularly proud of the work we were able to accomplish in the subcommittee that we call the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee. I would like to review the key provisions contained in this act that fell under the jurisdiction of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee.

As the chairman has pointed out, as well as the distinguished Senator from Michigan, in the last year, what we call information warfare, and what some call cyberthreats—and the American public is certainly becoming much more aware of that situation—to the United States, including the Department of Defense, have increased very dramatically. The Department of Defense reported that these attacks on Defense Department systems increased from under 6,000 in 1998, only 2 years ago, to over 22,000 in 1999. That figure is doing nothing but dramatically increasing and there is every indication that this trend is going to continue.

From a national economic standpoint in regard to private industry, we are very susceptible and we are very vulnerable. In regard to our national security, we are very vulnerable. I remain concerned that many important, what we call information assurance programs, designed to protect against such cyberattacks, basically remain underfunded by the Department of Defense. For example, at the hearing before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, as of this spring witnesses from the Department once again confirmed that such funding shortfalls remain significant and presented a list of almost \$500 million in unfunded requirements in this area. Obviously that is a considerable amount of money. When you compare it to the ever-increasing threats and vulnerabilities, you can see just how important this is.

For these reasons, we have included \$76.8 million in this bill not only for to-

day's underfunded requirements but also to really try to initiate programs such as training and education. Let me really underscore the word, in regard to education, in something called "cybersecurity," that will continue to provide meaningful solutions far into the future. Senator WARNER's initiative—what I refer to as the Roberts-Warner initiative, and the distinguished chairman refers to it as the Warner-Roberts initiative—he has embarked through his leadership and through his research on a whole series of scholarships in information security to attract our young people, the best and brightest; not to rely on those who come to us from foreign countries with ever-increasing higher immigration quotas. We must bring the next generation on to have this expertise. So these Warner scholarships in regard to information security for the Department of Defense will have far-reaching and, most important, positive effects in this situation.

Second, I want to talk about the terrorist threats to our citizens and our service members. It shows no sign of diminishing. Especially in regard to the weeks that led up to the millennium celebration, numerous individuals who were suspected of planning terrorist attacks directed at U.S. citizens were arrested in the United States and abroad.

This is a threat from state actors and nonstate actors all over the world; and with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the threat of a terrorist attack with a chemical, biological, or nuclear weapon is increasing at an alarming rate.

We asked the experts who came before the Emerging Threats Subcommittee, the experts whose job it is to determine what represents a vital national security risk: What keeps you up at night? What makes you really worry in regard to a vital national security threat?

Their response was largely along two lines of concern: one, in regard to the cyberattacks which we are already experiencing in private industry and the Pentagon experiences every day, and the other one was biological attacks. It is so easy to use, whether it be a state actor or a nonstate actor or anybody connected with organized crime or any individual who wants to cause a great deal of trouble.

We, as a nation, must continue to detect and try to deter such attacks, but if such an attack happens, we must be prepared to deal with the consequences. We call this consequence management. We in Kansas, just to the north of Oklahoma City, full well know what kind of a tragedy can occur in regard to consequence management. Stop and think a minute about a terrorist threat and what could happen in our urban areas or, for that matter, anywhere in the country, and my colleagues can understand the seriousness of this problem.

Our subcommittee will continue to play a leading role in ensuring the Department of Defense is adequately funded and structured to perform its critical role in the overall U.S. Government effort to, again, deter, detect, and combat terrorism. The bill contains an additional \$35 million for these efforts.

This year we continue a comprehensive review, initiated last year, of the activities of the Department of Defense to combat terrorism. Obviously, our goal is to make the Department efforts in this critical area more visible and certainly better organized. In fact, at a subcommittee hearing, leading Department of Defense witnesses testified to, No. 1, what their jurisdiction is; No. 2, what they have been doing; No. 3, what they plan to do and what their budget requirements are; and if, in fact, they could ask us for their priority concerns, what would they be.

Before this hearing, I asked them to sit in the order of their chain of command to figure out who was in charge and is this effort being properly coordinated and shared, and what about communication. They looked at one another. There were four witnesses and nobody knew who was at the top of the chain of command. Hello, we have a big problem in that respect.

We included in the markup a provision to address this. When I say "we," I include the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator BINGAMAN, and the distinguished Senator whose efforts, in part, led to the creation of the subcommittee, Senator LIEBERMAN.

We have also worked to increase the capabilities of the Department of Defense to assist in the event of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil involving the use of a weapon of mass destruction.

This bill also authorizes over \$1 billion, again to support the Russian threat reduction and nonproliferation efforts. During the post-cold-war decade, the U.S. Government has spent—I do not think too many of my colleagues recognize this; I know not too many of our American citizens understand this, but during the post-cold-war decade, the U.S. Government has spent over \$4.7 billion in the former Soviet Union to reduce the threat posed by the possible proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and weapons-usable nuclear materials and scientific expertise. After nearly a decade of working in Russia and the other states of the former Soviet Union, committing ourselves to future efforts, we thought it was important for us to review what these programs have achieved.

Senator LEVIN has spoken eloquently of the need for the continuation of this effort and the intent of the effort. I share his commitment, but I am concerned that for all the good intentions and all the significant investment that has been made, the return of reducing the threat has been too small relative to the \$4.7 billion. We can do better.

For example, the General Accounting Office found that \$481.2 million has

been spent since fiscal year 1993 on a program designed to secure the weapons-usable nuclear material in Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union, but only 7 percent of the total nuclear material identified as being at risk has been secured. I am troubled by this progress achieved in light of this significant investment. We are not going to scrap the program, but we must do better.

In March, the GAO testified that the costs associated with achieving the threat reduction will continue to increase due primarily to the following facts: Russia's inability to pay its share of the costs of these programs, and we are certainly working in that regard with our Russian counterparts; Russia's basic reluctance to provide the United States with needed access to its sensitive facilities. I was in Russia last August attempting to gain greater access. We will continue those efforts.

To help solve those problems, this mark contains several initiatives to obtain greater Russian commitment and necessary access to ensure these programs will have a greater chance of attaining their stated objectives, and if we do that, these programs will attain even further widespread support and they can be a success.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a modest, but extremely important, initiative in this bill with widespread bipartisan interest that will lead to a major joint field experiment in 2002. I do not know of any commitment that will be undertaken in the future by any of our military services that will not be joint.

This experiment will evaluate visions of our military services for future combat forces and ensure they can be brought together effectively for joint military operations to deter and counter the emerging threats to our national security. I am talking about the fact that we lack interoperability. I know the services and the service chiefs say we have this interoperability. With all due respect to the service chiefs and others, we do not have that ability to the degree we need it. That is why we feel we must press ahead with a major joint field experiment if we possibly can. It is absolutely essential.

Finally, my colleagues will find in this recommendation an affirmation of the subcommittee's strong support of the Defense Science and Technology Program. This bill includes an increase—I emphasize, an increase—of \$446 million to science and technology. That is a 9-percent increase over the President's budget request. It is this investment that will provide for future capabilities to deal with emerging threats to our national security.

This is a solid effort; it is a positive effort. It will meet the objective within the constraints of the defense budget for the work assigned to the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee. I urge approval of this legislation.

I join our able chairman in thanking the majority and minority committee staff, my subcommittee staff, and my personal staff for a job well done. I specifically mention Pam Farrell. If one puts charming and tenacious together, it might be considered an oxymoron. It is not the case with Ms. Farrell. Without her leadership and expertise and being just as tenacious as she can be, we would never have increased the science and technology budget by more than 9 percent over the President's budget. She does an amazing job.

I would also like to thank Ed Edens and Joe Sixeas, who is affectionately called Andy, for their work in regard to the counterterrorism efforts we are conducting, more especially with the RAID teams that we now say are CST teams; Chuck Alsup in regard to the joint experimentation initiative; Cord Sterling, who has been in Central America, South America, virtually every country where we have a threat in regard to drugs, working overtime. In regard to cyberattacks, Eric Thoemmes, does an outstanding job. He really has to keep up with that and has done a super job. Then on the cooperative threat reduction programs, Mary Alice Hayward.

All of these folks have done an outstanding job. Their minority counterparts have done likewise. We are only as good as our staff. In this regard, I want to pay personal thanks to the staff.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Before the Senator proceeds, I express my gratitude to our distinguished chairman of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee for a marvelous job. I commend the Senator for giving his staff due recognition for their wonderful work. It is a vital subcommittee. It is on the absolute cutting edge of everything we have to be doing in the Senate.

I thank the Senator and yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 3179

(Purpose: To establish a special subsistence allowance for certain members of the uniformed services who are eligible to receive food stamp assistance)

Mr. MCCAIN. I have amendment No. 3179 at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying aside the pending amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 3179.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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 206, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 610. SPECIAL SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FOOD STAMP ASSISTANCE.

(a) ALLOWANCE.—(1) Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 402 the following new section:

“§ 402a. Special subsistence allowance

“(a) ENTITLEMENT.—(1) Upon the application of an eligible member of a uniformed service described in subsection (b), the Secretary concerned shall pay the member a special subsistence allowance for each month for which the member is eligible to receive food stamp assistance.

“(2) In determining the eligibility of a member to receive food stamp assistance for purposes of this section, the amount of any special subsistence allowance paid the member under this section shall not be taken into account.

“(b) COVERED MEMBERS.—An enlisted member referred to in subsection (a) is an enlisted member in pay grade E-5 or below.

“(c) TERMINATION OF ENTITLEMENT.—The entitlement of a member to receive payment of a special subsistence allowance terminates upon the occurrence of any of the following events:

“(1) Termination of eligibility for food stamp assistance.

“(2) Payment of the special subsistence allowance for 12 consecutive months.

“(3) Promotion of the member to a higher grade.

“(4) Transfer of the member in a permanent change of station.

“(d) REESTABLISHED ENTITLEMENT.—(1) After a termination of a member's entitlement to the special subsistence allowance under subsection (c), the Secretary concerned shall resume payment of the special subsistence allowance to the member if the Secretary determines, upon further application of the member, that the member is eligible to receive food stamps.

“(2) Payments resumed under this subsection shall terminate under subsection (c) upon the occurrence of an event described in that subsection after the resumption of the payments.

“(3) The number of times that payments are resumed under this subsection is unlimited.

“(e) DOCUMENTATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—A member of the uniformed services applying for the special subsistence allowance under this section shall furnish the Secretary concerned with such evidence of the member's eligibility for food stamp assistance as the Secretary may require in connection with the application.

“(f) AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE.—The monthly amount of the special subsistence allowance under this section is \$180.

“(g) RELATIONSHIP TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.—The special subsistence allowance under this section is in addition to the basic allowance for subsistence under section 402 of this title.

“(h) FOOD STAMP ASSISTANCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘food stamp assistance’ means assistance under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

“(i) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No special subsistence allowance may be made under this section for any month beginning after September 30, 2005.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 402 the following:

“402a. Special subsistence allowance.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 402a of title 37, United States Code, shall take effect on the first day of the first month that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than March 1 of each year after 2000, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the number of members of the uniformed services who are eligible for assistance under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(2) In preparing the report, the Comptroller General shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard), the Secretary of Health and Human Services (with respect to the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service), and the Secretary of Commerce (with respect to the commissioned officers of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), who shall provide the Comptroller General with any information that the Comptroller General determines necessary to prepare the report.

(3) No report is required under this subsection after March 1, 2005.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment would provide the funding necessary to end the food stamp military. I come to the floor with this proposal which I introduced in March. Two months ago, I offered an amendment to the congressional budget resolution for fiscal years 2001 through 2005. The Senate adopted an amendment then to secure funding to end the “food stamp military” by a vote of 99-0.

I would expect a similar vote, but I think it is important that we get Members on record to try to rectify what is really a very deplorable and unacceptable situation, and that is, our junior enlisted service personnel, mostly in the pay grades E1 through E5 are on food stamps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles in the Washington Post, and several other newspapers—the Memphis Commercial Appeal, the London Sunday Telegraph—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1999]

FEELING THE PINCH OF A MILITARY SALARY; FOR SOME FAMILIES, PAY DOESN'T COVER THE BASICS

(By Steve Vogel)

On a muggy Saturday at Quantico Marine Corps Base, about two dozen Marines and family members quietly poked through piles of discarded furniture, clothing and household goods in what has become a weekly ritual at the big Northern Virginia installation.

Those who defend the nation were trying to make ends meet.

At 8 a.m., the patch of lawn was covered with beds, tables, dressers and desks. Within 45 minutes, almost all the furniture was gone. The price was right—everything was free.

The items had been gathered by volunteers who go “trashing” every Tuesday, scouring garbage left at curbs on the base. Every Sat-

urday, they give away what they collect to needy, eager Marine families.

Their efforts reflect a cold reality for thousands of low-ranking men and women in uniform assigned to high-priced Washington and elsewhere: Military salaries, never substantial, often fall far short of what they need.

“We’re talking about the basics of life here, and they don’t have it,” said Lisa Joles, a Marine wife who created the volunteer network two years ago. “Sometimes, they don’t have a thing. I didn’t know how large the problem was until I got to Quantico.”

Of the 40,000 enlisted soldiers, Marines, sailors and airmen based in the area, many feel compelled to work part-time or even full-time civilian jobs to supplement what their country pays them, according to military families and officials. Hundreds more, especially low-ranking troops with families, rely on food stamps or other forms of federal assistance. Many depend on the charity of their fellow troops.

“How can we send members of the military to Kosovo and expect them to do their job if they’re concerned about the family being able to afford new school shoes?” said Sydney Hickey, a spokesman for the National Military Family Association in Alexandria.

Since 1982, military salaries have fallen nearly 14 percent behind civilian pay, according to federal figures. Congress has tentatively approved a 4.8 percent pay raise to take effect Jan. 1; many service members will receive a second raise six months later.

But the raises still will leave a military-civilian gap of more than 11 percent, according to studies. The situation is particularly hard for families—and 53 percent of the enlisted force nationally is married.

“A single Marine, with due diligence, can get by,” said Thomas Loughlin, who heads the Marine Corps Community Services at Quantico. “The real problem is people with families. It’s a sad indictment of society that somebody who’s willing to give his life for his country gets paid close to minimum wage.”

Pentagon officials acknowledge that some service members face severe hardships, not only in the Washington area but also in other parts of the country. But they insist that such cases do not reflect conditions for the vast majority of troops, and they point to statistics showing that junior enlisted service members earn more than the general population of high school-educated 18- to 23-year-olds.

At the same time, the officials said that improving pay is critical to Pentagon efforts to solve problems in retaining people in the armed forces. “A lot of our troops are waiting to see what happens with the pay package,” said Rudy de Leon, undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness.

Military pay varies considerably by rank, length of service and other factors. A single Marine private first class, for example, would earn base pay of \$1,075 a month, plus a subsistence allowance of \$225 a month for food. Those living off base also receive a housing allowance that varies by jurisdiction and would be \$612 for someone living near Quantico.

In addition, members of the armed forces receive some benefits, such as medical care, at a fraction of the cost for most civilians. Commissaries offer items that are 30 percent cheaper than at civilian stores, according to Pentagon figures. Service members also do not pay federal taxes on their food and housing allowances.

A recent Pentagon study found that, overall, only 450 of the 1.4 million members of the armed forces were living at or below the national poverty level, which is \$413,332 for a family of three.

But advocates for military families said that the statistics and benefits do not reflect how difficult it is for many men and women to both serve their country and live comfortably in peacetime.

"We believe there are an awful lot of families who are living at the wire, and frequently fall over it," Hickey said.

Several evenings each week, as soon as he finishes duty at Quantico, Lance Cpl. Harry Schein darts off base, picks up his 14-month-old son from day care and drops him off with the boy's mother.

Then he drives up I-95 to Arlington and joins a group of Marines who moonlight by moving office furniture until about 11 p.m. On Saturdays and Sundays, he works from 4 p.m. until midnight as a security guard in Alexandria.

"Most of the Marines I know are living check to check and barely making it by and have to get some kind of supplement," said Schein, whose pretax paycheck is \$2,168 a month, including housing and food allowances. That, he said, does not cover his \$595-a-month apartment in Dale City; gas; car insurance; and day care, clothes and food for his son, Devantre.

On top of his part-time work, Schein has had to turn to the government's Women, Infants and Children nutrition program, which provides federal vouchers so he can buy formula, juice and baby cereal. The Navy-Marine Corps Relief Society also gave him several hundred dollars in commissary vouchers to buy food.

"All the pride in the world, all the awe people have when they see a Marine, all that isn't going to pay the bills," said Schein, 22.

The Queens, N.Y., native said that he joined the Marines to make his parents proud but that he is likely to leave when his enlistment runs out next year. "As much as I love being a Marine, monetarily, I can't," he said.

Military installations do not generally track how many troops receive public assistance. But many officials who work with low-income service members in the Washington area said that the problem is significant and has grown worse in recent years.

Many soldiers "can only afford food, clothing and shelter and getting to work," said Brenda Robbins, an Army Community Services worker at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. "Saving is almost obsolete."

A recent survey of 165 soldiers at Walter Reed found that 41 percent were using some form of public or private charity, according to Bill Swisher, a spokesman.

Commissaries at Fort Belvoir, Fort Meade, Fort Myer, Andrews Air Force Base, Quantico and Patuxent River Naval Air Station collected more than \$800,000 worth of food stamps and WIC vouchers last year, according to the Defense Commissary Agency.

More than \$21 million worth of WIC vouchers were redeemed at military commissaries last year, according to Pentagon figures. Nearly 12,000 service members—less than 1 percent of the force—received food stamps in 1995, the last year a study was conducted.

"I think it stinks, really, that a member of the armed forces has to go to food stamps," said Lance Cpl. Damon Durre, 25. But that's what the Quantico Marine did after finding he could not support his wife and two children on his take-home pay.

Service members in this area do not receive cost-of-living adjustments in their pay, unlike those in New York, San Francisco and Boston. Washington does not qualify as a high-cost area under a formula used by the military.

Housing allowances are adjusted according to jurisdiction, but many service members say it is not enough to cope with area rents, and many end up living 40 or 50 miles from their duty stations.

"The cost of living will eat you alive," said Sgt. Edna Jackson-Jones, a Marine at Quantico who tried to find affordable housing near the base but instead lives with her three children in an apartment in Frederickburg. "I had to go further south because it's cheaper down there."

Quantico offers classes in budgeting and buying cars and directs needy Marines to emergency aid, but officials say it is difficult to assist all those facing difficulties.

"We have a lot of problems reaching out to them, because many times, they don't want you to know they have a problem," said Maj. Kim Hunter, deputy director of Marine Community Services. "It's not their nature."

One result is that members of the military routinely work second jobs, often without permission from superiors, military officials acknowledged. Enlisted men and women sell goods at Potomac Mills, flip hamburgers at fast-food restaurants, do construction work, deliver packages for UPS.

"Seems like everybody who's been here a while has a part-time job," said Marine Lance Cpl. Robert Hayes, who has a second job as a mover. "You really don't have enough money to make it to the next paycheck otherwise."

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, TN, Mar. 5, 2000]

ON HOME FRONT, MILITARY FAMILIES STRUGGLE WITH LOW PAY

(By Kim Cobb, Houston Chronicle)

Quotesha Austin is tired of being poor. It is not what she expected as an Army wife.

Her husband, Pfc. Gary Austin, spends his days training at sprawling Fort Hood, where he drives a lumbering, tank-like vehicle called a Bradley. He is paid \$1,171 a month before taxes, a couple hundred dollars in subsistence pay and a housing subsidy that does not cover the rent for his family.

"That spells broke," Quotesha Austin says dryly. They can't afford a car, and she can't find a job that pays enough to cover day care for her two children.

In November, she began collecting food stamps, and the Austins joined the list of an estimated 12,000 military families who do the same.

More than \$13 million in food stamps was redeemed last year in military commissaries. There is no way to measure how many were redeemed by military families in civilian supermarkets.

Although food stamp recipients are less than 1 percent of the nation's 1.4 million service members, the issue has embarrassed some officials who claim to be supporters of the military and has erupted as an emotional campaign topic for GOP presidential hopefuls George W. Bush and John McCain.

They argue it is an outrage that men and women who put their lives on the line for their country must seek help to feed their families.

For its part, the Defense Department has studied the food stamp issue and dismissed it as too costly to fix in light of the relatively small number of military families eligible for food stamps.

But the military has another problem—how to recruit and retain good people when jobs are plentiful and the economy is strong. The Senate Armed Services Committee met recently to discuss the subject.

Many advocates for better military pay point to a 13 percent gap between overall military pay and that for comparable civilian jobs. The defense-oriented Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments believes the gap is exaggerated but concludes that increasing pay and benefits to some degree is a reasonable response to recruitment problems.

The Defense Department has ordered another study on its food stamp families, the third since 1991. Defense spokesman Susan Hansen said incremental pay raises scheduled through 2005 and a proposed major boost in the housing allowance should help alleviate cost-of-living problems for everyone.

"But I think we've seen in the past that the food stamp issue is more a function of larger families for junior personnel than other demographic groups," Hansen said.

Food stamp recipient Shauntrel Linton says her husband joined the Army specifically because she was pregnant with their first child. Her father was in the military, and they assumed joining the Army would cover their young family's costs. "I think I thought he'd be making the same amount as my dad," she said.

The military doesn't want to encourage people who are young and at low levels in the military to have many children, said Steven Kosiak of the defense-oriented Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Although raising all military salaries costs more than just taking care of the food-stamp population, targeting special financial consideration to potential food-stamp recipients creates the problem of different pay for the same work. "But having said that, nobody wants to think there are military people who are so underpaid they are resorting to food stamps," Kosiak said. "This is not an unsolvable problem, but it is complicated."

The last Defense Department study, conducted in 1995, found that 59 percent of military food stamp recipients were living on the base. Most of that group would not be eligible for food stamps, the study speculated, if the agencies that administer them were able to fully measure "hidden compensation," like on-post housing.

Those conducting the study found that an additional 41 percent of recipients were collecting food stamps even though they lived off base and their housing allowances were calculated as part of their gross pay. The study determined that of 4,900 food stamp families living off base, only 1,100 should qualify for food stamps, based on income and family size.

At the lowest end of the scale, an enlisted man or woman at the pay grade of E-1 earns \$1,005.49 per month in base pay. The largest percentage of servicemen and women drawing food stamps are at the slightly higher E-4 pay grade, which starts at \$1,242.90 per month for those with less than two years of service.

The military got a 4.8 percent raise in January for every person in uniform. Seventy-five percent of all service members will receive another pay increase in July, although it's targeted to midgrade and noncommissioned officers.

[From the London Sunday Telegraph, Oct. 31, 1999]

U.S. SOLDIERS RELY ON CHARITY TO SUPPORT FAMILIES

(By David Wastell)

Thousands of American soldiers serving in the world's most powerful armed forces are so poorly paid that they are having to depend on charity to provide their families with basic household necessities.

The spectacle of America's defenders standing in line at social service offices, or raking through discarded furniture to find beds for themselves and toys for their children, has horrified the nation and is emerging as a potent issue in the forthcoming presidential election.

Although military authorities insist that the problem is small, and only affecting young men with unusually large families, soldiers' wives and welfare organisations say

that many more service personnel are struggling to make ends meet—but are too proud to seek the help which they need.

Tony Bradshaw, a 19-year-old lance-corporal at Quantico, a US Marine base 30 miles south of Washington, who has been receiving food stamps—vouchers that can be exchanged for goods at shops—for the past two months, said: "It's very hard to realise and admit it. I have to do whatever I can to provide for my family. But I did not expect it to be like this when I joined up."

A family of three—with one child and the wife not working—would qualify for food stamps if their pre-tax income is less than \$873 (£528) per month. A two-child family would qualify on income less than \$1,176 (£705) per month, rising to \$2086 (pounds 1252) for a family with five children.

Food stamps worth \$142 a month have helped eke out the \$1,000 monthly pay cheque on which L/Cpl Bradshaw, his wife Tenille and their two young children must live in a small, tin house in the middle of the base. Mrs. Bradshaw said: "Without food stamps my children would not be having much of a Christmas."

But the system can be humiliating. Despite having no other means of paying, L/Cpl Bradshaw was not allowed to buy a loaf of bread at the base's military supermarket recently because although he had his food stamps, he did not have with him an official card stating he was entitled to them. A long line of other shoppers, many of them fellow marines, saw him being refused.

Denis McFeely, food stamps programme manager at the nearest social services office to the base, said: "The coupons identify an individual in a check-out queue as being on a low income. Other people look to see what is being bought with their tax dollars. The programme has a stigma attached to it."

That is one reason why the true number of US servicemen and their families entitled to receive food stamps is almost certainly far higher than the 12,000 who actually do so.

The problem for young recruits to the American forces is that many in the junior enlisted ranks earn only just over \$1,000 a month before tax. Even after allowing for free—if rudimentary—housing and other benefits, a package that may be adequate for single soldiers puts those with even small families well below the official American poverty line.

Military pay has fallen behind the rest of the American economy as a result of budget squeezes over the last decade, and a recent vote by Congress to grant a 4.8 per cent increase from January still leaves a wide gap. Senator John McCain, who is trying to beat George W. Bush for the republican presidential nomination, is repeatedly raising the subject in his election campaign.

He said: "These enlisted service members proudly wear their uniforms on our behalf, ready to make the ultimate sacrifice. They are the very same Americans sent into harm's way in recent years in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, Kosovo and now East Timor. They have a right to a decent salary."

It is a sentiment shared by many at Quantico, where 7,200 marines, many of them officers in training, live and work inside the sprawling, 10 square-mile base with a small civilian town at its centre. Although the base boasts a marina and a leafy golf course, frequented by the marines' upper echelons, living conditions for lower ranks are more down-to-earth.

In one case a young soldier, his wife and their baby lived without furniture in their newly-allotted house for three weeks before contacting a voluntary group in desperation.

Tobias Miller, 18, who arrived at the base in March from Missouri with her husband Mike, a lance-corporal, shortly after he com-

pleted his basic training, said: "We slept on the floor for three weeks before I got up the guts to call someone." Almost all the furniture in their two-bedroom home was subsequently given to them by an organization called Help—Help Enlisted Lives Prosper.

Mrs. Miller and her husband also reluctantly decided to apply for food stamps. But after three separate visits to a social services office outside the base, during the last of which they were forced to wait for three hours, they gave up because they could not endure the humiliation.

Mrs. Miller said: "My mother was on food stamps and I never wanted to be on them myself. This isn't what my husband's recruiter led us to expect." Lisa Joles, 35, the energetic founder of Help and the wife of a local marine, has become an unofficial welfare officer for many of the young families who arrive on the base, often to set up home for the first time.

She encourages them to apply for food stamps and other welfare benefits. She has also worked hard to publicise the problem, something which has not endeared her to the marines' authorities. They have their own support system which Mrs. Joles insists she is trying to complement. They point out that any problems are not unique to Quantico.

Most weekends Mrs. Joles and her husband, Baron, an infantryman, distribute large quantities of furniture, clothing and other household goods which have been donated either by better-off marines or by sympathisers.

Families like the Bradshaws and the Millers have equipped most of their homes that way. Last week L/Cpl Eric Clay and his family—wife Alisha and children Kelsey, aged three and one-year-old Emily—were praising Mrs. Joles as they sifted through the mound of material she had gathered in a shed behind her house.

Mrs. Joles also organises small squads of wives to do temporary work for local employers, helping boost their families' income. But she is no soft touch: if the women do not learn how to manage the extra money they earn she will not ask them back. She said: "I don't want them coming back two weeks later saying they don't have enough money to buy diapers."

"I am teaching them to take care of their young man—that he belongs to the country—and if the country needs him, he will go. If his family is in chaos the marines are not getting 100 per cent from him."

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, these are stories concerning the lifestyles of the service men and women in the military. One in the Washington Post article of July 20 concerns Quantico Marine Corps Base in Virginia. One of the enlisted marines says:

I think it stinks, really, that a member of the armed forces has to go to food stamps," said Lance Cpl. Damon Durre, 25. But that is what the Quantico Marine did after finding he could not support his wife and two children on his take-home pay.

In the London Sunday Telegraph there is a story:

Food stamps worth \$142 a month have helped eke out the \$1,000 monthly pay check on which L/Cpl Bradshaw, his wife Tenille and their two young children must live in a small, tin house in the middle of the base. Mrs. Bradshaw said: "Without food stamps my children would not be having much of a Christmas."

But the system can be humiliating. Despite having no other means of paying, L/Cpl Bradshaw was not allowed to buy a loaf of bread at the base's military supermarket re-

cently because although he had his food stamps, he did not have with him an official card stating he was entitled to them.

These are just demonstrations of a situation that exists in our Armed Forces today; that is, that approximately 6,300 service members receive food stamps. That is an unofficial DOD report, while the General Accounting Office and Congressional Research Service place the number at nearly 13,500. There is some disparity with the numbers, but the fact is that there are still thousands on food stamps. Obviously, I believe this is a national disgrace and it needs to be repaired.

The amendment will cost approximately \$28 million over 5 years. That is an average of less than \$6 million per year, to pay for an additional allowance of \$180 a month to military families who are eligible for food stamps. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this amendment would save millions of dollars in the Food Stamp Program by removing service members from the food stamp rolls for good.

As we know, in recent years military pay increases have barely kept pace with inflation. But last year there was a significant increase, including a pay raise for admirals and generals, who received a 17-percent pay raise last year. And enlisted families continue to line up for free food and furniture.

I was pleased to hear the prospective Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vern Clark, support a food stamp stipend when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 16. Admiral Clark was asked by Chairman WARNER if he was concerned that a food stamp stipend would create an inequity between service members who qualify for food stamps and those who do not. Admiral Clark stated:

My view is that it is far, far more important to not have our people on food stamps than it is to have a small inequity. . . . This is the kind of thing that speaks volumes, much more than a few dollars that are involved in it, about . . . how important we think they are. I support any measure that would put us in a position where we do not ever have to have a single Sailor on food stamps.

I commend Admiral Clark for his clear thinking and his support of a measure that will reflect whether or not we care fundamentally for our service members. Admiral Clark is right. We need to rectify this problem. There is no provision in the bill at this time concerning the food stamp issue.

I might point out, this amendment is supported by The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Association for Uniformed Services, the Disabled American Veterans, The Retired Officer's Association, and every enlisted association or organization that specifically supports enlisted service member issues in the Military Coalition and in the National Military/Veterans Alliance. These associations include the Non Commissioned Officers

Association, The Retired Enlisted Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, and the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association.

During the budget resolution, I talked for a long time about this problem in the military. We are talking about, I believe, a \$290-some billion authorization. We are talking about now an additional \$6 million a year to handle a problem which has received enormous publicity, enormous visibility. In the view of officers and enlisted alike, it is a problem that has caused a great impact on the morale of the men and women in the military, whether they happen to be on food stamps or not.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I thank my colleague, Senator WARNER, the chairman of the committee, for allowing me to offer this amendment at this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague. This is an initiative on which he has worked for some time.

I wish to ask him a question or two. I intend to support it. I think we need a little clarification on one or two points.

I commend him for bringing this up. I commend him for his determination to address this issue, and not only this year but in past years.

It was passed by our committee, this basic language, in last year's bill; am I not correct?

Mr. MCCAIN. That is basically correct.

Mr. WARNER. Fine.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to engage in a brief colloquy with the chairman.

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

Mr. WARNER. This question of pay inversion, let me just sort of describe it. You have a sergeant who has served 5 or 6 years. He has a wife and two children. And then a private comes into his platoon, and he has a number of children, which enables him to qualify for food stamps.

Now we add a certain sum of money, which the Senator proposes, and the salary of the private is coming right up very close to the salary of the sergeant. Now, the Senator knows from his long experience in the military—and my experience is far more modest than our distinguished colleague from Arizona, but having served in the Department of Defense, I have watched for many years this question of pay because pay has a tremendous significance not only to the military person who wears the uniform, but to the wife and family. It is a matter of pride. It is recognition for his length of service, for his professionalism, which by virtue of that length of service is greater than the younger people coming on. How do

we address that? What guidance do we give, say, the officer corps and senior noncoms who have to deal with this issue, on the assumption that Congress passes it?

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague. I am sure the Senator from Virginia is aware, as he points out, that this is a problem, although the reason why we chose \$180 a month was so that while it would not completely close the gap, which is higher than that between the two ranks he just stated, far more important than that—I can only quote the prospective Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vern Clark, when asked by Chairman WARNER this past May 16, a few weeks ago, about this exact issue he raises. The response of the prospective Chief of Naval Operations was:

My view is that it is far, far more important to not have our people on food stamps than it is to have a small inequity. . . . This is the kind of thing that speaks volumes, much more than a few dollars that are involved in it, about . . . how important we think they are. I support any measure that would put us in a position where we do not ever have to have a single Sailor on food stamps.

Also, as I mentioned in my remarks earlier, every enlisted association: the Noncommissioned Officers Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, et cetera, who are also aware of this situation, still because of the gravity of the problems, support this \$180-a-month increase for those who are on food stamps.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. Indeed, we will have to call upon those organizations to help explain this because it is going to pose some problems. But like others, we have to deal with it.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I may respond briefly to my friend, Senator WARNER was involved in this many years ago when we had enormous retention problems in the military, especially in what we call critical rates—those who had specialized skills and talents. The chairman was involved in this because we decided we would give higher pay to people who were of the same time or even less time in the military because they had special skills. And they are today, and were then, receiving higher pay because of the special skills and the need to retain those people with special skills.

I have always felt that the backbone of the Navy was the bosun's mate. Yet we find in the Navy that the bosun's mate is the lowest paid, while the electronic technician, the computer specialist, and others, who are of equal rank—or rate, to be accurate—receive a much higher salary. We did that for practical reasons, which was that it was an absolute criticality of maintaining people in the Navy and other branches of the military who had these critical skills. We are sort of doing the same thing here. We are trying to correct the morale problem that exists

when the word spreads throughout the military and in our recruiting efforts in high schools all over America that if you are going to join an organization, i.e., the U.S. military, and you have children, you may still be on food stamps. I think there is some comparability between those two situations, although not an absolute one. I hope the chairman takes my point here.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I do. Of course, that is strictly a question of professionalism in the aviation community to which the Senator has given a lifetime of service. It is critical that they get higher pay, not only for flight but for retention purposes, than other officer segments. I have to chuckle. In what little military experience I have, I was an electrician's mate third class. I am not sure I could have qualified for a bosun's mate.

Mr. MCCAIN. Today, you could have a lieutenant who is an aviator making more money than a nonaviator officer, an E1 or E2 ranked senior to that person because of the criticality of keeping those people in the Navy.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is right, the electronic technician people, and so forth.

The second question is—and it is interesting—you were quoting from the future Chief of Naval Operations—indeed, an outstanding professional. He says he would rather not have people on food stamps. Isn't that what he said?

Mr. MCCAIN. He said:

My view is that it is far, far more important to not have our people on food stamps than it is to have a small inequity. . . .

The Commandant of the Marine Corps and the current Chief of Naval Operations also share those views.

Mr. WARNER. It is important as part of this colloquy that we lay the foundation that the Senator was very careful in arriving at his pay levels—not to bump sergeant, or jump over it, which I think was wise. In doing so, would I not be correct in saying you will not eliminate all food stamp cases? In all probability, the efforts, if adopted and signed into law, will still leave some on food stamps. Would I be correct?

Mr. MCCAIN. It is not clear because we have gotten two or three different estimates, I say to the Senator from Virginia. Several experts say this will largely eliminate the problem. There are others who say there will still be a few remaining, but all agree this would eliminate the overwhelming majority of service members on food stamps.

Mr. WARNER. It is going to have my support. Mr. President, those are the questions I had in mind. I thank the Senator for the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I commend my good friend from Arizona for his tremendous sensitivity to the issue that he raises. We still have service members who are receiving food stamps and that should not be the case.

If there is good news here—and there is—it is that, since 1991, the number of service members on food stamps has been dramatically reduced, as well as the percentage in the total force has gone down dramatically since 1991. In 1991, there were 19,400 service members receiving food stamps. That number went to 11,900 in 1995, and then in 1999 it went to 6,300. That number—which is the latest we have—does not include the fiscal year 1999 or a later pay raise. So we have at least some good news in this area, which is that the number of service personnel on food stamps has been reduced by about two-thirds since 1991.

As a percentage of our total force, the percentage has been cut roughly in half, from .9 percent in 1991 to .45 percent in 1999. So there has been significant improvement. Senator MCCAIN is absolutely right. We still have 6,300 service members on food stamps. We should not be in that situation. He is pointing out to this body again that we should try to do something about it. The informal estimate we get is that his amendment will help. It will not eliminate the number of people who we have on food stamps, but it will reduce by somewhat that number of 6,300. I am going to support it on that basis.

Again, I commend the Senator from Arizona for his constant raising of this issue until we can try to finally resolve this problem.

There is one little wrinkle in here which is sort of an irony, I guess. Maybe that is the best it is. For instance, if you take a typical E4 with three dependents who lives on base in Government housing, he will get the food stamps because he doesn't have a housing allowance. The person under this proposal who might be a similar E4 with the same number of dependents gets a housing allowance if he lives off base, and it is that housing allowance which pushes him above the eligibility level for food stamps. Yet, because that housing allowance may be inadequate to pay for housing, he may actually be in greater need for the food stamps than the person who is on base. However, that is something we will just have to try to work with. We have to try to make this work the best we possibly can to reduce the number of further service members who are receiving food stamps.

Again, I thank Senator MCCAIN for his constancy, his commitment, his dedication, and his passion to this issue. He is right, as he so often is in terms of what this goal must be, which is to remove members in the services from receiving food stamps. They should not need food stamps. We ought to be able to pay them enough and give them enough of a housing allowance so there is no need for them to receive food stamps.

I commend him. I will be supporting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and the ranking member

for their support of this amendment. I think the remarks of both pointing out that this is not a perfect fix but is a significant step in the right direction is entirely appropriate. Obviously, we will have to review the situation after we see what the result of this amendment is once it is enacted into law.

I thank both Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, momentarily I believe the Senator from Arizona will ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator.

I want to work with Senator LEVIN to see if we can order the sequencing of amendments this afternoon to accommodate the Senate. We will have the McCain vote. We will decide on that time in a few minutes. I have talked to our distinguished colleague from Nebraska, Mr. KERREY. He has a very important amendment. He just indicated to this manager that he is willing to bring it up and have a vote on it tonight. Is that correct?

Mr. KERREY. That is correct, unless the chairman is going to accept the amendment.

Mr. WARNER. I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. KERREY. Perhaps we can avoid the vote after he hears my argument. I am prepared to send an amendment to the desk and schedule a vote on it this evening. That is fine. I am ready to go as soon as we vote on the McCain amendment.

Mr. WARNER. I ask my colleague if he has any comment to make.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Mr. President, the managers will address the question of how we proceed from here at the conclusion of the vote on the McCain amendment. Let us proceed. I would suggest the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Let's proceed with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the McCain amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the

Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McCain
Akaka	Frist	McConnell
Allard	Gorton	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Graham	Moynihan
Baucus	Gramm	Murkowski
Bayh	Grams	Murray
Bennett	Grassley	Nickles
Bingaman	Gregg	Reed
Bond	Hagel	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Robb
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bryan	Helms	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hollings	Roth
Burns	Hutchinson	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Campbell	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Sessions
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Leahy	Thompson
Dorgan	Levin	Thurmond
Durbin	Lieberman	Torricelli
Edwards	Lincoln	Voinovich
Enzi	Lott	Warner
Feingold	Lugar	Wellstone
Feinstein	Mack	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Biden	Dodd	Lautenberg
Breaux	Domenici	
Crapo	Landrieu	

The amendment (No. 3179) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3173, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I modify the pending amendment, the Warner amendment No. 3173. I send to the desk the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Strike sections 701 through 704 and insert the following:

SEC. 701. CONDITIONS FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPUS UPON THE ATTAINMENT OF 65 YEARS OF AGE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF MEDICARE ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—Section 1086(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The prohibition contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to a person referred to in subsection (c) who—

“(A) is enrolled in the supplementary medical insurance program under part B of such title (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.); and

“(B) in the case of a person under 65 years of age, is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 226(b)(2) of such Act (42

U.S.C. 426(b)(2)) or section 226A(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 426-1(a))."; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "paragraph (1) who satisfy only the criteria specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2), but not subparagraph (C) of such paragraph," and inserting "subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) who do not satisfy the condition specified in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph";

(b) EXTENSION OF TRICARE SENIOR PRIME DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Paragraph (4) of section 1896(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ggg(b)) is amended by striking "3-year period beginning on January 1, 1998" and inserting "period beginning on January 1, 1998, and ending on December 31, 2001";

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2001 and terminates September 30, 2004.

(2) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I believe my distinguished colleague from Michigan has a request, and then I will present a UC request to the Senate.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington be recognized for 8 minutes as in morning business.

Mr. WARNER. Could I put in a UC request before that?

Would the Senator forbear and allow me to put in a UC request?

Mr. President, in consultation with the majority leader, the Democratic leader, and my colleague, Senator LEVIN—while I had hoped we could continue with votes tonight—we have now reached the following recommendation in the form of a UC request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia be recognized to modify his amendment, and following the modification of the amendment, the amendment be laid aside and Senator ROBERT KERREY be recognized to offer an amendment relative to strategic forces, and immediately following the reporting by the clerk, the Senator from Virginia be recognized to offer a second-degree amendment.

I further ask consent that following the debate tonight, there be 90 minutes additional beginning at 9:30 a.m. on the strategic forces issue, to be equally divided in the usual form, and following that debate, the amendments be laid aside.

I also ask consent that following that debate, the Senate resume the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, amendment No. 3173, and it be laid aside in order for Senator JOHNSON to offer a similar amendment, and there be 2 hours, equally divided, total, for debate on both amendments, and following that debate, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments.

I also ask consent that there be no amendments in order to either of the four amendments described above, or the language proposed to be stricken, and there be 2 minutes for explanation prior to each vote. The voting order for tomorrow would be as follows: Warner amendment No. 3173; Johnson amendment; Warner second degree to Kerrey;

Kerrey first degree, as amended, if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, I just want to be clear that the Senator from Washington would be recognized prior to Senator KERREY, and that that time would not come out of any time indicated.

Mr. WARNER. I have no objection to that.

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

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair and thank my colleagues for working out this UC.

If I could just make an announcement, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes tonight. However, Members should be aware that at least two, and up to four, back-to-back votes will occur sometime tomorrow commencing at around 12:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair and thank my colleagues for yielding me this time.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BELLINGHAM PIPELINE ACCIDENT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a solemn occasion in the lives of the people of my home State of Washington.

Many of my colleagues have heard me talk on the Senate floor about pipeline safety.

Today I want to remind everyone of the reason I have become such a strong advocate for improving pipeline safety.

June 10—one year ago, coming up this Saturday—will be the first anniversary of a horrible pipeline accident in Bellingham, WA.

In that accident, a gasoline pipeline ruptured and released more than 275,000 gallons of gasoline into Whatcom Creek. That gasoline caught fire and sent a fireball racing 1½ miles down the creek side. It created a plume of black smoke that rose more than 20,000 feet into the air.

Two 10-year-old boys and a young man were enjoying the outdoors on that quiet summer afternoon. Tragically, they died as a result of that pipeline rupture.

Three families in Bellingham, WA, will never be the same because of the events that took place on June 10, 1999.

As we mark this anniversary, we can never forget the lives that were lost.

For just a moment I want to ask my colleagues and the American people to pay tribute to those young lives; Wade King, Stephen Tsiorvas, and Liam Wood. I also want to honor their parents—who have endured a loss that no family should have to experience.

They have shown such strength and courage. They have led the charge for safer pipelines, and their advocacy has made a difference.

Their courage was clear to everyone who attended the Senate Commerce

Committee field hearing in Bellingham on March 13 and to everyone who heard them testify just last month here in Washington, DC, before the Commerce Committee.

They came to Washington, DC, to ask for one thing. They want this Congress to improve pipeline standards this year. This Congress—this year.

I believe we have a moral obligation to do everything we can to meet the parents' wishes and to protect everyone else from pipeline hazards. That is why I have been working to raise the safety standards for oil and gas pipelines.

There are 2.2 million miles of pipelines running across the country. They run near our schools, our homes, and our communities.

They perform a vital service. They bring us the energy we need to fuel our cars and heat our homes.

But at the same time, they are not as safe as they could be. We have a responsibility to pass a bill this year that will protect families from the dangers of unsafe pipelines.

To be honest, I—like many Americans—was not aware of those dangers until the accident in my State.

But as I spent months learning about pipelines, I found that the accident in my State was not a rare event.

Since 1986, there have been more than 5,700 pipeline accidents in this country, 325 deaths, 1,500 injuries, and almost \$1 billion in environmental damage.

On average there is one pipeline accident every day in this country, and 6 million hazardous gallons are spilled into our environment every year.

That is why back in January I introduced my own pipeline safety bill—the Pipeline Safety Act of 2000. I want to thank the Members who have signed on as cosponsors—Senators INOUE, GORTON, WYDEN, LAUTENBERG, and BAYH.

I want my colleagues to know, in the 4 months since I introduced my pipeline safety bill, at least 20 States have experienced pipeline accidents. In addition to my bill, pipeline safety measures have been offered by Senate Commerce Committee Chairman JOHN MCCAIN and by the administration.

I am pleased that all of the current proposals touch on five key areas of pipeline safety. First, all of these bills recognize the need to improve pipeline inspection and accident prevention practices, second, they recognize the need to develop and invest in new safety and inspection technology, third—and importantly—they expand the Public's right to know about problems with pipelines in their neighborhoods, fourth, they recognize that States can be better partners in improving pipeline safety. Finally, these bills increase funding for new State and Federal pipeline safety programs.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for the strong personal interest he has taken in this issue. I thank him for the very effective way he has worked to move this legislation forward. The Senate