

luncheons. We expect to have additional items to present to the Senate upon our return.

I again call attention of Members to the report of the Parliamentarian on those amendments that are subject to rule XVI. It will be my intention when we return to ask that the Chair rule that rule XVI applies to those amendments, and that they be declared out of order.

RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I ask that we stand in recess.

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3308

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I believe the pending business is the Boxer amendment, with 4 minutes equally divided

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes equally divided.

Mr. STEVENS. Senator BOXER.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the chairman for his graciousness. I urge my colleagues to vote affirmatively on this. I hope we can get a very overwhelming vote.

My amendment simply protects children at the Department of Defense housing or playgrounds, day-care facilities, schools, from poisonous and toxic materials. It is consistent with the DOD guidelines. Frankly, it seems to me we should all support it. Basically, the guidelines say they will stay away from these poisons when they do routine spraying.

We ought to codify this because there is a little bit of ambiguity. I am very proud of the Department of Defense in so many areas that deal with children. For example, child care centers at the Department of Defense are the best in the world, truly, and certainly are a model for so many other child care centers in our country. However, it did take some horrible mistakes before that was straightened out. We don't want to have a horrible mistake, a mistaken spraying. We want to make sure it is done right.

I am very pleased that the EPA is supporting this amendment. They helped with it. We spoke a number of times with Colonel Driggers who said he believed this was, in fact, consistent with the DOD written guidelines. It could be that they would rather not have us do this. I think it would be good for this Senate to go on record stating that for routine spraying against pests in these areas, let's use the less toxic materials. If there is an emergency, an outbreak of something

horrible such as encephalitis, we make room for that. We certainly have a clear exception in emergency situations. We are talking about routine situations.

We have seen Administrator Browner, with bipartisan support, ban some of the very harsh pesticides. I think we can work very well together in a bipartisan way to stop the routine spraying of these dangerous toxins.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, last evening I did offer to accept this amendment. It does have some problems, and in conference we will try to work out those problems.

I do believe that the use of pesticides approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency should be assured so that military children and those on military bases can have the same protections, protecting the food supplies of the commissaries and populated facilities on a military base. I think the preparation of homes, for instance, before they are occupied certainly requires the type of spraying approved by the EPA.

We will make certain there is full protection for those in the military. As I understand it, this is an amendment that is designed to prevent the use of the pesticides that would not be subject to approval by the EPA. I intend to support the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is necessary absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—14

Allard	Hutchinson	Sessions
Bond	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Enzi	Kyl	Thompson
Gramm	Landrieu	Voivovich
Hagel	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Specter
-------------	---------

The amendment (No. 3308) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we are awaiting the offering of other amendments on the Defense appropriations bill. There is no order, as I understand it, agreed upon between the leaders for another amendment to be offered at this time. So for any Senator who has an amendment to this bill, this is a good time to come and offer the amendment. We can have a debate on it.

The leadership has announced—at least the Republican leader has announced he wants to complete action on this bill tonight. To do that, we are going to have to make progress with the amendments. There are several pending amendments on both sides. So we urge Senators to come and cooperate with the managers of the bill so we can dispose of this legislation by the end of this session tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, we have done a pretty good job on our side of the aisle. We literally only have a handful of amendments left. I think you should spend more time urging Members on your side of the aisle. We only have one amendment that is going to take any amount of time. The Senator offering that amendment has been tied up in hearings all day and has been unavailable.

Senator BOXER has offered three amendments. She has said she will be back in an hour to offer her last one. As I say, we have just a few amendments. So I think if you can get rid of a lot on your side, we might be able to make some more progress. We are literally down to maybe seven or eight amendments on our side.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation and his cooperation with the managers in the handling of the bill. We are equal opportunity expeditors here. We want to expedite action on both sides of the aisle. I am sure the Senator understands that.

So we are working hard to try to get Senators to come to the floor now to continue the presentation of amendments, if they have them, on the bill.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3366, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To reduce the total amount provided for procurement by \$1,000,000,000 in order to provide \$922,000,000 for grants under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send a modified amendment to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to modify amendment 3366.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 3366, as modified.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. The total amount appropriated by title III for procurement is hereby reduce by \$1,000,000,000.

(b) There is hereby appropriated for the Department of Education for the fiscal year ending on September 30, 2001, \$922,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Education to award grants under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this Defense appropriations bill before us is a \$3 billion increase over the administration's request. It is almost \$20 billion more than we appropriated last year. Although for the past 2 years we have been focused on the readiness crisis—I think an important focus—the largest increase this year is not for personnel or operations or maintenance but for the procurement of weapons. This bill increases the amount of money for procurement of weapons almost 11 percent over last year. Let me just remind my colleagues that at the end of the cold war, a somewhat different era, this appropriations altogether is 2.5 times the military budgets of Russia and China and the six countries deemed to be the greatest threats to our Nation.

At a time when others recognize that the potential military threats to national security have declined dramatically, we have not. At a time when others want to put more emphasis on not just military readiness, which we must have, but other diplomatic solutions, multilateral efforts, we have not.

What I am doing in this amendment altogether is calling for a transfer across the board from this additional money for procurement, the 11-percent increase—a budget, again, that is \$3 billion above what the President himself requested. I am saying we ought to take about \$922 million, not quite \$1

billion—I am trying to keep this amendment consistent with budgetary rules—and transfer that to education for kids. It is not a lot of money, but it would make a huge difference. Part of what I am talking about is basically a transfer of a little less than \$1 billion from the Pentagon to the Department of Education, specifically focused on the title I program.

By transferring to title I this \$1 billion, which ends up to be about \$922 million after taking into account the costs of this reduction, this amendment is one step toward restoring some Federal funding for education that I think is very consistent with the definition of national security.

I define national security as, for sure, military readiness. But I also define national security as the security of our local communities. That includes making sure we do the very best by our children. That includes making sure that we as a nation do everything we can to live up to our national vow of equal opportunity for every child.

This amendment is all about our priorities. I look at the budget and I see a mismatch between some of our national ideals and goals in the speeches we give of what we say we care about and our actual spending priorities. The Senate committee reported out an education bill that would increase overall appropriations for education by \$4.65 billion from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2001. At the same time, the Department of Defense appropriations bill increased spending by \$20 billion—Education, \$4.65 billion; Department of Defense, \$20 billion.

We lead the world in our spending on defense, which is fine, but at the same time, we rank tenth in the world when it comes to education spending. Over the past 20 years, the Department of Education share of the Federal budget has shrunk from 2.5 to 2 percent. During the same time, the Federal share of education dollars has shrunk from 12 cents to 7 cents on the dollar. This is not the direction in which we need to be moving.

People we represent in our States are focused on education. They think we ought to be doing better. I understand full well, I say to my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, much of K-12 is State government spending. But we can be and should be a real player in certain decisive areas. We should be putting much more into early childhood development so children come to kindergarten ready to learn. We should be doing much better by way of funding the IDEA program. There is probably not a school board or school district in the country that does not believe this is an unfunded mandate, where they are called upon to meet children's special needs or called upon to support children with special needs but they do not get the Federal funding to which they are entitled.

The other critical program is the title I program. Actually, there is not a more important program than title I.

We had an amendment to double the authorization for title I, part A, to \$15 billion. Senator HARKIN was one of the leaders on that. It passed the HELP committee with the support of every Democrat and every Republican Senator, but I think we were only able to raise the appropriation by several million dollars, as I remember it, I say to my colleague Senator HARKIN.

I want to transfer \$1 billion to the title I program, and I want to talk about why. But first of all, when it comes to our priorities, when it comes to our commitment to education as opposed to just a commitment on the Pentagon budget, let me remind my colleagues, in a recent bipartisan poll: 60 percent of the American people say we spend too little on education; 40 percent of the people in our country say education should be the top funding priority in this year's budget; 75 percent of the American people say they would be willing to pay higher taxes to improve education; and 83 percent of Americans say we should equalize funding across districts, even if it means we should transfer funds from wealthy to poor districts.

It is absolutely amazing, the support that is out there. The title I program is a key investment, and we ought to be doing much better. Title I provides assistance to students who face the greatest educational barriers. They are the students whose parents have not had the educational opportunities or the luck in their life that many of us have had. Many of their parents are illiterate. Many of the parents of the students are poor. These are the students struggling to meet academic challenges. These are the children, the most vulnerable children, who need and deserve the support. Title I is used to fund the types of programs for these kids, for just such youth. We know they work.

As an example, 100 percent of major city schools use title I funds to provide professional development and new technology for students. We have been saying on the floor of the Senate and back in our States that the most important thing we can do to improve education is to have good teachers. That also includes good teachers for these children who are in the title I program.

We have been talking about the digital divide. We have been saying it is not right that in this country, those school districts, those wealthy communities, can be wired; they have access to the best technology. Those students will be equipped and they will be ready to do well. Students who come from poor districts and come from lower-income families, in those lower-income districts with less property wealth, they do not have access to this kind of technology. Title I money is used for that. Mr. President, 97 percent of the major city schools use title I money to support afterschool activities.

We have been through this debate. You can go to any neighborhood. I do

not think, I say to Senator HARKIN, it is just in the cities. I think it also applies to the smaller towns and rural communities. You can talk to the religious community; You can talk to the law enforcement community; You can talk to parents; You can talk to teachers; You can talk to support staff; You can talk to youth workers; They will all say: We need to have some positive programs and activity and support for kids after school, especially when many of them go home and both parents are working. We need to do that. Ninety percent of these schools use title I funds to support family, literacy and summer school programs, and 68 percent use title I funds to support preschool programs. Title I has shown some strong success, despite its underfunding.

I point out to my colleagues that this amendment is a matter of priorities.

Again, there is an 11-percent increase in procurement, \$3 billion more in this budget than the administration even asked. I am not talking about readiness programs. I am talking about a different world in which we live. When are we going to reorder some of our priorities and put just a little bit more of this investment in our children? When are we going to do better by children in our country?

Right now this title I program—which can be so important for educational development, can be so important in making sure these kids get the help they need, can be so important in making sure their parents become literate so they can help them read at home, can be so important for after-school programs, can be so important in trying to make sure that when these kids come to kindergarten they are ready to learn—right now we fund the title I program at a 30-percent level. That is to say, over 70 percent of the kids who could benefit do not benefit because there is no money. In my State of Minnesota, in our cities, after you get to schools that do not have 65 percent of the kids who are low income but only have 60 percent of the kids who are low income, they do not get title I money whatsoever because we have run out of funds.

Yet consider this: The largest gains in test scores over the past 30 years have been made by poor and minority students. One-third to one-half the gap between affluent whites and their poor minority counterparts has closed during this time—again because of the special help from the title I program.

A study by the Rand Corporation linked these gains to title I and other investments in these programs that give these kids more assistance. The final report of the "National Assessment of Title I" by the U.S. Department of Education showed that the NEAP, National Assessment of Educational Progress, scores for 9-year-olds in the Nation's highest poverty schools have increased over the past 10 years by 9 points in reading and 8 points in math. The Council of Greater

City Schools shows that 24 of the Nation's largest schools were able to decrease the number of fourth grade title I students achieving in the lowest quartile by 14 percent in reading and 10 percent in math in part due to the support of title I dollars.

In my State of Minnesota, for example, the Brainerd Public School District has a 70- to 80-percent success rate in accelerating students in the bottom 20 percent of their class to the average of their class following 1 year of title I-supported reading programs.

This is a successful program that directs resources to the poorest school districts in America. Forty-six percent of title I funds go to the poorest 15 percent of all schools in our country, according to a GAO report. Seventy-five percent of title I funds go to schools where the majority of children are poor, according to the U.S. Department of Education report.

The General Accounting Office estimates that title I has increased funding to schools serving poor children by 77 percent, and yet we fund this at about one-third of the level that is needed and it is unconscionable.

Yesterday I was in New York City. I went to a school, P.S. 30, in the Mott Haven community in the south Bronx, one of the poorest communities in the United States of America. I went there because I have such great respect for the work of Jon Kozol. Jon Kozol wrote a book called "Amazing Grace: The Lives of Children and the Conscience of a Nation." Now he has written another book, "Ordinary Resurrections." It is a book full of hope. It is about three children and it is about this special school. The principal's name is Miss Rosa, Aida Rosa, who came from Puerto Rico 3 years ago. Her friends keep telling her to retire, but this woman will not give up on these children.

When one visits such a school, part of the trip is inspiring and part of it is indignation swelling inside, which is why I am here.

It is inspiring that Miss Rosa will not give up on these kids. I say to my colleagues, not one child in the classes I visited was white. Not one child I met comes from a family with an income over \$10,000 a year. There are families in America—maybe some of our families—who spend that much on one vacation. These children come from families with incomes of less than \$10,000 a year. They are Latino Latina. They are African American. They are poor. About 30 percent of these children suffer from asthma. One can see the pumps they carry because they have these asthma attacks. Thirty to 35 percent of these children suffer from asthma. It is no wonder. There is an incinerator a block away. The air is so polluted. This happens in a lot of poor communities.

Miss Rosa does not give up on these children, the teachers do not give up on these children, and Jonathan Kozol does not give up on these children. My point is it is inspiring, but these chil-

dren could do much better if we would get the resources to the schools.

In my state of Minnesota, it is the same thing with Jackson Elementary School in St. Paul. I can think of elementary schools, junior high schools, and high schools I have visited. I visit a school every 2 weeks in my State. Over and over what these teachers say and what these principals say is: We are doing our best. Do not give up on any of these children. We know what works. We make sure when these children come to school they know they are loved. We hold them to high standards and expect them to do well. Never give up on them. Make sure that teachers are free to teach, and make sure we have an environment that emphasizes education and does not sell one child short.

We sell these children short. I do not understand our priorities. I do not understand why our commitment to education is such a small percentage of our Federal budget.

I do not understand how we can take a program such as the title I program—which is so important for low-income children and could make such a positive difference in their lives, would get more resources to some of these schools and some of these men and women who are teachers and principals and should be famous for the work they do—and fund it at a 30-percent or 35-percent level. I do not think it does any harm to who we are or what we are about as a nation to take less than \$1 billion out of the procurement budget across the board and put it into the title I program.

We ourselves, as I said, in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, voted to double the amount of money for title I. Yet we barely added any additional dollars to this critically important program.

The Nation's poorest schools are dramatically underfunded, they are dramatically understaffed, and they are dramatically under resourced. Title I helps get some of those resources to these communities. If title I was fully funded, Minnesota would receive about \$160 million more to educate needy students and almost 240,000 more students could be served. I am on the floor of the Senate to fight for these children in my State. Whatever the final vote is, if I can speak for a program that could make a difference in the lives of 240,000 more students in the State of Minnesota who are low-income kids, then I am going to do so, whether there is 1 vote for this amendment or whether there are 100 votes for this amendment.

I do not understand our priorities. Whatever happened to our national vow of equal opportunity for every child? How can we be talking today about how we are going to have tests and we are going to hold everybody accountable, but we do not make sure these children have the same opportunity to do well on these tests?

Why are we not investing in the achievement and the future of all the

children in our country? It is heart-breaking to visit these schools. It is inspiring but, at the same time, I come back to the Senate and say to myself: What can I do? When I visit these schools and meet these kids in any given class—yesterday I said to a lot of the teachers, to Miss Rosa, and others in the Mott Haven community in south Bronx, New York City: In the State of Minnesota—they did not believe it—in the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, we have many of the same populations.

The majority of our students are not white, Caucasian. In any given class, kids come from homes where different languages are spoken. Four or five different languages are spoken in the homes from which these kids come. There are some 90 different languages and dialects that are spoken in children's homes in Minneapolis and 70 in St. Paul. These children are also disproportionately low income, and they need the additional support if they are going to make it. It would seem to me we ought to make sure of that.

I am heavily influenced by the work of Jonathan Kozol. I love Jonathan's work over the years. He said something in his book that I am going to say on the floor of the Senate in my own words because I do this all the time. I will come to the floor of the Senate, and I will say: Come on, less than \$1 billion to the title I program, which is so underfunded in all of our States and, I say to my colleague from Montana, the rural communities.

I made a big mistake of not talking about greater Minnesota or rural America. We do not have the funding. Every teacher and every educational assistant and every principal and every parent who cares about education in these communities will tell you they do not have the funding and that we should do better.

But here is my point today. I could come out here on the floor and say: With this additional money for title I, if we make the investment in these children, who are, by definition, low-income children, then we will save money later on because fewer of them will drop out of school—and that is true—and we will save money because fewer of them will turn to alcohol and drugs—and that is true—and we will save money because they will be more economically successful and more productive—and that is true—and we will save money by investing a little more money in the title I program because fewer of these children will wind up dropping out of school and ending up in prison—and that is true. But you want to know something. We ought to spend this additional money, \$1 billion, or a little less than \$1 billion, in title I for another reason: Many of these children are little children; They are under 4 feet tall, and we should be nice to them. We should care about them. We should get some resources into these schools, even if it is not in our self-interest. We should do it because it is the right thing to do. That is why we should do this.

Forget all the arguments about investment and how it will help our economy. I came out here earlier and said: We should consider this in a national security framework. No. I scratch everything I said, though keeping it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We should transfer this small amount of money from this Pentagon budget to the title I program because we should care about these children. We should care about them. We should be nice to them. We should want them to do well.

Many of them come from neighborhoods with some pretty difficult circumstances in their lives. I say to my colleagues, you might have wanted to spend a little time in the Mott Haven community yesterday. It is incredible, some of the difficult conditions in which children not only survive but flourish. Why don't we just give them a little more assistance?

I really believe this is an important amendment. I want to again summarize for my colleagues a little bit of what I am trying to say. Again, please remember that it is one thing to talk about a readiness crisis. The big increase was in procurement. Less than a \$1 billion cut in procurement is hardly anything when it comes to the Pentagon budget. This appropriations bill is \$3 billion more than the administration's budget request.

This year, the education bill has an overall appropriation for education of \$4.65 billion—an increase. At the same time, the Pentagon budget goes up \$20 billion.

I say to all of my colleagues, I think this is an important amendment. All of us know of the title I program. All of us know the difference it can make in children's lives. All of us say we care about these children. This is an opportunity to basically match our vote with our rhetoric. This is, I will admit, a reordering-of-priorities amendment on a small scale because, after all, this is \$3 billion the administration didn't want. This bill is close to \$300 billion. Can't we take \$1 billion of this and do a little bit better by way of title I?

I will not end my remarks because I want to wait to hear what my colleagues say. But I will kind of finish up this part of my statement with a point that I do not like to make but I believe strongly about. So I am going to do it. I will say, some of my colleagues that I see on the floor—Senator INOUE and Senator BURNS—and Senator INOUE I especially believe I know well and know what he cares about—I do not think this applies to either one of my colleagues, regardless of how they vote; it can't because I know what Senator INOUE, in particular, is about. But, in general—so let me say this is not exactly just in relation to this amendment—I find that people in politics, in both parties, will relish having a chance to have a photo taken of them reading with a child. We are all for the children, and we say they are 100 percent of our future, but we are a dollar short when it comes to making the investment in their lives.

In particular, the unfinished agenda is poor children in America. It is incredible, but we have some 14 million poor children in our country today with its booming economy. Many of them, disproportionately, are of color. Many of them are in our inner cities. Some are in our inner suburbs, and some are in our rural areas. Many of the parents of these children didn't have the money to put them into the best developmental child care. They didn't have the great prekindergarten teachers. Some children did. And their parents—a single parent or both parents—are both working long hours. They don't have the money.

They can't spend \$10,000, \$12,000, \$14,000 a year for great child care. They come to kindergarten behind. They have not had some of the benefits that come from a family where your parents have more of an education and a much higher income. But you want to know something. I saw it yesterday in P.S. 30. I saw it yesterday in the Mott Haven community. I see it in Minnesota. Those children have the most beautiful eyes. They have the greatest determination. They are full of excitement and they are full of hope. They believe in the American dream, even though they never say it that way. By the time they are in high school, most of it is gone. I think we ought to be doing better. I think these children ought to figure into our priorities.

We all know the title I program is vastly underfunded. It is an embarrassment. Can't we at least put another \$922 million in this next year? Can't we do a little bit better by these children?

Mr. President, for now, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators BOXER and HARKIN be added as cosponsors of my amendment.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. If Senator STEVENS wishes to make a motion to table, that would still be in order; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside temporarily so I may offer my amendment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Reserving the right to object, I didn't hear the request.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I might offer another amendment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I object. I would like to work with the Senator, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa maintains the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, is the pending amendment the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be set aside and I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3355

(Purpose: To limit the use of funds for purchase and modification of Army High Mobility Trailers, and for modification of High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWVs) to tow the trailers, until the trailers are fully tested)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) proposes an amendment numbered 3355.

Mr. HARKIN. 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:

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the purchase or modification of high mobility trailers for the Army before the Secretary of the Army has determined that the trailers have been thoroughly tested as a system with the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles that tow the trailers, satisfy the applicable specifications, are safe and usable, do not damage the vehicles that tow the trailers, and perform the intended functions satisfactorily.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the modification of Army High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles to tow trailers before the Secretary of the Army has determined that, with respect to the towing of trailers, the vehicles have been thoroughly tested as a system, satisfy the applicable specifications, are safe and usable, are not damaged by the towing of the trailers, and perform the intended functions satisfactorily.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am proposing a very simple amendment. All it says is the Department of Defense thoroughly test its trailers and the trucks that pull them before they spend more money to modify them or to buy new ones.

I understand there is a rule XVI point of order against the amendment. So I will ask that it be withdrawn. But I wanted to take the time to at least let Senators know about and become aware of a very interesting problem in the Department of Defense which I think is indicative of some larger problems that we have in terms of testing and making sure that our weapons systems actually work before we spend our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to buy them.

For the next several minutes, I would like to tell the story of the Army trailers and why this amendment basically just says we ought to test them to make sure they work before we buy them.

You would think this would be common sense. But 6,550 trailers that the Army has purchased for more than \$50 million are sitting in storage right now. That is right, 6,550 trailers are now in storage because the Army never bothered to make sure they worked. The fact is that this amendment, which I think is necessary, says a lot about how waste and abuse continues to thrive at the Pentagon. I get nervous about some of these skyrocketing procurement budgets when I think about how some of the money gets thrown away. Let's go through the story of the trailers.

Most of what I am about to relate is in a GAO report, which I requested last year and which was published last year.

In the 1980s, the Pentagon decided it needed some trailers. I am talking about trailers that you load up with equipment, goods and stuff, and you pull them behind a truck. In 1980, the Pentagon decided that it needed some trailers for its high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles, otherwise known to all of us as humvees. That is all these are—trailers to be pulled behind some all-terrain trucks. I wouldn't think that would be too difficult. The Army found that the older M101 trailers they had were unstable with the humvees. So they set out to buy some new trailers. In 1993, they signed a contract for \$50.6 million to buy 7,563 new trailers.

In 1995, after a couple of years, they tested the trailers and found a serious problem. The trucks, as it turns out,

were never designed to pull trailers. When they tested the trailers, the rear crossmembers of the trucks tended to crack. They refer to this as "catastrophic failure." Despite this problem of the trucks' rear crossmembers cracking, the Army decided that the trailers had successfully completed testing.

You may wonder: How could that possibly be? Well, it was because they met the contract performance requirements. Mind you, they didn't work. They destroyed the trucks that pulled them. But they met the contract performance requirements. So the Army agreed to pay the contractor for the trailers and to pay for the modifications that would be needed. You would think in the contract specifications they would have said that the trailers should not damage the trucks pulling them. But evidently they didn't.

Then in late 1996, the Army faced a dilemma. The contractor was more than a year behind schedule in delivering them, and the Department decided not to buy more trailers in fiscal year 1997—not because they didn't work, which they didn't, but because they said they were now a lower priority.

In the contract that the Army negotiated, there was an escape clause which provided that during the fourth and fifth years, if the Army didn't want any more trailers, all they had to do was pay \$1 million in liquidated damages and they would be out of the contract. Did the Army pay the \$1 million and get out of the old contract? No. They renegotiated the contract and extended it another year. Not only that but the Army also agreed to pay the increased costs of the contractor and agreed also to increase the profit margin of the contractor in spite of the poor performance of these trailers. The net result was a 57-percent increase in the cost of the trailers. Instead of getting the 7,563 trailers for \$50.6 million, which was agreed upon in the contract, the Army ended up getting 6,700 trailers for \$57 million—\$6 million more for 900 fewer trailers.

That is not the end of it. From there, the story continues downhill.

In 1997, the Army modified the truck crossmembers—the one that was cracking all the time, and the bumpers—so the trucks could pull the trailers. But as they were modifying the truck, the trailer drawbar broke. They discovered that the drawbar design had no margin of safety; it bent every time the humvee went over a bump. Nonetheless, since the Army had already accepted the design, the Army figured it was their own problem and they let the contractor off the hook.

The Army continued to accept more of these trailers that they couldn't use. They couldn't use them. So the contractor kept making them and the Army kept accepting them; and they just put them in storage.

In 1998, they tested the trailers a third time with a new steel drawbar.

But now they found that the new, stiffer drawbar damaged the brakes on the trailers and again damaged the trucks.

In 1999, they made more modifications and tested the trailers a fourth time. Again, the trailers didn't work. Meanwhile, the units still don't have the trailers they have needed for more than a decade.

Now, the Army thinks they finally have the solution. They will use the steel drawbar on the trailers. They will install a more durable brake actuator on the trailers, and they will modify the trucks with reinforcement for this towing pintle. But they haven't even tested these modifications yet. So they don't even know if they will work.

Furthermore, their "conservative cost estimate" for the modification is \$22 million.

Let's add it up. We were going to pay \$50 million. We have already paid \$57 million. Now we are going to pay \$22 million on top of that. That would pay to modify only 6,700 trucks, one for each of the trailers.

I can only assume that the Army does not want to dedicate a truck for each trailer. That means the Army will have to modify all 19,564 trucks that are in the units to get the trailers. The 22 million they want is only for 6,700 trucks. But they are going to need another 13,000 trucks modified.

So are we looking at another \$44 million, maybe another \$50 million on top of it? I don't think they will dedicate one truck to each trailer. That would be foolish. I don't think we are through with the price increases yet. Somewhere down the line, the Army says, they will need another 18,412 high mobility trailers on top of the 6,700 they already have.

This is a story of mismanagement, a story of misprocurement, a story of whacky contracts, a story of piling one mistake upon another, a story of letting contractors off the hook, all at the expense of taxpayers and the expense of readiness and mobility for our troops in the field.

My amendment simply requires that before we dump more money down this rathole, before we modify the trailers and trucks or buy more trailers, we test them. We test the final product to see if it will meet the requirements for the all-terrain vehicles that are pulling them. We should make sure that they work, that they are safe, that they don't damage the truck, and that they can perform their intended mission.

I don't know when the end is in sight. We have already spent \$57 million. They want another \$22 million. That is \$79 million. If they are going to modify all the trucks, we are probably looking at another \$44 million on top of that, and they say they want 18,000 more of them. I don't know if there is an end in sight. Whether \$57 million or \$79 million or \$100 million, that may not in a \$300 billion budget for defense seem to be a lot but it is a lot of money to me. It is a lot of money to the taxpayers in my home State of Iowa.

I am afraid it is a symptom of a larger problem. If we cannot design a simple trailer that works, and test it adequately, how can we expect to build an advanced fighter plane that works or a missile defense that will hit a bullet with a bullet?

We never seem to learn our lesson. Today we are buying 10 F-22 fighter planes, the most advanced and most expensive in the world, even though they haven't been fully tested and have shown problems in the tests that have been done. We are talking about spending \$1 billion a year for national missile defense, even though it has had only two flight tests—one lucky strike and a near miss—and has never been tested against countermeasures that it would surely face.

If we are going to spend all this money, the public should at least demand weapons that work. My amendment would set that demand in writing for the trailers. I am not getting into the fighter planes and missile defense. I am only talking about simple trailers, so that never again will we pay three times for trailers—once to buy them, again to store them, and a third time to try to make them work right.

I wanted to take this time to talk about the trailer problem. I have been involved in this for some time. I think it is indicative of a larger problem. We should make sure we test all of our systems, make sure they work and are safe and meet the requirements we need before we shell out our taxpayers' dollars to buy them.

AMENDMENT NO. 3355 WITHDRAWN

Mr. HARKIN. Having said that, I understand there is a rule XVI point of order against my amendment, so I withdraw my amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 3355) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3366, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Parliamentary inquiry: Are we now back to the Wellstone amendment numbered 3366?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the Wellstone amendment.

I think it would be the height of irresponsibility to reduce this defense budget by \$1 billion, for any purpose. Obviously, for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has not yet been reauthorized, there will be billions spent—correctly so—for the improvement of the education of our children. To withdraw the funds from the Department of Defense and put money into a bill that has not yet been reauthorized, I think would be shirking our responsibility to support our troops in the field and make sure they have the equipment they need to do the job we are asking them to do.

Whether it be the missile defense system, the F-22, the F-16, the ships that

we need so badly, or whether it is a quality-of-life issue, we are trying to increase the pay levels and the quality of housing for our military. We are trying to provide the health care that is deserved for the people in the service and for their families.

Where would we take the \$1 billion? Which part of our military budget that is already underfunded would we withdraw? I think it is very important we continue to finish this bill, that we allocate the resources we need to stop the flight from our military that we see occurring as we speak. We are having a very hard time retaining the good people who are serving in the military. They are leaving the military. They are leaving the military for a variety of reasons, some of which we can do something about: pay, types of housing, health care, and making sure they have the training and the equipment they need to do the job we are asking them to do. We need to make sure we do retain our best people.

Second, I think it is very important we let potential recruits know we are going to take very seriously these quality-of-life issues. That is exactly what this bill, the underlying appropriations bill for the Department of Defense, is designed to do.

I object to any reduction of the Department of Defense bill to reallocate resources to other areas that have already had their budgets approved by this Congress. We have set the levels of spending in Congress. We have allocated money for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have allocated money for all of the other agencies to be able to do their jobs. We need to set up a firewall in defense. We need to say we are going to put the money into defense to keep our security in this country.

If we start adopting amendments such as the Wellstone amendment that would start taking \$1 billion out and allocating it to some other cause, I think we would be walking away from our responsibility to strengthen our national defense. When we are 6,000 below the congressionally mandated troop strength level, as we are today, I think it is most certainly the responsibility of Congress to say, why do we have 6,000 fewer troops than we have allocated to do the job of keeping the security of the United States? I think once we determine the cause, we need to address that cause and we need to correct the problem. The way we do it is to make sure we are fully funding the equipment, the training, and the quality-of-life issues for our military personnel. We are asking them to do a pretty tough job. We need to give them the tools to do it.

I am very fortunate to be able to visit so many of our troops around the world. I am very privileged to be on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee and, before that, on the Armed Services Committee. I have visited our troops in Saudi Arabia, Italy, Bosnia, Kosovo, Germany, as well as, of course,

throughout the United States of America. It lifts your heart to go to a base or to an outpost and talk to our military personnel. They are dedicated. They believe in our country. They believe in what they are doing. They are out there and they are going to do the job given to them to do.

In the 7 years that I have been in the Senate and have made it a point to visit our troops wherever they may have been, I have never yet met one who did not inspire me, who did not make me believe that the security of our country was being handled by these young people and these generals and these admirals. They are dedicated and they are doing a terrific job. But it is the responsibility of Congress, it is the responsibility of the Senate, it is the responsibility of this body to make sure every one of those young men and women out in the field, who are patrolling as we speak, who are walking along the lines between Kosovo and the former Yugoslavia, who are in Bosnia trying to keep Bosnia in a peaceful condition, who are in the deserts of Saudi Arabia right now, or in Kuwait, trying to keep some stability in the Middle East, get the support and the equipment and the training they need to do the job.

If we start voting for amendments that take \$1 billion out of an already short defense budget and start allocating that to other programs—worthy programs, but we have already set the spending limiting for those programs—we would be shirking our responsibility to support those who are supporting us. That is why I oppose the Wellstone amendment and why I hope this Senate will take the responsible action and reject any effort to take \$1 billion out of the funds for the defense budget. It has emergency money in it to replenish the coffers where we have taken from the basic defense budget to fund the peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Kosovo. It is essential we get on with our responsibility and reject the Wellstone amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from California has an amendment. Senator HARKIN is joining her. I would like to see if we can get a time agreement on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent the time be limited to not more than 45 minutes on each side. Is that agreeable?

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

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am wondering if the manager of the bill would be kind enough to notify the Senate when there will be some votes. We have about an hour and a half now on this amendment, if all time is used, and there then would be two votes; is that correct? I think that is what the leaders are talking about.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. I do not anticipate using the full amount of time on our side. I understand there has been one amendment put aside. I hope to have the votes occur somewhere around 6 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Then after that, it is my understanding the bill is in the process of being able to be wound up?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we still have the procedure to follow to apply rule XVI to the amendments that have not been withdrawn. We are compiling that list now. As soon as this amendment is finished, we will do that. The Senator would understand, I am sure, that some Senators may wish to appeal that or deal with it in some way. I hope not. We hope to conclude the rule XVI procedure and then vote at 6 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 3311

(Purpose: To strike Section 8114 regarding Operational Support Aircraft Leasing Authority)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 3311.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8114.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the managers. I have had a few amendments. I think this one is not one they support. They have been very supportive of my others. I am very proud that the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, has once again teamed up with me. We have been the team on this particular subject for awhile.

When I was in the House of Representatives, I served on the Armed Services Committee. It was a great honor to do so. There is nothing more important than our national security. What I found was that we were wasting many dollars. I thought we had cured some of those problems. For awhile I really didn't bring these issues before the body because I was convinced we were moving in the right direction. Suddenly, I am afraid, we see a reversal.

For example, in this bill, the military asked us for \$3 billion less than the committee actually voted out. This particular bill that is before us is \$3 billion more than the Defense Department requested. Why would we do that? Why would we not go along with what they say they need, and why would we pad this particular area, our

national defense? And why do I say that? Because if we look through the bill, we will find instances of waste.

We understand why this bill is padded when we particularly look at one area that Senator HARKIN and I joined forces on last year. That is the area of operational support aircraft. These are aircraft used for travel by the upper echelons of the military. What we do with our amendment is strike the section that allows nine of these operational support aircraft to be leased. In this bill, they are not specified as what they are, how much they each cost. We know nothing except that the Army can have three, the Navy can have three, and the Marine Corps can have three.

What do I suspect they are going to do with this? I think we have to learn from history and look back to last year's Defense appropriations bill. I offered an amendment with Senator HARKIN then that would have struck this same exact language that was used by the Air Force to lease six operational support aircraft. Senator HARKIN and I lost that fight. I thought we made a valiant effort, but we are back for this reason: A lot has happened since Senator HARKIN and I brought this matter before the body.

First, we know the Air Force plans to lease the most luxurious jets there are, despite the fact we had people here telling us they weren't going to lease these big, beautiful jets; they were going to go smaller.

Let's take a look at the Gulfstream. It is pretty slick. We are told if one were to buy this, it costs \$50 million a copy—luxurious travel. The Air Force has leased six. The Air Force took the same language they had in the appropriations bill last year and leased six of these.

Let's take a look at the interior of this plane. Senator HARKIN has a little different view. It is beautiful. This plane is used by billionaires. This plane is used by the top echelon of wealthy people in this country. We wonder why this bill has been padded with \$3 billion. I think it is to do things such as this that, with all due respect, were not spelled out in this bill.

If I were to read—I don't have time because I have agreed to a tight time limit—the language, all one would know about it is, it is the same as was put in for the Air Force. But they couldn't find anywhere listed a Gulfstream. Yet last year we were told, at this very same time in the debate, that the Air Force was not going to go for these Gulfstreams: "There is nothing in this language that says that." Yet that is, in fact, what they did.

We were right last year, and it is costing taxpayers a fortune to lease these jets. Let me say, it is cheaper to buy them than to lease them.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a New York Times article that discusses the fact that it is actually cheaper to lease these jets than to buy them.

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

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1999]

NATO SPENDING BILL INCLUDES EXECUTIVE
JETS FOR 9 GENERALS

(By Tim Weiner)

An urgent request from the Air Force is buried in the multibillion-dollar emergency bills that will finance NATO's air war in Yugoslavia.

Smart bombs? F-16 fighters?

Not exactly. The Air Force wants to lease Gulfstream executive business jets to ferry four-star generals around the world. The cost could run to half a billion dollars over a decade.

The Air Force is asking for top-of-the-line Gulfstream V's to replace the Boeing 707's, some as much as 30 years old, that transport nine of the nation's top military commanders.

The Gulfstreams can fly eight passengers nonstop for 7,500 miles, wrapping them in sweet silence and comfort, the company says.

The Air Force already has two Gulfstream V's for the very highest Government officials. Moguls from the movies and Microsoft fly them. Why not the military's most powerful commanders, men like Gen. Wesley Clark, who is running NATO's air war?

So the Pentagon and the Senate Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator Ted Stevens, Republican of Alaska, worked out a deal that would let the Air Force lease six Gulfstreams for the military's nine unified and regional commanders-in-chief, Congressional staff members said.

Those in the Air Force and in Congress who support the request—none of whom would be quoted by name—say leasing could be cheaper than maintaining the 707's. And the Gulfstreams cost less than the planes some of the commanders originally sought: a fleet of Boeing 767's, which run upwards of \$100 million each.

The new fleet would give the commanders "the capability to travel within the full length of their theaters or to Washington, D.C., without an en route stopover," the Air Force said in a "fact sheet" submitted to Congress two weeks ago to underscore the commanders' needs.

Only one of the nine commanders-in-chief, or Cincs, General Clark, is based overseas. The others work in Virginia, Illinois, Colorado, Nebraska, Hawaii and Florida, where three of them have headquarters. But with the United States playing the role of the world's sole superpower, their responsibilities are global, the Pentagon says.

The Air Force noted that the Gulfstream V is "the single aircraft most capable of performing the Cinc support role, at significantly reduced costs."

One new Gulfstream was included in this year's Pentagon budget. But the Gulfstream V can carry only a small contingent. So the Air Force said it might also consider two Gulfstreams and four specially equipped 737-700's, which carry at least 126 passengers in their commercial configuration.

The Senate's emergency spending bill includes a measure aiding Central American hurricane victims, which is where the leasing arrangement originated. The measure goes to conference on Tuesday with the \$13 billion measure passed by the House last week.

The Gulfstream measure includes only the legal authority to sign a lease—no money. It does not mention the money at all.

But the leasing deal, if carried out, could cost \$476 million or more over 10 years, according to Air Force documents and Congressional staff members.

It would actually cost less to buy each of the nine commanders his own Gulfstream V—\$333 million. But that might be a harder sell, said a Congressional staff member working on the Senate's still evolving emergency bill.

"You don't want to look like you're buying the Cincs executive jets," he said.

Mrs. BOXER. First of all, we are not buying them. We are leasing them, and that costs money. If we were to buy these nine, it would cost a half a billion dollars. I am embarrassed to say it. That amount of money could put 5,000 police on the streets. That amount of money could double the number of children we have in after-school. That amount of money could take care of a lot of veterans' health care.

The other plane that is in the same category is called Bombardier. It is made in Quebec. I don't have a photo of it. It is just as luxurious, just as expensive. It goes for about the same. I say to my friends who want to make sure our generals have what they need: Why do we have to go to the top of the line?

If the answer comes back that we are not necessarily doing that and we are not spelling it out, then why not preclude them from going to the top of the line? Two things have happened that are important since this debate last year.

No. 1, those who said the Air Force would never buy the top of the line were proven wrong. We said they would do it, and they will leased these top of the line jets.

No. 2, Senator HARKIN, Congressman DEFAZIO, and I wrote to the General Accounting Office. Because we respect our friends who said these operational support aircraft were necessary, we said to the GAO, which is our investigative arm, Will you do a study? They did. Guess what they titled this study. The title of this study comes back: "Operational Support Airlift Requirements are not Sufficiently Justified."

Let me reiterate sort of the partridge and the pear tree about why we should strike this language. Last year, we were told they needed the aircraft. Here is the GAO report, the investigative arm of Congress, coming back saying we do not need any more right now because we don't know what we have. I will share the quotes from that study.

Second, the Air Force proved they were going to go to the top of the line. This is the same exact language. After all, I guess if the Air Force has it, the Army needs it, the Marines, and the Navy, then we are going to allow them to have the same latitude.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from California has 45 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Presiding Officer let me know when I have used 20 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

I want to share with my colleagues the results of this GAO study.

GAO report: "Operational Support Airlift Requirements are not Sufficiently Justified."

The processes that DOD uses to identify its requirements for operational support airlift have a number of weaknesses that make it difficult to assess whether the current inventory meets the wartime needs.

That is one statement. We will go through the statements with you.

The next statement:

Although DOD directive 4500.43 states that operational support airlift requirements should be based solely on wartime needs, the methodology that DOD used in 1995 and 1998 does not draw a clear link to the scenario for two major regional conflicts specified by the National Military Strategy.

In other words, the operational support aircraft have to be linked to what military needs in case of war—not that it is comfortable for generals in time of peace.

I understand that it is comfortable to go on a plane such as this, but that is not what taxpayers should be paying for. We should be paying for what we need in time of war. That is what the DOD is supposed to do.

What else do they tell us in this report?

The lack of clear linkage to wartime requirements raises questions about whether the support aircraft fleet is appropriately sized to meet short-notice mobility needs in wartime.

My friends, this is serious. We are going ahead with this appropriations—this green light—to lease all of these airplanes when the GAO is saying to us that the "lack of clear linkage to wartime requirements raises questions about" the fleet and whether it is appropriately sized. It may be terribly overly sized.

Let's see what else we have.

This is the one I think says it all.

The joint staff . . . has not maintained records documenting its previous requirements reviews, so it is not possible to determine whether some options for reducing requirements were examined.

I have to say to my colleagues who I hope are watching this from their offices that there is a need here to defend the United States of America, and we should do everything we can to do that. If we are going under the scenario of being prepared to fight two major conflicts—some people think that is outmoded, but if that is what we are doing—then everything we do in this budget should reflect that need. And we are being told that the Joint Chiefs do not maintain records documenting their requirements for these aircraft.

How on Earth can we possibly justify this kind of open-ended language in this bill?

The GAO sums up:

For all these reasons, we believe a more rigorous process is needed to better ensure that support aircraft requirements accurately reflect wartime needs.

I think if you really believe that supporting our military is one of the most important things we can do in making sure we have dollar for dollar the best military in the world, then you should vote for the Boxer-Harkin amendment.

There is no reason given in any of the documentation in the Department of Defense as to why they need this aircraft. There is no rationale. The GAO has studied this. They are nonpartisan. They are the investigative arm of Congress. They have come back and told us they can't even find their records. Yet we are going blindly ahead, it seems to me, and providing this open-ended language, which will result, I predict to you, in nine more of these aircraft, and they could be the most luxurious in the world.

We already know that the Defense Department has 144 jets in its fleet of operational support aircraft. This includes 71 Learjets, 13 Gulfstreams, the one Gulfstream V, and 17 Cessna Citations.

We know the GAO has studied all of this, and they are saying to us: Time out. What is the rush?

When I take a look at these luxury jets, I can only say this: We know there are cheaper luxury jets that would have to make just one stop—I have a photo of that—just one stop. This plane is about \$18 million compared to \$50 million, which would have to make one stop to refuel.

I have to say to my friends that it is a beautiful plane. It is a comfortable plane. For a general to stop and stretch his or her legs, as the case may be, and fill up the tank once on the way to a meeting in peacetime—

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mrs. BOXER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator put that photograph back up.

Mrs. BOXER. Certainly. I will finish my sentence, and then I will yield. Then I am happy to yield. I have to finish my thought.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator yielded to me.

Mrs. BOXER. This is a smaller aircraft. We were hoping that the Air Force was going to look at this. But they came back with the Gulfstreams.

I yield for a question.

Mr. STEVENS. If I am correct, that is a UC-35 that the Senator put up there, and that is what we are going to lease. That is exactly what this provision covers, the UC-35s.

Mrs. BOXER. This is not a UC-35. This is not.

Mr. STEVENS. What is it?

Mrs. BOXER. That is a Citation X.

The point I am making is there is nothing in the language, I say to my dear friend, that suggests exactly what plane they are going to use. There is nothing in this language. Last year, under the same language, the Air Force leased the Gulfstream. That is the point we are making. We are not limiting them to this.

I have to say that I know we are in a surplus situation. But we have a lot of needs for our military personnel. I know my friends fought for that. We are looking at military personnel who are not living in adequate housing. We

know that Senator MCCAIN has taken the lead in trying to get our people off food stamps. We have an unfunded priority of veterans' health.

I think what Senator HARKIN and I are simply saying is this: It is unnecessary to have this many planes when we now have a quite unbiased report that says, "Operational Support Airlift requirements are not sufficiently justified."

Why would we run off and buy more when we don't know what we have? We have seen with vague language we could wind up with top-of-the-line jets.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BOXER for yielding me this time.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of her amendment. We have worked hard on this over the last couple of years to try to bring sense and rationality to this procurement of luxury jets for the military.

I was going to ask my friend from California if we might engage in a little colloquy to let our fellow Senators know where we are coming from. It is not the intention of the Senator from California, nor mine, to say that there should be no smaller corporate-type jets within the Department of Defense. We are not trying to say "none." We are not trying to cut them out. There are 364 support aircraft in the inventory right now.

I ask the Senator, is it, the intention of the Senator to do away with all these types of jets?

Mrs. BOXER. Not at all.

As my friend knows, we don't even really know how the jets they have now are meeting our needs in a situation such as during wartime, which is the directive that they have to go by. The DOD has to rationalize and tell us, under their own directive, how their support meets the needs in wartime.

Clearly in this report it is stated there is no rationale for what they have now, let alone what they have to have.

Furthermore, we are saying that if they got these nine additional planes, which we don't even know if they need, under this language they would be able to buy the fanciest jets in the world, despite the fact that Senator STEVENS doesn't think they will.

The Senator of Alaska wasn't positive that the Air Force was going to lease the six Gulfstreams last year, yet they did. It is the same language.

Mr. HARKIN. What happened to the six airplanes last year that we fought against? Have they started leasing those airplanes yet?

Mrs. BOXER. They put out an RFP. The only two companies that qualified for the RFP happened to be the two companies that made a \$50 million luxury jet.

The Air Force is moving forward and doing exactly what we said they were going to do.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator is correct, the request for proposal that delineated the requirements, the GAO said there is no real basis for those requirements. They just plucked them out of thin air. They devised, if I am not mistaken, an RFP to get the jets they wanted. But there is no basis for the RFP requirement.

That is what I read in the GAO report. For example, I say to the Senator from California, in the GAO study on page 7, "One military officer involved in the 1995 study said that using an assumption of four flights a day yielded a requirement deemed to be too high and that using an assumption of two flights a day yielded a requirement deemed to be too low." So it came out at three.

Listen to this: "Operational support airlift requirements are significantly affected by this single assumption of how many flights a day you have. For example, our review of support aircraft found that 55 fewer aircraft were required when assumptions of two flights a day were used rather than three for overseas theaters."

Again, the GAO is saying there is no real rational basis for this. They say four is deemed too much, two is deemed too little. So, voila, they decided on three. But again, there is no rational basis for why they needed three flights a day.

We didn't have this study last year. This study just came out in April of 2000. Last year, we offered the amendment that dealt with six aircraft, and our worst fears were realized. They put out an RFP, limited to the most luxurious jets. So we requested the study. In light of the fact that we have the GAO study that basically says we have no basis on which to procure these aircraft, now we will lease nine aircraft.

Let's get this straight. Last year, we did not have the GAO study. Our amendment was defeated. The bill said they could lease up to six aircraft. This year, we have the GAO study that says there is no basis for the requests, but now nine are requested this year.

Please, someone tell me what kind of sense this makes.

Again, I have been a pilot all my life. I enjoy flying. I know airplanes pretty darned well. We are not trying to say that commanders in the field, theater commanders, don't need long-range airplanes. They do. What I am saying is we are playing a game here. It is sort of a game of, I am a general and guess what. I have got a nice big fancy jet to ferry me around. Well, Admiral Smith over here looks at General Jones and says, hey, he's got a big old jet that flies him around. How come I don't have one? And then the general over in the Marine Corps says, well, I have to have one, too. I am as high ranking as that other general or admiral. And the Air Force general says, I have to have one, too.

Come on. There is a lot of this game involved here. I don't mind some perks for our military officers. They don't get paid a lot of money. They do a

great job of defending our country. We call upon them in wartime and they lay down their lives. If you are just honest about it, this is a perk, a perquisite.

But how much of a perk? Do they really need a Gulfstream V that can carry up to 19 passengers so they can put four or five people on board and travel in luxury? No, they don't need that. CINCPAC operates out of Hawaii and needs a longer range plane to go from Hawaii to Guam, Okinawa, Japan, or Korea. I understand that. But commanders in the United States don't need those. They can land at any airport in the United States and get refueled. They don't need those longer range planes. You may need one for Europe. Already in the inventory we have 13 Gulfstream III's that have a 3,500-mile nautical range. Now the Gulfstream V has a 5,500-mile nautical range.

We already have one of those in inventory. I don't know where it is. I don't know who operates it. But we already have one. We have 13 Gulfstream III's with a 3,500-mile nautical range. That is not too shabby. And a Gulf-

stream III is a very luxurious plane, I can assure you. The GAO says it can carry up to 26 passengers, but that is maximum loading. Actually, a Gulfstream III would probably carry about 10 or 12 people at most on any flight. They already have 13 of them. Is that enough? We don't even know. The GAO says we don't even know if that is enough.

I am not saying we do not need some of these planes. But I think we need a really thorough study of these inventories, to justify the requirements.

The GAO said:

The Department of Defense has not clearly explained the basis for the key assumptions it is using to justify the requirements or identified the assumptions that should be updated in each succeeding review.

What does it mean? The Pentagon has no clue about how many planes they need; no clue.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. Let me just finish this.

The GAO found there is no justification for how many times a day airports are connected. There is no criterion for why some airports are key airports and others are not. There is no consider-

ation of how large different planes need to be. Nobody could even tell the GAO whether the requirement for 85 aircraft in the continental United States had been considered in the 1998 review or who was supposed to look at it in the current review. So how do they come up with their assumptions? Here is what GAO said. I will repeat it:

One military officer said using an assumption of four flights a day yielded a requirement deemed to be too high, using an assumption of two yielded a requirement deemed to be too low by the commanders in chief.

What does that mean? They cooked the books. That is all they are doing, they are cooking the books. They are saying I would like to have this Gulfstream V, so write it up so that I need it. That is all that is happening.

I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mrs. BOXER. I wanted to make sure my friend was aware we have a copy of the RFP done by the Air Force. I ask unanimous consent this document be printed in the RECORD.

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

Aircraft Capabilities and Characteristics	Thresholds	Objective
4.1.1.1.* Range	Aircraft shall be able to fly no-wind range of 5000 NM carrying a full passenger and crew complement, plus their baggage using AFI 11-202, Vol. III, Chapter 2 procedures. Fuel reserves consist of fuel required to descend to 10,000 feet MSL at destination airfield, climb to optimum altitude for diversion to an alternate airfield 250 NM away, descend to 10,000 feet, hold for 45 minutes, and then make a penetration/approach and landing.	Aircraft shall be able to fly no-wind range of 6000 NM carrying a full passenger and crew complement, plus their baggage
4.1.1.2. Flight Characteristics	Cruise speed 0.80 Mach, cruise ceiling after gross weight takeoff equals 31,000 ft minimum after 30-minute direct climb. Be able to operate out of a 5,000-foot runway. FAR landing distance shall not be greater than 5,000 ft at maximum landing weight.	A minimum of 10 minutes at takeoff power.
4.1.1.3.* Payload Capabilities	Small aircraft shall carry 5 crew, 12 passengers. Medium aircraft shall carry 11 crew, 26 passengers. Maximum payload requirements to determine range calculations shall consist of all items (food, water, toiletries and non-consumables such as blankets and pillows) in sufficient quantities to support crew and passengers for four days. Assume 1.5 (1 light, 1 full) first class type meals per person, per sortie. (Assume 2 lbs. per full meal) The weight and volume of passenger support items are separate from the personal baggage allowance. Assume a weight allowance of 275 lbs. per person for individual body and baggage (175 lbs. per person plus 100 lbs. baggage).	
4.1.1.4. Mission Planning	Standard commercial system, provisions for generating the information found on a DD Form 365-4, Weight and Balance Clearance Form F—Transport. Automated capability to do aircraft performance analysis (takeoff and landing data) and flight planning. Shall include performance data for all climatic conditions. Computer flight plan able to be uploaded into the flight.	Integrated with aircraft systems. Incorporation of a unique mission planning component on the Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) architecture.

* Denotes Key Performance Parameter.

Mrs. BOXER. What it shows is exactly what my friend is saying, aircraft should be able to fly no-wind range of 5,000 nautical miles. Only two aircraft, this one called the Global Express—that is made in Canada, and then the Gulfstream V, which, as my friend pointed out, the Air Force has put out this proposal, it is in the 5,000 nautical mile range. So this is the characteristic. If you look at this and other characteristics, it can only be these luxury jets.

But I wanted to ask my friend if he saw the letter from the Department of Defense to the General Accounting Office on page 27 of this report. I ask him to take a look at it because it seems to me, any thinking person would read this and say the Department of Defense agrees with HARKIN and BOXER. If you look at this letter in the second paragraph, it says:

The department agrees with many of the findings in the GAO report. Accordingly, it will take the GAO's findings into consideration in future determinations of operational support airlift.

That is very nice. When will they take it into consideration? After they have sprung for half a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money? What we are saying is we have this report, folks. Yet in this particular bill before us, I

wonder if my friend is aware, in order to take effect these leases must be done before 2004. So they are essentially rushing to run out and lease these aircraft so, as my friend says, they can have the same aircraft as the Air Force.

Mr. HARKIN. Frankly, I say to the Senator from California, if we have to swallow this, they ought to at least buy the airplanes, not lease them. The taxpayers are going to get stung, big time, for leasing these aircraft, but it looks as if it is less in the beginning. Over the years, we are going to pay probably, what would the Senator say, three to four times as much for these aircraft?

Mrs. BOXER. Hundreds of millions of dollars more, according to the New York Times.

Mr. HARKIN. That is if we lease them rather than buying. So we are compounding it, adding insult to injury. The taxpayers are getting socked for airplanes the military doesn't really need, and then they are leasing them, which means we are paying even more money for airplanes we do not even need. Again, you would think with this GAO study we would say: Wait, we don't need these nine. Let's wait until we see what the requirements really are.

The requirements are always couched in terms of wartime necessity. We are not at war. It doesn't look as if there is anything bubbling up on the horizon that is going to be a major war for the United States in the next couple of years. So we have time to do an assessment to find out what our requirements really are. Does Admiral or General so-and-so really need a Gulfstream V? We don't know that. Maybe they could get by with a C-21.

I want to be perfectly honest. I have used these aircraft. As Senators, sometimes we travel to remote areas of the world. Because of time requirements and when we have to go, we have to utilize these aircraft. Last year, Senator REID and I utilized a C-21. We flew commercially to Jakarta, Indonesia, and then we flew a C-21 from Jakarta to East Timor. There were no commercial flights we could take over there at that time. Then we had to fly back. Then I went in that up to Okinawa, Okinawa to Shanghai, and over to Japan, all on routes that would have been very difficult commercially to do.

This is a C-21. You are cramped. There is no bathroom. You can't stand up; you can't stretch out, and there

was room for about five passengers on that and we were loaded. Flying those long distances, we would have to land and refuel, and get up and go, land and refuel.

I am saying, if that is good enough for a Senator, why can't a general do that? I didn't say I have to have a Gulfstream V with all the luxury and the bathroom and a chef on board and a glass of champagne—no, we don't need all that stuff. I just need basic transportation to get me from point A to point B to C to D to E.

Yet I come back to the United States and look around, and I see nice luxury jets being used by generals and admirals, people flying around the United States in these luxury aircraft. I wonder, do they really need to travel that way? Why don't they fly in a C-21? It is cheaper. We have a lot of them. Lord knows, we have a lot of C-21s. We have probably 71 of them. They are cheap. They are efficient. They are fast. They are not very comfortable, but they serve the purpose.

So I just say what we have here is a game of one-upmanship. General so-and-so has a nice plane. Admiral so-and-so wants one, too. Another general wants one.

Again, I say to my friend from Alaska, I am not saying we don't need a number of these aircraft. Some of them we do. Some of them have to be larger for longer flights, as in the Pacific, maybe the European theater. But we do not need them here in the continental United States, and that is what we are getting stung with.

We ought to come to our senses. This is waste, pure and simple. I do not even mind, as I said earlier, a little perk of office for the generals, if they have to get in a plane and fly someplace. But they don't need this kind of perk. A C-21 is fine enough to fly around the continental United States for any general or admiral, for any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And a Gulfstream III is more than adequate for any Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or any admiral or general to fly from here to Europe.

I would say to the Senator from Alaska, a Gulfstream III can fly from here, land in Gander, land in Iceland, it can refuel, or it can land over in Shannon, Ireland, and refuel and make any city in Europe with one-stop refueling—one stop. They do not need the Gulfstream V. Corporate executives fly all the time from the United States to Europe in Gulfstream IIIs. They don't need Gulfstream Vs.

Of course, some of the bigger corporations, may have a Gulfstream V, but that is the private sector. If they want to do that, that is fine. We are talking about public servants here. Generals and admirals are no more or less public servants than the Senator from Hawaii, Iowa, Alaska, or California. They do not need to be mollycoddled. They do not need to be babied and pampered like some corporate executive.

If a corporate executive wants to be babied and pampered, that is up to their board of directors and their stockholders. The American people are the stockholders of the Department of Defense. I do not believe our constituents want to spend their hard-earned tax dollars so some general or admiral can fly around in a Gulfstream V in luxurious comfort while we have troops on food stamps and while we are trying to raise the pay of those on the bottom.

So I say let's take a little time here. Let's take a breather. They do not need to lease the nine aircraft right now.

Let's take a look at the GAO report. Let's give the Department of Defense 1 year to come back, and let's see their justification.

I ask the Senator from California again for that justification for the RFPs that just went out:

Aircraft should be able to fly no-wind range of 5,000 nautical miles.

Why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. Why?

Mrs. BOXER. How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven and a half minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I yield my friend 4 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will not take 4 minutes, but I appreciate the Senator from California yielding me time.

Why? Why 5,000 miles? That is the threshold. The objective is the "Aircraft shall be able to fly no-wind range of 5,000 nautical miles carrying a full passenger and crew complement, plus their baggage." Why? We do not know why, but that is what they said.

The GAO report says, as the Senator from California said, there is no justification for it. They plucked the numbers out of thin air. They cooked the books, and I do not like it.

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield on the remaining time he has? I thank my friend for joining me. This is someone who knows what it is to fly military aircraft. I could not have a better partner on this amendment than TOM HARKIN.

I want to close this particular portion, and then we will have a few minutes left to respond to the criticism that I am sure will now be leveled at us from some very astute people.

Here is the point: Last year when we got in this fight, they told us: Oh, no, they were not going to go out and get these Gulfstreams. We said we thought they were; nothing in this language precludes it. They went out with an RFP. We were right: Luxury planes, \$50 million a copy if you were to buy it.

Secondly, we said OK to our friends, you don't believe us; we will have a GAO report, the nonpartisan arm of Congress, investigate. That is what they do, they investigate. Guess what they said. "Operational support airlift requirements are not sufficiently justi-

fied." Guess what else. The Department of Defense says they agree. So why are we in this bill allowing for leases of nine jets which are not defined? They can well be these luxury jets. I thank my friend and ask for his final comments.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to anyone who is watching this debate, get on your computer, get on the Internet and dial up www.gulfstream.com. Dial up gulfstream.com and take a look at the Gulfstream V and Gulfstream III, I say to my constituents, or anyone who is watching—gulfstream.com. Dial it up and take a look at the Gulfstream V and ask yourself: Does a general or an admiral or anyone who is a public servant really need this kind of luxury? The answer, I think, will be obvious.

I reserve any remaining time.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 4½ minutes, and the Senator from Alaska has 45 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am going to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas and 10 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii. I want to start off by saying we are talking about UC-35 support aircraft under a pilot lease program. I do not know what this business is about someone saying last year—I do not know the straw man. Last year, I said we expected them to lease intercontinental aircraft of a large size, and they did. This time we are telling you we expect them to lease UC-35-type aircraft for operational and support utility purposes.

There are nine planes authorized to be leased—three for the Army, three for the Navy, and three for the Marine Corps—to replace planes that are aging, many of them more than 30 years old, older than the pilots who are flying them.

It is time we woke up to the fact that it costs so much to operate them, so much to maintain them that it is too expensive. We are trying to modernize without buying so many airplanes. We want to lease them.

This is a pilot program, as was the one last year, to see what the cost will be as we have to replace this fleet. It is an aging fleet. As a matter of fact, we bought the first G-3 the first year I was the chairman of the subcommittee in 1981. Those planes are now over 20 years old, the 21s are over 30 years old, and we have to replace them.

We have two pilot projects: One is to lease the larger ones and one is to lease these smaller ones. We are going to see what it costs us, what the maintenance costs are.

I am getting tired of these GAO reports written by people who do not know what they are talking about, and we are going to do something about that, too. That same person who has been writing these reports has condemned every airplane we have bought in the last 5 years. It is time we stopped listening to the people who do not know what they are talking about.

These are pilot programs to lease aircraft, instead of replacing them, to determine what the maintenance costs will be, what will the cost to the Government be if we pursue a leasing program, which most major businesses do now, rather than buying aircraft. I think it will be cost effective. But above all, this is a program to determine the cost, whether there is a choice for us, instead of buying replacements, to lease these aircraft. Until we put the pilot programs in place, we will not know.

I think this is the rational thing to do. I have seen a lot of straw people, but you get on the www.gulfstream.com all you want and look at the beautiful airplanes. They are not what we are talking about. We have not bought any of those either. We have not bought planes such as those they will see advertised for commercial purposes. We bought them for military purposes. They are stripped down, and they are functional aircraft. The ones we leased last year are functional now. I invite my colleagues to take a ride on one and look at them.

As a practical matter, right now, I yield to my friend—

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENS. No, you wouldn't yield to me. I am not going to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I yielded to my friend.

Mr. STEVENS. You didn't yield to me.

Mrs. BOXER. I did certainly yield to you.

Mr. STEVENS. No, you didn't.

Mrs. BOXER. I did; I did.

Mr. STEVENS. On your time. If you want to spend your time, I am happy to use it. Mr. President, on her time I yield to her.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield on your time.

Mrs. BOXER. Fine. I yielded to you on my time, but if that is how you want to do it, fine. I will say this: There is nothing in this language that says you are leasing a particular type of aircraft. This is the same language that was used which gave the Air Force the ability to get the Gulfstreams.

If my friend wants to change the language, that is great, but the language is the same. The Air Force took that language and is buying luxury jets, and besides which the GAO says do not get any more because they do not even know what they have they are so disorganized over there when it comes to the operational airlift.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the language is exactly the same; the Senator is right. It is for leasing aircraft for operational support and utility airlift purposes, and it specifically says it is a multiyear pilot program. There is not an expanded program as has been represented. It is nine planes total to see what the costs will be of operations under this pilot-type program as compared to the cost of buying such an aircraft and flying it for military purposes.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for yielding. The way I understand the amendment, as crafted by the distinguished Senator from Iowa and the distinguished Senator from California, it is that they would strike the appropriations process to lease UC-35 aircraft. We are not talking about—I took some notes—either Gulfstreams or Boeing 727s or Learjets and, as a matter of fact, I do not think, with all due respect to my colleagues, we are talking about pampering or mollicoddling or glasses of champagne in regard to this aircraft.

We are talking about basically the operational support airlift aircraft, and the capability and the importance that these aircraft have in performing the missions as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Secretary of Army, all three of which have put these particular aircraft—nine UC-35s—on their unfunded list.

So if we are going to go to "gulfstream.com"—I don't know if the Commandant of the Marine Corps has a dot com or the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, but they certainly had these aircraft on the unfunded list.

Now, let me talk a minute about the GAO report. The Senator from California was exactly right when she stated the response from the Department of Defense to the GAO and all the criticism of the GAO. As a matter of fact, let me say something about the GAO. It is a lot like an economist. I hope someday to find an expert witness from the General Accounting Office with one arm so he can't say "on the other hand." I don't know how many times, when I had the privilege of being the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the other body, we would have GAO reports that were highly critical of many of the programs that we had under our jurisdiction.

I am finding out in the Intelligence Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and, yes, the Agriculture Committee—we ought to have it before the Ethics Committee—but, at any rate, in these three committees, we still have expertise in the GAO. Sometimes it is very helpful and other times I think a little myopic.

But at any rate, this is what the Department of Defense says in regards to the GAO report. They agree.

The Department agrees with many of the findings in the GAO report. Accordingly, it will take the GAO's findings into consideration in future determinations of operational support airlift requirements.

So they agree that this inventory should be based solely on joint wartime readiness requirements of the commands as opposed to any kind of personal use, as described in great detail by my two friends and colleagues.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the GAO draft report.

I do not think that is the issue. The issue is whether or not we will lease nine. And they would go three to the Army, three to the Navy, and certainly three to the U.S. Marine Corps. They are on the unfunded list.

Now, if this amendment is successful, they will not be leased and they will not replace, as the distinguished chairman has pointed out, aging aircraft, C-12s. I think, over the long term, this will provide a greater test to see, under a cost-benefit standard, as to whether or not this is in the best interests of the taxpayer, as we provide this aircraft.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I don't have time. I will see at the end, if I can ask for more time, and I would be delighted to yield to my good friend.

In war, this fleet—I am talking about operational support airlift aircraft—is maintained and ready to provide the commander quick transportation and to remote locations.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa said—if I can find my notes—that we are not at war. Well, we are not at war. Some people in Kosovo might challenge that. But we are involved in 141 nations. We have U.S. troops—men and women in uniform—in 141 nations. Fifty-five percent of all the nations in the world have U.S. troops stationed in those countries. The operational airlift capacity that is provided by these nine UC-35 aircraft is absolutely vital on those missions.

What am I talking about? Joe Ralston is the new Supreme Allied Commander. He took the place of Wesley Clark. The first obligation, as he told me in a courtesy call, is to pay as many courtesy visits as he can to his counterparts in Russia. How is he going to get there?

What happens if something breaks out in Kosovo? How does he get there? No, we are not at war, but in terms of our obligations and in terms of our military being stretched and stressed and hollow, it seems to me we ought to be very careful when we talk about operational support airlift aircraft.

Let me give you another example.

I have a congressional fellow in my office. He is an F-15 pilot. I know one case where his aircraft, in support of Operation Southern Watch—that is to prevent drugs from coming into this country—had to divert due to a massive fuel leak. Again, in regards to this operational support airlift aircraft, basically what happened, it was dispatched with maintenance crews and the very critical parts to fix the aircraft very quickly and return it to mission ready status.

That is what these aircraft are used for. As a matter of fact, I have here a statement that only 5 percent of these aircraft, in terms of missions, were ever even used by generals.

Here it is: In fiscal year 1999, less than 5 percent of the operational support missions were for generals or admirals. What does the 95 percent do?

The operational support airlift mission does provide—as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps—efficient and effective transportation of commanders, key staff personnel, couriers, critical spare parts, and equipment in support of both peacetime and wartime operations.

These missions, according to the people who fly them, are typically unpredictable, high priority, and require very short notice in regards to the airlift of the people, the cargo, and the mail. These lifts are normally in support of contingency deployments—goodness knows, we have those today in 141 nations—not compatible with commercial transportation or larger aircraft.

The critical delays in the transportation of senior leaders, key staff personnel, urgently needed parts, supplies, and software could ultimately impact unit effectiveness and combat readiness.

I want to say, in closing, that my distinguished friend from Iowa referred to a so-called—I know he was not being specific in regards to the Marine Corps—“General Smith” in the Marine Corps who would look around to other generals who might have a Gulfstream or a 727 or a Learjet, or whatever, and say: Gee whiz, I would like to have that perk.

I just want to set the record straight. I asked the Marine Corps, I asked the Commandant: What about this statement, Mr. Commandant? I am talking about “General Jim Jones.” And this is the statement that worried me because it is very similar to the statements that have been made on the floor by the proponents of this amendment. The response was:

The Pentagon already has enough aircraft to taxi Generals and Admirals around the world. In fact, they have more than 300 executive aircraft, including more than 100 jets suitable to transport high-ranking officers.

I asked the Commandant, I said: Will you please comment about this statement. And the response was:

The 3 UC-35s are for Active Marine Corps forces, not the Navy.

The Marine Corps does not provide executive airlift.

Let me repeat that: The United States Marine Corps, according to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, does not provide executive airlift.

[The Marine Corps has] a small fleet (24) of Operational Support Airlift aircraft that are tied directly to a Joint Staff validated war-time requirement. . . .

These aircraft support Marine Forces deployed [around the world].

The need to replace—

And this is what the chairman of the committee was trying to point out—aging/obsolete CT-39G aircraft has been accelerated by the transfer of 2 of the Marine Corps 3 remaining CT-39s to the Navy. . . .

We do not even have the obsolete aircraft. That is nothing new for the Marine Corps. We do not even have that.

I continue with the answer in regards to that statement that has been stated by the Commandant:

The increased performance and short field capability of the UC-35 will ensure OSA support to forward deployed Marine Corps forces remains viable well into the 21st century.

Again, I am quoting from the Commandant:

The Marine Corps has placed 3 UC-35s on the Commandant's FY00 APN Unfunded Priority List in order to accelerate delivery to the West Coast and Okinawa to support Marine forces.

[These] Missions are typically unpredictable, high priority, and require short notice airlift of people, cargo, and mail. These lifts are normally in support of contingency deployments not compatible with commercial transportation, common user airlift, or other organic airlift.

That is a long way from being mollycoddled or thinking that you must have a perk aircraft because some other admiral or general might have a perk aircraft.

I agree with the Senators from Iowa and California, we must make sure that the Department of Defense, as is indicated by their response, adheres to the GAO report, without question.

Nobody wants to soak the taxpayer for any kind of generals' special fleet. That is not what this does. This amendment would strike nine unfunded priority requests by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. I will put that dot com at the end of my remarks and hope people will pay attention to the people who have that responsibility.

I hope my colleagues will oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am not a pilot. However, I believe that in this body I spend more time on aircraft than other Members.

My home is in Hawaii. Whenever I leave the city of Washington to return home, I must prepare myself for 11 hours and 15 minutes of flight time. In that sense, I believe I am an experienced person when it comes to flying. However, in my case, because of the uncertainty of the schedule in the Senate, we cannot make reservations 3 or 4 months ahead of time. I have had a reservation for this Friday, but I just canceled that because I think we are going to be handling appropriations measures. As a result, if something should come about making it possible for me to fly back to Hawaii this Friday, I may be able to get a flight, leaving at some strange hour, economy class, which I don't mind. But at the end of the trip, I usually can get home to my apartment and spend an evening of rest.

The men who fly these planes have special responsibilities. When they get on a flight to go to Russia, they are not going to be escorted to a fancy hotel as soon as they land. They are expected to go to a meeting at that point. The

least we can provide our commanders is some rest and some comfort before they get into some big business.

Secondly, these are not just any old aircraft. They have to be specially equipped. In wartime and in peacetime, these planes are their headquarters. They make command decisions on these flights. They are expected to be in contact with the men and women under their command at all times. We are fortunate. In a sense, we are 8-to-8 employees. We get to work about 8 o'clock and we leave work about 8. A military commander is like a police officer. He is on duty 24 hours a day. These aircraft must be equipped to be able to provide support for his 24-hour-a-day responsibility.

Yes, we do have 71 Learjets in the inventory at this time. That is a large fleet, 71 Learjets. But they are getting pretty old and inadequate for the assignments. Within 5 years, about 45 are going to be retired. Within 10 years, we will find that all of these will be gone.

We have 707s. I don't know how many of my colleagues have been flying on 707s recently, but they are considered pretty old, 35 years old. Whether we like it or not, we will have to retire these aircraft. Yes, we have C-22s, the 727. They are 25 years old. They can't last forever. They are going to be retired pretty soon.

A third consideration: This provision in our bill does not specify the name of the aircraft. We do this deliberately because we don't want to favor one company over another. If we put in the G-5 that we are favoring one company, the Grumman, or if we put in something else, we are going to be favoring another company. That is not our wish. We want this to undergo a competitive system. I think we have fulfilled that requirement by this amendment.

Overall, there is another consideration. We have been speaking of admirals and generals. Much of the time you will find that these aircraft are being used by our civilian leaders, Cabinet people. Just 2 days ago, the Secretary of State went to Syria, to Damascus, to attend the funeral of President Assad. She did not go on Pan American or TWA. She went on a military aircraft. I would hope that we Americans would want our Secretary of State to travel in an aircraft worthy of her position. We can easily say United Airlines is good enough for me, why is it not good enough for general so-and-so? Well, if he is going home for vacation, he should take United Airlines or Delta, whatever airlines he wants to take. But these aircraft are not being used for personal purposes. They are being used for military purposes. I hope we will understand this. I hope when the vote is called, we will vote against this.

I would support my colleagues from Iowa and California if I at any time thought these aircraft were perks. They are not perks. Any person who is willing to command troops and stand in harm's way in my behalf and in behalf of the people of the United States,

I say a G-5 is good for them. If we get something better than that, so be it. Nothing is too good for them.

I hope my colleagues will support the leadership and managers of this measure and vote against this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 23 minutes remaining, and the Senator from California has 4 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from California 2 minutes and apologize. She did recognize me for a four-line comment.

I yield myself what time I use to make this statement: The issue has been raised about large aircraft. That is a different issue. We have gone back and checked what this issue is. This is support aircraft. The Air Force told us today they will have to add \$900 million to the budget to maintain and upgrade the existing support aircraft for the next 10 years. Leasing these smaller aircraft to replace them will cost \$525 million over the next 10 years. If our pilot program works, these aircraft in what we call the CINC Support Pilot Program will save \$275 million. I think that is a good idea. It makes sense to try it for the UC-35s, and I hope the Senate will support that.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska for giving me a little bit of time. I began to doubt my own memory, but I am glad that he agreed that I did, in fact, yield to him. Of course, I have tremendous respect for him, but I don't agree with him on this particular issue.

I want to address what one of my dearest friends in the Senate, Senator INOUE said. He said: I don't want to see our generals and people who put their lives on the line for their country flying around in a commercial jet.

I totally understand that. I didn't disagree with him on that. I say to my friend from Hawaii that I personally don't want the generals traveling around via United or TWA.

That is not what this is about. I want to make sure we have the appropriate number of operational support aircraft in the fleet. We know—because the GAO took a long time investigating—that in fact the joint staff has not maintained records documenting its previous requirement reviews, so it is not possible to determine whether some options for reducing requirements were examined.

I say to my friend from Hawaii that the issue isn't that we shouldn't have operational support aircraft. Of course, we have to and we must. But why on Earth do we go ahead in this appropriations bill with language identical to that which we saw last year which resulted in the Air Force going out with a proposal for six of the most expensive luxury jets? We now have the same language for nine jets. There is no limit on language that the Navy or the Army can come back with. That is why we are structuring it. We are simply saying it would be fiscally responsible.

I am one of the people who, years ago when I was in the House, found—I forget how much it was—I think it was an \$11,000 coffeepot, something like that, and the expensive wrenches and spare parts the military was using. Every time I got up on the floor of the House I was truly lectured: You don't know what you are saying. There is no backup for this. Eventually they believed we were right. They weren't going out for competitive bids for these spare parts.

I question no one in this Senate in terms of their wanting the best defense we can have. But I don't think we get the best defense when we waste dollars.

I am suggesting that the language in this appropriations bill, believe it or not, doesn't have a cap. Am I right on that point? It has no cap. It has no dollar figure. It only caps the number of aircraft to nine. But if they do what the Air Force did—Senator STEVENS says they won't, and perhaps they won't—but if they did do what the Air Force said, it would be almost one-half billion dollars.

Our amendment says strike that language. Let's have more of a review. Let's not waste money.

We weren't born yesterday. We know people love to travel in luxury. There is not one person listening to this debate who wouldn't enjoy kicking back on this type of luxury jet.

Let's show a picture of it. That is not the question. But the issue is whether taxpayers have to spend that much money when we don't know what is in the requirements. We don't know what planes are in the Air Force, the Marines, or the Army. We do not have a study. It simply says operational support airlift requirements are not sufficiently justified. We don't know what is in the garage. Let's put it that way. That was the verb I was looking for. We don't know what is in the garage. Let's not go out and willy-nilly allow them to get an additional nine aircraft. These are beautiful aircraft. There is no question they are wonderful. But we were told: Oh, well. Maybe the Senator from Alaska believed that he said he fully expected them to get the Gulfstream. I remember the debate a little differently. The debate was that we were not sure what they were going to wind up getting. They were going to wind up getting these. Just because the Air Force has them doesn't mean we have to have them in the Army. It

doesn't mean we have to have them in the Navy.

I think Senator HARKIN was right. He said he knows airplanes. He knows aircraft. This is about luxury. What the military should be about is mission. What is the mission? What do we need and what do we have? The GAO report clearly is telling us they do not know what they have.

I think it is rather embarrassing; they do not know what they have. Yet we are going ahead as if everything was wonderful. No one on our side of the argument—we had over 30 people last time—has ever said that we don't have anything but the greatest respect for our generals and our admirals. But we have respect for the taxpayers. Senators can argue with one another. I don't know what we appropriate for the GAO every year, but they have some very smart investigators. They made an investigation and said: We don't know what they have.

Why should we get any more until we really know for sure?

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the operational support airlift fleet has decreased from 520 in 1995 to 364 today. We are reducing the number of these aircraft. Now we are starting a pilot project of leasing them to see if we can save even more money. But we must go through the concept of replacing these aging aircraft.

By the way, one last comment as a pilot: People say: Well, they can land and take off, and they can land and take off, and they can land and take off. I am also a pilot. Every time you let down and land and take off again, you use more fuel than if you fly straight through. These planes are designed to save us money by having "the legs," as we call it, to go the distance and not have to stop and burn more fuel as they land and take off.

Does the Senator wish any more time?

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time. I serve notice that I intend to move to table the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I need to find out whether it is proper for us to go ahead and have this vote now. We had intended to complete the Wellstone amendment. Does it meet with the approval of both sides to proceed with this amendment now? I want to make a statement before we have the rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been asked for.

Mr. STEVENS. I agree with the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, following this vote, I ask unanimous consent that there be 4 minutes equally divided on the Wellstone amendment so the Senator can explain his amendment and we can respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Following that, it is my intention to move to go to third reading and have final passage on this bill. I serve notice on all those involved that we will have a managers' package following the vote on this amendment before taking up the Wellstone amendment. If there is no further objection, after the Wellstone amendment, we will go to third reading and have final passage immediately after that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no further second-degree amendments to any amendment on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 3311. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Akaka	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Fitzgerald	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Biden	Gramm	Moynihhan
Bingaman	Gregg	Murkowski
Bond	Hagel	Nickles
Breaux	Hatch	Reed
Brownback	Helms	Roberts
Bunning	Hollings	Roth
Burns	Hutchinson	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Leahy	Thurmond
DeWine	Lieberman	Voivovich
Dodd	Lott	Warner

NAYS—32

Abraham	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Bayh	Grams	Reid
Boxer	Grassley	Robb
Bryan	Harkin	Sarbanes
Byrd	Johnson	Schumer
Conrad	Kennedy	Sessions
Dorgan	Kohl	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Edwards	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—3

Domenici	Rockefeller	Specter
----------	-------------	---------

The amendment (No. 3311) was rejected.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next votes in this series be limited to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BURNS be added to the Baucus amendment No. 3372 as an original cosponsor.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be added as an original cosponsor to amendment No. 3361.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3177, AS MODIFIED, 3178, AS MODIFIED, 3282, AS MODIFIED, 3285, AS MODIFIED, 3287, AS MODIFIED, 3290, AS MODIFIED, 3294, AS MODIFIED, 3295, AS MODIFIED, 3297, AS MODIFIED, 3313, AS MODIFIED, 3333, AS MODIFIED, 3340, AS MODIFIED, 3345, 3347, AS MODIFIED, 3359, AS MODIFIED, 3361, 3372, AS MODIFIED, 3376, AND 3377, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the second managers' package with the amendments that have been agreed to on both sides, as modified. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3177, As Modified, 3178, As Modified, 3282, As Modified, 3285, As Modified, 3287, As Modified, 3290, As Modified, 3294, As Modified, 3295, As Modified, 3297, As Modified, 3313, As Modified, 3333, As Modified, 3340, As Modified, 3345, 3347, As Modified, 3359, As Modified, 3361, 3372, As Modified, 3376, and 3377) were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3177, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To set aside \$6,000,000 to support smart maps and other intelligent spatial technologies)

At an appropriate place in the substituted original text, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$6,000,000 may be made available to support spatio-temporal database research, visualization and user interaction testing, enhanced image processing, automated feature extraction research, and development of field-sensing devices, all of which are critical technology issues for smart maps and other intelligent spatial technologies.

AMENDMENT NO. 3178, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To set aside \$7,000,000 for the procurement of the integrated bridge system for special warfare rigid inflatable boats under the Special Operations Forces Combatant Craft Systems program)

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading "PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$7,000,000 may be made available for the procurement of the integrated bridge system for special warfare rigid inflatable boats under the Special Operations Forces Combatant Craft Systems program.

AMENDMENT NO. 3282, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To state the sense of the Senate regarding the payment by the Secretary of the Air Force of \$92,974.86 to the New Jersey Forest Fire Service as reimbursement for costs incurred in fighting a fire resulting from a training exercise at Warren Grove Testing Range, New Jersey)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. (a) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Air Force should, using funds specified in subsection (b), pay the New Jersey Forest Fire Service the sum of \$92,974.86 to reimburse the New Jersey Forest Fire Service for costs incurred in containing and extinguishing a fire in the Bass River State Forest and Wharton State Forest, New Jersey, in May 1999, which fire was caused by an errant bomb from an Air National Guard unit during a training exercise at Warren Grove Testing Range, New Jersey.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Funds for the payment referred to in subsection (a) should be derived from amounts appropriated by title II of this Act under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD".

AMENDMENT NO. 3285, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To set aside \$18,900,000 to meet certain unfunded requirements for MH-60 aircraft of the United States Special Operations Command)

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading "PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$18,900,000 may be made available for MH-60 aircraft for the United States Special Operations Command as follows: up to \$12,900,000 for the procurement of probes for aerial refueling of 22 MH-60L aircraft, and up to \$6,000,000 for the procurement and integration of internal auxiliary fuel tanks for 50 MH-60 aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 3287, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for the conveyance of an Emergency One Cyclone II Custom pumper truck to the Umatilla Indian Tribe, the current lessee)

Under the heading CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE insert before the period the following: "Provided further, That the amount available under Operation and maintenance shall also be available for the conveyance, without consideration, of the Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper truck subject to Army Loan DAAMO1-98-L-0001 to the Umatilla Indian Tribe, the current lessee".

AMENDMENT NO. 3290, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

“SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION.—No funds made available under this Act may be used to transfer a veterans memorial object to a foreign country or entity controlled by a foreign government, or otherwise transfer or convey such object to any person or entity for purposes of the ultimate transfer or conveyance of such object to a foreign country or entity controlled by a foreign government, unless specifically authorized by law.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY CONTROLLED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—The term “entity controlled by a foreign government” has the meaning given that term in section 2536(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) VETERANS MEMORIAL OBJECT.—The term “veterans memorial object” means any object, including a physical structure or portion thereof, that—

(A) is located in a cemetery of the national Cemetery System, war memorial, or military installation in the United States;

(B) is dedicated to, or otherwise memorializes, the death in combat or combat-related duties of members of the United States Armed Forces; and

(C) was brought to the United States from abroad as a memorial of combat abroad.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3294, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available \$5,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Air Force for Advanced Technology (PE603605F) for the LaserSpark countermeasures program)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amount appropriated under title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE”, up to \$5,000,000 may be made available under Advanced Technology for the LaserSpark countermeasures program.

AMENDMENT NO. 3295, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available \$3,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide for Logistics Research and Development Technology Demonstration (PE603712S) for a Silicon-Based Nanostructures Program)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amount appropriated under title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE” for Logistics Research and Development Technology Demonstration, up to \$2,000,000 may be made available for a Silicon-Based Nanostructures.

AMENDMENT NO. 3297, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available \$50,000,000 for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-Wide for directed energy technologies, weapons, and systems)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amount appropriated under title IV under the heading “RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE,” up to \$50,000,000 may be made available for High Energy Laser research, development, test and evaluation (PE 0602605F, PE 0603605F, PE 0601108D, PE 0602890D, and PE 0603921D). Release of funds is contingent on site selection for the Joint Technology Office referenced in the Defense Department’s High Energy Laser Master Plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 3313, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To modify the funds available to offset the effects of low utilization of plant capacity at the Arsenals)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amount appropriated under title II under the heading “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY” for Industrial Mobilization Capacity, \$56,500,000 plus in addition \$11,500,000 may be made available to address unutilized plant capacity in order to offset the effects of low utilization of plant capacity on overhead charges at the Arsenals.

AMENDMENT NO. 3333, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available up to \$3,000,000 for Other Procurement for the Air Force for certain analyses of the restart of the production line for the U-2 aircraft)

In the appropriate place in the Bill, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amounts appropriated in title III under the heading “OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE”, \$3,000,000 shall be made available for an analysis of the costs associated with and the activities necessary in order to reestablish the production line for the U-2 aircraft, at the rate of 2 aircraft per year, as quickly as is feasible.

U-2 AIRCRAFT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the managers for accepting my amendment making up to \$3 million available to analyze the cost and feasibility of restarting the production line for the U-2 aircraft at a production rate of two aircraft per year.

The U-2 has proven itself to be the workhorse of our airborne intelligence reconnaissance system. We saw the value of its capabilities graphically demonstrated during the Kosovo air operation, where it was an integral part of the air strike mission. Unfortunately, the Kosovo air operation also revealed how bare the cupboard is in terms of U-2 aircraft. The scarcity of U-2 aircraft in our inventory—fewer than three dozen operational aircraft—was sharply accentuated by the Kosovo crisis. To move our U-2 assets into Kosovo, we were forced into the difficult position of drawing down our U-2 capabilities in other theatres.

Would the Chairman agree that U.S. commanders-in-chief around the world, including the Southern Command, which is in charge of intelligence relating to the drug war in Colombia, rely extensively on the U-2 and yet lack the assets needed to completely fulfill their requirements, so that even in the absence of a regional crisis such as Kosovo, our U-2 resources are thinly stretched?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. We do, of course, have satellites that provide regular intelligence, but in terms of special missions and real-time needs on the ground, the reconnaissance capabilities provided by aircraft such as the U-2 and UAV are irreplaceable.

Mr. BYRD. Given the current attrition rate of U-2 aircraft, approximately one a year, the situation will only worsen. Moreover, I understand that the research and development effort to develop unmanned aerial vehicles such as Global Hawk, while promising, is still immature. Yet we do not now have a U-2 production line in place to replace the aircraft that we lose through attrition. In the interests of ensuring

that we have an adequate inventory of reconnaissance aircraft to meet the needs of the commanders-in-chief, would the Chairman agree that it would be prudent for the Defense Department to keep its options open and, at a minimum, prepare an analysis of the cost and feasibility of restarting the U-2 production line?

Mr. STEVENS. I concur with the Senator. This is a matter on which the Committee should seek more thorough analysis.

Mr. BYRD. I am hopeful that my amendment will provide that analysis. It is my intent, and I hope the Chairman would agree, that the findings of this analysis should be provided to Congress in an unclassified report prior to next April, when the next budget will be considered, so that we will have the necessary information on which to base our decisions.

Mr. STEVENS. I agree that such a report would be useful and timely, and I look forward to receiving it.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the chairman for his attention and his support.

AMENDMENT NO. 3340, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for the operation of current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Failure to operate and standardize the current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites along the Southwest border of the United States and the Gulf of Mexico will result in a degradation of the counterdrug capability of the United States.

(2) Most of the illicit drugs consumed in the United States enter the United States through the Southwest border, the Gulf of Mexico, and Florida.

(3) The Tethered Aerostat Radar System is a critical component of the counterdrug mission of the United States relating to the detection and apprehension of drug traffickers.

(4) Preservation of the current Tethered Aerostat Radar System network compels drug traffickers to transport illicit narcotics into the United States by more risky and hazardous routes.

(b) Of the funds appropriated in title VI under the heading “DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE”, up to \$23,000,000 may be made available to Drug Enforcement Policy Support (DEP&S) for purposes of maintaining operations of the 11 current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites and completing the standardization of such sites located along the Southwest border of the United States and in the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 3345

(Purpose: To set aside funds for maintaining the industrial mobilization capacity at the McAlester Army Ammunition Activity, Oklahoma)

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY”, up to \$3,800,000 may be available for defraying the costs of maintaining the industrial mobilization capacity at the McAlester Army Ammunition Activity, Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 3347, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide \$5,000,000 to support a tropical remote sensing radar)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title VI under the heading "COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE", up to \$5,000,000 may be made available for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar.

AMENDMENT NO. 3359, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To repeal the prohibition on use of Department of Defense funds for the procurement of a nuclear-capable shipyard crane from a foreign source)

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Section 8093 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-79; 113 Stat. 1253) is amended by striking subsection (d), relating to a prohibition on the use of Department of Defense funds to procure a nuclear-capable shipyard crane from a foreign source.

AMENDMENT NO. 3361

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

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Of the funds provided within Title I of this Act, such funds as may be necessary shall be available for a special subsistence allowance for members eligible to receive food stamp assistance, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT NO. 3372, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To set aside for preparation and training for the digitization of FA-18 aircraft technical manuals, \$5,200,000 of the amounts appropriated for the Navy for RDT&E for the Navy technical information presentation system)

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the total amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY" for the Navy technical information presentation system, \$5,200,000 may be available for the digitization of FA-18 aircraft technical manuals.

AMENDMENT NO. 3376

(Purpose: To add funding to the Title II, Defense-wide, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, for the Virtual Worlds Initiative)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds available in Title II under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION" (DEFENSE-WIDE) up to \$2,000,000 may be made available to the Special Reconnaissance Capabilities (SRC) Program for the Virtual Worlds Initiative in PE 0304210BB.

AMENDMENT NO. 3377

(Purpose: To add funding to the Procurement of Ammunition, Marine Corps for procurement of ROCKETS, ALL TYPE, 83mm HEDP)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds available in Title III under the heading "PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY/MARINE CORPS, up to \$5,000,000 may be made available for ROCKETS, ALL TYPE, 83mm HEDP.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3366, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 4 minutes equally divided on the Wellstone amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Can I go to third reading now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an order for 4 minutes of debate on the Wellstone amendment, followed by a vote on the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Following that, I will move to go to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this is a \$290 billion budget altogether. This amendment takes \$1 billion from procurement, not from readiness. This takes \$1 billion more than the President requested. It puts the money into the title I program.

This is a matter of priorities. This is a program that helps poor children in America, never mind that it helps them do better in school, never mind that it helps them graduate, never mind that it helps them contribute to our economy, never mind that it leads to less high school dropout, never mind it leads to less children winding up incarcerated and in prison.

Vote for this because most of these children are under 4 feet tall and they are all beautiful and they deserve our support.

The title I program is funded right now at a 35-percent level. This is a matter of priorities.

People in the country believe we should do better by these children. We should do better by these children. It is \$1 billion out of all the procurement—\$57 billion—that goes to children in title I.

I hope Senators will vote for this. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a strange circumstance. The Senator's amendment, really, would be subject to a point of order if we had already raised the caps. We have not raised the caps, so this is not the time to make a point of order. But it is the time to point out that the Senator's amendment would move money from defense into education, and it would violate the principle of the wall that we put up between defense and nondefense.

I do hope that the Senate will support the committee in voting to table, and I do move to table this amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. STEVENS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back his time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to table Wellstone amendment No. 3366, as modified.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is a 10-minute vote; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I remind the body, this is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—83

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

NAYS—15

Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Daschle	Lautenberg	Schumer
Dodd	Leahy	Torricelli
Durbin	Murray	Wellstone
Feingold	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Specter
-------------	---------

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 3176, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To add \$6,000,000 for research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide, for the initial production of units of the ALGL/STRIKER to facilitate early fielding of the ALGL/STRIKER to special operations forces)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate. There is one

amendment we left out of the managers' package. I would like to present it at this time. It is amendment No. 3176, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3176), as modified, was agreed to as follows:

On page 109, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8126. Of the amounts appropriated in title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$6,000,000 may be made available for the initial production of units of the ALGL/STRIKER to facilitate early fielding of the ALGL/STRIKER to special operations forces.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I was just asked why we didn't raise rule XVI to the amendments that were on the list. Although they were introduced, they were not called up. So the point of order has not been raised because they were not called up. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I now ask for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

NAVAL ACADEMY BOARD OF VISITORS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the Naval Academy Board of Visitors meeting this week I learned that the Naval Academy is required to use funds generated by the Visitor's Center to repay a long-term government loan. I believe that these funds would be better utilized by the Midshipmen Welfare Fund that supports extra-curricular activities not covered by appropriated funds. Knowing of the strong leadership of the chairman and the Senator from Hawaii and support of our Service Academies, I inquire as to whether they would be willing to review this repayment program in conference, and if the facts merit, work to eliminate this requirement?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator that I will work with him and the other interested members to ensure that this matter is addressed in our conference in a manner that will provide a favorable resolution for the Academy.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join with my chairman and will work to favorably resolve this item in conference.

C-5 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the Chairman for taking

the time to discuss an issue that is very important to my colleagues, myself, and national security—the modernization of our strategic airlift fleet.

In this year's Defense Appropriations report, there is a restriction on using procurement funds for avionics upgrades of the C-5As. The Report also appears to restrict the High Pressure Turbine Replacements. I do not believe that was the Committee's intent.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. The Committee does not believe this report language limits replacing C-5 High Pressure Turbines. Those replacements should occur to the entire C-5 fleet based on Defense Department requirements.

Mr. BIDEN. I understand, however, that the Committee is concerned about the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) for the C-5 As. Just to clarify, there are two models of C-5s in the Air Force, 76 of the older A-model and 50 of the newer B-model. The C-5's mission is to take heavy loads over a long-distance. It is capable of carrying more cargo farther than any other plane in the United States' military.

In particular, the C-5 regularly runs missions to and from Europe and the Pacific and the United States. For this reason, compliance with the International Civil Aviation Organization's rules in high-density flight areas is important for the entire fleet of C-5s. The AMP will bring C-5 aircraft into compliance with the new Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) standards established by the International Civil Aviation Organization. Compliance with GATM is important because it allows aircraft to use more operationally efficient airspace and lowers operational costs.

This is one of the reasons that the Senate Committee on Armed Services specifically requested that the Secretary of the Air Force proceed to test AMP upgrades on both A and B models in its Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Authorization Report and that both defense committees in the House of Representatives supported this program for the entire C-5 fleet.

Mr. STEVENS. The Committee is aware of the new standards, but is concerned that the Air Force is not investing in the proper mix of modernization and new aircraft to meet our strategic airlift needs.

We are still waiting to receive the long overdue Mobility Requirements Study 2005 (MRS '05) that will clearly lay-out what our strategic airlift needs will be for the foreseeable future. In addition, once that requirement is clear, we will get the Air Force Analysis of Alternatives for Outsized/Oversized Airlift (AoA). This study will provide a clear understanding of what mix of aircraft will most efficiently and effectively meet the operational requirements of the military.

When the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shelton, testified before our Committee, he expressed reservations about making further investments in the C-5A fleet.

Mr. BIDEN. I share the Senator's concern that we have still not received MRS '05 and the AoA. However, my conversations with the Air Force lead me to believe that both A and B model planes are expected to be flown by the Air Force for 20 to 40 years to come, whether in Active-duty, Reserve, or Guard units.

While I know that no one in the Senate cares more about the safety of our military personnel than my colleague from Alaska, I remain concerned that some increased risk will be incurred by aircrews flying planes that have not had AMP upgrades. AMP also includes the installation of important safety features like Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System and an enhanced all weather navigational system, the Terrain Awareness and Warning System. Some of these systems were mandated by Congress after the tragic death of Secretary Ron Brown.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct, I do not believe that the Committee's language endangers any of our aircrews. Instead, it is a delaying mechanism to prevent investing in these planes before we are sure that they will be flying for the next 20 years. If, in fact, these studies suggest that, then we will take another look at the needs of the A-models.

Mr. BIDEN. I appreciate that commitment by my colleague. I would also like to clarify with the Senator from Alaska that he supports proceeding with AMP for the B-models.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIDEN. In that case, I think it important to consider the difficulty of proceeding with upgrading the C-5Bs without A models available to do regular missions to Europe where the compliance issues could become a problem.

In addition, if I am correct about the continued use of the C-5As for decades to come, then not proceeding with the AMP for the A models will create a set of new problems.

First, efficient use of aircrew members and crew interfly will be prevented because of the dissimilarities that would exist between A and B model avionics and navigation systems. This is particularly problematic when additional aircrew members are needed to meet Major Theater War requirements.

Second, by attempting to maintain two separate avionics and navigation systems within the relatively small C-5 fleet (126 airplanes), additional spares and support equipment will be necessary with increased unit costs.

Already, the C-5 has been particularly hard-hit by the lack of necessary parts. This is likely to exacerbate that problem.

Last, the language will also create changes in the existing contracts for these on-going programs. Until we know for sure what MRS '05 and the AoA will say, creating this new difficulty does not make sense.

Mr. STEVENS. Again I say to the Senator that I think Chairman

Shelton's testimony was very persuasive. He urged against using our scarce airlift resources on the A-model upgrades. However, my friend makes a good point that changing the program at this point, before we receive MRS '05 and the AoA may be premature. I am willing to re-examine this issue when we go into the Conference with the House.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator for taking another look at this critical issue and again say that I agree with him on the need to get the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Air Force to submit their overdue studies.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I would like to follow-up on what my colleague from Delaware has just mentioned.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for accepting my amendment No. 3352, which was cosponsored by Senator BIDEN. This amendment restores full funding (\$92.5 million) for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation funds for C-5 modernization programs, including the C-5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engineering Program. This amendment, in addition to the Committee recommendation of \$95.4 million requested by the Pentagon in procurement funds for C-5 modernization programs, will allow the current C-5 Galaxy modernization programs to continue for the upcoming Fiscal Year.

I would like to point out the only question that we are discussing now is which C-5 Galaxies will be modernized. I would like to thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for clarifying the committee's position on the C-5 High Pressure Turbine modernization. I also thank the Chairman for agreeing to consider allowing the expenditure of procurement funds for the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) on the C-5A models.

Just yesterday, I was at Dover Air Force Base, home to 26 C-5Bs and 10 C-5As. Each year, the community leaders, the base leadership, and the Delaware congressional delegation meet to discuss issues important to the Air Base. During a presentation by Colonel S. Taco Gilbert III, the commander of the 436th Airlift Wing at Dover, he mentioned the importance of this program for safely and efficiently operating the Galaxy.

The AMP will allow the C-5 to operate safely, effectively and more reliably. Features like the Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) and the Terrain Awareness and Warning System are important safety measures for the crews flying our C-5s. Bringing the C-5 into compliance with the Global Air Traffic Management standards will allow the C-5 to use advantageous flight paths and reduce fuel consumption and other costs. Finally, the new equipment will increase the reliability rates for the C-5 Galaxy and allow off-the-shelf replacements for hard to replace parts.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, my three colleagues have discussed in

great detail the issues surrounding C-5A modernization efforts. I understand the Chairman's concern with modernizing the C-5A and believe that we must take a serious look at how it fits into our nation's airlift requirements—an effort that is currently underway. At the same time, I believe it is important for us to keep our options open and slowing C-5A modernization efforts now might prove costly in the future, for the very reasons given by the Senator from Delaware.

I am pleased that the Chairman is willing to re-examine this issue in conference. I am also thankful to the junior Senator from Delaware for his leadership on this issue. I thank the Chair.

CASA C-212

Ms. COLLINS. I would like to take a moment to discuss with the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations the potential needs of the Army National Guard and the Special Forces Groups, in particular the 10th and the 20th Special Forces Groups, for a short take-off and landing, fixed wing aircraft to meet their training and mission requirements. Special Forces units, in particular, require such aircraft to get in and out of "hot spots" and other situations and areas where no landing field exists.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Maine addressing the utility of a multi-function short take-off and landing fixed wing aircraft for the Army National Guard and the Special Forces Groups.

Ms. COLLINS. I am concerned that the Special Forces Groups and the Army National Guard do not have sufficient aircraft available to meet their needs. In fact, I have been informed that, between October of 1998 and September of 1999, the 10th and the 20th Special Forces Groups could not support 23 missions because of the lack of aviation support available. As such, I would ask that the Army National Guard and the Special Forces Groups assess their needs for a short take-off and landing fixed wing aircraft and, in particular, the C-212 STOL fixed wing aircraft. I ask further that the Army National Guard and the Special Forces Groups report to Congress on the results of their assessments within six months so that we can determine whether funds should be appropriated in fiscal year 2002 for the purchase of such aircraft. Mr. Chairman, do you support such an assessment and report to Congress?

Mr. STEVENS. I do and will be interested in personally reviewing the reports in advance of the fiscal year 2002 appropriations cycle. I thank my colleague for her dedication and commitment to the armed forces.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the distinguished Chairman for his continued support for our nation's national defense.

TITLE III: SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I seek recognition with the distinguished

chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Alaska to discuss a very important matter to our national security. Both the House and Senate versions of the FY2001 national Defense authorization bill contain provisions that supported the President's budget request and authorized \$1.51 billion for Navy procurement of two LPD-17 amphibious ships in FY2001.

The LPD-17 program is a critical ship for the modernization of the Navy's amphibious force. It will carry more than 700 Marines and the equipment and means for them to get ashore and perform their mission—whether that mission is combat related, peace-keeping or in response to crisis throughout the world. It is a Commandant of the Marine Corps, before the Senate Armed Services Committee that "there are no underutilized amphibious ships," and the testimony by Lieutenant General Rhodes before the Seapower Subcommittee where he stated that "the operational flexibility and forward presence our Amphibious Ready Groups represent will be significantly enhanced with the FY03 delivery of the first of 12 LPD-17 amphibious ships." He further stated, "these ships will overcome amphibious lift shortfalls."

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine, in recognition of the importance of the LPD-17 program and the importance of these ships to the overall modernization program of the Navy and Marine Corps. During consideration of the FY2001 Defense appropriations bill, concern regarding delays in the design and construction of the lead LPD ship at the lead shipyard led to a decision by the Committee to defer funding for the fifth and sixth ship of the class. The Committee did, however, recommend a total of \$485 million for this program.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Alaska's support for the LPD-17 program, and would like to take a few minutes to discuss with the distinguished chairman the critical need for these ships.

Mr. STEVENS. I have always been a supporter of the LPD-17 program and the Committee very much appreciates the need for the lift capacity of this ship. In fact, it is my understanding that the *San Antonio* and her 11 sister ships will be the functional replacement for four classes of older amphibious ships. And in 2008, when the last LPD-17 class ship is scheduled to join the fleet, the amphibious force will consist of 36 ships or 12 three-ship Amphibious Ready Groups (ARGs) consisting of one LHA or LHD, one LPD and one LSD.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for making that point. As I discussed during the debate last week on the fiscal year 2001 Defense Authorization bill, the Armed Services Committee is working hard to come to terms with the force levels necessary

to accomplish the many missions our Navy and Marine Corps are called on to accomplish.

The increase to war fighting capability that LPD-17 brings is critical to our naval force's future success. The LPD-17's ability to accommodate new equipment, such as the Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle (AAAV), the Landing Craft Air Cushioned Vehicle (LCAC) and the vertical lift MV-22, and the remarkable communications, integrated computer technology and quality of life improvements are the qualities of the ship that the Marine Corps and Navy need to support the National Strategy and the Marine Corps' doctrine of Operational Maneuver From The Sea.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from Maine for her work to establish and hold the necessary shipbuilding rate for the nation's defense. I also recognize that the sustained investment of \$10 to \$12 billion in the shipbuilding account is necessary to maintain a minimum shipbuilding rate of 8.7 ships per year.

Specifically, in regard to the LPD-17 program, the committee recognizes that the Navy has never employed such a rigorous new approach for a new class of ships—wherein the goal is to have 95 percent of the design work completed before construction begins, rather than much lower levels in previous designs. This is an important fact, because it means the design work will lead to efficient construction of these ships, and set the standard for the next generation ship designs.

Ms. SNOWE. As always I am impressed by the chairman's knowledge and his grasp of the issues. We have worked closely over the past few weeks to determine how the Navy and industry stand in regard to their progress with this new ship class, and I appreciate that we are in agreement as to the value and need for this critical ship. I look forward to our continued work together in support of this program.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague for her dedication to this issue. During our trip to the shipyard in her state to examine new facilities and to meet with company officials first hand, I was impressed with the level of leadership, innovation, workmanship and coordination. I am also encouraged by information that has been forthcoming from the Navy and industry regarding their progress in resolving possible LPD-17 program management issues. It is my intent that should additional funding become available, it will be applied to the uninterrupted construction of these necessary ships.

Ms. SNOW. Again, I thank the chairman for his forthrightness, his knowledge and his desire to keep American strong. I would also like to commend him for his continued dedicated efforts to our men and women in uniform and the efforts he has undertaken in this most important appropriations bill to provide them with the compensation,

tools and equipment they need to maintain America's pre-eminence in the world.

SUSTAINABLE GREEN MANUFACTURING

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Sustainable Green Manufacturing initiative. This is an important effort to help the Army reduce pollution in its key manufacturing processes by introducing clean technologies and techniques onto production lines. Partners in this initiative include the TACOM Armament Research and Development and Engineering Center at Picatinny Arsenal, the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence, The New Jersey Institute of Technology, and the Physical Science Laboratory of New Mexico State University.

Mr. President the objectives of this initiative include the promotion of sound environmental principles in design, material selection and manufacturing of Army products; the reduction of Army costs throughout the product life-cycle by efficient use of resources; the development of sound and environmentally benign manufacturing practices by using the highest quality science and technology and applying these practices, methods and materials to the acquisition process. The House provide \$7 million for this program in its Appropriation Bill and I urge the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE to work during conference to provide this level of funding for this important program.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me assure my colleague from New Jersey that I am aware of this important effort and I will do what I can in conference to ensure that the Sustainable Green program receives funding in FY2001.

Mr. INOUE. I too want to tell my friend from New Jersey that I will work with our chairman in conference to ensure funding for this important program.

CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to bring the Senate's attention to an important initiative called the Configuration Management Information system. CMIS was developed in an effort to provide the Department of Defense with a standard system that addresses the configuration structure and management requirements of complex military weapons systems, to include their hardware and software. Originally developed in 1990 to support Military Sealift Command's configuration management requirements, the CMIS architecture was identified as the best CM database structure across all DOD. CMIS has progressed through a series of incremental development cycles to include demonstrating compliance with Y2K requirements. Currently, responsibility for the CMIS database architecture is assigned to the Naval Air Systems Command for deployment into the operational environment.

Xeta International Corporation has been tasked by the CMIS Program

Management Office to identify platforms of weapons systems data for migration into CMIS. These platforms include the EA-6B, F-14, H-60, DD-21, DDG-51, F-15, and F-16. Additionally, Xeta has been tasked with the responsibility to liaise and collect this data from various DOD Program Management Offices throughout the military. Xeta extracts the configuration management data from existing legacy databases, engineering drawings and other technical documentation in an effort to accurately populate data fields within the CMIS architecture. Once populated, this "cradle-to-grave" configuration management repository is utilized in many ways by a variety of DOD offices as well as contractors in order to accurately configure the product and to support life cycle maintenance of the weapons systems platforms. Additionally, Xeta has been tasked to develop a CMIS security capability (to include a multilevel secure computer environment) when operating in a Local or Wide Area Network (LAN/WAN).

Unfortunately, Mr. President, no additional funds were included in the Senate bill for this project. I would like to ask my friend from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, whether he is aware of these potential shortfalls?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I appreciate being made aware of the importance of the CMIS project, and that this program's goal will ultimately lead to great savings to the services by decreasing life cycle costs of a variety of weapon systems.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for those remarks. I concur that this is a project important for both Louisiana and the services. For that reason, I hope the Senator from Alaska would agree that the funding of this project should be a priority within the Navy's Operations and Maintenance accounts.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, CMIS needs support to be fully realized. The Department of the Navy should ensure that the funds within the President's budget are applied to this priority. I am hopeful that additional funds can be made available to fully implement CMIS.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, again, I thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with him on this project.

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to commend the chairman, the senior Senator from Alaska, and the ranking minority, the senior Senator from Hawaii, for their long and effective leadership in evolving the Defense Health Program. The Senate bill added nearly \$700 million to the President's request, funding the total Defense Health Program at \$12.1 billion for FY01. And, of great importance to me and many other members of this body, the Committee has once again committed the Department of Defense's medical science capabilities to the management

of a major cancer research program, extending to breast, prostate, cervical, lung, and other cancers. There is over \$330 million in this bill dedicated to cancer-related research.

I would like to bring to the attention of the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member an important area of cancer research—the investigation of genealogical and genetic databases that can uncover medical precursors to cancer in humans. My state of Utah has a history of genealogical research that is known to the millions of Americans who routinely visit the family history websites that originate from Utah. But millions of Americans are also potentially benefiting from a lesser known program. This program is currently developing a genealogical database that will help identify and predict genetic structures associated with the development and, hopefully, prevention of, cancer.

Mr. President, I wish to make you aware of the Utah Population Database which is a very promising development in the area of genealogical research related to cancer. This data base is housed at the University of Utah where scientists are learning to use this unique comprehensive genealogical set of data to help predict, detect, treat, and prevent cancer. I am therefore asking the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member to support the continued development and use of the Utah Population Database by increasing the University of Utah's program for genealogical cancer research in the coming fiscal year by an additional \$12.5 million.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Utah for his kind remarks. The ranking member and I remain fully committed to continuing DOD participation in the national cancer research program. I want to assure the Senator that National Cancer Institute-designated comprehensive cancer centers, like the Huntsman Cancer Institute of Utah, are an important part of cancer research and a necessary element to the DOD effort. I find the Senator's request entirely reasonable and intend to assist this anticancer effort.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I, too, commend the Senator from Utah for his continuing support of this committee's effort to expand and improve cancer research. This is an important topic in my state of Hawaii, where the Cancer Research Institute at the University of Hawaii has been long committed to finding treatments for the many varieties of cancer common not only to Hawaii but to the rest of the nation. I strongly support the commitment of the chairman to the request made by the Senator from Utah.

NAVY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to express my thanks for the manager's package that provides an additional fifteen million dollars in Navy O&M and RDT&E funding for the Navy Information Technology Center (ITC) in New Orleans.

This additional funding represents an important portion of the request made by myself and the senior Senator from Louisiana, Senator BREAUX. The Appropriations Committee's action ensures that the Navy and Defense-wide Human Resource Enterprise Strategy programs will continue at the Navy's Information Technology Center (ITC) in New Orleans.

This funding provides for the further consolidation of Navy active duty and reserve personnel legacy information systems and enables the continuing transition of all Navy manpower and personnel systems into the enterprise-wide human resource strategy. However, I should stress that this is not simply a Navy program, but has taken on defense-wide significance under the leadership of the Program Executive Officer for Information Technology, Joe Scipriano, and his team located at the ITC in New Orleans.

I want to express deep gratitude to Chairman STEVENS and our ranking member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, DANIEL INOUE. Thanks also go to professional staff Steven Cortese, Charles Houy, Tom Hawkins, Gary Reese, and Kraig Syracuse.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, we are excited in Louisiana that the "enterprise strategy" we are developing for human resources systems is recognized by the Appropriations Committee as a model for other service and DOD wide information systems. All of these legacy systems need to be modernized to become cost effective and interoperable. The committee's support for our efforts, and for other information technology additions to this bill, confirm the need to restructure and coordinate all of our service and DOD wide information systems. Only by doing so can we provide real-time information to our warfighters that improves both readiness and effectiveness of our troops.

The ITC in New Orleans was just recently chartered as part of the Navy's year old Program Executive Office for Information Technology and Enterprise Management (PEO/IT). Specifically, the ITC is designated by the Navy's PEO/IT as the "primary support command for enterprise software development."

The PEO/IT is the Navy's only PEO for Information Technology and has been delegated authority for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet, Enterprise Acquisition Management, the ITC, the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS), and other information technology programs. The PEO/IT's authority over these programs was chartered in November 1999, well after the FY 2001 DOD budget process had commenced.

Interim and additional funding for the ITC in New Orleans is critical in FY 2001. This funding will ensure that the ITC can continue to provide the Navy and DOD's unique enterprise strategy integration efforts. Only by

pursuing this strategy can we guarantee that current human resources information systems and future systems are developed, integrated and managed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 and other OMB initiatives based on the Government Performance Results Act. This enterprise strategy develops and integrates new and current legacy information systems so that they will all be interoperable and provide our service personnel and commanders in the field real-time, usable, human resource data about training, experience, and other human resource data from which our commanders can make deployment decisions, fulfill combat mission requirements, and improve readiness.

Again Mr. President, I thank the chairman, and our ranking member, the senior Senator from Hawaii, for recognizing the importance of this effort. I look forward to working with them in future years to provide for its continued success.

NONLINEAR ACOUSTIC LANDMINE DETECTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AT STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss with Senator INOUE and Senator STEVENS an important Army research and development effort in nonlinear acoustic landmine detection being done at Stevens Institute of Technology in New Jersey.

Mr. President, let me begin my thanking Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE for their leadership last year in working with me to obtain \$1 million in funds to initiate this very promising effort, in which engineers at the Stevens Institute of Technology are applying expertise in non-linear acoustic phenomena to develop a new method for detection of mines and other buried man-made objects. The technology can differentiate between rocks, other solid objects, and actual land mines. This will improve landmine removal safety and speed, and contribute to our efforts to save lives and prevent injuries. With an additional \$3 million the Stevens Institute can fully land this technology's development, which has so much promise for protecting our military personnel as well as civilian populations.

Although the allocation's situation we faced in the Appropriations Committee in considering the DOD Appropriations measure made it very difficult to fund this effort, I look forward to working with Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE in conference to continue this research effort. It is my understanding that the House has included \$1.4 million related to this effort, half of which is intended specifically for the research and development at Stevens. But given the great life-saving promise of this technology, I hope to work with Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE in achieving an increase of \$3 million for the Stevens Institute of Technology effort. In this regard, I yield to Senator STEVENS for his thoughts on this effort.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Senator LAUNTENBERG's point is well taken regarding research and development effort for nonlinear acoustic landmine detection research. I worked with Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator INOUE on getting this effort started last year. Although this year's allocation prevented us from providing the necessary funding during the committee consideration, I am committed to working in conference towards the goal of an additional \$3 million for the Stevens Institute effort for FY 2001. This could be an important breakthrough that can save lives, both among our service men and women and civilian populations. I yield to Senator INOUE for his thoughts on the initiative.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to work with Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator STEVENS to provide the startup funds for research and development effort for nonlinear acoustic landmine Detection research, which is being done at Stevens Institute of Technology in New Jersey. This work promises to dramatically improve mine detection, and in so doing prevent serious injury and save lives. I am committed to working with Senator LAUTENBERG and Chairman STEVENS towards the goal of a \$3 million increase for the Stevens Institute effort during conference with the House.

CLOSED DISPOSAL TECHNOLOGIES

Mr. REID. I thank my colleagues and good friends from Alaska and Hawaii for their hard work on this bill. This is an important bill, a good bill, and I commend their efforts.

I rise to engage the senior Senator from Alaska in a colloquy on an important issue. Recent studies have suggested that civilians living near Army Depots which dispose of munitions through open burning and open detonation (OB/OD) suffer from cancer and other maladies at rates higher than would normally be expected. I have asked the Secretary of the Army to study whether open burning represents a health risk to civilian communities, and he has agreed to do so. This study will not be completed for some months.

In the meantime, the Army should be studying possible alternative disposal methods to open burning that are environmentally sealed and are not open to the atmosphere, and evaluate whether open burning should eventually be phased out over time in favor of other, safer approaches. In the event that evidence shows open burning to be dangerous to civilians, these alternatives would give the Army and the Congress a range of alternatives that they will be able to quickly consider and rapidly implement in order to minimize the danger to the public.

I would ask the Senator from Alaska if he would seek to include language in the conference report to accompany this bill directing the Army to conduct such a study?

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the senior Senator from Nevada. I believe that Congress has a responsibility to ensure

that the military conducts its operations in a manner that does not pose an undue health and safety risk on the population. I support your proposal, and will seek to include this language in the conference report to the FY01 Defense appropriations bill.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator, and look forward to working with him on this important matter.

MOTBY

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss with Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE the situation at the Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne (MOTBY). As the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee recall this military facility was closed as a result of the 1995 round of the BRAC Commission closings resulting in the loss of 3,000 jobs and economic hardship in Bayonne and Hudson County. The environmental and infrastructure problems existing at the base at the time of its closure were enormous and not completely disclosed or maybe not completely known by the Army.

I thank Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE for their help in providing \$7 million for MOTBY last year for demolition and removal of facilities, buildings and structures. This funding was critical for MOTBY as it struggles to deal with the substantial environmental and infrastructure problems left by the Army when it left the base. But, Mr. President, there is so much left to be done. Among the problems remaining are significant amounts of friable asbestos in dozens of buildings, major leaks in the water and sewer systems, contamination of the land and ground water and piers that are structurally unsafe and in danger of collapsing into the water.

Mr. President, \$5 million is contained in the House appropriations bill for stabilization of the South Berths at MOTBY. I strongly urge the distinguished chairman and ranking member to uphold the House position of \$5 million for the MOTBY South Berths in conference.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am aware of the environmental and infrastructure problems at MOTBY and I was pleased to join last year with the ranking member, Senator INOUE, and the Senator from New Jersey to be able to provide funding to address some of these problems last year. I understand that the other body has \$5 million for stabilization of the South Berths at MOTBY. Let me assure my friend from New Jersey that I will do what I can in conference to provide significant additional funding for FY 2001.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues from Alaska and New Jersey for support of additional funding for MOTBY and will join with Senator STEVENS to ensure that we do what we can in conference to enable this to happen.

LPD 17

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss with the distinguished

chairman of the Appropriations Committee the provision of the FY 2001 Defense appropriations bill that defers full funding for two LPD 17 class vessels. The Landing Platform Dock (LPD) 17, *San Antonio* class, is the latest class of amphibious force ship for the United States Navy. This ship shoulders the critical mission of transporting marines, helicopters, and air-cushioned landing craft to trouble spots around the world. Moreover, the LPD 17 is a model of acquisition reform.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the deferral of funds that would have been used to procure two LPD 17 class ships in fiscal year 2001. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, what is the nature of your commitment to this program?

Mr. STEVENS. Let me state at the outset, unequivocally, that I fully and strongly support the LPD 17 program, a program for which the distinguished junior Senator from Maine has been an effective advocate. As I stated in my opening remarks to this bill, I am committed to seeing the program progress and delivery to the Navy of no fewer than the required twelve ships. The recommendation the committee has made and the language in bill is intended to stabilize the design of the program fiscal year 2001. It does not reflect a lessening of our commitment to the program itself, in its entirety.

I agree with my dear friend and colleague that the LPD 17 is a critical program for the Navy and Marine Corps service members and that it continues to provide our marines essential transport to troubled areas around the world.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, shipbuilders in my home State and others have stressed the criticality of the LPD 17 Program to their workforce over the next six to eight years as they strive to transition successfully between maturing programs and the construction of the next generation of ships. I am concerned that any delay in the LPD 17 schedule may, in fact, affect the rates and costs of the various Navy shipbuilding programs and cause workers to lose their jobs. How have you addressed these concerns in this bill?

Mr. STEVENS. My friend has raised excellent points. I have been briefed on these technical and programmatic concerns and have discussed them with both the Department of Defense (Navy) and the industry teams. They have both presented their projected impacts of the appropriations provision and mark on the program. However, the recommendation of the committee is to get the program back on a stable track with a stable design. This bill provides some \$200 million in order to ensure that there will be no interruption in work at the affected shipyards.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his clarifications. Let me also express my deep admiration for the chairman's outstanding

leadership and for his steadfast support for our nation's national defense.

HURRICANE FLOYD

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, during the past week, there has been a great deal of misinformation emanating from the ivory towers of liberal newspaper editors in North Carolina. They have made futile attempts to place blame for what they describe as the "stalled" aid to Eastern North Carolina victims of Hurricane Floyd. The tone and the substance of those editors are mystifying when we consider that North Carolina has been specified by the federal government to receive more than \$2 billion in federal aid.

There are some politicians who are feeding the editors false and misleading information while they themselves know better. They complain about politics, even though their actions clearly suggest they themselves are practicing politics in its very worst form. I am dismayed that much of the false and unfair criticism has focused on some distinguished Senate colleagues, who have done far more for North Carolina's flood victims than the political finger-pointers.

One in particular who has done much for North Carolina is the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS, who has been deeply and consistently concerned with the plight of the flood victims. Since the day Hurricane Floyd struck North Carolina, nobody has shown more concern or been more willing to help than Ted STEVENS. He has stood with us every step of the way, and I shall never forget his friendship and his compassion.

And if I may impose Senator STEVENS one more time, may I engage him in a colloquy to set the record straight? First, is it not correct that the Senate, under the leadership of the Appropriations Committee, directed more than \$800 million in federal aid to go to flood victims this past fall not long after the flood hit Eastern North Carolina?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Is it not correct that this 1999's aid package of more than \$800 million was in addition to nearly \$1 billion of federal disaster aid directed to North Carolina through established federal disaster programs?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Is it not correct that the Senate, with only one dissenting vote, approved, in October 1999, \$81 million in payments to farmers, but the House refused to follow the Senate's action because North Carolina tobacco farmers would benefit?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Is it not correct that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, along with the Majority Leader, Mr. LOTT, have made clear their intent to include additional emergency natural disaster aid—in-

cluding the aforementioned \$81 million for farmers—in the Military Construction Conference Report?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. That is our intention.

Mr. HELMS. Is it not correct that the Military Construction bill is likely to be the first appropriations bill to reach the President's desk for signature?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. That appears to be a likely outcome.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chairman. He is always candid, always helpful, and an outstanding Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am genuinely grateful for his concern for the flood victims of North Carolina.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate the comments of the senior Senator from North Carolina. He has been diligent in reminding us of the plight facing the flood victims of North Carolina, and I appreciate his strong interest in making sure that additional aid is forthcoming as quickly as possible.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I just wanted to briefly comment on this year's Defense bill, and my decision to support it. Last year I came to the floor and was forced to oppose the bill after the Budget Committee engaged in some accounting hijinks in order to squeeze an extra \$7 billion into the Defense budget. Even though the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the bill would exceed the Budget Resolution, the Budget Committee used an accounting gimmick to get around the rules. Budget gimmicks do more damage than just allowing the Congress to engage in irresponsible spending. Gimmicks delude the American people, and destroy their faith in the process.

Last year we crowed loudly about the savings in the Budget Resolution, and then quietly added extra money back into the budget all year long. One of the biggest offenders was the Defense Appropriations bill.

This year, however, things are different. While I did not support the Budget Resolution, at least this year the Defense bill is abiding by the level set out in the Resolution. At least this year we are being honest about how much will be spent on Defense. There are no gimmicks, no smoke and mirrors. I applaud Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE for their efforts this year to stay within their budget allocation. It was not easy, it never is, but they were successful.

The bill before us is still three billion dollars above the President's request, but I reluctantly support the bill. It is a more responsible bill than years past. Not only do we strengthen our commitment to our soldiers and their family through improvements in the housing allowance and a 3.7 percent pay increase, but we also face up to our overseas commitments. For the first time Congress and the Department of Defense have included funding, roughly \$4.2 billion, for our operations in Iraq and Bosnia. Next year we will not be

called on to furnish emergency funding for an operation that is not a surprise, not unplanned, and while dangerous, it is not an emergency. I am pleased that we are including these funds in the bill.

Like all my colleagues, I am very concerned about how much we spend on our defense and where we spend it. I believe that the greatest assets funded in the Defense budget are our people, and that we need to do more to let them know how much their country values them. This bill moves in that direction, and it does that in an honest and aboveboard manner.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise once again to address the issue of wasteful spending in appropriations measures, in this case the bill funding the Department of Defense. A careful review of this bill reveals that the obvious deleterious implications of pork-barrel spending on our national defense continue to be ignored by Congress. I find it absolutely unconscionable that I have had to fight so hard to secure \$6 million per year to eliminate the food stamp Army while the defense appropriations bill before us today includes over \$4 billion in wasteful, unnecessary spending that was not included in the Pentagon's budget request and, in most instances, is not reflected in the ever-expanding unfunded requirements lists.

In point of fact, it would appear from this bill that there is no sense of propriety at all when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money. With the armed forces stretched thin as a result of 15 years of declining budgets while deployments have expanded exponentially, how can we stand before the public with a collective straight face when we pass a budget funding those very same armed forces that includes language "urging" the Secretary of Defense "to take steps to increase the Department's use of cranberry products in the diet of on-base personnel and troops in the field." "Such purchases," the language goes on to say, "should prioritize cranberry products with high cranberry content such as fresh cranberries, cranberry sauces and jellies, and concentrate and juice with over 25 percent cranberry content."

Mr. President, what heretofore shall be referred to as "the cranberry incident" must be an attempt at humor on someone's part. When I read through a defense spending bill, I see hundreds of millions of dollars earmarked for such programs and activities as the development of a small aortic catheter, marijuana eradication inside the United States, and the recovery of Civil War vessels on the bottom of Lake Champlain. I see every single year money earmarked for the Brown Tree Snake. I see a list of unrequested programs added to the budget that includes such items as the Alaska Federal Health Care Network, the Hawaii Federal Health Care Network, the Pacific Islands Health Care Referral Program, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Fort Wainwright utilidors, and Fort Greely runway repairs. Was the \$300

million in the budget for the Pearl Harbor shipyard so inadequate that an additional \$24 million had to be added, four times the amount needed to remove military families from the rolls of those eligible for food stamps?

Fifteen million dollars was added for the Maui Space Surveillance System—\$15 million—to improve our ability to track asteroids. I do not intend to minimize the importance of such activities, but only the cast of Star Trek could conceivably have looked at a list of military funding shortfalls and concluded that a total of \$19 million had to be in the fiscal year 2001 budget for this purpose. And whether \$9.5 million should be earmarked for the West Virginia National Guard is, of course, open to question.

Mr. President, I voted against the defense authorization bill in committee because of my frustration at that measure's failure to include vital quality of life initiatives for our active duty military—initiatives that were thankfully accepted when the bill moved to the Floor. And that bill included less than the companion appropriations bill does in unneeded and wasteful spending. I dislike the annual earmarks for hyperspectral research in the authorization bill as much as the ones in the appropriations measure, and the authorizers similarly demonstrate an absence of fiscal restraint in throwing money at chem-bio detectors of questionable merit, and the \$9 million in the authorization bill for the Magdalena Ridge Observatory is every bit as deserving of skepticism as the money in the appropriations bill for the aforementioned Maui program, but, on the whole, the authorizers adhered more closely to the unfunded requirements lists than did the appropriators, who seem to have missed the idea.

Mention should also be made of the growing corruption of the integrity of the process by which the budget request and the unfunded priority lists are assembled. To the extent that repeated efforts at shining a light on pervasive and damaging pork-barrel spending has borne fruit, it further cannot be denied that the problem, to a certain degree, has merely been pushed underground. Like the speakeasies and bathtub gin of an earlier era, the insatiable appetite in Congress for pork has been increasingly reflected in the amount of political pressure placed on the services to include unneeded projects in the budget request and on the unfunded priorities lists. The integrity of the budget process is under increasing assault, and the national defense cannot help but suffer for our weakness for pork.

Mr. President, I look forward to the day when my appearances on the Senate floor for the purpose of deriding pork-barrel spending are no longer necessary. There have been successes along the way, but much more needs to be done. There is \$4 billion in unrequested programs in the defense appropriations bill. Combine what that

\$4 billion could buy with the savings that could be accrued through additional base closings and more cost-effective business practices and the problems of our armed forces, be they in terms of force structure or modernization, could be more assuredly addressed. The public demands and expects better of us. It remains my hope that they will one day witness a more responsible budget process. For now, unfortunately, they are more likely to witness errant asteroids shooting through the skies like tax dollars through the appropriations process.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the bill before us today. I would like to sincerely thank Senators STEVENS and INOUE for their strong leadership on the Defense Subcommittee. I also would like to recognize the diligence and professionalism of the staff on this Committee.

Every year this Committee goes through the difficult exercise of trying to allocate sufficient funds to provide for our nation's defense. These decisions require balancing carefully between present and future, people and technologies.

This year, despite the fact that this appropriations bill provides over \$3.1 billion more than was in the President's budget request and \$20 billion more than the FY 2000 appropriation, the decisions to fund the wide array of critical Defense priorities were just as difficult as in the past. Despite these challenges the Committee has put together a comprehensive bill that meets many of the most pressing needs of the National Defense and remains within the constraints of the budget authority and outlay limits established in the 302(b) allocation.

I would like to briefly mention some of the most important aspects of our defense addressed in this spending package.

The bill provides \$287.6 billion in new spending authority for the Department of Defense for FY 2001. In parallel with the Defense Authorization, the bill funds a 3.7 percent pay raise, new increases in recruiting and retention benefits, strengthens our missile defense program, boosts the Army Transformation Initiative, and provides a long awaited pharmacy benefit for our military retirees.

The bill also provides approximately \$4.1 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund, almost double the funding provided in last year's bill. It is our hope that the Department of Defense will now have ample resources to conduct unforeseen contingencies and protect the resources we provide in this bill for training and combat readiness.

There is good news for the Research and Development appropriation. The Committee approved \$39.6 billion, an increase of \$1.74 billion over the budget request. The Ballistic Missile Defense Program alone received an additional \$4.35 billion. These resources will help prevent erosion of the scientific and

technological foundation of our armed forces.

The Committee also provided for items that will ensure that New Mexico based defense installations and programs remain robust. I would like to briefly highlight some of the items that received funding in the appropriations bill.

Of the increase in Operation and Maintenance funding provided by the committee an additional \$5.1 million is included to maintain and upgrade the Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility. This is the largest warfighter-in-the-loop air defense simulation system in operation and proudly operated by the 58th Special Operations Wing at Kirtland Air Force Base. Another \$8 million will upgrade the MH-53J helicopter simulator to include Interactive Defensive Avionics System/Multi-Mission Advanced Tactical Terminal capability. Both of these projects will strengthen and support our Air Force's readiness and capabilities.

American dominance relies heavily on our technological superiority. The Committee recognizes this and, therefore, supported substantial increases to Research and Development funding above the President's request. Of this, an additional \$24.4 million will go to the High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility at White Sands Missile Range to support advanced weapons development and transformation initiatives for solid state laser technology. The Theater High Energy Laser anti-missile program, successfully tested last week at White Sands also received an additional \$15 million. Finally, the Airborne Laser program's budget was fully restored with an increase of \$92 million. ABL is the Air Force's flagship program in directed energy weapons systems. Keeping this missile defense potential on track is vital to our demonstration of the role lasers can play in future defense capabilities.

The Committee also recognized the active and reserve Army's need for lighter, more mobile command and control vehicles. Therefore, the bill funds a \$63 million increase to the Warfighter Information Network program to produce these communications shelters; Laguna Industries manufactures these shelters.

The bill includes many other New Mexico defense activities. An additional \$16 million will be provided for the Information Operations Warfare and Vulnerability Assessment work of the Army Research Laboratory at White Sands. The Committee also provided \$10 million for the Magdalena Ridge Observatory and \$5.3 million to combat the threat of terrorism with radio frequency weapons.

With the help of my colleagues new technology has a strong foothold in New Mexico and I thank them for supporting us in our endeavors. There are more hurdles ahead of us but each step takes us closer to our ultimate goal of being a major source of support to the

military technological transformation in the 21st century.

I believe this bill demonstrates the balance required to best fund our armed forces. Again, I am pleased by the hard work of my colleagues on this Committee and express, once again, my admiration for the hard work of Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE in achieving an appropriate spending package for our military men and women.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, shortly before Memorial Day, an excellent analytical piece was printed in the Washington Post under the headline For Pentagon, Asia Moving. I am afraid that not many of my colleagues had an opportunity to read that piece, because they were preparing to go home to visit their constituents over the Memorial Day recess. I would like to draw their attention to this thoughtful analysis of events and circumstances that will shape American Defense policies for the next several decades.

In essence, the article suggests that, of necessity, the focus of American defense planning, our strategy and tactics—our deployments—will shift from Europe to Asia. Current events in Korea, the rise of China as a modern military power, the spread of nuclear weapons to South-Asia, all of these dictate a re-examination of our defense policies. We must attend to how we train and where we may someday fight.

To me, the article suggests the importance of Hawaii to our Nation's defense posture in the twenty-first century. The Washington Post article notes that, to many Americans, Hawaii appears to be well out in the Pacific, but it is another 5,000 miles from there to Shanghai. "All told, it is about twice as far from San Diego to China, as it is from New York to Europe."

We need to think about what this means. As U.S. economic interests in Asia come to dominate our economy, so too will U.S. security interests in Asia come to dominate our military policies. We must think about the distances involved and the need to be able to strike distant targets swiftly and with precision. The Air Force will need more long-range bombers and refueling aircraft. I have long advocated the acquisition of more B-2 bombers. The war in Kosovo showed that they could strike at long range and with precision. The Post article suggests to me that we may at some time need them in Asia and that we had better be prepared by making those investments soon.

Similarly, the Navy will have to put more of its resources into the Pacific. Already the Navy has placed a larger percentage of its attack submarines in the Pacific. Surely, this will be followed by decisions to forward position carriers and other elements of carrier task forces. I believe Pearl Harbor will become even more important to the Navy. I know the people of Hawaii are prepared to welcome additional ships.

The Army, too, is faced with the need to be able to respond quickly to deter

future threats in Asia. We need to look to more joint training exercises and even the possibility of keeping some of our forces in Korea after peace takes hold on the Peninsula.

Mr. President, I commend this May 26, 2000 Washington Post article to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in full in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 2000]

FOR PENTAGON, ASIA MOVING

(By Thomas E. Ricks)

When Pentagon officials first sat down last year to update the core planning document of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they listed China as a potential future adversary, a momentous change from the last decade of the Cold War.

But when the final version of the document, titled "Joint Vision 2020," is released next week, it will be far more discreet. Rather than explicitly pointing at China, it simply will warn of the possible rise of an unidentified "peer competitor."

The Joint Chiefs' wrestling with how to think about China—and how open to be about that effort—captures in a nutshell the U.S. military's quiet shift away from its traditional focus on Europe. Cautiously but steadily, the Pentagon is looking at Asia as the most likely arena for future military conflict, or at least competition.

This new orientation is reflected in many small but significant changes: more attack submarines assigned to the Pacific, more games and strategic studies centered on Asia, more diplomacy aimed at reconfiguring the U.S. military presence in the area.

It is a trend that carries huge implications for the shape of the armed services. It also carries huge stakes for U.S. foreign policy. Some specialists warn that as the United States thinks about a rising China, it ought to remember the mistakes Britain made in dealing with Germany in the years before World War I.

The new U.S. military interest in Asia also reverses a Cold War trend under which the Pentagon once planned by the year 2000 to have just "a minimal military presence" in Japan, recalls retired Army Gen. Robert W. RisCassi, a former U.S. commander in South Korea.

Two possibilities are driving this new focus. The first is a chance of peace in Korea; the second is the risk of a hostile relationship with China.

Although much of the current discussion in Washington is about a possible military threat from North Korea, for military planners the real question lies further ahead: Who to do after a Korean rapprochement? In this view, South Korea already has won its economic and ideological struggle with North Korea, and all that really remains is to negotiate terms for peace.

According to one Defense Department official, William S. Cohen's first question to policy officials when he became Defense Secretary in 1997 was: How can we change the assumption that U.S. troops will be withdrawn after peace comes to the Korean peninsula? Next month's first-ever summit between the leaders of North and South Korea puts a sharper edge on this issue.

In the longer run, many American policymakers expect China to emerge sooner or later as a great power with significant influence over the rest of Asia. That, along with a spate of belligerent statements about Taiwan from Chinese officials this spring, has

helped focus the attention of top policymakers on China's possible military ambitions. "The Chinese saber-rattling has gotten people's attention, there is no question of that," said Abram Shulsky, a China expert at the Rand Corp.

THE BUZZWORD IS CHINA

Between tensions over Taiwan and this week's House vote to normalize trade relations with China, "China is the new Beltway buzz-word," observed Dov S. Zakheim, a former Pentagon official who is an adviser on defense policy to Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush.

To be sure, large parts of the U.S. military remain "Eurocentric," especially much of the Army. The shift is being felt most among policymakers and military planners—that is, officials charged with thinking about the future—and least among front-line units. Nor is it a change that the Pentagon is proclaiming from the rooftops. Defense Department officials see little value in being explicit about the shift in U.S. attention, which could worry old allies in Europe and antagonize China.

Even so, military experts point to changes on a variety of fronts. For example, over the last several years, there has been an unannounced shift in the Navy's deployment of attack submarines, which in the post-Cold War World have been used as intelligence assets—to intercept communications, monitor ship movements and clandestinely insert commandos—and also as front-line platforms for launching Tomahawk cruise missiles against Iraq, Serbia and other targets. Just a few years ago, the Navy kept 60 percent of its attack boats in the Atlantic. Now, says a senior Navy submariner, it has shifted to a 50-50 split between the Atlantic and Pacific fleets, and before long the Pacific may get the majority.

But so far the focus on Asia is mostly conceptual, not physical. It is now a common assumption among national security thinkers that the area from Baghdad to Tokyo will be the main location of U.S. military competition for the next several decades. "The focus of great power competition is likely to shift from Europe to Asia," said Andrew Krepinevich, director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a small but influential Washington think tank. James Bodner, the principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, added that, "The center of gravity of the world economy has shifted to Asia, and U.S. interests flow with that."

When Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni, one of the most thoughtful senior officers in the military, met with the Army Science Board earlier this spring, he commented offhandedly that America's "long-standing Europe-centric focus" probably would shift in coming decades as policymakers "pay more attention to the Pacific Rim, and especially to China." This is partly because of trade and economics, he indicated, and partly because of the changing ethnic makeup of the U.S. population. (California is enormously important in U.S. domestic politics, explains one Asia expert at the Pentagon, and Asian Americans are increasingly influential in that state's elections, which can make or break presidential candidates.)

Just 10 years ago, said Maj. Gen. Robert H. Scales Jr., commandant of the the Army War College, roughly 90 percent of U.S. military thinking about future warfare centered on head-on clashes of armies in Europe. "Today," he said, "it's probably 50-50, or even more" tilted toward warfare using characteristic Asian tactics such as deception and indirection.

WAR GAMING

The U.S. military's favorite way of testing its assumptions and ideas is to run a war

game. Increasingly, the major games played by the Pentagon—except for the Army—take place in Asia, on an arc from Tehran to Tokyo. The games are used to ask how the U.S. military might respond to some of the biggest questions it faces: Will Iran go nuclear—or become more aggressive with an array of hard-to-stop cruise missiles? Will Pakistan and India engage in nuclear war—or, perhaps even worse, will Pakistan break up, with its nuclear weapons falling into the hands of Afghan mujaheddin? Will Indonesia fall apart? Will North Korea collapse peacefully? And what may be the biggest question of all: Will the United States and China avoid military confrontation? All in all, estimates one Pentagon official, about two-thirds of the forward-looking games staged by the Pentagon over the last eight years have taken place partly or wholly in Asia.

Last year, the Air Force's biggest annual war game looked at the Mideast and Korea. This summer's game, "Global Engagement 5," to be played over more than a week at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama, will posit "a rising large East Asian nation" that is attempting to wrest control of Siberia, with all its oil and other natural resources, from a weak Russia. At one point, the United States winds up basing warplanes in Siberia to defend Russian interests.

Because of the sensitivity of talking about fighting China, "What everybody's trying to do is come up with games that are kind of China, but not China by name," said an Air Force strategist.

"I think that, however reluctantly, we are beginning to face up to the fact that we are likely over the next few years to be engaged in an ongoing military competition with China," noted Princeton political scientist Aaron L. Friedberg. "Indeed, in certain respects, we already are."

TWIN EFFORTS

The new attention to Asia also is reflected in two long-running, military-diplomatic efforts.

The first is a drive to renegotiate the U.S. military presence in northeast Asia. This is aimed mainly at ensuring that American forces still will be welcome in South Korea and Japan if the North Korean threat disappears. To that end, the U.S. military will be instructed to act less like post-World War II occupation forces and more like guests or partners.

Pentagon experts on Japan and Korea say they expect that "status of forces agreements" gradually will be diluted, so that local authorities will gain more jurisdiction over U.S. military personnel in criminal cases. In addition, they predict that U.S. bases in Japan and South Korea will be jointly operated in the future by American and local forces, perhaps even with a local officer in command.

At Kadena Air Force Base on the southern Japanese island of Okinawa, for example, the U.S. military has started a program, called "Base Without Fences," under which the governor has been invited to speak on the post, local residents are taken on bus tours of the base that include a stop at a memorial to Japan's World War II military, and local reporters have been given far more access to U.S. military officials.

"We don't have to stay in our foxhole," said Air Force Brig. Gen. James B. Smith, who devised the more open approach. "To guarantee a lasting presence, there needs to be a private and public acknowledgment of the mutual benefit of our presence."

Behind all this lies a quiet recognition that Japan may no longer unquestioningly follow the U.S. lead in the region. A recent classified national intelligence estimate concluded that Japan has several strategic op-

tions available, among them seeking a separate accommodation with China, Pentagon officials disclosed. "Japan isn't Richard Gere in 'An Officer and a Gentleman,'" one official said. "That is, unlike him, it does have somewhere else to go."

In the long term, this official added, a key goal of U.S. politico-military policy is to ensure that when Japan reemerges as a great power, it behaves itself in Asia, unlike the last time around, in the 1930s, when it launched a campaign of vicious military conquest.

SOUTHEAST ASIA REDUX

The second major diplomatic move is the negotiation of the U.S. military's reentry in Southeast Asia, 25 years after the end of the Vietnam War and almost 10 years after the United States withdrew from its bases in the Philippines. After settling on a Visiting Forces Agreement last year, the United States and the Philippines recently staged their first joint military exercise in years, "Balikatan 2000."

The revamped U.S. military relationship with the Philippines, argues one general, may be a model for the region. Instead of building "Little America" bases with bowling alleys and Burger Kings that are off-limits to the locals, U.S. forces will conduct frequent joint exercises to train Americans and Filipinos to operate together in everything from disaster relief to full-scale combat. The key, he said, isn't permanent bases but occasional access to facilities and the ability to work with local troops.

Likewise, the United States has broadened its military contacts with Australia, putting 10,000 troops into the Queensland region a year ago for joint exercises. And this year, for the first time, Singapore's military is participating in "Cobra Gold," the annual U.S.-Thai exercise. Singapore also is building a new pier specifically to meet the docking requirements of a nuclear-powered U.S. aircraft carrier. The U.S. military even has dipped a cautious toe back into Vietnam, with Cohen this spring becoming the first defense secretary since Melvin R. Laird to visit that nation.

The implications of this change already are stirring concern in Europe. In the March issue of *Proceedings*, the professional journal of the U.S. Navy, Cmdr. Michele Consentino, an Italian navy officer, fretted about the American focus on the Far East and about "dangerous gaps" emerging in the U.S. military presence in the Mediterranean.

WHERE THE GENERALS ARE

If the U.S. military firmly concludes that its major missions are likely to take place in Asia, it may have to overhaul the way it is organized, equipped and even led. "Most U.S. military assets are in Europe, where there are no foreseeable conflicts threatening vital U.S. interests," said "Asia 2025," a Pentagon study conducted last summer. "The threats are in Asia," it warned.

This study, recently read by Cohen, pointedly noted that U.S. military planning remains "heavily focused on Europe," that there are four times as many generals and admirals assigned to Europe as to Asia, and that about 85 percent of military officers studying foreign languages are still learning European tongues.

"Since I've been here, we've tried to put more emphasis on our position in the Pacific," Cohen said in an interview as he flew home from his most recent trip to Asia. This isn't, he added, "a zero-sum game, to ignore Europe, but recognizing that the [economic] potential in Asia is enormous"—especially, he said, if the United States is willing to help maintain stability in the region.

"TYRANNY OF DISTANCE"

Talk to a U.S. military planner about the Pacific theater, and invariably the phrase

"the tyranny of distance" pops up. Hawaii may seem to many Americans to be well out in the Pacific, but it is another 5,000 miles from there to Shanghai. All told, it is about twice as far from San Diego to China as it is from New York to Diego.

Cohen noted that the military's new focus on Asia means, "We're going to want more C-17s" (military cargo planes) as well as "more strategic airlift" and "more strategic sealift."

Other experts say that barely scratches the surface of the revamping that Asian operations might require. The Air Force, they say, would need more long-range bombers and refuelers—and probably fewer short-range fighters such as the hot new F-22, designed during the Cold War for dogfights in the relatively narrow confines of Central Europe. "We are still thinking about aircraft design as if it were for the border of Germany," argues James G. Roche, head of Northrop Grumman Corp.'s electronic sensors unit and a participant in last year's Pentagon study of Asia's future. "Asia is a much bigger area than Europe, so planes need longer 'legs.'"

Similarly, the Navy would need more ships that could operate at long distances. It might even need different types of warships. For example, the Pentagon study noted today's ships aren't "stealthy"—built to evade radar—and may become increasingly vulnerable as more nations acquire precision-guided missiles.

Also, the Navy may be called on to execute missions in places where it has not operated for half a century. If the multi-island nation of Indonesia falls apart, the Pentagon study suggested, then the Navy may be called upon to keep open the crucial Strait of Malacca, through which passes much of the oil and gas from the Persian Gulf to Japan and the rest of East Asia.

The big loser among the armed forces likely would be the Army, whose strategic relevancy already is being questioned as it struggles to deploy its forces more quickly. "At its most basic level, the rise of Asia means a rise of emphasis on naval, air and space power at the expense of ground forces," said Eliot Cohen, a professor of strategic studies at Johns Hopkins University.

In a few years, Pentagon insiders predict, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be from the Navy or Air Force, following 12 years in which Army officers—Generals Colin L. Powell, John Shalikashvili and Henry H. Shelton—have been the top officers in the military. Perhaps even more significantly, they foresee the Air Force taking away from the Navy at least temporarily the position of "CINCPAC," the commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific. There already is talk within the Air Force of basing parts of an "Air Expeditionary Force" in Guam, where B-2 stealth bombers have been sent in the past in response to tensions with North Korea.

PARALLEL WITH PAST

If the implications for the U.S. military of a new focus on Asia are huge, so too are the risks. Some academics and Pentagon intellectuals see a parallel between the U.S. effort to manage the rise of China as a great power and the British failure to accommodate or divert the ambitions of a newly unified Germany in the late 19th century. That effort ended in World War I, which slaughtered a generation of British youth and marked the beginning of British imperial decline.

If Sino-American antagonism grows, some strategists warn, national missile defense may play the role that Britain's development of the battleship *Dreadnought* played a century ago—a superweapon that upset the

balance by making Germany's arsenal strategically irrelevant. Chinese officials have said they believe the U.S. plan for missile defense is aimed at negating their relatively small force of about 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If the United States actually builds a workable antimissile system, former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski predicts, "the effect of that would be immediately felt by the Chinese nuclear forces and [would] presumably precipitate a buildup." That in turn could provoke India to beef up its own nuclear forces, a move that would threaten Pakistan. A Chinese buildup also could make Japan feel that it needed to build up its own military.

Indian officials already are quietly telling Pentagon officials that the rise of China will make the United States and India natural allies. India also is feeling its oats militarily. The Hindustan Times recently reported that the Indian navy plans to reach far eastward this year to hold submarine and aircraft exercises in the South China Sea, a move sure to tweak Beijing.

Some analysts believe that the hidden agenda of the U.S. military is to use the rise of Asia as a way to shore up the Pentagon budget, which now consumes about 3 percent of the gross domestic product, compared to 5.6 percent at the end of the Cold War in 1989. "If the military grabs onto this in order to get more money, that's scary," said retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner, who frequently conducts war games for the military.

Indeed, Cohen is already making the point that operating in Asia is expensive. He said it is clear that America will have to maintain "forward" forces in Asia. And that, he argued, will require a bigger defense budget.

"There's a price to pay for what we're doing," Cohen concluded. "The question we're going to have to face in the coming years is, are we willing to pay up?"

SECTION 8014

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, may I engage in a colloquy with my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Hawaii?

As Senator INOUE knows, the Manager's amendment currently before the Senate includes an amendment to section 8014. That section addresses the procedures that must be followed by Department of Defense agencies which seek to outsource certain civilian functions to private contractors. Since 1990, this provision has been included in the Defense appropriations bills for each of the last ten years. Throughout that time, section 8014 has provided for certain exceptions to the procedures, including an exception when the private contractor is a Native American-owned entity. This exception has been included in furtherance of the Federal policy of Indian self-determination and the promotion of economic self-sufficiency for the native people of America.

The exception for a private contractor that is a Native American-owned entity is an exercise of the authority that has been vested in the Congress by the U.S. Constitution in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, often referred to as the Indian Commerce Clause. As the senior Senator from Hawaii and vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs knows, this is by no means the only Federal legislation that recognizes the special

status of Native Americans in commercial transactions with the Federal Government which is based upon the trust relationship the United States has with its indigenous, aboriginal people. There are, in fact, numerous examples of provisions of Federal law that seek to provide competitive assistance to businesses that are owned by Indian tribes or Alaska Native regional or village corporations. Congress has enacted such laws because they have been found to be the most effective and appropriate means of ensuring and encouraging economic self-sufficiency in furtherance of the Federal policy of self-determination and the United States' trust responsibility. There is considerable judicial precedent recognizing such laws as a valid exercise of Congress' constitutional authority, perhaps the most significant of which is the United State Supreme Court's 1974 ruling in Morton versus Mancari.

It has come to my attention that a lawsuit has been filed challenging the Native American exception in section 8014 as a racially-based preference that is unconstitutional. That challenge is simply inconsistent with the well-established body of Federal Indian law and numerous rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Native American exception contained in section 8014 is intended to advance the Federal Government's interest in promoting self-sufficiency and the economic development of Native American communities. It does so not on the basis of race, but rather, based upon the unique political and legal status that the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the America have had under our Constitution since the founding of this nation. It is a valid exercise of Congress' authority under the Indian commerce clause. While I believe that the provision is clear, we propose adoption of the amendment before us today to further clarify that the exception for Native American-owned entities in section 8014 is based on a political classification, not a racial classification.

Because my colleague was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations in 1990 and involved in the drafting of section 8014, I would like to know whether my understanding of the purpose and intent of section 8014 is consistent with the original purpose and intent, and whether the amendment before us today is consistent with the original intent of section 8014.

Mr. INOUE. My Chairman is correct in his understanding. The Congress has long been concerned with the ravaging extent of poverty, homelessness, and the high rates of unemployment in Native America. The Congress has consistently recognized that the economic devastation that has been wrought on Native communities can be directly attributed to Federal policies of the forced removal of Native people from their traditional homelands, their forced relocation, and later the termination of the reservations to which the government forcibly relocated them. In

1970, President Nixon established the Federal policy of self-determination, and that policy has been supported and strengthened by each succeeding administration.

The Congress has sought to do its part in fostering strong Native economies through the enactment of a wide range of Federal laws, including a series of incentives that are designed to stimulate economic growth in Native communities and provide economic opportunities for Native American-owned businesses. Native American-owned businesses include not only those that are owned by an Indian tribe or an Alaska Native corporation or a Native Hawaiian organization, but those businesses that are 51 percent or more owned by Native Americans.

As the U.S. Supreme Court has made clear, time and again, the political and legal relationship that this nation has had with the indigenous, aboriginal, native people of America is the basis upon which the Congress can constitutionally enact legislation that is designed to address the special conditions of Native Americans. In exchange for the cession of over 500 million acres of land by the native people of America, the United States has entered into a trust relationship with Native Americans. Treaties, the highest law of our land, were originally the primary instrument for the expression of this relationship. Today, Federal laws like section 8014, are the means by which the United States carries out its trust responsibilities and the Federal policy of self-determination and economic self-sufficiency.

I thank my Chairman for proposing this clarifying amendment which I believe is fully consistent with the original purpose and intent of section 8014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPENCER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Byrd	Durbin
Akaka	Campbell	Edwards
Allard	Chafee, L.	Enzi
Ashcroft	Cleland	Feinstein
Baucus	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Bayh	Collins	Frist
Bennett	Conrad	Gorton
Biden	Coverdell	Graham
Bingaman	Craig	Gramm
Bond	Crapo	Grams
Breaux	Daschle	Grassley
Brownback	DeWine	Gregg
Bryan	Dodd	Hagel
Bunning	Domenici	Harkin
Burns	Dorgan	Hatch

Helms	Lieberman	Santorum
Hollings	Lincoln	Sarbanes
Hutchinson	Lott	Schumer
Hutchison	Lugar	Sessions
Inhofe	Mack	Shelby
Inouye	McCain	Smith (NH)
Jeffords	McConnell	Smith (OR)
Johnson	Mikulski	Snowe
Kennedy	Moynihan	Stevens
Kerrey	Murkowski	Thomas
Kerry	Murray	Thompson
Kohl	Nickles	Thurmond
Kyl	Reed	Torricelli
Landrieu	Reid	Voivovich
Lautenberg	Robb	Warner
Leahy	Roberts	Wyden
Levin	Roth	

NAYS—3

Boxer	Feingold	Wellstone
-------	----------	-----------

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Specter
-------------	---------

So the bill (H.R. 4576), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its position on this bill with the House and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK) appointed Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. DURBIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I believe that we completed action on this bill in almost record time.

I want to personally thank Steven Cortese, majority staff director, and Charles Houy, minority staff director, for their very intense work, and their respective staffs. Since last Friday we have been working to try to eliminate some problems in this bill. Without question, they are responsible for the speed and dispatch with which we have been able to handle this bill.

There are many amendments we are now taking to conference that may be subject to later modification. We will do our very best to defend the Senate position as represented by the vote that has just been taken in the Senate.

I thank my distinguished friend and colleague from Hawaii for his usual cooperation. Without it, passage of this bill would have been impossible.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for 10 minutes each.

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

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it has been nearly 14 months since the Columbine tragedy, and over a year since the Senate passed common sense gun safety legislation as part of the Juvenile Justice bill, and still the Republican majority in Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until Congress acts, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight.

Following are the names of a few Americans who were killed by gunfire one year ago, on June 13, 1999:

Robert Ayala, 21, Chicago, IL.
Timothy Croft, 39, Detroit, MI.
Warner Freeman, 21, Philadelphia, PA.

James Harley, 40, Baltimore, MD.
Rico Perry, 27, Charlotte, NC.
Wesley Rodenas, 19, San Bernardino, CA.

Thoyce Sanders, 45, Dallas, TX.
Charles Stewart, 32, Dallas, TX.
Mario Taylor, 23, Chicago, IL.
Renardo Wilson, 38, Dallas, TX.
Unidentified male, 49, Portland, OR.
Mark Pierce, 36, Providence, RI.

Mr. Pierce was killed in a late-night drive-by shooting after a confrontation between one of his friends and two young men, one 18 and one 21, at a marina on the Providence River waterfront. After an initial scuffle, the two young men departed and returned within an hour in a car. One of them opened fire with a handgun, killing Pierce. It's another example of a quarrel that, in another time in America, might have resulted in a bloody nose and a bruised ego, but instead took the life of Mark Pierce.

And, Mr. President, the gun violence continues every day across America. Three weeks ago, a 15-year-old girl in Providence, who was a key witness for the prosecution in an upcoming murder trial, was shot with a handgun at point blank range in her front yard on a Sunday evening. She died the next day. She was to testify in the trial of a 19-year-old charged with shooting to death a 17-year-old last August.

Just this past Friday, in Providence, Rhode Island, two college students were carjacked at gunpoint, robbed, taken to a nearby golf course, and shot execution style with a .40 caliber semi-automatic handgun. The handgun was stolen from the car of a freelance photographer while he shopped at a local convenience store in February. This case makes a strong argument against concealed carry laws and other liberal gun laws that encourage citizens to bring their handguns out of their homes and into the streets of our cities. It also underscores the need for aggressive research into smart gun technology to ensure that a weapon can only be fired by its legitimate owner.

Finally, although in this instance the police were able to trace the gun relatively quickly because it was stolen in Providence and reported by the owner, in many cases crime guns cannot be traced because law enforcement is completely dependent upon the record keeping of gun manufacturers and gun dealers, and post-retail private sales are usually unrecorded. If we registered handguns and licensed handgun owners, the police could put out an immediate alert when a weapon is reported stolen, and they could trace a weapon more quickly upon its recovery after a horrible crime like this one. In addition, the assailants would face yet another felony charge for illegal possession of a weapon not registered to them.

Mr. President, twelve young Americans lose their lives to gun violence every day. That's a new Columbine tragedy every 24 hours. It is time for Congress to do its part to reduce gun violence by passing sensible gun safety legislation to keep firearms out of the hands of children and convicted felons. We should do so without further delay. I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING THE ISRAELI MISSING IN ACTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the Israeli soldiers captured by the Syrians during the 1982 Israeli war with Lebanon.

On June 11, 1982, an Israeli unit battled with a Syrian armored unit in the Bekaa Valley in northeastern Lebanon. The Syrians succeeded in capturing Sgt. Zachary Baumel, 1st Sgt. Zvi Feldman and Cpt. Yehudah Katz. Upon arrival in Damascus, the crew and their tank were paraded through the streets draped in Syrian and Palestinian flags.

Since that terrible day in 1982, the Israeli and United States Governments have been working to obtain any possible information about the fate of these missing soldiers, joining with the offices of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations, and other international bodies. According to the Geneva Convention, the area in Lebanon where the soldiers first disappeared was continually controlled by Syria, therefore deeming it responsible for the treatment of the captured soldiers. To this day, despite the promises made by the Syrian Government and by the PLO, very little information has been forthcoming about the condition of Zachary Baumel, Zvi Feldman, and Yehudah Katz.

June 11 marks the anniversary of the day these soldiers were reported missing in action. Eighteen pain-filled years have passed since their families have seen their sons, and still the Syrian Government has not revealed their whereabouts.

One of these missing soldiers, Zachary Baumel, is an American citizen from Brooklyn, NY. An ardent