

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—100

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, (H.R. 4576), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 17, 2000.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will just take a minute. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry here.

It is my understanding under the agreement there is about an hour and a half that has been set aside to speak on the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill; is that right? Approximately that much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, there are 60 minutes for Senator MCCAIN from Arizona, 20 minutes for Senator BYRD, 15 minutes for Senator GRAMM of Texas, and 6 minutes equally divided between Senators INOUE and STEVENS, by previous agreement.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent when that time is used, if those Senators have used it, the Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to speak for 15 minutes.

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

Who yields time? The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise once again to address the issue of pork-barrel spending in an appropriations bill, in this case the defense appropriations conference report. This bill will pass by an overwhelming margin and with minimal debate. It will occasion the release of innumerable press statements attesting to our individual successes in bringing home the bacon.

As we worship at the altar of pork-barrel spending, let's reflect a bit on the merits of our activities with respect to the practice of adding unrequested programs to the defense budget for parochial reasons. When the defense appropriations bill first emerged from committee, some of us found interesting the inclusion of language urging the Secretary of Defense to "take steps to increase the Department's use of cranberry products. . . ." What I referred to at the time as "the cranberry incident," Mr. President, in retrospect represented the high point of the process by which this conference report was assembled.

There are over \$7 billion in unrequested member-adds in this bill—over \$7 billion. That does not just represent a continuation of business as usual pork-barrel spending; it represents an egregious expansion of a practice that drains vital resources from a military that has witnessed a multitude of readiness problems while deploying at record-high levels. As we struggle with answers to such problems as how to modernize tactical aviation, maintain a fleet of sufficient size and capability to execute its mission, and fund ongoing and unforeseen contingencies, it is less than reassuring to read through the defense spending bill and see \$1.8 billion earmarked for development of a handheld holographic radar gun, although Trekkies across the nation will no doubt be pleased by this project.

It is tiresome to scan these bills every year and see the annual member-adds of millions of dollars for spectral hole burning applications and for free electron lasers. And it is particularly tiresome, right after passing an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that included an executive jet for the commandant of the Coast Guard, to see in this bill a \$60 million earmark for a new 737 for CINCPAC—an important command but \$60 million for an aircraft that was neither requested nor required constitutes just one of many questionable additions to this bill.

We have finally reversed 15 years in declines in defense spending, but for what purpose. To transfer \$10 million to the Department of Transportation to realign railroad tracks in Alaska? To transfer \$5 million to the National Park Service for repair improvements at Fort Baker in northern California? To transfer another \$5 million to the Chicago Public Schools to convert a

former National Guard Armory? Was our objective in increasing defense spending to allow us to more freely earmark funding for such endeavors as the \$500,000 for Florida Memorial College for funding minority aviation training; \$21 million for the Civil Air Patrol; to continue to fund a weather reconnaissance squadron in Mississippi that the Air Force has been trying to get rid off for more years than I can remember? There is over \$4 million in this bill for the Angel Gate Academy. There is the now annual allocation to preserve Civil War-era vessels at the bottom of Lake Champlain, this year in the amount of \$15 million. There is \$2 million for the Bosque Redondo Memorial in New Mexico and the usual \$3 million for hyperspectral research.

If a project is so worthy of Defense Department support, why doesn't it ever show up in a budget request? Why do we need to add money every single year for the National Automotive Center and its prize off-shoot, the Smart Truck Initiative. With another \$3.5 million in the fiscal year 2001 defense bill for Smart Truck, I'm beginning to wonder if the intellect of this truck will be such that it will not only be capable of heating up a burrito, but will also perform advanced calculus while quoting Kierkegaard. When I look through this bill, I begin to lose sight of its fundamental purpose. The distinction between the defense bill and the Health and Human Services bill gets lost when you see \$8.5 million for the Gallo Center for Alcoholism Research, \$4 million for the Gallo Cancer Center—see a pattern emerging?—another \$1.5 million for nutrition research, \$1.5 million for chronic fatigue syndrome research, and, of course, \$1 million for the Cancer Center of Excellence—this latter add a reminder that if you call something a "center of excellence" you are assured of being a beneficiary of Congress's largess.

Mr. President, I do not take issue with research into important health problems affecting millions of Americans. But the abuse of the defense budget grows every year. It has long been used as a cash-cow for pet projects, but did that have to extend to the allocation of millions of dollars for programs of such exceedingly low priority that they don't even show up on already politicized unfunded priority lists?

Astronomical Active Optics, Mr. President, were deemed worthy of over \$3 million in defense funds, as was coal based advanced thermally stable jet fuel. Fifteen million dollars for the Maui Space Surveillance System, another annual add, \$5 million for the Hawaii Federal Health Care Network, \$8 million for the Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program, \$1 million for the Alaska Federal Health Care Network, \$1.5 million for AlaskAlert, \$7 million for MILES 2000 equipment at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$7.5 million for a C-130 simulator for the Alaska National Guard, the annual \$10 million

for utilidor repairs at Eielson Air Force Base and Fort Wainwright, Alaska, and \$21 million for an unmanned threat emitter system for Eielson, and \$7 million to sustain operations at Adak Naval Air Station, an installation of apparently marginal utility or the Navy would include it in its funding request. Re-use of Fort Greely, Alaska, receives \$7 million for airfield improvement. One of my favorites, \$300,000 for the Circum-Pacific Council for the Crowding the Rim Summit Initiative, represents a new addition to this list.

The inclusion of so-called "Buy American" provisions continue to waste billions of dollars every year. These out-dated protectionist policies serve neither U.S. nor allied interests. It goes against the basic logical policy of getting the best product for the best price for the men and women who wear our nation's uniform. Additionally, these provisions, for example, the requirement to purchase only propellers manufactured in the United States, were added in conference—a practice with which I take strong exception and will discuss further in a minute.

I have repeatedly addressed the growing perversion of the process by which budget requests and service Unfunded Priority Lists are put together. It has been clear for several years now that the services are under considerable political pressure from Capitol Hill to include in their budget requests or, at a minimum, on the Unfunded Priority Lists, unnecessary and unwanted items. Funding for the ubiquitous LHD amphibious assault ship for Mississippi is the classic example of this phenomenon. Indeed, the Defense Department and the Navy's rejection in the past of proposals to incrementally fund ships has given way to unrelenting pressure from members of Congress to so fund the LHD. Similarly, C-130s and passenger jets are routinely added to the UFR lists solely as a result of political pressure. In effect, then, my efforts at highlighting pork-barrel spending have resulted to some degree in the problem being pushed underground. That's called progress in Congress. It's called deception everywhere else.

The fiscal year 2001 defense appropriations conference report takes the problem a major step further. The integrity of the budget process is under a new and devastating assault by the Appropriations Committee. There is in this conference report language specifying the very weapon systems the committee expects to see included in future budget submissions. It is a long list prefaced with the warning that "the conferees expect the component commanders to give priority consideration to the following items . . .," which it then goes on to detail.

Finally, I would like to address the equally fascinating tendency of the Appropriations Committees to arrive at final budget numbers that exceed what was in either House or Senate bill. It is my understanding that conference is a

process whereby differences between respective bills are the subject of negotiations resulting in agreements that either match one of the two numbers in question or find a compromise in between. I find it interesting, therefore, that this conference report has 166 instances of final numbers exceeding those that were in either bill. In many instances, funding was added in conference for which none was included in either chamber's bill. For example, \$17 million was added in conference for a capital purchase plan for Pearl Harbor, and \$10 million materialized for modifications to M113 armored personnel carriers. There is \$10 million in the conference report which was in neither bill to continue the artificial issue of test firing Starstreak missiles, and \$1 million for natural gas microturbines. In this bill vital for our national defense is \$1.7 million for the South Florida Ocean Management Center and \$1 million for Community Hospital Telehealth Competition. And, of course, the \$60 million for CINCPAC's new 737 was added in conference. For none of these programs, totaling over \$200 million, was funding included in either the House or the Senate bill.

The total dollar amount for the entire category of conference items for which no funding was included in either chamber's bill or for which the final number exceeds what was in either bill is over \$2 billion. Two billion dollars, Mr. President, in unrequested, unnecessary items that emerged miraculously in conference. I've heard of the fog of war resulting in horrendous casualties, but I'm perplexed by this fog of negotiating that results in horrendous budgets.

Sadly, Mr. President, I could go on for another hour. I think, however, that I have made my point. The \$7 million in the defense bill for the Magdalena Ridge Observatory in New Mexico, combined with the aforementioned adds for Astronomical Active Optics and the Maui Space Surveillance System leads me to ponder the universe of pork-barrel spending at a higher philosophical plane than in the past. We are adding millions of dollars every year to the defense bill so that we may better scan the heavens, perhaps as part of an ultimately futile effort to better understand our place in the cosmos. Only by applying such logic to the process of reviewing spending bills upon which we vote, however, can I hope to understand the phenomenon by which we regularly send billions of dollars down a black hole. At the end of the day, I guess Einstein's theory of relativity, as well as Newtonian laws of gravity, are at the center of the budget process. The practice of pork-barrel spending has been out of control for years; only now can we take it to a cosmic level never before contemplated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 OUT OF SCOPE ITEMS (THOUSANDS)

Program	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Defense Acquisition University	\$100,331	\$100,331	\$100,331	\$102,331
Defense Finance & Accounting Service	1,416	1,416	1,416	2,416
Army National Guard Information Mgt.	20,115	25,115	20,115	27,315
UH-60 Blackhawk Helicopter	64,651	183,371	120,451	189,601
TH-47 Kiowa Warrior Helicopter	0	1,800	0	24,000
M113 Armored Personnel Carrier Upgrades	0	0	0	10,000
Special Purpose Vehicles	1,021	1,021	1,021	6,671
National Guard Multi-role Bridge Co.'s	0	0	0	1,000
Launched Grapnel Hooks	0	0	0	1,000
AV-8B Litening Targeting Pods	40,639	40,639	81,139	120,639
Shoulder-fired Lightweight Assault Weapon 83 mm HEDP	0	0	0	5,000
Capital Purchase Plan (Pearl Harbor)	0	0	0	17,000
Air Traffic Control On-board Trainer	0	3,000	0	4,000
Shipboard Programmable Integrated Communication Terminals	0	0	0	3,000
F/A-18 Technical Manual Digitization	0	0	0	5,200
Advanced Technical Information System	0	0	0	2,000
Boeing 737 for CINCPAC Executive Jet	0	0	0	60,000
Integrated Bridge System for NSW Rigid Inflatable Boat	0	0	0	4,000
Natl Guard WMD Civil Support Team Equip	0	0	0	900
Emergency Support Helicopter	0	0	0	2,500
Tank Trajectory Correctable Munition	0	0	0	3,000
Air Force Ctr of Acquisition Reengineering	0	0	0	2,000
Air Force Knowledge Management Project	0	0	0	2,000
Handheld Holographic Radar Gun	0	0	0	1,000
Environmental Quality Technology	13,994	54,494	19,994	60,994
Electronics and Electronic Devices	23,869	40,969	34,469	41,269
Defense Research Sciences ..	132,164	132,164	136,414	137,914
Materials Technology Research	11,557	15,557	24,557	27,557
EW Technology Research	17,310	17,310	17,310	22,310
Missile Technology Research Modeling and Simulation	47,183	69,183	55,183	70,683
Technology	30,479	32,479	35,479	36,479
Vehicle and Automotive Technology	63,589	68,589	87,089	89,089
Countermeasures Systems	12,386	17,786	17,786	17,886
Medical Technology	75,729	98,729	102,229	112,729
Warfighter Advanced Technology	15,469	17,469	20,469	21,969
Vehicle and Automotive Adv. Technology	148,114	162,114	89,114	168,114
Training Advanced Technology	3,072	6,072	3,072	7,072
EW Advanced Technology	15,359	20,359	15,359	30,359
Missile/Rocket Advanced Technology	25,107	25,107	47,107	52,107
Tactical Exploitation of Natl Capabilities	57,419	43,419	57,419	58,419
Engineering Development of C3 Systems	49,316	49,316	49,316	61,816
Engineering Development of Weapons	22,505	30,505	31,505	33,505
Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar	17,898	26,898	21,898	28,898
Threat Simulator Development	13,901	16,011	18,801	21,001
Munitions Standardization ..	11,276	14,776	13,276	16,776
Force XXI Battle Cnd, Brigade & Below	63,601	63,601	63,601	64,601
End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities	57,906	81,906	72,906	89,906
EW Technology—Remote Signal Sensor	0	0	0	4,900
Environmental Cleanup Demonstration	0	0	0	3,000
Multifunctional Intelligence Sensor	0	0	0	12,500
Starstreak/Stinger Live Fire Test	0	0	0	10,000
Northern Edge Launch Range Equipment	0	0	0	3,000
Northern Edge Launch Range Infrastructure	0	0	0	4,000
Trajectory Correctable Munition	0	0	0	3,000
Intelligent Power Control Vehicle Systems	0	0	0	4,100
Information Networking Systems	0	0	0	12,500

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 OUT OF SCOPE ITEMS (THOUSANDS)—Continued

Program	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Natural Gas Microturbines ...	0	0	0	1,000
Bradley Vehicle Hull & Turret Electronics	0	0	0	2,000
Navigational Electronic Digital Compass	0	0	0	1,000
Printed Wiring Board Technology Center	0	0	0	3,000
Natural Gas Air Compressor Technology	0	0	0	1,000
Air & Surface Launched Weapons Tech	37,966	52,966	49,966	55,466
Human Systems Technology	39,939	38,139	33,939	40,439
Computer Technology	68,076	92,026	87,576	106,526
Oceanographic & Atmospheric Technology	60,320	68,070	65,320	77,070
Air Systems and Weapons Advanced Tech	39,667	54,667	45,367	61,167
Surface Ship & Sub HM&E Technology	37,432	68,232	57,232	73,432
Personnel Training Advanced Tech	26,988	42,988	29,988	45,988
Environmental Quality & Logistics Tech	24,002	39,002	42,202	52,502
Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology	58,296	62,296	61,296	66,796
C3 Advanced Technology	29,673	35,673	44,673	45,673
ASW Systems Development	19,680	24,680	24,680	27,680
Surface Ship Torpedo Defense	0	11,000	0	16,000
Shipboard System Component Development	244,437	254,437	252,437	258,437
Ship Preliminary Design Studies	46,896	46,896	50,496	56,896
Navy Conventional Munitions Navy Logistic Productivity	28,619	30,619	31,619	33,619
Multi-mission Helo Upgrade Development	66,946	79,946	77,946	83,946
EW Development	97,281	133,781	122,281	134,781
Airborne MCM	47,312	50,312	47,312	51,312
SSN-688 & Trident Modernization	34,801	62,801	49,801	72,801
New Design SSN	207,091	212,091	210,091	214,091
Ship Contract Design/Live Fire T&E	62,204	72,204	72,204	78,204
Navy Tactical Computer Resources	3,291	28,291	3,291	30,891
Information Technology Development	15,259	23,259	18,259	29,259
Marine Corps Program Wide Support	8,091	14,891	9,091	17,891
E-2 Squadrons	18,698	37,698	18,698	50,698
Consolidated Training Systems Development	27,059	34,559	32,059	38,559
Marine Corps Communications Systems	96,153	107,153	99,153	109,153
Information System Security Program	21,530	30,130	21,530	32,130
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	4,759	15,759	8,759	23,759
CEC P31	0	0	0	10,000
Maritime Fire Training/Barbers Point	0	0	0	2,000
Materials Micronization Technology	0	0	0	1,000
Virtual Company LINK	0	0	0	2,000
South Florida Ocean Management Center	0	0	0	1,750
Aircraft Affordability Project DP-2	0	3,500	0	4,500
SAR All Weather Targeting System-AWTS	0	0	0	4,000
AC Hi-Temp Superconductor Electric Motor	0	0	0	4,000
Fleet Health Technology	0	0	0	3,000
Ship-towed Tripwire Sensor	0	3,000	0	8,000
Compatible Processor Upgrade Program	0	0	0	3,500
Air Vehicle Dem/Val Bridge Contracts	0	0	0	88,984
Engine Dem/Val Bridge Contracts	0	0	0	22,500
Advanced Food Service Technology	0	0	0	2,500
AQS-20 Sonar Data Recording Capability	0	0	0	1,000
Sub Combat System Q-70 Retrofits	0	0	0	8,000
Human Resource Enterprise Strategy	0	8,000	3,000	9,000
Distance Learning at CAL State, San Berna	0	0	0	5,000
CBIRF: Chem Agent Warning Network	0	0	0	2,000
E-2C RMP Littoral Surveillance	0	0	0	15,000
E-2 C Improved Composite Rotordome	0	0	0	2,000
Naval Intelligent Agent Security Module	0	0	0	2,000
18-inch Lens Sensor Development-TARPS	0	0	0	5,000
Electro-optical Focal Plane Array Develop	0	0	0	3,000
Aerospace Flight Dynamics	48,775	52,315	49,327	53,675
Space Technology	57,687	61,687	68,287	69,487
Air Force Conventional Munitions	45,223	45,223	45,223	52,223
Advanced Aerospace Sensors	28,311	44,811	40,311	46,811

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONFERENCE REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 OUT OF SCOPE ITEMS (THOUSANDS)—Continued

Program	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Flight Vehicle Technology	2,445	7,645	6,272	11,045
Integrated Command & Control (IC2A)	214	0	5,014	8,014
Compass Call	5,834	25,834	15,834	21,834
Extended Range Cruise Missile	0	0	20,000	40,000
Theater Battle Management C41	41,068	41,068	46,068	48,568
Information Systems Security Program	7,212	25,703	12,212	29,503
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	136,913	143,913	152,613	157,913
Handheld Holographic Radar Gun (H3G)	0	0	0	1,000
Laser Spark	0	0	0	3,000
EW Survivability Enhancements	0	0	0	3,500
Civil, Fire, Environmental Shelters	0	0	0	2,746
ACES II Ejection Seat for Higher Weight	0	0	0	4,000
X-15 Test Stand at Edwards AFB	0	0	0	500
Air Force Center of Acquisition Reengin	0	0	0	2,000
Air Force Knowledge Management Project	0	0	0	2,000
Defense Research Sciences University Research Initiatives	90,415	100,415	102,015	109,815
Medical Free Electron Laser	253,627	289,627	263,627	292,077
Biological Warfare Defense Materials and Electronics Technology	15,029	25,029	15,029	20,029
High Energy Laser Program	162,064	166,564	150,064	168,314
Explosives Demilitarization Technology	249,812	259,312	255,812	264,312
Advanced Aerospace Systems Chemical & Biological Defense Program	8,964	23,164	19,664	30,164
Special Technical Support Generic Logistics R&D Tech Demos	26,821	26,821	30,936	34,821
46,594	49,344	55,694	57,894	59,577
Strategic Environmental Research Program	10,777	14,777	15,777	29,577
Advanced Electronics Technologies	23,082	47,382	37,082	48,182
Agile Port Demonstration	51,357	57,357	51,557	59,557
Advanced Sensor Applications Program	191,800	211,800	198,300	221,500
Environmental Security Technical Certification	0	0	5,000	7,500
BMD Technical Operations	15,534	24,534	31,034	38,334
International Cooperative Programs	24,906	24,906	25,406	29,256
Chemical & Biological Defense Program	270,718	292,718	304,218	313,218
General Support to C31	116,992	116,992	124,992	130,992
Joint Simulation System	83,800	83,800	88,800	89,800
Information Technology Center	3,769	34,469	9,769	38,769
University Advanced Materials Research	24,095	24,095	24,095	42,095
Military Personnel Research Center for Counterproliferation, Monterey	0	0	0	20,000
Lightweight X-band Antenna F-22 Digital EW Product Improvement	0	0	0	4,000
Advanced Lithography Demonstration	0	3,000	0	5,000
Navy Center of Excellence in Electro-optics	0	0	0	4,000
NTW Missile Defense Radar Competition	0	0	0	80,000
Chem/Bio CBMS II Upgrades	0	0	0	2,000
Community Hospital Telehealth Consortium	0	0	0	1,000
Total Number of Out of Scope items:	166			
Total Plus up of these items over the President's Budget Request:	over \$2.2 Billion.			

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I do not intend to take all of my time. I would like to have Senator GRAMM use some of his time.

I would like to say I am not proud to be here on the floor. This bill probably ranks up with the two or three of the most outrageous pork-barrel spending bills that I have observed in my years here since 1987. I should have demanded that the bill be read and I should be doing everything I can to block it. I intend to explain why.

This bill, I say in all respect—in all respect to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and my good

friend from Hawaii—is a disgrace. This bill has had \$2 billion added on in conference—added on in conference. Not a single Member of this body who was not part of the conference had anything to say about \$2 billion—B, billion—that was added in conference. As I say, I have not seen anything quite this bad—or perhaps I have, but it is very rare. This is a remarkable document. It has millions and millions and millions of dollars devoted to projects that have nothing to do with national defense.

Mr. President, there is \$4 million—excuse me—\$8.5 million for the Gallo Center for Alcoholism Research. What is the Gallo Center for Alcoholism Research? That was added in the conference.

It has \$4 million for the Gallo Cancer Center, \$1.5 million for chronic fatigue syndrome research, \$1 million for the Cancer Center of Excellence. What does the Cancer Center of Excellence have to do with national defense?

Mr. President, there are \$4 million in this bill for the Angel Gate Academy. What is the Angel Gate Academy? There is now an allocation to preserve Civil War-era vessels at the bottom of Lake Champlain, this year in the amount of \$15 million; \$2 million for the Bosque Redondo Memorial.

I am one of the few Members who know what the Bosque Redondo Memorial is. That is when we marched the Navajo Nation to Canyon de Chelle and killed thousands of the Navajo Nation. What does that have to do with defense?

Mr. President, \$3 million for hyperspectral research; astronomical active optics were deemed worthy of over \$3 million in defense funds, as was coal-based advanced thermally stable jet fuel. Coal-based jet fuel? What do we have, a guy in the back of the plane shoveling coal?

Mr. GRAMM. The Germans tried that.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, \$7 million—of course Alaska is here, of course Hawaii is here. There is \$5 million for the Hawaii Federal Health Care Network. I say to the Senator, my dearest friend, what in the world is the Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program? The Hawaiian Islands Federal Health Care Network? Alaska Federal Health Care Network? \$1.5 million for AlaskAlert, \$7 million for equipment at Fort Wainwright, \$7.5 million for the C-130 simulator.

There is a gift for CINCPAC, Commander in Chief of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific. Perhaps he needs a new \$60 million airplane. Perhaps he needs it, I don't know. We will never know because it was not in the House bill, it was not in the Senate bill, and it was put in in conference, \$60 million.

This is a remarkable document. I have submitted for the RECORD a four-page document. Many pages show: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; Conference—a Capital Purchase Plan at Pearl Harbor: Budget, zero; House,

zero; Senate, zero; Conference, \$5 million. What is that all about? What is that all about? Was it ever discussed on the floor of the Senate? Was it ever discussed at a hearing? Was it ever, dare I say, discussed in the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is the authorizing committee for these projects? Was it ever? No.

This is quite remarkable. Air Force Center of Acquisition Reengineering: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; Conference, \$2 million.

There is a Handheld Holographic Radar Gun—I repeat that—a Handheld Holographic Radar Gun: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; Conference, \$1 million.

Is there anyone in this body besides the appropriators, besides the appropriators in this body, who is going to vote \$1 million of the taxpayers' money who knows what in the world a Handheld Holographic Radar gun is? Perhaps the Presiding Officer knows. He is a very smart guy. Perhaps Senator GRAMM—he is an economist; he is a former college professor—perhaps he knows.

Here is one. Information Networking Systems: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; Conference, \$12.5 million. What does that mean?

Intelligent Power Control Vehicle Systems: House, zero; Senate, zero; Budget, zero; Conference, \$4.1 million. What does that mean?

One of my annual favorites—here is one that really is puzzling. Air Vehicle Dem/Val Bridge Contracts: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; Conference, \$88,984,000.

My friends, you are going to vote to appropriate \$88,984,000 of taxpayers' dollars for an Air Vehicle Dem/Val Bridge Contract.

Here is another one, Advanced Food Service Technology: Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; \$2.5 million for Advanced Food Service Technology. Mr. President, Advanced Food Service Technology? Again, what is that all about? Was it ever requested by the administration?

The answer is no.

Compass Call—I will not go into the Compass Call.

NTW missile defense radar competition. That may be very important. Budget, zero; House, zero; Senate, zero; conference, \$80 million. I say to my friends, \$80 million will be spent on NTW missile defense radar competition which, again, never had a hearing in the Senate Armed Services Committee, was never discussed on the floor of the Senate, never discussed on the floor of the House, and 80 million of taxpayers' dollars.

Here is another one. Information Technology Center. Budget, zero. For the uninitiated, "budget" means requested by the administration. The administration requested no money for it. The House put in no money for it in their Defense appropriations bill. The Senate put zero dollars in their bill. Yet it emerged from conference: Information Technology Center, \$20 million;

\$20 million is now being spent on the Information Technology Center which none of us knows what in the world it is, except for a chosen few.

What is happening here is that Members of the Senate and House who are not members of the Appropriations Committee are being deprived of their rights to knowledge and voting and discussing, debating, and making judgment on programs. And we are talking about big money here. We are talking about \$2 billion—B, billion—that have been added in conference which neither House ever debated, discussed, nor amended.

I think it is wrong, and I will return to something I said several times, both publicly and privately. It is time we made some tough decisions around here: Abolish the authorizing committees or abolish the appropriations committees. I am told by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee that \$600 million was transferred out of Navy accounts into Army accounts—\$600 million—by the Appropriations Committee.

We all know how the system is supposed to work. The authorizing committees authorize, and then the Appropriations Committee allows certain amounts of money which, in their best judgment, is needed. Now we are shifting hundreds of millions of dollars and adding \$2 billion. We are inaugurating programs that have no relation—no relation whatsoever—to national defense.

What in the world does a Gallo Research Center have to do with anything that is regarded defense?

Mr. President, \$7 million for the Magdalena Ridge Observatory in New Mexico—what does the Magdalena Ridge Observatory in New Mexico have to do with national defense?—combined with the aforementioned adds for Astronomical Active Optics and the Maui Space Surveillance System.

Some months ago, I completed a failed Presidential campaign. I learned a lot of things in that campaign, but I also found that many Americans who did not vote in the 1998 election—in fact, we had the lowest voter turnout in history of the 18-to-26-year-old voter in the 1998 election, and all of the predictions now are that we will have an even lower voter turnout in the year 2000 Presidential campaign.

They said, particularly young people: You don't represent me anymore; you don't respond to my hopes, dreams, and aspirations. I think these young people have another complaint: You don't have anything to do with the expenditure of my tax dollars.

It is controlled by a few and, in many cases, those few are controlled by special interests. Recently, there was a fundraiser conducted by the Democratic Party where one could pay \$500,000 and buy a ticket. When I first came to the House in 1983, if someone had told me that, I would have said: You're crazy.

Here we are in a process where I am not able to represent the people of my

State, much less the other young Americans who thought that I was a decent public servant. How can I represent the taxpayers of my State when \$2 billion is put in, in a conference about which I have no input? How can we call ourselves their representatives when they add money into an appropriations bill in a conference? Most Americans think \$2 billion is a lot of money.

I will tell my colleagues this right now: We are not taking care of the men and women in the military. We have pilots leaving at the highest rate. We cannot retain them. We have young men and women leaving in the highest numbers we have ever experienced since the 1970s. We are not meeting our recruiting goals. Yet we can spend \$7 million for the Magdalena Ridge Observatory; we can spend money for the LHD amphibious assault ship in Mississippi; C-130s and passenger jets are routinely added. The list goes on and on.

I will have more to say because I have asked for the time, but it is not fair to the people of this country. I tell my appropriator friends now: You risk losing the confidence of the American people when you carry out these kinds of procedures. You risk and deserve the condemnation and criticism of average citizens when you use their taxpayer dollars in such fashion in a bill that says "Defense appropriations bill" and we give money to some Gallo outfit. It may be a good and worthy cause, but so much of this has nothing to do with national defense, and the procedure that is being used is not acceptable.

I tell the appropriators now, and I want to make them very well aware, if next year this kind of behavior and these kinds of parliamentary procedures are pursued, I will do whatever one Senator can do to block passage of this bill. I say that not only because of my offense at this kind of procedure that has taken place, but I say that on behalf of the men and women who serve in the military today who are not having their basic needs met.

We still have thousands of young men and women on food stamps. We still have marines recapping tires so they can buy additional ammunition with which to practice. We still have men and women in the military living in barracks that were built in World War II, and we will spend \$2 billion that has nothing to do with their health, welfare, and benefit.

I have that obligation, and that obligation clearly supersedes that of my obligation to my dear friends in the Senate. It has to stop. I was discussing this with my friend—and he is my dear friend—the Senator from Alaska. I said: This is terrible, all the things that have been put in.

He said: You should have seen what they tried to put in.

In all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, it is not good enough.

I see the Senator from Texas has more to say. I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, my dad was a sergeant in the Army. I have always believed in a strong defense, and I have always prided myself on the fact that at least, in my opinion, no one in the Senate was a stronger supporter of national defense and a stronger supporter of the men and women who wear the uniform of this country and who keep us free. I, therefore, thought it was incumbent on me to explain why I am going to vote against this Defense appropriations bill.

Let me start by giving you a little history because I think it explains why we are at this extraordinary point with a bill that seems so very hard to explain. It started with President Clinton. It is, unfortunately, a standard pattern that, from time to time, we have Presidents who come into office and cut defense, and then as they are on the verge of waving goodbye, they propose massive increases in defense spending.

My dear colleague from Arizona will remember that the largest period of increases in defense spending in the peacetime history of the country did not start while Ronald Reagan was President. It, in fact, started the last year Jimmy Carter was President, even though Jimmy Carter cut national defense expenditures consistently during his Presidency.

President Clinton, in the first 5 years he was President, cut defense spending every single day. In the first year of his Presidency, real defense spending fell by 5.8 percent. In 1994, real defense spending again fell by 5.8 percent. In 1995, it fell by 4.7 percent; in 1996, 4.9 percent; in 1997, 0.5 percent; in 1998, 2.8 percent. In every one of those years, real resources that we committed to national security and to the well-being of the men and women who defend America declined.

Then, in 1999, finally, as we were looking at the 1999 budget, the Joint Chiefs of Staff finally stopped toeing the line for President Clinton, stopped apologizing for the decimation of the military, and pointed out that the military had been hollowed by Bill Clinton. It was a revelation that was late in coming, and it is a shame on the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they let it run for so long.

So in 1999, led, I am proud to say, by the Republican Congress, we actually increased defense spending in real terms for the first time since Bill Clinton had been President.

Now, in his final budget submission, President Clinton, as he is heading toward the exit, having cut defense consistently since he became President—even counting the increase Congress added last year, real defense outlays have been cut by 17 percent—now, in his parting budget, President Clinton proposed \$16 billion of increases in defense spending.

We might have celebrated that fact—having written a budget that added \$16 billion and expanded our modernization programs, improved health care for our active duty military and for our retirees—there are many good things we could do with that \$16 billion—but Congress was not going to be outdone. How dare Bill Clinton, in the final hours that he has in the White House, submit a massive increase in defense spending and have Congress just say yes.

So remarkably, we find ourselves today in a situation where the President proposed a \$16 billion increase, Congress has raised that by another \$14 billion, and, as a result, we have over a 10-percent increase in defense spending in 1 year. I would submit that this is political upmanship that makes absolutely no sense. What has happened is, the surplus is literally burning a hole in our pockets.

The picture is actually worse because there are all kinds of gimmicks in the bill that would allow more to be spent. You might wonder how \$2 billion that nobody voted on in either House of Congress could be added in conference. Let me explain how it happened. In fact, I am sure people wonder: Where do these emergencies come from? Every week or so now, they are seeing Congress pass an emergency funding bill. And they might ask: Where do these emergencies come from?

On page 54 of this Defense appropriations bill, we have an emergency created. This is how it happened. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, in section 8166, cut spending for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund by \$1.1 billion.

They took the \$1.1 billion out of the appropriations bill, and then, in title IX, they added it back, but this time as an emergency. So, in the middle of page 54, an emergency is created, by taking money away from needed expenditures on American overseas contingency operations—we take the money away in the middle of page 54—then we spend this money on all of these programs that Senator MCCAIN is talking about, and then, at the bottom of page 54, we add it back because we have an emergency.

Well, where did the emergency come from? The emergency came from the fact that they took the money from overseas operations to spend on other things. That is where the emergency came from.

So they created the emergency in the middle of page 54, and then at the bottom of page 54, having created a crisis—we might have to bring troops home from Kosovo as a result of the money taken in the middle of page 54—so at the bottom of page 54, having created the emergency in the middle of the page, they then solve the emergency by taking exactly the same amount of money, declaring it an emergency so it does not count under the budget, and adding it back.

It, I think, speaks volumes that Senator MCCAIN looked at this bill, and I

looked at this bill, and we both came up with a list of programs that we thought were indefensible. We never talked about our choice of programs, but there is not a single overlap on our lists. That tells me we were picking from a large bushel basket full of additions.

Let me give you a few that I think deserve a prize. Five million dollars is earmarked out of Army operations and maintenance. I remind my colleagues, this is an area where we have a critical shortage of funding, where we have provided emergency money in the past. In clear violation of the base closing law—which says, when you close a military base you can't keep building infrastructure on that military base; when you have closed it, when you have transferred it to the civilian sector, you can't keep spending defense money on it—in clear violation of the base closing law, we provide \$5 million, which we transfer to the National Park Service, to build infrastructure on a base that has been closed.

No. 2, we provide \$4 million to monitor desert tortoise populations. Remember, we are taking \$4 million out of the defense budget. In fact, we declared an emergency when we took the money away from overseas operations, and then we put it back in for an emergency so we could fund programs such as monitoring desert tortoise populations.

It is interesting, when you press, to learn what the justification is. The justification, you will be happy to know, is that we may, at some point, want to expand a military base, and the desert tortoise population might be relevant.

I remind my colleagues, we are closing military bases. Nevertheless, in this bill, with all of our needs, we found room to provide defense money to monitor the desert tortoise population in California.

Because we have a huge backlog in depot maintenance for our ships in the Navy, this Congress has provided \$362 million of emergency money to try to deal with this backlog in ship maintenance so our ships can perform their missions. In this bill, we take \$750,000 out of that emergency money and use it for renovations on the U.S.S. *Turner Joy*. Senator MCCAIN will be one of the few people here who will remember the U.S.S. *Turner Joy*. It is a destroyer. It is well known because it was involved in the Tonkin Gulf action that got us deeper into Vietnam. But it has been out of the Navy since 1982. We are providing \$362 million on an emergency basis to catch up with ship maintenance, and yet we are basically giving a tourist bureau money to do renovation on a ship that has been out of the Navy since 1982.

There is \$5.5 million for an Army research and development project. This is money meant for modernization so if we have to send men and women into combat, they will have technological superiority. We use this \$5.5 million for laser vision correction. Laser vision

correction is a miracle. They can come in and do it, and you don't have to wear glasses anymore. But the point is, what does that have to do with national defense? Why are we funding medical research out of the national defense budget?

Then there is \$2.8 million to buy new office furniture for the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, CA. At first you might say, OK, we built a new building; we have to buy new furniture. But there isn't a new building. We are not building a new building at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, CA. The question is: Why do we need new furniture now? What is wrong with the old furniture? The answer: The surplus is burning a hole in our pocket. This is a grab bag. It is like one of these sales you see on television where they dump the clothes on a table and they are on sale, and everybody grabs a piece of it.

Finally, \$3.5 million is added in Army research, development, test, and evaluation for artificial hip research. Now look, artificial hip research is important. There are people who have deteriorating joints. We fund research at the National Institutes of Health to deal with health problems. What are we doing taking \$3.5 million out of defense to fund this kind of activity?

I will conclude on this: We took \$1.1 billion out of defense. We declared an emergency because we didn't have enough defense money. Then, having declared an emergency and gotten the money, then we take the \$1.1 billion that was supposed to be spent on defense and spend it on other things. As a result, we literally have an almost endless list of projects exactly like these. You have to ask yourself, is this really the best use for the taxpayers' money?

I say to my colleagues, I am going to vote against this Defense bill because this is runaway spending at its worst. I voted against other bills because of the obscene way we literally are throwing money at these appropriated accounts. In this election year, with many close elections, we literally are spending money on anything that might have a constituency. This process has got to stop. I think it undermines the good work we are doing.

I thank Senator STEVENS. We have been working to resolve a disagreement over two unnecessary pay shifts. Senator STEVENS has agreed—graciously, I might add—to fix that. But I am going to vote against this bill on the basis under which we are today considering it. I am going to vote against this bill because you cannot defend this kind of runaway spending. The only defense I've heard is that, in a big bill, you are going to take on some spending. I don't think that is good enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator GRAMM for his efforts and his discussion of a bill that, obviously, is going to be passed by overwhelming

numbers. Again, I point out, this is a Defense appropriations bill—appropriations. It is supposed to be for the money, not for making policy or authorizing.

One of the more egregious practices that has crept in lately, that doesn't have a lot to do with money but has a great deal to do with national policy and in the end costs taxpayers enormous amounts of money, is the Buy American provisions. We started out with a couple. Now we have more and more and more. I will mention a couple of them.

You have to buy only American products related to welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain. You can only buy American relating to carbon alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense, specifications to be determined by the American Iron and Steel Institute. There are Buy American restrictions related to the procurement of vessel propellers and ball and roller bearings.

I am told that a request for proposal, so-called RFP, to people to bid on vessel propellers that would have been opened to, certainly, our NATO allies was recently published and, strangely enough, this was put in the bill. There is a requirement for the use of U.S. anthracite as the baseload energy for municipal district heat for U.S. military installations in Germany. I have remarked on this before because it has been there a long time. It is the classic example of taking coal to Newcastle. We have to take American coal, put it on a ship, and transport it to Germany to be used in Germany. I have never gotten an estimate as to how many millions that costs Americans.

It exempts the construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, clothing or textile materials from Secretary of Defense waiver authority relating to the Buy American requirements involving countries with which the United States has reciprocal agreements. In other words, the United States has a reciprocal agreement, particularly with some of our NATO allies, and the Secretary of Defense cannot give any waiver for the purchase of clothing or textile materials. This is protectionism at its most egregious.

It prohibits the development, lease, or procurement of ADC(X) class ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines and propulsors are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity.

It transfers \$5 million to the National Park Service for repair improvements at Fort Baker in northern California; \$500,000 for Florida Memorial College for the purposes of funding minority aviation training. It is a worthy program. I would support it, if it were not in a Defense appropriations bill. It transfers \$34 million to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center. We have an appropriations bill upon which that would have

been entirely appropriate. Then they go on to restrict the center's ability to establish its own personnel levels.

There are restrictions on the ability of the Department of Defense to contract out any activity currently performed by more than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees.

This is an appropriations bill, Mr. President. Now the Department of Defense cannot contract out any activity, no matter how much money it would save the taxpayers, under any circumstances, if there are no more than 10 DOD civilian employees. It doesn't matter if there are a thousand military people. More than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees. That is offensive, to have that kind of language in a DOD appropriations bill.

It prohibits reduction to disestablishment of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron, Air Force Reserve, Mississippi. We all know we have the capability to monitor weather, thanks to modern technology.

It mandates continued availability of funds for the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics in Georgia.

It requires the Army to use the former George Air Force Base, California, as the airhead for the National Training Center.

We could not let the Army or Department of Defense make that decision. We require the U.S. Army, no matter what it may cost, to use George Air Force Base as the airhead for the National Training Center.

It authorizes the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement requirements relating to the costs to the Department of Defense associated with the conduct of conferences, seminars, and other educational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center.

It is well to note that the Asia-Pacific Center is located in Hawaii. Why don't we waive reimbursement requirements for any center in America or the world? Why just for the Asia-Pacific Center?

It transfers \$10 million to the Department of Transportation to realign railroad tracks at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, Alaska.

I wonder if there are railroad tracks that need to be realigned at other defense facilities in America. I would imagine so.

It mandates that funds used for the procurement of malt beverages and wine for resale on a military installation be used to procure such beverages from within that State.

Suppose they could get those beverages at a lower cost from some other State?

It earmarks \$5 million for the High Desert Partnership in Academic Excellence Foundation, Inc., for the purpose of developing, implementing, and evaluating a standards- and performance-based academic model at schools administered by the Department of Defense Education Activity.

What makes the High Desert Partnership the place to get the \$5 million?

Was there ever a hearing on it? Did the Personnel Subcommittee or Armed Services Committee ever look at it? No.

It earmarks \$115 million to remain available for transfer to other Federal agencies.

That is \$115 million; just transfer it to other Federal agencies. Why?

It earmarks \$1.9 million for San Bernardino County Airports Department for installation of a perimeter security fence at Barstow-Daggett Airport, California.

It earmarks \$20 million for the National Center for the Preservation of Democracy.

It earmarks \$7 million for the North Slope Borough.

It earmarks \$5 million to the Chicago Public Schools for conversion and expansion of the former Eighth Regiment National Guard Armory.

I argue, Mr. President, that there are guard armories all over America that could be converted.

It earmarks \$1 million for the Middle East Regional Security Issues Program.

It earmarks \$2 million, subject to authorization, for the Bosque Redondo Memorial in New Mexico.

It earmarks \$300,000 for the Circum-Pacific Council for the Crowding the Rim Summit Initiative.

It earmarks \$10 million for the City of San Bernardino, contingent on resolution of the case of City of San Bernardino v. United States.

Mr. President, it is obvious that this procedure in the Congress of the United States of authorizing and appropriating has lurched completely and entirely out of control. When you are earmarking \$2 billion out of an appropriations bill which has neither been examined nor voted on by either body, we have a case that has got to be remedied, and we have obviously wasted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

The American people deserve better. I say again to the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, with whom I have an excellent and warm personal relationship, this cannot stand. Next year, if this kind of practice continues, then I will have to do everything in my power to stop it, as I said before, not only because of my obligation to the taxpayers, which is significant, but my obligation to the men and women in the military who are being shortchanged by these procedures and, indeed, neglected in many respects.

I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 20 minutes remaining for Senator BYRD and 6 minutes for Senators STEVENS and INOUE.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I shall use half of that 6 minutes, if I may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the conference report to accompany H.R. 4576, the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Appropriations Act was endorsed by all the Senate conferees, and enjoys the full support of our distinguished ranking member Senator INOUE.

This bill, in combination with the emergency supplemental bill passed last month, provides a true jump start to restore the readiness, quality of life, and modernization of our Armed Forces.

The Senate considers this conference report at the earliest point in the year since 1958—which means the Department of Defense can plan now to execute the funds provided by Congress for the full fiscal year.

Our adoption of this conference report today would not have been possible without the extraordinary effort and leadership of House Chairman, JERRY LEWIS.

In partnership with the former House Chairman, and current ranking member, JACK MURTHA, they reported the bill in early May, and presented it to the Senate in time for us to act prior to the July 4th recess.

Both committees set the FY 2001 bill aside to complete work on the FY 2000 supplemental in late June. That bill provided \$6.5 billion to repay the Army for operations in Kosovo, and to address critical personnel, medical, and fuel cost increases.

This bill extends those initiatives, providing needed funds for new medical benefits for military retirees, real property maintenance, depot maintenance, and environmental restoration.

The most significant initiative contained in the conference report is the nearly \$1 billion increase for the Army transformation effort.

Last October, Gen. Eric Shinseki, the new Chief of Staff of the Army, established a new vision for the Army—a more mobile, lethal and flexible force for the 21st century.

In this bill, funding is provided to procure the first two brigade sets of equipment for the new "transformation" force.

We are determined that this new force be equipped as rapidly as possible, and intend to maintain this pace of funding in fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

Meeting our national strategic priorities, the bill establishes a new national defense airlift fund, to procure C-17 aircraft.

The centerpiece of how our Nation can maintain its global leadership position is strategic mobility. As our force is as small, to meet our national commitments, we must be able to respond to crises anywhere on the globe—the key to that is the C-17.

Finally, this bill accelerates development, and seeks to reduce technical risk, on the full spectrum of our missile defense programs.

The conference worked to keep the airborne laser, space-based laser, national missile defense, and Navy theater-wide programs on track, and pro-

vide additional funds for the Arrow Joint Development Program with Israel.

It is again my privilege this year to join my colleague from Hawaii in presenting this bill to the Senate. We simply could not have completed our work without his leadership, guidance, and partnership. I would now like to yield to Senator INOUE for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I want to begin by informing the Senate that, at \$287.9 billion, this act represents the largest defense spending measure in history.

The act is \$176 million more than was recommended by the Senate and \$706 million below the House level.

The conference agreement is a fair compromise between the two Houses. Funding for many items of priority of each of the bodies have been included, but concessions were also required of each Chamber.

Our chairman and his House counterpart should be given great credit for this measure.

I am confident the funding contained in this act will allow our military to meet their most critical readiness and modernization needs in the coming year.

However, Senators should be advised that the bill does not provide a blank check to the Pentagon.

It includes reductions in some programs that, such as in the Navy's LPD-17, are behind schedule, over budget, or simply not ready to proceed.

In addition, the conferees concurred with the House, terminating the Discoverer II and Sadarm programs.

Mr. President, these were difficult decisions, but by making these tough choices the conferees were able to identify sufficient resources to protect those programs which are truly critical to the support of our military forces.

I want to assure my colleagues that the No. 1 priority in this bill is to protect near-term readiness.

The men and women willing to go into harm's way to protect the rest of us simply must be provided the tools they need to defeat any threat.

To help meet our readiness requirements, the conference agreement includes the following among its many accomplishments:

- (1) Fully funds a 3.7 percent military pay raise;
- (2) Provides an increase of more than \$400 million for real property maintenance;
- (3) Provides an increase of \$234 million for depot maintenance; and
- (4) Provides funding for a new pharmacy benefit for our older retirees.

At the same time, the bill provides sufficient funding for modernization programs so that future readiness will also be protected. We must continue to invest for the future to ensure we are never caught unprepared.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees were able to provide nearly

\$1.4 billion in support the Army's newest initiative commonly referred to as "transformation."

These funds will allow the Army to begin to outfit its first two interim combat brigades with new equipment to test out this revolutionary concept.

This is the highest priority of the Army Chief of Staff and is critical to supporting our Army.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the many items included in this bill to ensure that our defense forces remain second to none.

Mr. President, this is a very good compromise agreement. I strongly encourage all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, a process of this nature, which involves appropriations in excess of \$275 billion, is a result of many hours and many days of collaboration and consultation with hundreds of people, including the President, the various Secretaries, committee staff members, Senators, and Representatives. A measure of this magnitude, obviously, will be supported by some and criticized by others. One can never come forth with a "perfect" bill. It is just not possible.

However, I believe it is important that certain clarifications be made. I know, for example, that my dear friend from Arizona spoke of the Navy Theater-Wide Missile Defense Program and suggested that the House had not sought the funds, and neither did the President of the United States nor the Senate of the United States. However, I am certain the Senator would have noted, if he studied the report carefully, that this was debated on this floor for very many minutes. It was debated in the House, it was debated in the Appropriations Committee and in the authorization committee. The only difference was that the House provided \$130 million to be designated for very specific purposes. In the Senate, for the same program, we provided \$50 million for the whole program itself.

When the compromise was reached, we decided to let the Department of Defense make its allocations. So we drew a new line item. The new line item obviously was not requested by the President, nor by the House, nor by the Senate. But the matters debated and compromised were fully debated by this body. That can also be said for many other programs.

I wish to advise my colleague that as far as I am concerned, this measure is a good one. It addresses the needs of our military. It provides the funds that are necessary to feed, clothe, and adequately and appropriately arm our men so they can stand in harm's way with some confidence that they will be protected.

I commend my chairman, the Senator from Alaska, for his leadership on this matter. It is not easy.

I am the first to admit that there must be some waste in a measure of this magnitude. There are some that we may disagree with as to its merit

and its relevance to do defense. But that is my view. Others may disagree with me. But I think overall this is a fine bill and it is worthy of support by the Members of the Senate.

I yield the remainder of my time.

SAR FACILITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to engage the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my colleague from Florida in a brief colloquy concerning the South-Florida based Advanced Tropical Remote Sensing Center and its Synthetic Aperture Radar [SAR] facility.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I'd like to join Chairman STEVENS and my colleague from Florida in this colloquy to address this important issue.

Mr. STEVENS. I would be happy to address this important topic with Senator MACK and Senator GRAHAM. I am pleased to confirm that this conference agreement provides \$4.9 million dollars for remote sensing research and development activities in the RDT&E Defense-Wide University Research Initiatives account.

Mr. MACK. I am very pleased to have this confirmation, and to know the Senators' personal interest and support. As the Senator is aware, one of our major objectives for this center, an objective supported by the leadership of SOUTHCOM, is to greatly enhance our nation's drug traffic interdiction capability.

Mr. GRAHAM. This will be the only SAR facility of its kind in the east, and the Department of Defense has indicated to us, its' strong interest in developing this capability further in South Florida. It was for this reason that we asked the Senate to approve, which it did, an amendment for up to an additional \$5 million dollars specifically for drug interdiction activities at the facility.

Mr. STEVENS. I know that Senator MACK and Mr. GRAHAM intend that the Department of Defense drug interdiction officials provide all appropriate support possible on this important objective. Addressing the shortage of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance coverage is an important step in strengthening DoD's drug interdiction efforts.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, it was for the purpose of securing a clarification of their intent on this matter that I sought this colloquy. I thank them for their support, interest, and leadership.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I look forward to working with Senator MACK and Chairman STEVENS to secure funding for this important project.

CRUSADER PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise to ask my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for clarification on the language in the Defense appropriations conference report concerning the Crusader program.

The language states that fifty percent of the funding for the Crusader program cannot be obligated or expended until thirty days after the Secretary of Defense submits the Congress a comprehensive Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) on the Crusader program. I would ask the Chairman, is this language intended to delay the continuing development of the Crusader program?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Oklahoma that the language in the statement of managers is not intended to delay the continued development of Crusader. I would also state that Senator INOUE and I expect that the AOA should be completed and delivered to the Congress by December 15th of this year.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the Chairman is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I believe that it is not the intent of the conferees to require that the Department of Defense prepare a weapon system analysis AOA as required for the Department of Defense Directives for system milestone reviews. Instead, I believe what is needed is a quicklook analysis that evaluates the capabilities and costs of Crusader and comparable weapons system alternatives to support the Army's Transformation Initiative to include the counterattack corps and brigade combat teams.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

LONGBOW APACHE HELICOPTERS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of our Defense Appropriations subcommittee, engage in a colloquy with me on the topic of proposed international sales of Longbow Apache helicopters?

Mr. STEVENS. I will be happy to engage in such a colloquy with my colleague.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator for his time and compliment our distinguished Chairman for skillfully guiding this bill through the challenging process of mark-up and conference. As the Chairman is well aware, the Stinger air defense missile and the Apache Longbow are two programs of great interest to me and to the state of Arizona. Over 41,000 Stinger missiles have been delivered and over \$4 billion has been invested in Stinger weapons and platforms, and over 1,200 Apaches have been delivered to the U.S. and our allied forces.

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the Senator's interest and of the Stinger's and Apache's capabilities. They are fine systems and have received the support of this committee for years.

Mr. KYL. And I thank the Chairman for the committee's report. Sales of Apache Longbow and Stinger, however, apparently are being jeopardized by what I believe is a misinterpretation of congressional language contained in the FY00 DoD conference report. Therefore, I am seeking his help in clarifying the intent of Congress with regard to that provision.

In the FY00 DoD Appropriations bill, section 8138 directs the Army to "conduct a live fire, side-by-side operational test of the air-to-air Starstreak and air-to-air Stinger missiles from the AH-64D Longbow helicopter." The provision further states that the Army is "to ensure that the development, procurement or integration of any missile for use on the AH-64 [Apache] or RAH-66 [Comanche] helicopters . . . is subject to a full and open competition which includes the conduct of a live-fire, side-by-side test as an element of the source selection criteria." My understanding is that the intent of this provision was to direct the Army to conduct a test of two systems in order to ensure that its helicopters are fielded with the best possible air-to-air missile.

The problem, is that the Army has interpreted this provision so broadly as to prevent the sale of Apaches equipped with a Stinger air-to-air capability to our allies. Apparently the Army view is that they cannot do so until the operational test is conducted. Is it the Chairman's understanding that this language was intended to in any way obstruct the potential sale of Stinger-equipped Apaches to any U.S. ally?

Mr. STEVENS. I believe that the intent of Section 8138 was to require the Army to conduct an operational test of Stinger and Starstreak, not to impede sales of the Apache.

Mr. KYL. I thank the distinguished Chairman for engaging in this colloquy and for his insight, and I yield the floor.

ABRAMS-CRUSADER COMMON ENGINE PROGRAM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I commend Senator STEVENS for his leadership and work on this important bill. Clearly, America has a continuing need to maintain a robust, well equipped military that is capable of defending freedom and preserving the peace. This bill advances the Department of Defense and our military services toward this objective.

One element of this bill involves the U.S. Army's innovative effort to improve the Operation and Support cost of our M-1 Abrams main battle tank and the new Crusader Mobile Artillery system. For several years, the Army has recognized that the maintenance and support cost of the present M-1 tank was excessively high. Concurrently, the Army was developing the next generation of mobile artillery systems—to be called the Crusader.

Late last year, the Army made a bold decision to pursue a consolidation of the engine component of both the M-1 and Crusader program. This consolidated effort is called the Abrams-Crusader Common Engine (ACCE) program. By consolidating the engine procurement for both vehicles, the goal is to reduce the costs to the Army for both vehicles.

Mr. President, I noticed that the Senate version of this bill reduced the amount of funds available for the ACCE program by \$48 million. I learned

the committee had concerns over the Army's interest in developing a new engine for these two vehicles. This conference report, however, restores \$20 million to the ACCE program. I would ask the chairman of the committee if the restoration of this \$20 million reflects a change in the committee's view of the program or do you remain concerned that the program is too costly and adds concurrency to the Crusader system?

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the assistant majority leader for his kind words and note that I have very good support and participation on the defense subcommittee with Members from both sides of the aisle, so I share his kind words with my colleagues on the committee.

Regarding the ACCE program, the Senator is correct: this conference report restores \$20 million to the ACCE program. He is also correct that the Senate bill had a larger cut to the program and that the cut reflected substantial reservations over the cost of a new developmental engine for both the M-1 and the Crusader.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman for that explanation. It is encouraging to once again recognize that the Chairman—while a vigorous advocate for a robust defense capability—is constantly vigilant to ensure that the money we spend for defense is also a sound investment.

The Army's initiative to re-engine the M-1 is a good idea. Maintenance and fuel costs associated with operation of the M-1 are very high; perhaps as much as 60 percent of the M-1's total O&S cost. Replacing the current gas turbine engine with a more fuel-efficient and reliable engine has the potential to save substantial amounts for the Army. However, the cost to develop a new engine could be quite high. There is even one press article citing a Defense Department official indicating the development costs could approach a half billion dollars. So, while the Army initiative is a good one, the costs associated with the program are prohibitive.

Regarding the Crusader program, the engine selection will be critical to the overall performance and success of the vehicle program. If the Army were to proceed with the consolidated ACCE program, it is clear that concurrency in the Crusader program would be higher than if the Army selects an engine already developed and currently in production.

As a final question for the Chairman, does the cut reflected in this conference report for the ACCE program indicate a lack of support for the M-1 re-powering effort or the Crusader system?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this conference report contains funds to support both the Crusader vehicle and the M-1 re-powering effort. These efforts are supported in the final bill. The final funding levels reflect the substantial concern over the cost to de-

velop a new engine, as well as the desire to see the Army pursue an NDI solution.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate the time and attention of the Chairman to my concerns related to the Crusader system and the ACCE program, in particular.

BAYONET 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question regarding the defense appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2001. I noticed that the conference report retained a very important project to buy new bayonets for the Marine Corps. Is the funding within the Marine Corps Procurement line in fact for Bayonet 2000?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. The conference report includes \$2 million for Bayonet 2000 in the Marine Corps procurement account.

Mr. INOUE. I also concur with Chairman STEVENS.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished Chairman, and the distinguished Ranking Member for that clarification, and appreciate their hard work on the conference report.

MTAPP

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise today to query my distinguished colleague from Alaska, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, on a program of importance to my constituents. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the conference committee that of the \$4,000,000 appropriated in the Air Force's operation and maintenance title for the Manufacturing Technical Assistance Pilot Program (MTAPP), \$2,000,000 shall be expended during fiscal year 2001 only for the continued expansion of the program into Pennsylvania through the National Education Center for Women in Business at Seton Hill College? As the Chairman may know, half of the appropriated FY2000 funds are not being provided to the program in Pennsylvania, and I seek to ensure that during FY2001 the funds are allocated between the two MTAPP programs.

Mr. STEVENS. My distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania is correct that the conference committee intends that \$2,000,000 of the Fiscal Year 2001 appropriation for MTAPP be expended in Pennsylvania through the National Education Center for Women in Business at Seton Hill College. Further, it is my understanding that FY2000 monies intended to be spent in Pennsylvania pursuant to last year's appropriations bill have yet to be obligated. Therefore, I wish to express to the Senator my clear intent to ensure that FY2000 and FY2001 monies fund the MTAPP in the manner this committee and the Congress intend.

ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I was wondering if the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee

would rise to engage in a brief colloquy.

Mr. STEVENS. I am happy to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. GREGG. I congratulate the Chairman on a strong bill that will improve our national security. As a conferee I understand the many challenges he faced in putting this bill together. While I support the overall bill, I would like to express my deep concern over a provision of this conference report that reduces funding for an important electronic warfare system for the F/A-18E/F. The conference report reduces funding for the Integrated Defensive Electronic Countermeasure (IDECM) program by \$29.6 million in the F/A-18E/F procurement account. I understand that this reduction may provide insufficient funding for Low Rate Initial Production, significantly increase the risk to full rate production, and may mean that operationally deployed F/A-18E/F aircraft will not have adequate protection against radio frequency guided missile threats. Therefore, I would like to ask the Chairman for his support in addressing this issue for FY01.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate the Senator's concerns. My understanding is

that the Navy planned to buy 30 Low Rate Initial Production units. However, testing of the IDECM system occurs throughout fiscal year 2001. The operational evaluation of the IDECM System will not be complete until early in fiscal year 2002. The conferees were concerned about a large LRIP buy proceeding ahead of the test program. The conference recommendation still allows the Navy to buy 20 units, more than the number required for the operational deployment. I will work with you to review the test results and to ensure that the LRIP program is appropriate.

ALCOHOLISM RESEARCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my colleague from Alaska in a brief colloquy concerning the Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program that is funded again this year in the Defense appropriations bill. Would research proposals related to alcoholism be appropriate for consideration under the Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct. The conference report includes \$50 million in funding for the Department of Defense to conduct a Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program to pursue medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health. Alcoholism research would be an entirely appropriate candidate for funding consideration.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the statement of the managers to accompany the conference report on H.R. 4576 included a table to delineate the projects recommended for funding in the Defense Health Program. Unfortunately, the information included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and printed in House Report 106-754 deleted one line from the recommended list of projects. To clarify the agreement of the conferees, I ask unanimous consent that a table taken from a copy of the official papers which lists the actual agreement be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Operations and Maintenance:				
Government Computer-Based Patient Records		(10,000)		(6,000)
Comprehensive breast cancer clinical care project (Note: The conferees support continuation of a public/private effort, in coordination with a rural medical center and a not-for-profit medical foundation, to provide a program in breast care risk assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and research for the Department of Defense. The program shall be a coordinated effort among Walter Reed Army Medical Center, National Naval Medical Center, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a rural primary health care center, with funding management accomplished by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.) [Transferred from RDT&E.A.]		7,000		7,000
Post-polio Syndrome [Transferred from RDT&E.N.]		3,000		3,000
Coronary/Prostate Disease Reversal [Transferred from RDT&E.N.]				6,000
Community Hospital Telehealth Consortium				1,000
Medicare Eligible Health Options Study		2,000		2,000
Claims Processing Initiative		3,600		3,600
Military Treatment Facilities Optimization		134,000		
Reimbursement for Travel Expenses		15,000		
Reduced Catastrophic Cap		32,000		
Senior Pharmacy Benefit		94,000		
Military retiree pharmacy benefit			137,000	
Senior Pharmacy Increase				100,000
Outcomes Management Demonstration at WRAMC			10,000	10,000
Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program			8,000	8,000
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines			7,500	7,500
Hawaii Federal Health Care Network (PACMEDNET)			7,000	7,000
Clinical Coupler Demonstration Project			5,000	5,000
Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance [Transferred to O&M, Navy.]			5,000	
Tri-Service Nursing Research Program			4,000	4,000
Defense and Veterans Head Injury Program			3,500	
Graduate School of Nursing			2,000	2,000
Brown Tree Snakes			1,000	1,000
Alaska Federal Health Care Network			1,000	1,000
Biomedical Research Center Feasibility Study			1,000	1,000
Oxford House DoD Pilot Project			750	750
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences			(6,300)	(6,300)
Research and Development	65,880	327,880	402,880	413,380
Head Injury Program		2,000		3,000
Joint U.S.-Norwegian Telemedicine		4,000		2,000
Cancer Research (Note: Only for cancer research in the integrated areas of signal transduction, growth control and differentiation, molecular carcinogenesis and DNA repair, cancer genetics and gene therapy, and cancer invasion and angiogenesis.)		6,000		5,500
Army Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program		175,000	175,000	175,000
Army Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program		75,000	100,000	100,000
Ovarian Cancer Research Program			12,000	12,000
Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program			50,000	50,000

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, at my request, the conferees added a \$2 million item to match a program that the House had included. This program, under the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Appropriation, is listed under the Human Systems Technology Program as "Maritime Fire Training/Barber's Point".

This funding is to be available to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to meet its civilian crewing demand and assist in maintaining a cadre

of qualified seafarers for times of national emergencies.

The Department of Defense is facing a significantly smaller pool of Merchant Mariners than existed in the past. In recent Senate testimony, Vice Admiral Gordon Holder, Commander of the Military Sealift Command, identified the issue of Merchant Mariner availability as a key issue to his command. Admiral Holder testified that "MSC's difficulty in recruiting and retaining a professional cadre of civil

service merchant mariners also extends to the U.S. Commercial Merchant Fleet." Moreover, a recent study by the National Defense Transportation Association has identified potential merchant mariner shortages. The new requirements of the standards of training, certification, and watchkeeping will have an impact on our ability to maintain a qualified pool of seafarers.

The Pacific Theater is the fastest growing sector for civilian U.S. Merchant Mariners, with at least 2,500 civilian seafaring jobs coming online over the next three years. To assist the Department of Defense in meeting its civilian merchant mariner requirements, the conferees provided this funding. It is contemplated that the funds will be used for a maritime fire training facility at the Hawaii National Guard Facilities at Barber's Point. The facility will be used to train service component and civilian merchant mariners.

Mr. REID. Thank you for your hard work on this bill. This will provide the funding necessary for a strong military. I rise today to discuss one item contained in the Defense Appropriations Conference Report.

The Conference Report includes language under Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, National Guard Counterdrug Support directing that of the funding provided in the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account, \$2,000,000 above the state allocation be provided to the Nevada National Guard to allow for the Counterdrug Reconnaissance and Interdiction Detachment unit in northern Nevada to expand operations to southern Nevada.

I would like to clarify that the funds for this project should be made available from the overall "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense account of \$869,000,000 and not from the money allocated to the National Guard Counter-Drug support program, sometimes called the Governor's State Plan, which was also separately increased by \$20,000,000 in the bill. I believe that this is reasonably clear from the language of the report, but I wanted to ensure there was no confusion. Is my description of the breakdown of the funding correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, your interpretation of the language is correct.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your clarification and again would like to thank you for your good work on this bill and support of the military.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Department of Defense appropriations conference report that the Senate will pass today does not reflect the realities of the post-Cold War world in which our men and women in uniform serve this country.

I want to state very clearly, Mr. President, that my opposition to this bill should not be interpreted as a lack of support for our men and women in uniform. Rather, what I cannot support is the Cold War mentality that continues to permeate the United States defense establishment.

I strongly support our Armed Forces and the excellent work they are doing to combat the new threats of the 21st century and beyond. However, I am concerned that we are not giving our forces the tools they need to combat these emerging threats. Instead, this

bill clings to the strategies and weapons that we used to fight—and win—the Cold War.

I say again today what I have said so many times before. The Cold War is over, Mr. President. It is time we stopped fighting it.

For example, as my colleagues know, I strongly support terminating production under the Navy's Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missile program. During the recent consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2001, I offered an amendment that would have terminated production of this Cold War-era weapon, which was designed specifically to be a first-strike strategic missile that would attack targets inside the Soviet Union from waters off the continental United States.

I deeply regret that the Senate did not adopt this amendment, and that production of the Trident II missile will continue for at least one more year. This conference report includes more than \$433 million to purchase 12 more of these missiles, as well as another \$9.5 million in advanced procurement funds for additional missiles the Navy hopes to buy in future years.

It is beyond my comprehension why the Navy needs more of these missiles when it already has 372 in its arsenal. Despite the fact that it already has ten submarines that are fully equipped with this devastating weapon, the Navy wants to backfit four of its older Trident I submarines with these newer weapons. To achieve this, the Navy wants to have a total of 425 of these missiles, so the President continues to request them in his budget. And the Congress continues to spend the taxpayers' money on acquiring more Trident II missiles even as the United States negotiates further arms reductions with Russia.

I also continue to be deeply concerned about the Pentagon's procurement strategy for tactical aircraft. This conference report includes nearly \$2.8 billion for the multi-year procurement of 42 of the Navy's FA-18E/F aircraft. My opinion on this program is well known. I have not been shy about highlighting the program's myriad flaws, not least of which is its inflated cost compared to the marginal at best improvement over the FA-18C/D aircraft. I am troubled that the Department of Defense and the Congress are committing \$2.8 billion in taxpayer money to purchase 42 of these aircraft when there are still so many design problems that need to be overcome. And this is just the first installment for the taxpayers. The Navy hopes to eventually have a fleet of 548 of these aircraft.

The General Accounting Office concluded in a report issued in May 2000 that the noise and vibration problems with the aircraft's wings, which the Navy has known about since September 1997 but has not corrected, are sufficient cause to delay multi-year procurement of the FA-18E/F. GAO ar-

gued that if this problem is not corrected before full-rate production, costly retrofitting and redesign of the wings will likely be necessary later. The GAO report also outlined serious problems with the plane's engine. Despite GAO's recommendation, and despite the fact that, in a February 2000 report, the Department of Defense's own Commander of the Operational Test and Evaluation Force found that there are 27 major and 88 minor deficiencies in the aircraft, and that five of the major deficiencies concern its aerodynamic performance, the Pentagon has chosen to move forward with this costly multi-year procurement.

In my view, Mr. President, the Department of Defense should have been absolutely sure this aircraft's design problems were addressed before beginning a multi-year procurement process. I continue to have serious concerns with the safety, effectiveness, and cost of this plane. I will continue monitor closely this procurement, including attempts to resolve the problems outlined by GAO, and I will continue to scrutinize future appropriations requests for this program.

The Cold War-era Trident II missile and the new FA-18E/F aircraft are just two of the many examples of questionable spending in this bloated Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. President, this debate is really one about priorities. Of course all of the members of this body would agree that we must maintain a strong national defense. Our debate should be about how we can best maintain a strong defense, modernize our forces to respond to the new threats of the 21st century, adequately compensate our men and women in uniform, and reign in the out of control defense spending that continues to line the pockets of contractors around this country.

And it is high time that the Pentagon rethink its priorities. I am utterly appalled that at a time when members of our Armed Forces are on food stamps that this body tabled, by a 65-32 vote, an amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] to strike a provision in the Senate version of this bill which would allow the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy to spend taxpayers' money to lease nine so-called "operational support aircraft." These aircraft are actually luxury jets that are used to transport high-level military officers. This provision, which was included in the pending conference report, will allow nine more of these jets to be leased, three each for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The General Accounting Office has argued that such a lease is costly and unnecessary.

Mr. President, this bill exceeds the fiscal year 2000 level by nearly \$20 billion. The Congress has given the Pentagon \$3.3 billion more than it says it needs to defend this country. The Congress has added aircraft and ships that

the Pentagon did not request, and added spending in other areas, and somehow has not yet managed to fully fund the National Guard.

Mr. President, as I have said time and time again, there are millions upon millions of dollars in this bill that are being spent on out-dated or questionable or unwanted programs. This money would be better spent on programs that truly improve our readiness and modernize our Armed Forces instead of on programs that continue to defend us against the hammer and sickle that no longer looms across the ocean. This money also would be better spent on efforts to improve the morale of our forces, such fully manning and adequately compensating our National Guard; ensuring that all of our men and women in uniform have a decent standard of living; or providing better housing for our Armed Forces and their families.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to voice my objection to a particular provision of the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Appropriation Act. Overall, I believe this legislation does much to meet the needs of the U.S. military. However, I believe that a provision relating to the procurement of C130Js sets a dangerous precedent which may jeopardize the military readiness of our nation.

The Air Force requested two C130J aircraft in the FY01 budget. No other aircraft presently in the Air Force inventory can do what the C130 does. It is capable of taking cargo into small, unimproved airfields where larger, jet engine aircraft are not capable nor designed to go. The C130 is our only "intra theater" airlift, unlike the C17s, C141s and C5 which are "inter theater" airlift.

Each year that the Air Force has received appropriations for C130Js, it has assigned the aircraft to those units in its total force which were in greatest need. In 1978, the Air National Guard even developed sound guidelines, based on objective criteria, to ensure that the units with the most aged and corroded aircraft received replacements first. This allocation method has been fair and effective and ensured that all units of our Air Force are modernized in an appropriate manner.

For the past twenty-one years the Air Force has had the authority to determine where newly acquired aircraft were assigned—and the units most in need received the planes. However, many units are still flying planes which first flew in Vietnam and are rapidly reaching the end of their useful service life.

This year, however, the Defense Appropriations Act directs that the two C130Js go to Western States Air National Guard units for firefighting. First, let me say that I am sympathetic to anyone at risk for forest fire damage. However, I question whether firefighting should be the determining factor for the allocation of military aircraft, particularly when the aircraft

in this bill would be used to replace existing firefighting aircraft. Secondly, the designation of these aircraft for Western States deviates from the guidelines which the National Guard designed and has followed for the past twenty years. These aircraft units are not at the top of the Air Force's priority replacement plan. Lastly, and most importantly, the inclusion of this directive language could set a very bad precedent. This would be the first time Congress has usurped the authority of the Air Force in determining which units should receive new C130 aircraft.

It is my hope that this provision is an exception to the rule and that next year the Congress will not override the decision of the Air Force to allocate aircraft based on an objective evaluation of need. I hope that, and will work to ensure that, Congress allows the Air Force to exercise its judgement in deciding which units should be modernized with any aircraft approved in the budget process. To do otherwise raises serious doubts about our commitment to military readiness.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I am supporting the fiscal year 2001 Defense Appropriations Act with a very mixed sense of frustrated resignation and expectant hope for the way we are resourcing our national defense. A major source of frustration this year is that we will have missed yet another opportunity through the decision made in the budget process to meet our new, growing or neglected national security requirements.

We should have been able to fix our military medical health care system and keep our promise of health care to thousands of military retirees who feel they have been cheated by the nation. We should have been able to raise the pay of our service members to bring it more in line with the private sector faster. We should have been able to fund our dangerous ship and aircraft maintenance backlogs. We should have been able to lay the foundation for increasing our ship construction rate to ensure we keep our 300-ship Navy strong and ready. We should have been able to increase our funding of basic science and technology to set the conditions for the rapid development of the next generations of ships, aircraft, and land combat forces.

It is a source of continuing disappointment to me that there is still too much parochial, pork-barrel spending in the defense appropriation process. Last year, the Defense Appropriations bill was so overburdened with pork, I voted against it in protest. Increasing defense spending, so necessary to the demands of our national security today and into the future, will not improve our military capability and readiness if money is funneled into projects that serve parochial interests, not the national interest.

My views on the need to increase defense spending and my objections to pork-barrel spending are well known and I regret the missed opportunity

this appropriation represents. Yet, having said that, there are many elements of this defense appropriations act that are critically important and which I fully support. This appropriation continues the trend and our commitment in the Congress to increase spending for our national defense—\$15 billion above last year's appropriation and \$3.3 billion above the President's request. Most importantly, it does more to take care of our most important national security resource—people. This appropriation increases pay for our service men and women by 3.7 percent, increases housing allowances for military families, increases quality of life enhancements, and increases enlistment and retention bonuses to deal with critical challenges in personnel.

This appropriation supports important ship construction and maintenance requirements to keep our Navy strong and ready. It provides full funding, \$4.1 billion, for our next aircraft carrier CVN-77 and \$1.7 billion for procurement of a third Virginia Class for New Attack submarines. Very importantly, this appropriation increases the President's request for ship depot maintenance by \$142 million, and appropriately makes these funds immediately available to the Navy as a matter of emergency to deal with a critical ship repair backlog.

We need to take a lesson from this session's consideration of how Congress provides for the common defense. We need to take advantage of historic budget surpluses to objectively and aggressively deal with the challenges of defending America's interests in a still very dangerous world. We need take advantage of a political and popular willingness to invest in today's and tomorrow's security and ensure that we fully resource our armed force's requirements for a good quality of life, training, equipment, maintenance, and modernization. Finally, Mr. President, we need to take advantage of an opportunity to keep our promise of health care to the thousands of military retirees who gave the best years of their lives to the defense of this nation. I regret we missed this opportunity, but on balance, this bill satisfies many of our national security requirements, and merits support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am authorized to do so, and I yield the remainder of the time of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

Mr. President, has all time now been yielded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. STEVENS. The time set for the vote on this bill is 3:15. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to express my concern and the concerns of my constituents regarding Section 204 of the FY 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations legislation now before us, the provision which affects the conservation of the silvery minnow. News of the showdown between federal and state agencies over the conservation of this fish on the Rio Grande has reached my state. My constituents are now concerned, Mr. President, about the impact this language will have on the future survival of this species, as well as the precedent that language of this type will have on the implementation of the Endangered Species Act in Wisconsin and across the country. They are so concerned, that on July 22, 2000 a constituent drove from Madison to a fair in Waukesha to speak to me about this matter and missed me by minutes. When constituents are that concerned, I have to bring it to the attention of other members of this body.

The White House on Friday threatened to veto the Energy and Water Development bill, in part because of this provision that could prevent protection of the endangered Rio Grande silvery minnow.

I am concerned, Mr. President, that we would be seeking to take this action in this bill because, while we are here in Washington, in Albuquerque, federal, state, and environmental lawyers are continuing a federal court-ordered mediation. This mediation is seeking something much more important than legislative ink on the page, Mr. President, rather it seeks river water for the minnow before its critical habitat runs dry—unfortunately it could run dry potentially as soon as next week.

The Department of Interior, through its U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Reclamation, is trying to keep the minnow from oblivion.

Let me explain my concerns, Mr. President. They are concerned that Section 204 would prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from using any funds to open irrigation dams. It is the opening of those dams that would provide direct river flow to sustain the minnow. I understand that earlier this month, the Bureau of Reclamation caused concern within the irrigation district with its legal opinion that the government owns the dams.

I understand that legal ownership and contractual and other water rights issues in the West are extremely contentious. I am grateful to come from a riparian water rights state, and to avoid these kinds of disputes in Wisconsin. But, I'll tell you, Mr. President, Wisconsinites expect that Congress will

stay out of this legal wrangling when a species' survival is at stake.

These dams help divert the flow of the river to some 10,000 farmers of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. The conservancy district holds long-standing rights to the water under state law, which does not recognize in-stream flow for fish as a beneficial use. But the Bureau of Reclamation has told the conservancy district that the dams must be operated so an in-stream flow of at least 300 cubic feet per second can sustain a "last stand" surviving population of minnows downstream.

The White House has said "the Administration strongly objects to provisions included in the Senate bill" that would "severely constrain" the government's efforts to protect and sustain the minnow. Moreover the Office of Management and Budget has said that "adequate flows" must be ensured on the Rio Grande and warned that a "failure to protect the minnow this year could lead to its extinction."

Mr. President, my constituents want the water managers and environmentalists to continue the court ordered mediation they have begun. The parties to the mediation are environmental groups; the conservancy district; the Bureau of Reclamation; the state water engineer; and the city of Albuquerque.

The Rio Grande silvery minnow occurs only in the middle Rio Grande. Threats to the species include dewatering, channelization and regulation of river flow to provide water for irrigation; diminished water quality caused by municipal, industrial, and agricultural discharges; and competition or predation by introduced non-native fish species. Currently, the species occupies about five percent of its known historic range.

This species was historically one of the most abundant and widespread fishes in the Rio Grande basin, occurring from New Mexico, to the Gulf of Mexico. It was also found in the Pecos River, a major tributary of the Rio Grande, from Santa Rosa, New Mexico, downstream to its confluence with the Rio Grande in south Texas. It is now completely extinct in the Pecos River and its numbers have severely declined within the Rio Grande.

Decline of the species in the Rio Grande probably began as early as the beginning of the 20th century when water manipulation began along the Rio Grande. Elephant Butte was the first of five major dams constructed within the silvery minnow's habitat. These dams allow the flow of the river to be manipulated and diverted for the benefit of agriculture. As times this manipulation resulted in the dewatering of some river reaches and elimination of all fish. Concurrent with construction of these dams, there was an increase in the abundance of non-native and exotic fish species, as these species were stocked into the reservoirs created by the dams. Once es-

tablished, these species often out competed the native fish.

The only existing population of minnow continues to be threatened by annual dewatering of a large percentage of its habitat. My constituents want to be assured that their future survival is not threatened by legislative action. That is why I have strong concerns about this provision and would like to see that it is removed from the bill.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2912

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Illinois, I object.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am disappointed that there has been an objection, but I am not surprised.

I say to my friend from Massachusetts, who is on the floor, who has been a leader on these issues for 35 years—that is, in trying to establish some fairness in immigration policy.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator would be good enough to yield.

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is a privilege to join my colleagues in introducing the "Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act of 2000." This important legislation will help re-establish fairness and balance in our immigration laws by making it fairer to apply for green cards, advancing the date for registry from 1972 to 1986, and providing equal treatment for Central American and Haitian immigrants.

Our legislation will also provide fairness for immigrants from Central American countries and Haiti. In 1997, Congress granted permanent residence to Nicaraguans and Cubans who had fled from dictatorships in those two countries. But it excluded many other Central Americans and Haitians facing similar conditions. The legislation will eliminate this unfair disparity by extending the provisions of the 1997 Act to all immigrants from Central America and Haiti.

By providing parity, we will help individuals such as Gheycell, who came to the United States at the age of 12 with her father and sister from worn-torn Guatemala. She went to school here, and became active in her community. In high school, she formed a club that helped the homeless in Los Angeles. She is now attending college. Her