

is such an important piece of legislation.

At some point later in the day, when the House, we hope, completes their work on the airlines legislation, which they have worked on during the night, and we worked on during the night, we will move to that. The managers understand that.

I hope that people will understand how hard these two veteran legislators—Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER—have worked on this legislation. I personally know of the time they have spent on this bill in the past week, and prior to that they spent much more time on it. This is a very crucial time in the history of this country, and although it is always important, it is even more so now.

I hope Members will be very cautious in trying to make a Christmas tree out of this piece of legislation. The two leaders want as little controversy with this legislation as possible. We understand the Senate rules, that any person can do anything they want with this legislation. But we certainly ask that they be very cautious with this legislation. We have a timeframe within which we very badly need to complete this bill—as soon as possible. By next Wednesday at 2 o'clock, we not only have to complete this legislation but also do the continuing resolution to get us past the fiscal year. So there is really a lot to do.

I repeat for the third time, I hope that Members will be very discrete in what they do with this legislation as it relates to these two managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me first thank the Senator from Nevada for his very kind words and for his efforts and the leadership on both sides of the aisle in helping to bring this bill forward. Senator WARNER and I have indeed worked very hard on it and, as always, we have worked together to bring a bill forward that hopefully the Senate can pass and pass quickly. But without the support of our leadership, that would not have been possible. As hard as we and our staffs work, it takes leadership support to make it happen. We are grateful that Senator REID is on the floor, and we thank all leaders not on the floor.

Mr. WARNER. If the Senator will yield, I join that with respect to the leadership provided by our distinguished majority whip. Yesterday on the train, as we were going to New York, we had Senator DASCHLE, Senator LOTT, Senator REID, Senator LEVIN, and I, and I think we finished up basically the procedural and, to some degree, the substantive points that remain, under the circumstances on which we concluded on the eve of visiting ground zero.

That is an example of how, throughout the last six or seven days, Senator LEVIN and I have collaborated on bringing together a closure of the differences that were experienced in the

committee, when the committee for the first time in living memory had a partisan division on reporting out a bill.

I commend our chairman and the leadership. I think we are prepared today to present to the Senate a very fine bill on behalf of the men and women of the Armed Forces, their families, and those who are dependent and work with our Armed Forces. It would be my hope that in the course of the day, we can address such items as Members wish. But I think on our side, having participated in our caucus this morning, there is a feeling that we would like to move forward on this bill; and depending on the number of hours today, quite possibly we can bring to closure a number of issues and possibly begin to focus on when final passage could be achieved, subject to the leadership's desire for the time of the vote.

I thank my colleague.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 163, S. 1438, the Department of Defense authorization bill; that once the bill is reported, I be recognized to offer a managers' amendment; that the amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object—and I certainly will not object—I have joined with my distinguished chairman in preparation of the managers' amendment and will be a co-sponsor of it.

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

The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1438) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1598

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the managers' amendment is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1598.

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

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

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

The amendment (No. 1598) was agreed to.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—\$1,300,000,000 is hereby authorized, in addition to the funds authorized elsewhere in Division A of this Act, for whichever of the following purposes the President determines to be in the national security interests of the United States—

- (1) research, development, test and evaluation for ballistic missile defense; and
- (2) activities for combating terrorism.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this is no ordinary time in our country. In New York and just across the Potomac in Virginia, our fellow citizens continue to sift through the ruins left by the most deadly attack ever against the United States. Our fury at those who attack innocents is matched by our determination to protect our citizens from more terror and by our resolve to track down, root out, and relentlessly pursue the terrorists and those who would shelter or harbor them. The President spoke eloquently and forcefully last night setting out those goals.

Against this background, we bring the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 to the floor of the Senate. The bill authorizes the full amount requested by the administration for national defense, including the \$18.4 billion requested by the President in his amended budget request. The bill also addresses a number of important priorities identified by the Armed Services Committee.

I am pleased we were able to add a significant amount of money, over \$700 million, to the budget request for compensation and quality of life.

We added more than \$1 billion to improve the readiness of the military services to carry out their assigned missions.

We added a large amount of money to advance the transformation of the military services and to improve the capability of the armed forces to meet nontraditional threats, including terrorism.

Even in advance of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, we gave particular attention to the problem of terrorism as reflected in our bill and in the report that accompanies it. Not only did the committee fully fund the President's proposal for combating terrorism, we were able to add funds for a new combating terrorism initiative to improve the ability of the U.S. forces to deter and defend against terrorism, including additional funds for research by the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy on the detection, identification, and measurement of chemical and biological weapons, and funds to upgrade Army installations and make them less vulnerable to terrorism. Much more remains to be done in this area, and that has surely been dramatized by the events of September 11.

We have already passed a \$40 billion emergency supplemental for our war on terrorism. I understand the Department of Defense will be coming forward

with an additional supplemental budget request in the next several weeks, and our committee will review any such request.

The U.S. military is by far the most capable fighting force in the world. From Europe to the Persian Gulf to the Korean peninsula, the presence of U.S. military forces and their contributions to regional peace and security reassure our allies and deter adversaries.

U.S. forces have excelled in every mission assigned to them, including the 1999 NATO air campaign over Kosovo and ongoing enforcement of the no-fly zones over Iraq, humanitarian operations from Central America to Africa, and peacekeeping operations from the Balkans to East Timor.

The U.S. armed forces remain the standard against which all militaries are measured. Our armed forces are without peer today, and this bill will help ensure they remain so for the foreseeable future. At his confirmation hearing before the Armed Services Committee last week, Gen. Richard Myers, the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that we have military forces and capability that we need to respond to the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

We identified five priorities to guide our consideration of the bill: Continuing the improvements in the compensation and quality of life of the men and women of the armed forces and their families; improving the capability of the armed forces to meet non-traditional threats, including terrorism and unconventional means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction; sustaining the readiness of the military services to carry out their assigned missions; encouraging the transformation of the military services to lighter, more lethal, and more capable forces; and improving the efficiency of Department of Defense programs and operations.

Let me briefly address each of those areas.

One of our top priorities was to continue the improvements in the compensation and quality of life for our men and women in uniform. In this regard, we approved a pay raise of at least 5 percent for all military personnel and targeted pay raises of between 6 and 10 percent for enlisted personnel and junior officers, and we provided \$17.9 billion requested by the Department to fully fund the Defense Health Program, including the significant new benefits we authorized last year.

The committee approved a number of other important initiatives to improve the quality of life for our military, and, in particular, the bill before us would authorize \$30 million to improve retention efforts by allowing personnel with critical skills to transfer up to 18 months of unused benefits under the Montgomery GI bill to family members in return for a commitment to serve 4 additional years.

Senator CLELAND has been fighting for that initiative since he came to the Senate, and I am delighted we were able to include it in our bill this year.

We added more than \$450 million for family housing and other military construction to improve the facilities in which our military personnel work and housing in which they and their families live.

We added more than \$230 million to increase the basic allowance for housing and eliminate all out-of-pocket housing costs for service members and their families by the year 2003, which is 2 years earlier than the Department of Defense plan.

Finally, the bill includes a set of provisions offered by 18 members of the committee, led by Senators LANDRIEU, ALLARD, CLELAND, and NELSON, to ensure overseas voters and absent military voters have a meaningful opportunity to exercise their voting rights as citizens of the United States.

Another top priority of our committee was to improve the ability of the United States and U.S. forces to deal effectively with nontraditional threats, including terrorism, unconventional means of delivering weapons of mass destruction, and the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The Emerging Threats Subcommittee, under the leadership of Senator MARY LANDRIEU and Senator PAT ROBERTS, took the lead in this effort.

Our committee added funds to the budget request to help address non-traditional threats. First, the bill adds funds for a combating terrorism initiative to improve the ability of U.S. forces to deter and defend against terrorism, including almost \$100 million for research by the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to detect and identify chemical and biological weapons in advance of their use, and more than \$75 million to upgrade Army installations and make them less vulnerable to terrorism.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to add \$13 million to the budget for standoff explosive detection research and development, a proof-of-concept system for predetonation of explosive devices and hand held explosive detectors for the U.S. Navy, all fulfilling the requirements which were so urgently identified in the aftermath of the October 2000 attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

If we can develop that standoff explosive detection, if we can come up with the technology to do that, learning the lesson which we learned to our great expense, cost, and horror with the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, we will make a very significant gain in the war against terrorism.

The bill would authorize the full \$400 million requested by the administration for cooperative threat reduction programs, to continue destroying and dismantling nuclear warheads and missiles in the former Soviet Union, and we added more than \$50 million to De-

partment of Energy programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related expertise.

Earlier this year, a bipartisan task force, chaired by former Senator Howard Baker and former White House counsel Lloyd Cutler, concluded the following: The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-useable materiel in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home.

With this funding, the committee has placed itself firmly on record in support of the continuing effort to reduce the threats posed by offensive nuclear weapons, their delivery systems, and related material.

Another priority of the committee was to sustain the readiness of the U.S. military. Toward that end, we added approximately \$1 billion to the budget request to fund critical priorities of the military services. These additions included the following: Almost \$250 million to improve the readiness of Army aviation, including additional Black Hawk helicopters, upgrades to Apache helicopters, and additional TH-67 training helicopters.

We added \$125 million for upgrades to the B-2 and B-52 bombers and an additional \$100 million to maintain B-1 bombers to ensure we will continue to have a ready, capable bomber fleet.

We added more than \$120 million to upgrade engines and reduce maintenance costs for the F-15 and F-16 aircraft, and we added almost \$100 million for the maintenance of surface ships and Navy and Marine Corps equipment.

The committee also added money to increase full-time manning in the Army National Guard, to upgrade the Navy's electronic warfare aircraft, to improve the operational safety and capabilities of the test ranges and space launch facilities, and to continue modernizing the training aircraft used by the Air Force and Navy for the training of new pilots.

Again, I emphasize these additions to the President's budget request were all made before the events of September 11. There will be additional ones I will list in a moment, but we will be receiving in the next few days an amended budget request from the administration, or a supplemental budget request, to add additional funds to those I am outlining.

We do not have that request before us yet, so we are unable to respond to it. Of course, it will be mainly an appropriations request, but we also hope as authorizers to have an opportunity to take a look at that request in the days ahead.

The committee also gave priority to continued support for transformation of the U.S. military forces. To do this, we added more than \$800 million to the budget request to advance the transformation efforts of the military to a lighter, more lethal, and a more flexible force. These additions included the

following: Nearly \$400 million to support Navy transformation, including more than \$300 million to support conversion of four excess Trident missile submarines to carry Tomahawk cruise missiles; more than \$200 million to increase the defense science and technology budget, including substantial increases for advanced materials and manufacturing technologies, nanotechnologies, and cutting-edge communication technologies. We added almost \$200 million for Army transformation programs, including full funding for all of the objective force priorities on the Army's list of unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2002, and more than \$80 million to fund continued efforts to develop and field unmanned vehicles.

I want to give special credit to our ranking member, Senator WARNER. He has been an active advocate, for as long as I can remember, for putting additional funds in for our unmanned aerial vehicles and other unmanned vehicles. He has had a great deal of foresight in focusing on the importance of doing that, and I have supported those efforts, but the credit for the leadership really belongs to Senator WARNER. The Nation is in his debt for that and so many other actions on his part. In future years and future decades, we will see the payoff for these kinds of investments now in these unmanned vehicles.

The money that is needed to fund these priorities was obtained through management and other efficiencies identified by the committee. In particular, we determined the Department should be able to achieve significant savings through improved management of its purchases of services, including—I emphasize this—the increased use of performance-based service contracting, competition for orders under service contract, program review spending analyses, and other best practices commonly used in the commercial sector.

In fact, the final report on an OMB pilot program 3 years ago concluded Federal agencies should be able to save as much as 15 to 30 percent on their service contracts through the use of performance-based service contracting alone. There has not been much done in that area. There is a lot we can do, and we will harvest significant savings when we do so, as this bill provides.

We are also able to achieve efficiencies by identifying programs in which the Department requested more money than it could wisely spend in fiscal year 2002. We approved a reduction of \$592 million to the V-22 tilt rotor Osprey aircraft program because of continuing concerns about the program and the recommendation of the V-22 review panel that production should be kept to a minimum sustaining rate in order to minimize the number of aircraft requiring retrofit after these programs have been addressed.

Similarly, we approved a net reduction of about \$250 million to the Joint Strike Fighter Program because of the likely delay of the launch of the engi-

neering and manufacturing development phase of the JSF Program.

The bill before us authorizes a new round of base alignments and closures for the year 2003, and that will produce a significant increase in the Department of Defense's savings that it has achieved the four previous rounds. The civilian and military leadership of the Department of Defense has told us for years, through two administrations, that the Department of Defense has excess infrastructure and needs a new round of base closings to free up funds for higher priority defense needs and to support the successful transformation of our military and implementation of the Quadrennial Defense Review.

Senator MCCAIN and I have been fighting for a new BRAC, as we call it, for more than 4 years. I am glad the committee endorsed by a 17-8 vote the proposal the administration sent to us.

Now we are asking the Department of Defense whether or not, in light of recent circumstances, there is any change in their position that they want the tool of reducing excess infrastructure in order to make savings so they can apply those savings in the years ahead to other vital needs of the Defense Department. That request has been sent to the Department of Defense to see what their current position is in light of the events of September 11. We will have discussions with our colleagues relative to this matter in the hours and days ahead, and with the Defense Department, because we do want to make sure the Defense Department position is still the same and that is still a tool they consider to be essential for them in waging a war efficiently and in having resources needed to wage future efforts, such as the long effort that is going to be needed in the war against terrorism.

In short, we believe this is a strong and balanced bill that fully funds the amount requested by the administration for national defense, and it goes a long way to meet the urgent needs of our military. In light of recent events, we are obviously going to do more, as we have with the enactment of \$40 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill last week. On top of that, in the next few days we will be receiving a request for additional funds given the circumstances that have unfolded.

As important as the funding that we provide is, there is something else that is critically important. That is the unity of purpose that we show as we enter into the current struggle. Debate on a bill such as this is an inherent part of our democracy. While our democratic institutions are stronger than any terrorist attack, in one regard we operate differently in times of national emergency. We set aside those differences that we cannot bridge. We try to resolve differences that we previously were unable to resolve. But in cases of other differences, we put them off for another day, where the effort or attempt to resolve them now would create dissent where we need unity.

There are a number of these issues that were in this bill. One had to do with the question of national missile defense. We were able, by one vote in committee, to put into the original bill which came before this Senate a provision which would have required Presidential certification in the event that it was decided or determined there were activities that were going to be funded that were in conflict with the arms reduction and arms control treaty that we entered into. It was a matter of major seriousness, regardless of what position people took on that issue, to just about every Member of this body. Rather than to have the effort made to resolve that issue now, we decided we would withhold those provisions. That is why a few days ago I withdrew those provisions from this bill and introduced under rule XIV a separate bill which contained those provisions.

Under that rule, today, that separate bill which contains these provisions relative to national missile defense is on the calendar of the Senate. It is available for the majority leader to call up, should he choose to do so, for debate by this body. If and when—and I emphasize the "if," not just the "when"—the administration determines that an activity for which it is using funds from this bill conflicts with the arms control treaty, the ABM Treaty, it would then be an option for the majority leader to call up the bill that is now on the calendar which would then provide the opportunity for us to debate whether or not we wanted to fund such activity. That was the way in which we preserved that option, delayed that debate that preserved the rights of people who feel strongly about that issue, including myself, to have such a debate should it be appropriate to do so.

To summarize what we have done relative to those provisions, relative to national missile defense, the specific provisions relative to activities for which funds might be used from this bill in conflict with the ABM Treaty, the provision which is now on a separate bill would not have prohibited such activities but, rather, would have deferred a congressional decision on funding them until we had a determination from the administration as to whether the activities would be in conflict with the treaty.

For some Members, that is very important information. As the author of that provision, I believe very strongly that we have a responsibility to determine whether or not a testing activity or funding conflicts with an arms control agreement. Some might vote to approve the funding without regard to that arms control agreement. Others would want additional information and the nature of the conflict between the treaty and the requested activity. Some Members would want to know the significance of the testing effort, to weigh whether or not the value of the test which is in conflict with that arms

control agreement outweighs some of the negative circumstances which might be created by the unilateral withdrawal which would have to take place before such a testing activity occurred.

It seemed to me, regardless of one's position relative to the issue of whether or not we should proceed with such activities in conflict with the treaty, that was important information for all Members to have. We don't have that information now. The Department has been unable to tell us whether or not any of the activities which funds are being asked for in this bill, and to be authorized in the bill, are in conflict with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. They have been unable to tell us. The thought behind the language was that if and when the time comes when they do determine there is such a conflict, at that time Congress should have an opportunity to vote.

Again, I emphasize that language, subject of much debate and much dissent, has now been withdrawn from this bill by myself and put into a separate bill which is now on the Senate calendar. This was a very difficult decision, I tell my good friend from New Jersey.

While the Senator is presiding, I must say how extraordinarily moving he and Senator TORRICELLI were in New Jersey yesterday, as many Senators visited New Jersey after our visit to ground zero in New York City. It helped Members get a full picture by our visit to New Jersey with the presentations which were made to us by Senator CORZINE, Senator TORRICELLI, by the Governor of New Jersey, and by so many mayors who helped to round out exactly what the effect was of that attack upon us on September 11. I know I speak for all who were present yesterday in New Jersey when our Presiding Officer, Senator CORZINE, and Senator TORRICELLI made such an effective presentation. Many of us were not aware that perhaps half of the people killed in that terrorist attack were residents of New Jersey. While New York City was ground zero, and we had severe losses at the Pentagon, New Jersey and also many from Connecticut and I believe from as many as 40 or 50 other countries were attacked by those terrorists. There were many, many countries symbolized on that attack on the World Trade Center when citizens from so many countries were killed in that attack. I think Britain lost literally hundreds of its citizens.

What was so dramatically presented to us yesterday was the fact that New Jersey's families are suffering in as great a number as any other place, including New York, as a result of that attack. I just wanted to thank Senator CORZINE for his role in bringing us to New Jersey, along with Senator TORRICELLI. It makes a difference.

Just as important as it is that we stand together in these days, coming together where we can on a bill which is so important to the defense of this

Nation and to our security—and where we cannot agree, trying to defer those other issues to a different time and place—it is also important that our colleagues join us in trying to focus on issues that directly relate to this bill as this bill comes before the Senate.

Obviously, amendments are appropriate. They always are appropriate. But there are some amendments currently being filed that really cannot be appropriately considered on this bill. It is going to require all the efforts of all of us to focus on the material in this bill and the subject matter of this bill if we are going to get a bill passed as it should be passed urgently; if not today, and that is unlikely—by Monday or Tuesday.

(Mr. CORZINE assumed the chair.)

Mr. WARNER. Today may be possible.

Mr. LEVIN. Today may be possible, I am told by my good friend, Senator WARNER. We should not even eliminate that possibility. But if we all cooperate in the kind of spirit which we have in bringing this bill to the committee and trying to avoid amendments which are not related to the subject matter of this bill, we have a chance of passing this bill as it should be passed, with great urgency and with great unity and with one voice.

Senator WARNER and I have spent a lot of time in the last few days working to do just that—to be able to bring a bill to the floor where we can say together that we, the members of the committee, all support this bill now.

We hope other Members of the Senate will join in this debate, offer amendments as they must, which relate to the subject matter, but help us to pass this bill with the urgency which is required and the unity which, God knows, is appropriated in circumstances such as this.

I want to say one other thing to my friend from Virginia before I yield; that is, how grateful this Nation is to him for his leadership in bringing to our attention the losses, the personal losses and the tragedies that were involved in the attack on the Pentagon. I was able to personally join with Senator WARNER on a number of these visits that he has made. I know how many hours he has spent with, not only the families of those who have lost loved ones at the Pentagon but with the leadership at the Pentagon focusing on how to restore the Pentagon, to let the terrorists know we are going to restore New York, we are going to restore the Pentagon, and we are going to restore any other places they were able to damage.

But I thank Senator WARNER because he has played the leadership role in bringing to the attention of the Nation that the losses in New York are the largest losses numerically, assuredly, but that we had almost 200 people between the people working in the Pentagon and the people on the airplane that hit the Pentagon, lost in Virginia. I know how his heart goes out to those families.

I can only tell him—I know he already knows every Member of this Senate is with you and with your colleague from Virginia in your efforts to bring some peace and closure and then some restoration to those families and to your State. I thank you for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. The morning of September 11 was a moving moment in the life of every American. Senator LEVIN and I, within a very short time after learning of the attacks both in New York and in Virginia, and of course the devastation that occurred in Pennsylvania and the peripheral tragic consequences that came upon the States of New Jersey, Connecticut, Maryland and the District of Columbia, in close proximity to these attacks—I called my friend and I said I think you and I should show our support at this point in time for the men and women of the Armed Forces and for the President and for the Secretary of Defense.

I made a call to the Pentagon which resulted in the Secretary of Defense saying, "Your participation this day of the attack would be welcome and helpful."

The two of us met and went to the Department of Defense. Just a few hours after that attack, Senator LEVIN, the Secretary of Defense, and I stood right there, about 100 yards or so from where that plane crashed into that edifice, the Pentagon, which represents, to our men and women in uniform, the epicenter of the command and control of their destiny.

I thank my colleague for joining me that morning in going to the Department. I think every time I have had the opportunity to address the Senate since that period, I begin by saying that all of us in the Senate have in our minds, in our prayers, the victims who were lost in these attacks and their families, no matter where they are, around the nation and around the world. Yes, we have them in our prayers. But, those prayers are combined with prayers for literally thousands of men and women: firefighters, policemen, rescue squads, hospital and Red Cross workers, construction workers—that realm of individuals that shun recognition but who selflessly responded to those sites, first in New York and then in a fraction of time in Virginia, to try to help at those sites where the attacks were inflicted.

That band of brothers and sisters, as one fireman said to me, whether they are in Virginia or New York or Pennsylvania, or from any of the many States and localities that sent help, represent the finest traditions of this great Nation about how we respond and help each other in time of need, all of us.

Now the Nation is arm in arm united behind our President, moving forward—steadily, carefully, thoughtfully—to address the needs of the Nation and the means by which we, seeking justice, will bring about a redress

of these criminal acts, perhaps with the use of force, which is likely to be necessary. Of course, last night, as our President spoke, I and others had in mind the men and women in the uniform of the United States Armed Forces and their families who will bear the brunt if and when that force is used.

Mr. President, I thank my chairman. We have worked together in this chamber for 23 years and now we face another challenge. We are fortunate to have on our committee men and women who are absolutely committed to do what is necessary and proper to help this country in this hour of challenge and need.

I think it is appropriate, following the President's magnificent address last night—and I know of no President in the history of the United States of America who has ever been faced with a more challenging, a more complex framework of international security issues, economic issues, and threats to the United States than has our President, President Bush—that we now take up and swiftly pass this Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2002 that provides the President the resources he has asked for and that our armed forces need.

The President not only rose to the occasion last night, but I think, if I may say, he exceeded in every way our hopes and prayers that he would take command—as he did—and deliver a very clear message.

Today, as the Senate turns to the consideration of our national defense authorization bill for the year 2002, in this time of national emergency, it is time we provide our President and the men and women of the Armed Forces, and the thousands of civilians who support those men and women, the requirements that they have for the coming fiscal year as best we can judge them.

The chairman indicated that the President would be forthcoming any day now with an amendment to the 2002 bill. Our committee and other committees of the Senate will immediately turn to that, upon receipt. It is my expectation that it can be incorporated in this legislation during the course of the conference between the House and the Senate.

The events of September 11 have forever changed this world, and forever changed the United States. The one change that is clear is that we are a stronger nation today. That inherent strength emerged not a second after the infliction of these grave attacks. The 11th, when we saw the smoke billowing from our homeland, is a day forever etched into everyone's memory.

The initial shock was followed by a surging sense of new purpose and strength and, a word that all of us understand—"patriotism"—love of country for the freedoms that we have.

Now a responsibility and a challenge fall upon the Congress—a coequal branch our Government—to work with

our President and to serve our citizens. It is vital that we very carefully—as we have done—and expeditiously address this bill and, hopefully, act on it. The leadership has been tremendously supportive of Senator LEVIN, myself, and other members of the committee throughout the course of the past few days as we have worked to bridge our differences and bring this bill to the floor.

I hope we can pass this bill, for this bill will communicate a message to our citizens and to the world that the U.S. resolves to do whatever is necessary to protect our homeland and our forces abroad, to work with our allies for their mutual protection, and to address the full spectrum of threats that confront our Nation, the entire Western World, and, indeed, all of civilization. As we have all heard and felt, this was not just an attack on America, but an attack on the world and the fundamental principles of civilization.

All of us in this Chamber have recognized the fact that this is an increasingly dangerous world. There will be a time to look back on events and how well we were prepared, and how we were not prepared, to deal with this crisis. But those debates are yet to come. Now is the time for unity. We have it here today in the Senate.

I addressed my caucus this morning outlining what Senator LEVIN and I have agreed upon. He addressed his caucus. We bridged the one remaining difference early this morning between the hours of 8 and 9. This managers' amendment, which we have just adopted by unanimous consent, in my judgment, satisfactorily addresses the remaining differences we had.

When the authorization bill was reported out by the Armed Services Committee almost 2 weeks ago, there was a division among its members. That was understandable because our side—the Republican side—was unified behind what we saw were clear and justified requests by our President. The bill, at that time, contained certain provisions which we believed might impede his ability under the Constitution as the chief architect of foreign policy to continue and, hopefully, conclude certain negotiations he has undertaken with Russia with regard to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Further, we thought the dollar amounts which our President requested of the Congress for the purpose of initiating new research, development and testing with regard to our Nation's absolute necessity to prepare ourselves today, and most especially for future generations, against the threat of a limited attack on us, were inconsistent with what I believe are the President's justifiable requests. For that reason, we were not able to report out, as is the tradition of our committee, a bipartisan bill.

But in the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, the distinguished chairman and I, working with our Members on both sides, have now

bridged these differences in large measure. We agree at this time, for reasons I have stated, that we feel that, in the aftermath of these attacks, the justification for moving forward with new ways to prepare this Nation against a limited attack of missiles is enhanced by what we saw on the 11th. It brought to us the realization that, yes, while there was some thought it was remote that a missile could attack this Nation someday, now we cannot ignore or eliminate any part of that full spectrum of threats that may be directed towards this country.

So, as never before, we are strongly committed to support our President.

In my own many years on this committee, I have worked as ranking member with Chairman Nunn, Chairman Stennis, and others. There were rare times when the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee recognized, for whatever reason, that they could no longer have bipartisanship. I am reminded of two instances between Senator Nunn and myself. One was when we had a difference of view on the Tower nomination, and the other was the Gulf War resolution giving President George H. W. Bush the authority to utilize force in 1991.

History reflects the outcome of those two events. But I remember that Senator Nunn and I shook hands. We recognized we had to go our different ways, and we did it. In the aftermath of both events, we rejoined as the chairman and ranking of the committee to work together. Senator LEVIN and I have likewise done so.

There came a point in the course of our deliberations—it was actually last weekend following a joint appearance—when we were on a national television show that I told him I felt I had to go my separate way and introduce legislation which reflected very clearly what we Republicans perceived as the essentials that the Commander in Chief, the President, desired and needed. This included preserving his ability to continue negotiations regarding the ABM Treaty and to prepare for a future, limited missile attack. Hopefully, God will never let that happen. Regardless, we must make preparations.

For a while we went our separate ways. But then in due course, Senator LEVIN introduced this bill we are acting on today. I say to my colleagues that I believe, along with the managers' amendment, this bill satisfies the concerns we had with the bill originally reported to the Senate by the committee, with regards to the ABM Treaty and equitable funding for ballistic missile defense. After careful consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary, and many others—consultations I have had at length every day this past week—I can represent to our chairman and to all members that the administration now supports this bill as it is drawn.

Proceeding on, we have, as managers of this bill, introduced legislation

which we believe should meet the expectations of the Senate and that the Senate, hopefully, will act swiftly upon this bill. I did not realize we would have the opportunity to consider this bill today, and I thank our leaders for recognizing the importance and timeliness of this important legislation.

I hope Members, having heard the deliberations in our caucuses this morning regarding this bill, know those areas in which they are interested. If they have amendments, they should bring them to the floor. Hopefully they will be germane to the provisions of this bill and respectful of the spirit of discretion our leaders have asked for so that we can move expeditiously on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join us in sending our President and our fellow citizens in the world a message of this resolve by passing this bill. I remember also Governor Bush, when he was a candidate, reminded us almost prophetically in the Citadel in the fall of 1999 that: “The protection of America itself will assume a high priority in a new century. Once a strategic afterthought, homeland defense has become an urgent duty.” In that same Citadel speech, he called for “anti-ballistic missile systems, both theater and national, to guard against attack and blackmail.” He also called for strengthening our intelligence community and developing the technologies to detect chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons threatening our shores. The threat, as he perceived it then, required greater emphasis on homeland defense.

Our committee, when I was privileged to be chairman several years ago, with the help of my now chairman, Senator LEVIN, established a subcommittee entitled “Emerging Threats.” The responsibility of that subcommittee was to provide the full committee with the wide spectrum of issues as they saw it with regard to known, anticipated, and unanticipated threats. This subcommittee examines whether the current elements of the national defense we have in place need to be strengthened or, indeed, new initiatives taken to strengthen, to hopefully deter, and, if necessary, to respond to these threats. This subcommittee has done a lot of valuable work. Senator ROBERTS was chairman; now Senator LANDRIEU is chairman. They have continued to provide very helpful assistance to the full committee, and the full committee has acted in many ways to protect our country from the growing threat of terrorism.

When the bill was adopted by the committee this year—and I commend the chairman—the chairman actually, with his initiative, added another \$200 million towards antiterrorist activities. As he mentioned earlier, part of that increase was expanding the scope of research and development of unmanned military vehicles. I thank the chairman for his recognition of my

modest role in that. I assure you, I could not have achieved those initiatives as chairman without his support and that of the other members of the committee.

The President of the United States has committed significant resources to deal with the types of terrorists threats we witnessed a week ago. For fiscal year 2002, President Bush requested \$5.6 billion for the Department of Defense for activities to combat terrorism. This is a \$1 billion increase over last year’s level of funding. Again, the chairman added another \$215 million, for which I commend him. With the committee’s support, we clearly have a bill that addresses homeland defense, and supports this highest priority concern our President brought to the attention of the Nation in the fall of 1999 at the Citadel.

Missile defense, in my judgment, is a critical component of that homeland defense. The President stands by his vision to prepare America and begin now to look at new options by which to prepare us to hopefully deter and then defend against a limited attack. This is clearly the time to stand by our President.

I remember when the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, George Tenet, came before our committee. He has repeatedly warned us that “America’s superpower status does not bestow invulnerability upon us but in fact makes us a target for the angry and disaffected of the world.”

That was in his testimony. We as a Nation have grown accustomed to being safe within our borders. While many of us recognized the growing vulnerability, this vicious attack on our homeland removed all doubts about the full spectrum of the capabilities, military and otherwise, that the terrorists can use to inflict damage upon us.

We have heard incredible stories of courage and heroism amidst the tragedy of the past week and a half. Our Nation today, as the President said last night, remains in danger. All American citizens should understand that. I remember so clearly in my past experience with the military, there was occasionally that sign—the all clear, sound the all clear bell aboard ships. And at my airbase in Korea, the cold winter of 1951–1952: The all clear siren had blown—We could rest easy.

Today, that siren has not blown. I don’t know, nor does anyone else know, when that siren can be blown across this Nation. We are in danger at this moment. We remain in danger. But the world should know that we are a much stronger Nation, and we are prepared, with the men and women of the Armed Forces today and the other many resources that we have, to deter and hopefully not let another attack hit this Nation.

I hope those Members who have amendments will come to the floor. I see other Members seeking recognition. I hope our members of the committee will likewise come and express

their views about this bill and their active participation on the committee.

Again, I thank our chairman. I thank all members of our committee and our magnificent staff, on both sides. We have produced a commendable piece of legislation which is deserving of prompt consideration and enactment by the Senate.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MR. ALLARD. Mr. President, I thank both the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking Republican, Senator WARNER, for their diligent efforts in reaching this compromise. It means a lot to me, to the State of Colorado, and particularly to the Nation. When you consider the events that happened just 10 days ago, those tragic events, it is imperative that we get a Defense authorization bill to move forward.

The way the issue of missile defense started out in the subcommittee on which I am the ranking Republican, it was a rocky road. The chairman of that strategic subcommittee, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, is a tremendous chairman. I like working with him. There are a couple of committees on which I serve with him, where he is the chairman and I am the head Republican. Our working relationship I describe as superb. He listens, tries to work with the minority side. I try and do everything I can to work with him. We have a very good relationship.

It was with a heavy heart, when reporting out of that subcommittee our portion of the armed services bill, we had it reported out in a divided mode. We had a strict partisan vote, Republicans voting against it, Democrats were for it, the chairman. It was over the issue of missile defense. Then the issue went to the full Armed Services Committee and that debate continued.

I know when it got to that point in the debate, people began to lock in their positions, and we would still be tied up today if it would not have been for the tremendous leadership of our chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVIN, as well as the ranking Republican working together on this most important issue.

There are many other important issues in this bill. I am particularly pleased that we have moved forward with missile defense. I am pleased the restrictive language in missile defense was taken out and the funding is there with the flexibility to either use for missile defense or for terrorism. The President, in light of the recent changes in the last 10 days, needed that flexibility. I, for one, was more than willing to give it to him.

I appreciate the efforts in the area of defense environmental management of my chairman, what has been in the committee; in particular, the support in the bill for closure sites which would benefit the sites’ surrounding communities and the Nation as a whole. This

would provide a clean and safe environment at the sites of former defense nuclear weapons facilities. It would free up scarce resources as these sites are cleaned up and closed down to help advance environmental cleanup and restoration at other environmental management sites.

In my subcommittee, we had basically two functions.

We have the armed services function, and then also we have the Energy Department function. So we deal with many of the nuclear programs, as well as the bombing programs and missile defense and defense intelligence. So I think this was important to the country as well as the State of Colorado.

I also appreciate the efforts for the National Nuclear Security Administration. The National Nuclear Security Administration appears to be making important strides. There are still enormous challenges ahead, but I think the NNSA seems to be moving in the right direction. In intelligence matters, I was encouraged by the support for unmanned aerial vehicles, sensor capabilities, and commercial satellite imagery. I am still concerned, however, that other critical components of the intelligence architecture did not receive similar support.

Processing and dissemination of intelligence products remains a weakness in the overall system. Current programs in intelligence are underfunded and would greatly benefit from increased support. Hopefully, we have taken care of much of that with some of the funding approved by the Senate in the past week.

I was pleased with the support for greater Department of Defense involvement in the development of reusable launch vehicles. However, I should note that I was disappointed that the committee had opted not to implement any of the reforms of the Space Commission. This is an area of particular interest to me and to another former member of the subcommittee, Senator BOB SMITH.

There was a lot of hard work put into the Space Commission report. So I was very disappointed that there wasn't more consideration taken on those recommendations.

I was also a member of another commission, the NRO Commission. Many of the provisions we recommended in our commission were adopted in the Intelligence Committee and then subsequently adopted in my subcommittee and the full Armed Services Committee.

So I think we have set the stage for us to move forward at this point in time. I am supportive of the bill and am pleased the chairman and the ranking member could work out our differences and move forward. I look forward to the debate, and I thank the ranking Republican for his tremendous statement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado yields the floor. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been listening intently to our chairman, our ranking member, as well as the Senator from Colorado. I find myself in agreement with virtually everything that has been said. I think it is important for us to realize something that really has not been said, which is that on Friday, September 7, we met—the Senate Armed Services Committee. We passed out of the Armed Services Committee our Defense authorization bill. Four days later, we find ourselves at war. So there are some things that have changed; the dynamics have changed—those things which we know are urgent to our Nation's defense and to our national security. They weren't there back on September 7 when we passed our authorization bill.

I have around 14 amendments at the desk. It is not my intention to offer any of them now or call for a resolution to those. But I will be doing it when we get into the bill on Monday.

One is to give the President the authority to waive sanctions against allies in our war on global terrorism. This was something we didn't really anticipate on September 7. It was just a matter of weeks ago that we passed sanctions against both India and Pakistan, which receive both military and economic aid. There are some conditions under which the President can waive these sanctions, but they are not too well defined. They put him in a position, when negotiating with countries, where he doesn't have that authority firmly planted within his powers to do it. So I am going to propose in an amendment, No. 1593, that we provide for notification in a 30-day period of time to Congress. But the President can say, if you do this, we are going to lift sanctions.

You might argue that there are vehicles in place to lift sanctions right now. But if it happens that we are in recess at that time, if it happens that there is some ambiguity as to whether or not Congress would go along with it, this way he can say, yes, we are going to lift these sanctions or waive these sanctions. I don't think there will be a lot of opposition to this. It is something that would give power to the President, who last night, I believe, gave the defining speech of his career.

Second, it deals with something more technical, but I think we need to look at it differently now, and that is depot maintenance. Depot maintenance refers to the type of maintenance of our military fighting equipment that has to be done in a publicly owned depot. The idea behind it, which has always been our policy, was we should have the capability of doing core maintenance—maintenance that would help us in times of war—so that we don't take the risk of being held hostage by a single supplier or contractor. So what I am going to be suggesting is to change our waiver policy. What we have done over the past several years is

say, well, we do want the depots to have the capability of maintaining our vehicles.

Take, for example, aircraft, the air logistics centers; there are three. There used to be five; now there are three. They are operating with equipment put in place back during World War II. It is outdated. We still have on the books a law that says 50 percent of the core maintenance has to be done in a public depot. So we have been operating on waivers now for several years. The waivers are put in there by the Secretary of the Air Force, in this case, or the Secretaries.

This power should be changed so that there is a new accountability. We have gone waiver after waiver after waiver, with no hope that in the following year we would be able to do it without a national security waiver. I will suggest it be written into the bill that we give the President of the United States the authority to waive the performance of depot level maintenance instead of the Secretary of the Air Force. If the President signs the waiver, he must deliver a report that lists why the waiver is necessary and what will be done to prevent the waiver from being required in the future.

The President, under the amendment I will be offering, may delegate this to another party. The President has that responsibility. This is what is missing because right now it goes from administration to administration without any interest in really resolving the problem or saying what we are doing to increase the capability of our public depots in order to make the maintenance that is prescribed by law.

There are several others. I want to say that even though I am hoping that the amendment I have filed—I have two, 1597 and 1596, that would attach to the Defense authorization bill an energy policy for America. Let me be critical not of Democrats, not of Republicans, but of both, going all the way back to the early eighties because then, when President Reagan was President of the United States, we tried to get him to have an energy policy. In fact, Don Hodel was Secretary of the Interior at that time, or in that timeframe.

Mr. President, we had this dog and pony show where we went all around the United States—to the consumption States, not the production States—demonstrating clearly that the outcome of every war, back to and including the First World War, has been determined by who has control of the energy. That is still true today.

Nobody believed it then. Since then we have gone through the Persian Gulf war. We realize we have enemies in the Middle East, and yet to a great extent we are reliant on the Middle East for our ability to fight a war. It is insane we should continue that policy.

I know there are a lot of Members who are asking why it is an issue right now. It is an issue now because this is a readiness issue. I spent 5 years as

chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee. It is now chaired by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Senator AKAKA, and I am his ranking member.

I can tell you right now that we are not ready in many areas to fight the war we are looking at right now. One of those areas is our dependency on foreign oil.

Let me put up a chart. My amendment is not a partisan attack. I hope my colleagues do not take it as such. I have been urging Democrats and Republicans to deal with this for years, and they have refused to do it. Even George Sr., coming from an oil patch, said: Yes, we have to have an energy policy, the cornerstone of which would be the maximum percentage of the energy we need to fight a war.

In the year 2000, 19.6 million barrels a day was used for the consumers of America. I guess what I am trying to say is, our need for petroleum consumption has been going up for a long time. From the year 2000 to 2001, it is up to 19.7 million barrels of oil a day. That is on the rise.

The second chart shows our domestic oil production has sharply decreased over the last 10 years. We have produced less domestic oil since World War II. In January of 1991, we produced 17.6 million barrels a day, and that has dropped down to 6 million barrels a day during this timeframe.

On chart No. 3, we can see that our domestic oil production continues to decrease while our consumption continues to increase. This was not true in the days when we started calling this to the public's attention, but it is true today.

That means we are getting oil from foreign sources, and that is what this chart shows. It shows our imports in that same year, January of 1991, were 4.6 million barrels a day, and they went up to 8 million barrels a day. It has almost doubled since that period of time.

Our dependence on foreign oil has dramatically increased since 1973 and is projected to increase in the future. Currently, 56.6 percent of U.S. oil needs are met by foreign sources. This presents a real energy and national security problem. The military is equally dependent on foreign oil, as is the general public. We must seek to drastically increase a domestically produced, diverse energy supply, including nuclear, coal, oil, gas, and renewables.

All these sources of energy are addressed in the House bill, and I have one amendment that would merely adopt the language in the House bill and also the language in the bill from the Senate Energy Committee.

Looking at our dependence on foreign oil imports and how it has escalated, we are today at 56 percent. We were at 36 percent when I talked about going around the country alerting people to the seriousness of the problem. In the same progression, we are going to be up to 66-percent dependent upon foreign sources in our ability to fight a war.

What is most startling is that we depend on nations in the Middle East, such as Iraq, to supply our oil needs. The Middle East supplies about 25 percent of our oil needs. What shocks an awful lot of people is that of that amount, we are importing 862,000 barrels a day from Iraq, a country we just defeated in a war 10 years ago, a country whose President made the statement that: If we had waited 10 years to march into Kuwait, the Americans would not have come to their aid because we would have the capability of lobbing a missile at them. That is the dilemma in which we find ourselves today. That is why I say this is a national defense issue.

Iraq is the fastest growing source of United States oil imports. That is the same nation that we took military action against seven times last month, the same nation we know has links to bin Laden, who is the prime suspect in the horrible attacks in New York and Washington, as well as the U.S.S. Cole and both Embassy bombings in East Africa.

This is a major national security problem. Energy will be critical if and when America engages in military action.

Operating a modern war machine requires a lot more oil than it used to. A contemporary 17,500-soldier U.S. Army division uses twice as much oil daily than did an entire 200,000-soldier field army during World War II.

The 450,000 barrels of petroleum products consumed daily by the 582,000 soldiers in the Persian Gulf was four times the daily amount used by the 2 million allied soldiers who liberated Europe from the Nazis. Today it takes eight times as much oil to meet the needs of each soldier as it did during World War II, and the Department of Defense accounts for nearly 80 percent of all U.S. Government energy use.

What I am saying is this is a very serious issue, and this is an issue that directly relates to our readiness, relates to our ability to defend America, and relates to our ability to carry on the war which we are in right now. It is very important that we pass an energy package. I don't care if it is the House wording, I don't care if it is the wording that came out of the Senate Energy Committee, but it directly relates to our ability to fight a war.

It will be perfectly acceptable to me if we make an arrangement whereby we agree to passing a comprehensive energy policy by the end of this year and not having it as a part of the Defense authorization bill because it would complicate things. It is very important we pass our Defense authorization bill and get it into conference and signed into law in a very short period of time.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to support the Armed Services

Committee actions on the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization bill. I also commend the chairman, Mr. LEVIN, and ranking member, Mr. WARNER, for their part in leading the committee, as well as guiding the committee, in their efforts to bring about a bill that will give confidence to the people of our country.

My friend and partner, Senator INHOFE, and I have worked closely to ensure that the Readiness Subcommittee's actions support the full committee's five goals for this bill. As Chairman LEVIN has described, these goals are: One, to continue improvements in the quality of life; two, to sustain readiness; three, to encourage transformation; four, to improve the capability of the Department of Defense to meet nontraditional threats; and five, to increase the efficiency of Department of Defense operations.

Our subcommittee worked together to make contributions in all five areas, and these actions are reflected in the bill we present to you today.

In the area of improving quality of life, the bill takes strong steps to improve the facilities in which our military personnel work and the housing in which they and their families live. This bill supports the \$10.0 billion administration request for military construction and family housing for fiscal year 2002, which is a 10-percent increase over fiscal year 2001 levels. This funding will, according to Department of Defense calculations, reduce the current 192-year replacement cycle for military facilities to 101 years. While this is a significant improvement, this figure is still nearly double the standard of approximately 57 years accepted in the private sector.

The bill invests an additional \$451 million from savings and efficiencies achieved elsewhere in the budget to make further improvements in military facilities, including projects to enhance mission performance, build additional unaccompanied housing and family housing, purchase key tracts of land at military installations to prevent future encroachment problems, and adequately fund legally binding cleanup requirements at facilities closed by previous base closure rounds.

The bill also includes an increase of \$40.0 million for personal gear for military members to improve their safety and comfort in the field.

The committee's second theme was one that I and the whole committee care deeply about: sustaining the readiness of our Armed Forces.

This bill supports the funding increases contained in the administration's budget request to more accurately reflect the increased use of spare parts and the higher prices for spare parts associated with older weapons systems. In addition to the requested increases, the bill provides almost \$100 million in additional funding for maintenance work on surface ships and other Marine Corps and Navy equipment. These funds will increase the

availability of equipment to units and allow them to spend more time training.

The bill also supports the budget request for an increase of seven percent in real terms for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization over fiscal year 2001 levels. I believe that these additional funds will provide critical improvements to service members' places of work, allowing for greater productivity and increased job satisfaction.

I also believe that further advances in sustainment, restoration and equipment maintenance are possible, in particular by increasing attention to corrosion prevention technologies and products. As I know from the military facilities in Hawaii and elsewhere in the Pacific, maintaining military equipment and facilities in wet, salty, and hot environments is a significant challenge. I believe progress can be made on this critical issue that will both improve the service life of our property and the lives of our service members who have to maintain this property.

This bill includes a \$7.4 million increase for anti-corrosion product testing and treatments, and directs the Department of Defense to coordinate anti-corrosion research and testing across the military services. The bill also supports small increases in a limited number of ammunition programs to reduce training and war reserve shortfalls and enhance troop safety.

The committee's third goal was encouraging transformation. This bill includes small increases to support necessary training for the Army's new Interim Brigade Combat Teams (IBCTs), a critical step in the Army's transformation to a lighter, more rapidly-deployable force. Other actions taken by the Readiness Subcommittee to improve efficiency should also result in savings in both the current and future budgets, savings that can be redirected to the necessary process of transforming our armed forces.

The committee's fourth priority was to improve the Department of Defense's capability to meet non-traditional threats, the importance of which was made painfully and sorrowfully clear to us all last week. Many of my colleagues will speak forcefully on this issue, and I share their sentiments of outrage and extreme sadness as we cope with this horrendous attack. The committee looks forward to bringing further recommendations to our colleagues on this critical issue in the near future. Until this occurs, the bill before us will provide funding for the requested improvements to bases and installations that will increase the safety of our forces at home and abroad.

The fifth theme of our bill this year was to improve the efficiency of DOD programs and operations. This is a goal the committee shares with Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and we look forward to working with him

closely to make further progress on this in the future. The bill presented here today takes important steps to help us along the path.

In the area of acquisition reform, the bill includes a number of provisions to improve the acquisition of equipment and services. One provision would require the Department to set up a management structure, management information system, and program review structure for the Department's contracts for services. A related provision would establish savings goals for services contracts and goals that would be achieved through the application of best commercial practices, including competition, performance-based contracting, and spending analyses.

Another provision strengthens requirements for competition for multiple-award contracts to purchase products and services, and would require approval for sole-source awards. The bill also includes provisions enabling DOD to shorten the acquisition cycle for weapons systems by codifying a technological maturity requirement for key technologies to be incorporated into new systems.

Other provisions of the bill address acquisition workforce issues and aim to ensure that the defense components have sufficient staff to manage requirements in a cost effective manner. I was impressed by the work of the Acquisition 2005 Task Force's recent report, "Shaping the Civilian Acquisition Work Force of the Future." I intend to confer with the Task Force to further define the extent of the problem. As the chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services as well as the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, the issues raised by the Task Force are of great interest to me.

This bill also takes steps to improve financial management within DOD. Specifically, it includes a provision that would refocus comptroller and auditor resources on addressing systemic problems in DOD financial systems rather than wasting resources on reviews of financial statements. Another provision codifies the Department's Senior Financial Management Oversight Council and financial feeder systems compliance process to provide top-level guidance in addressing financial management problems.

Though the committee finished its work just days prior to last week's terrible attacks in New York and at the Pentagon, I believe that the bill we produced is just as relevant today as it was then. This bill lays a firm foundation to fortify our armed forces, takes many important actions to sustain and improve their readiness in both the short- and the long-term, and represents a product which I commend to my colleagues. I urge your support for this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was going to make a statement on an amendment I had filed. I did not know the Senator from Georgia was about to speak now. I will be happy to yield to him.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I am glad to work with the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly on an amendment I offered to the armed services bill. It relates to survivor benefits for people in the military who are killed in the line of duty. I had offered this amendment with Senator INOUYE actually before September 11, the day that changed all of our lives, because I thought there was an injustice in the law as it deals with our military personnel; that is, if someone died in a training accident or in the line of duty but had not yet retired, he or she would not be entitled to any retirement benefits, even the benefits already earned. So if someone died after 10 years of service and had not had the opportunity to serve the full 20 years, the survivors would have no benefits.

I do not think that is the way to treat our military families, so I have been working on a piece of legislation that would allow those people who die in the line of service while on active duty to have the retirement benefits for their survivors—just what they have already accumulated. It would not give them the full 20 years, but it would give them the 5 years they served or the 10 years they served. This is something that now takes on an even bigger, more important role as we are dealing with the issues of September 11 because, as we know, over 100 of our military personnel were in the Pentagon and were killed in the line of service while on active duty.

So I am offering this amendment, once again, to the armed services bill. I hope it will be accepted. I hope both sides will agree that all those who were in the Pentagon at the time should have the survivor benefits to which they are entitled by their years of service.

The interesting thing about this is that the very parts of the Pentagon where this particular issue was being worked is the part that was hit.

I want to specifically mention a couple of the people who were in the Pentagon and who are now missing who were really pushing for my legislation to go forward—not for themselves because they were already retired. But they knew about the dangers of not taking care of our people. They were in the Pentagon talking to the personnel

about the necessity of this particular piece of legislation. COL Gary F. Smith, who was the Chief of Army Retirement Services, and Army MSG Max Beilke were working on this legislation. Those two men were in the Pentagon and are now missing as of September 11, 2001. LTC Smith wrote to my staff about this legislation on June 15 saying:

Those of us who work on these issues daily know how important this will be. We'll keep our fingers crossed and hope it will get into law.

That was written to Jimmie Keenan, who is an Army nurse on my staff detailed to me as an Army fellow. She is an expert in this area and has worked tirelessly on this issue. She has worked long hours. It was because of her experience in working with her fellow members of the military medical corps that she realized there was something wrong. Many times in a training accident, for instance, we go through an elaborate procedure to medically retire someone who is already dead. That is what we have been doing—where we could—if someone died in a training accident. Before we declare a military person dead, we go through a process that medically retires that person.

My staff says this isn't right; why would we go through this process when the family is already in trauma and the people around the person who has died are in trauma? Why do we have to go through that? Why don't we just say when someone dies in the line of duty, for heaven's sake, they should have the benefits to which they are entitled by the number of years they serve?

She went to work. It is a great idea. Another fellow knew what was needed. And they worked on this for almost a year.

It just happens that the people who were working on it with her in the Pentagon will not be able to see this bill pass. But what they will get is the comfort of knowing that their families are going to be taken care of in a much better way than before.

I am asking the managers of the bill to put this provision in the managers' amendment. I think it is a very important part of taking care of all members of the military—not only the ones who have died before and not only the ones who died on September 11.

I think this is an important message to the members of our military who are getting ready to be called up. Many are already called up. Many are waiting for those orders. That is what our military does. They wait until they are called up to serve their country. They are waiting to be called to service today as we speak and as we are seeing the preparations to enact the war against terrorism that our President so eloquently laid out for the people of America.

As we know, the brunt of carrying out the President's orders is going to be on the men and women of our military. I want them to answer the call knowing that if anything does happen

to them, their survivors will be entitled to the benefits of their retirement for whatever number of years prorated they would be entitled to under the preretirement laws.

I thank Jimmie Keenan and Ray Ivie in my office, along with Michael Ralsky and David Davis who have also helped on this issue.

In memory of LTC Gary Smith and MSG Max Beilke, I ask that this amendment be accepted.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, it has been an incredible 10 days.

I was reading in the New York Times today a marvelous quote of John Kennedy that I think is appropriate for where this country stands as we face our future.

Only in winter can you tell which trees are truly green. Only when the winds of adversity blow can you tell whether an individual or a country has steadfastness.

In so many ways over the last week and a half, it has been my honor and personal privilege to be a part of this great body, to see its steadfastness in the face of adversity, and to see the wonderful staff people come back to work even though they knew they were at least for a moment in time a target of the terrorists.

It has been encouraging to see the steadfastness of my own people in my own home State of Georgia as they rally for the cause.

It has been a marvelous thing to experience, watching television and seeing the experience of New Yorkers who rose to the occasion to honor their firefighters, and to honor their policemen, and who did what it was difficult to do in dealing with that terrifying situation which still goes on this day.

But one element of steadfastness we are showing is that this legislative process continues. The Senate Armed Services Committee was busy buttressing the defense of America before the attack. We are busy today buttressing the defense of America after the attack.

I would like to discuss today this pending legislation—the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2002.

Just 2 short weeks ago, the Senate Armed Services Committee completed its markup of this authorization bill, which I heavily support. After the tragic events of last week, in a very timely fashion, we bring this measure to the floor to begin the process of providing our military men and women with the resources they will need to respond in this crisis.

As all of us are aware, last week people and property of the United States were attacked in a vicious, deliberate, cowardly, and inhumane fashion. The full cost of this attack is only now becoming clearer.

In the days that followed the attack, I was often asked what I thought was the historical meaning of this moment.

I have often quoted Admiral Yamamoto who planned and executed the attack against Pearl Harbor. Afterwards, he was quoted as saying he feared he had only "awakened a sleeping giant." In so many ways I think that is exactly what has happened to our country. We have become awakened. This sleeping giant called America is now awakened.

What is also clear to the perpetrators of this crime, while being unified against our country, is that we are now unified against them. The President spoke eloquently and with great strength last night in that regard. But I will say that the U.S. military will not be alone in this fight. Indeed, I have spent some time this morning listening to testimony before the Governmental Affairs Committee regarding how we ought best to support the President's establishment of a National Office for Homeland Security. In that hearing, it was the unanimous consent of the witnesses that the current effort of the myriad agencies involved in the fight against terrorism, including the Department of Defense, must be better coordinated.

The Government Accounting Office report recently released—actually released yesterday—sums up the issue succinctly. "Current Federal efforts," the GAO says, "to combat terrorism are inherently difficult to lead and manage because the policies, strategies, programs, budgets, and activities are spread across more than 40 different Federal agencies."

Since the problem appears to be one of coordination—and the GAO has fingered that—I believe the President's Office of Homeland Security is an excellent solution. It promises to adapt our Government to accomplish more effective counterterrorism coordination and assign responsibility for measurable results.

It is simple enough to be rapidly implemented—and that is important—without disrupting the operations of the agencies which are affected.

I join the distinguished chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator LIEBERMAN, in his desire to move quickly to support the President's action with appropriate legislation.

Notwithstanding the fact that our response to terrorism will involve many agencies, it will be our military that will be on the cutting edge—the tip of the spear, so to speak. It will be our military, our young men and women, that will wage one of the most visible and dangerous attacks that we have seen in many, many years. They are on the cutting edge of this war on terrorism. For many around the world, the performance of our military will characterize our success or failure in the war on terrorism.

As the military carries out its critical part in the war, we must also continue to provide for our military men and women in terms of their security as they protect our national security. This bill does that.

Prior to the recent terrorist attacks, the Senate Armed Services Committee increased the original budget request for combating terrorism by well over \$200 million. This increase includes over \$100 million to support research and development aimed at detecting, defending against, and responding to the use of weapons of mass destruction. The other half of this increase—over \$100 million—would increase the ability of U.S. forces to deter and U.S. installations to defend against a terrorist attack.

Within this latter total, the committee determined that the Army had an unfunded mandate for installation security, and we provided an additional \$778 million to address this need.

The committee also added funding of almost \$14 million for U.S. special operations for the special operations command. Though we expect additional requests and will identify future needs, the measure pending before the Senate continues this committee's bipartisan efforts to provide a solid foundation for combating terrorism.

Just one anecdote: On the last day of consideration of this massive bill, authorizing over \$300 billion to be spent for our defense, one of the questions I asked my fellow committee members was: Defense against what? What is the threat? This was 2 weeks ago.

Senator PAT ROBERTS, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, for the last couple years has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats. Senator MARY LANDRIEU from Louisiana is now the chairman of that subcommittee. I asked both of them in their research, in their hearings, in their study of the real threat against America: What is it? What are we defending against?

Both agreed the most likely threat to the country was a terrorist attack, a stealthy attack, with no known address, no return to sender address, especially biological or chemical attack. That was the threat No. 1. Threat No. 2 was cyber-warfare against our Internet, against our computers to, in effect, shut us down in terms of our communications and our data processing.

I thought about that last Tuesday when we had the terrifying attack on this country. We were zeroing in on the fact that the real honest to goodness threat against this Nation was going to be a terrorist attack.

Today I had the pleasure of visiting with two former Members, Senator Warren Rudman and Senator Gary Hart, part of the Hart-Rudman commission, who months ago identified the chilling fact that it wasn't a question of whether this country was going to get hit by a terrorist attack but when. Lord knows, we have learned that lesson.

As we proceed in the days and weeks and months ahead to consider additional counterterrorist efforts, I cite an editorial that appeared in Monday's Atlanta Journal Constitution.

In that editorial, former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, in whose seat I now sit,

whose position I now have in the Senate and position I have on the Senate Armed Services Committee, coauthor of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Act, who currently serves as cochairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, clearly summarized the threat we face and outlined some key elements that should be included in our response.

Senator Nunn points out that the terrorists' murderous deeds are limited only by the weapons they are able to employ—limited only by the weapons they are able to employ. He notes that the disintegration of the former Soviet Union left many thousands of tons of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, along with the scientists who worked with those weapons, adrift in an eroding infrastructure of inadequate controls and depressed economies.

We must prevent terrorist groups from exploiting this situation to obtain weapons of mass destruction, weapons materials and know-how. As we have only narrowly averted some attempts by terrorists to purchase these materials in recent years, I call on my colleagues to act on the recommendation of the bipartisan task force that called for a fourfold increase in the funding of programs aimed at reducing the threat of inadequately safeguarding weapons, materials, and know-how in Russia.

As Senator Nunn correctly states:

We must develop a comprehensive defense against the full range of threats based on relative risk and supported by strong alliances around the world so that the pain of today will not be known by the children of tomorrow.

In the trials to come, we must remember our military might springs from the willingness of our people to serve. I have always thought, since I was a young serviceman in Vietnam, 35 years ago, the key to our defense is our defenders. They are the military and civilian personnel who make up the Department of Defense. They are our defenders.

As chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I am pleased to inform the Senate that this authorization measure is a good bill and the provisions that address the needs of our military men and women and their families enjoy the full and bipartisan support of all members of our committee.

Some of the personnel provisions in this legislation include: total funding for personnel-related items at a level of \$106 billion, about \$7 million over the original budget request; and support for the recommended active duty end strength requested by the administration. This includes an increase of over 3,000 personnel in the Navy and almost an increase of 2,000 in the Air Force. This bill provides an increase in the full-time manning end strength by almost 2,000 personnel. This is the first installment of an 11-year plan to increase full-time manning, which is one of the top readiness priorities for the Reserves.

As we now know, some 50,000 reservists have already been called up. All of our State adjutant generals have said to us that they need help with the shortage in full-time support that they receive from the active duty force.

This bill also provides a significant pay raise—well above the rate of inflation—for all military personnel.

Mr. President, again, for our troops in the field, military personnel, there is a significant pay raise in this bill, well above the rate of inflation. We recommend a targeted pay raise that ranges from 5 percent to 10 percent, beginning in January of 2002. It is between 5 and 10 percent. Enlisted personnel and junior officers will receive a pay raise of at least 6 percent or more.

We also extend the special pays and bonuses that are so important for recruiting and retention. As someone who has served on the Personnel Subcommittee over the last 5, 5½ years, and now chairs that subcommittee, as you know, we have been struggling with recruitment and retention. I am pleased to report the military services have seen a burst of recruitment around the country. That is another sign that the steadfastness of this country is sound, particularly when we are threatened.

Acceleration by 2 years of the existing plan to gradually increase the basic allowance for quarters to eliminate average out-of-pocket expenditures for off-post housing by 2005—accelerate that by 2 years—the BAH will cover median housing costs by 2003. We have capped the average out-of-pocket expenditures for 2002 at 7.5 years.

The bill authorizes a significant increase in funding for the defense health program, which includes full funding for TRICARE for Life. That is for the military retirees over 65. This is the retiree benefit that this committee initiated. The bill includes an authorization of an expanded benefit for disabled dependents of active duty personnel. This benefit includes comprehensive health care, home health care, and case management services for the disabled family member and respite care for the primary caregiver to the disabled family member. We recognize that providing for the special needs of disabled family members increases the capability of service members to perform their military mission.

The bill also includes two new initiatives to help retain service members with critical skills. As a matter of fact, I was surprised to actually learn that part of the report recommended a focus on terrorist attacks and an emphasis on homeland defense. This report by Senator Rudman and Senator Hart also included recommendations to dramatically upgrade the Montgomery GI bill. Some of those recommendations were already in this authorization bill.

These initiatives include my own initiative, which I worked on for 3 years with my staff, to allow service members to transfer up to 18 months of unused Montgomery GI bill benefits to

family members and Senator HUTCHINSON's education savings bond initiative. Both of these help the educational package now available to service men and women.

The bill also authorizes retired service members with a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay and veterans disability compensation, contingent upon the President proposing and Congress authorizing an offset.

The bill also authorizes pilot programs with the VA for a joint program of graduate medical education, and for the VA to conduct separation and retirement physicals.

Finally, the bill authorizes \$35 million for impact aid and \$5 million for impact aid for children with severe disabilities. Not only is this bill good for our service members, but this year's Defense authorization bill provides critical resources to sustain and improve the strength of America's Armed Forces, from funding initial production of the world's most advanced fighters, such as the F-22, to addressing infrastructure concerns, to adding to our airlift capabilities, and providing extra C-130s—shortfalls that DOD identified, and it guarantees that we as a nation are continuing the strong tradition of supporting our military, as well as preparing for the threats of the future.

In conclusion, I thank Chairman LEVIN for his leadership and hard work on this bill and the ranking Republican, Senator WARNER—he and his staff. They have made a strong contribution to this year's authorization bill.

I think we should all commend these two gentlemen for their tremendous dedication to our Nation's military and their continued example of true bipartisan cooperation and accomplishment.

Mr. President, I will conclude with a line that I came across when I was going through Reserve Officer Training Corps school as a young cadet, written by one of Wellington's troops after the Battle of Waterloo, after the glory of the battle had long since faded. He wrote once that:

In time of war and not before,
God and the soldier men adore,
But in time of peace, with all things righted,
God is forgotten and the soldier slighted.

Mr. President, over the last 10 days, this country has in many ways rediscovered our God and certainly has rediscovered our soldiers, our service men and women. This bill is in their interest. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a number of our colleagues have been calling both leaders asking for some update on the schedule for the day. I wanted to notify Senators that the negotiations on the airline legislation have just been concluded. So it is my expectation that we will take the bill up within the next hour and a half.

All Senators should be on notice that we will attempt to get a unanimous

consent agreement to move to the bill shortly after the legislation has been drafted, and it would be my expectation to take the bill up immediately. There would be most likely a rollcall vote before the end of the day. I guess, in the 3:30 to 4 o'clock range we will take the bill up. I am not sure about the length of the debate. We will have a rollcall vote on that legislation before the end of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking member, as well as the eloquent statement that my colleague, Senator CLELAND, has just made.

This is a good bill. It is one that strengthens our military and enhances the quality of life for our Armed Forces and prepares our Nation to confront terrorism.

One group of Americans will be on the front line of the new war on terrorism: our reservists and National Guard members. President Bush has authorized a callup of 50,000 of these citizen soldiers. They may soon leave their families and civilian jobs and, at a great personal sacrifice, report to active duty. They will be among those who will confront our enemies, defending our freedoms in a shadowy and potentially brutal war.

Our Nation must do all we can to support these brave men and women and their families. There are many things we need to do to address the issues for reservists' quality of life. One of those is to ensure that those who are called to duty and their families have access to uninterrupted health care coverage.

Currently, when reservists are called up, they are temporarily considered active duty components. While they are in harm's way, members of the Reserves and National Guard and their dependents are entitled to the same military health care coverage as other military personnel, with what is called TRICARE. Reservists who have deployed for more than 30 days during a major contingency may extend their military health care coverage for 30 days after they return.

I have discussed this issue at length with several reservists and the leadership of the Missouri National Guard, and I can tell you 30 days simply is not enough. Oftentimes, civilian employers are unable to restore the reservists' health care benefits immediately. In other cases, Reserve members have quit their jobs before deploying and have no source of insurance when they return home.

On Monday I will offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senators DEWINE, LEAHY, LANDRIEU, JOHNSON, BREAUX, BINGAMAN, DODD, and THURMOND. The amendment is based on legislation I introduced with Senator DEWINE earlier this year with seven co-sponsors. Our amendment will allow reservists returning from deployments

without health care, to extend their TRICARE coverage for up to 180 days or until their civilian health insurers return their coverage to them.

This legislation would address the circumstances faced by reservists like Capt. Terri McGranahan. She volunteered to be a part of our peacekeeping mission in Kosovo. During her service, she worked in a health clinic that had been newly painted with a toxic sealant. Working in this clinic had made her very ill, resulting in pneumonia. Eventually, she developed a spot on her lung. She did not detect this condition right away. When she finally sought medical treatment, the 30 days of TRICARE coverage had already expired.

When she returned home, her private health insurance company refused to cover her. She asked the Army for help, but was turned down. Captain McGranahan has fallen through the cracks of two health care bureaucracies.

We have to do better than this.

Mr. President, my amendment will provide comfort to thousands of reserve families whose loved ones risk their lives defending our Nation. But more important it would be part of our national effort to unite behind our troops during this time of national crisis.

The bill on which the amendment is based has been endorsed by 28 organizations across the country, including the Reserve Officers Association, National Guard Association, Enlisted Association of the National Guard, the Air Force Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, and several other organizations promoting quality of life for our service men and women.

Over 50,000 reservists may soon be called into service. As President Bush himself has said, "We're talking about somebody's mom, or somebody's dad, somebody's employee, somebody's friend, or somebody's neighbor."

Our initial cost estimate for our original bill was just 5 million dollars a year. This proposal is not extravagant in a \$343 billion defense budget. It is the right thing to do, and it is needed right now. This is not a permanent solution. We need a full health care program for these service men and women. The Defense authorization bill requires the Pentagon to study this issue, and I look forward to reviewing it. But in the meantime, I am pleased to offer this amendment in the name of our Missouri's National Guard and Reservists, as well as our country's other citizen soldiers.

General Eisenhower once said:

Leadership cannot be exercised by the weak. It demands strength—the strength of this great nation when its people are united in purpose, united in a common fundamental faith, united in their readiness to work for human freedom and peace.

Mr. President, let us assure our citizen soldiers that when they return home, they will not be denied health care because of their military's service.

They deserve no less. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and at 2:45 p.m. the Senate recessed, subject to the call of the Chair, and reassembled at 3:07 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor this afternoon to speak on the subject of our Defense authorization bill.

First, let me say how appreciative I am of the leadership of Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER. These are two Senators who trust one another and who work beautifully together. I have personally witnessed the work they have done both publicly and during many hours of private negotiations. I cannot thank them enough for their extraordinary leadership at this very important time in our Nation. I truly think that God has blessed us at this time to have these two fine men helping lead the negotiations at this particular time on a very important bill for our country.

President Kennedy reminded us during the height of the cold war that to ensure the peace we must prepare for war. September 11 seems to many of us literally years ago. It was just last week that our preparations for 21st century warfare were cut dramatically short. We had just reached the point where the American public was beginning to comprehend that future wars would, indeed, be very different; We would need a different sort of military to combat them. However, national security infrastructure is a large, lumbering ship. It takes time, focus, patience, and determination to turn its direction.

On September 11, early in the morning, the attention of our Pentagon turned on a dime to this new threat. As all of us are now beginning to understand, 21st century warfare is very different.

I have referred to the current attack on the United States as a silent war. People have asked me what I mean by that. I mean that the resources we employ to fight this war may not be visible on CNN. We will fight electronically, with our special forces, with our intelligence operatives, with psychological operations. It will be a war in

which our greatest victories may never be fully appreciated and in which our full vulnerabilities are perceived by only a few.

It is also a silent war because silence is the only real asset of our enemies. When we can identify our foes, they will be eliminated. For that reason, we must be relentless and patient. We are in a chess match with killers. A great deal rides upon its outcome.

My confidence in our victory comes from one simple fact: Our opponents rely on a few pathological minds to win this war. Our Nation can call upon the minds of free-thinking, freedom-loving people around the world to ensure our victory. And ultimately we will prevail.

We have a long journey in front of us. Today we take another step. I commend our chairman, Senator LEVIN of Michigan, and Senator WARNER of Virginia for their outstanding leadership at this time.

As the chairperson of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee, I am clear about the work our committee must undertake over the next few months and perhaps years until the successful conclusion of this conflict. I also sincerely thank the Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, our ranking member of this important committee, for his cooperation, his insight, his vision, and his passion on this subject. His advice and counsel and our excellent working relationship have made a difficult task more bearable.

It should be noted that I have determined a new policy for our subcommittee. From now on, all meetings of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee will be bipartisan in nature. We have neither the time, nor do the American people have the patience, for partisan squabbling and bickering because the stakes are so high.

In formulating the Department of Defense budget for the next fiscal year, we considered five priorities. Sadly, recent events have brought three of those priorities to the forefront. We have done very good work recently in ensuring that our military is ready to meet nontraditional threats and to ensure that our Armed Forces are ready to defend our Nation on a moment's notice. Now is the time to enact all of our plans and defend America and its values against this unprecedented challenge to our Nation.

In addition, we have sought to improve the quality of life for our service men and women and their families. It is the service family who will keep the hearth warm while our fighting men and women are deployed. We must provide them with the quality of life they deserve.

In almost every war of which we are aware and have studied—and many have actually participated in—it was always hard on the family. I imagine and predict that in this war, in some ways it will be harder on families because the intelligence, the secrecy of what we have to do, while it was al-

ways important in past wars, is going to be more so. There will be families separated from loved ones for long periods of time and children who will never be able to receive a letter from a father or a mother or to hear their voice for long periods of time. I urge that our Nation give some extraordinary and new thinking to what we might do to support the families who are going to be called to the front lines and, in addition, to recognize while my committee only supervises and oversees the military operations, as our President and as our leaders have so eloquently stated recently, it is not just men and women in uniform who are on the front line, but our firefighters, our local elected officials, our National Guard, business people, in many instances, are on the front line, depending on what their business is. Their families need special consideration.

We have also done important work in improving the efficiencies of the Department of Defense. This will become more crucial in the coming days as our Nation commits its treasury to the present struggle. We must ensure that we invest wisely in the best possible means toward ensuring absolute victory.

There are a few aspects of this legislation of which I am particularly proud. We have made a significant investment in upgrading and sustaining our fighters and our bombers. Any student of modern history cannot overlook how important these are to conducting modern war and how vital they will be to achieving victory in this new type of war.

In this bill, we have authorized a 5-percent pay raise for all of our service personnel. Perhaps it can be more. Perhaps 5 percent is not enough. We can revisit that issue. It is another step along with an 8-percent pay raise that was done the year before and raises the year before to make the paycheck begin to match—which it can never quite do, obviously—the sacrifices our men and women are called on to perform.

As we contemplate the tasks that our men and women in uniform face, we are made aware of our duty to properly compensate them and their families and to support them financially, psychologically, emotionally and, in many ways, spiritually.

We have provided a guarantee that our fighting men and women will be able to fully participate in democracy while being deployed abroad. We included language in this bill to ensure that their right to vote will be uninhibited, barriers taken down, and that valid votes will be counted.

This Nation set a precedent in 1864, when we conducted a Presidential election in the midst of a paralyzing war. This bill ensures that we will not allow the current crisis to disrupt our democratic process.

I now focus, briefly, and in conclusion, on the work done by the Emerging Threats Subcommittee in the last