

statute should be ignored and does not mean precisely what it says.

It is time we focus on substance and I sincerely hope that the two leaders can find a time before the July recess for us to take up this important Yucca Mountain resolution.

I would note that all debate is limited to 10 hours, so it would be possible to take up the resolution one afternoon or evening and have a vote the next morning. That would create very little inconvenience to the leaders' schedule, but I look forward to whatever they can work out.

It is time for either the majority leader or his designee—perhaps the chairman of the Energy Committee who introduced the resolution and so ably guided it through committee—to make the motion to proceed and establish, under the rules of the Senate and the procedures laid out in the act, a time and date certain when the Senate can debate and vote on this resolution—as the act intended.

This matter is long overdue. It is the obligation of this body. The House of Representatives has done its job, and the Senate should do its job.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business and to extend morning business time for 10 minutes.

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

#### YUCCA MOUNTAIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have heard my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska speak, as I have heard the Senator from Idaho speak on several occasions during the last few days. I have chosen not to respond because what my friends have spoken about we have heard many times.

We have a situation on which the American people are now focusing. The focus for many years has been whether Yucca Mountain is a suitable site for a nuclear waste depository. Scientifically, that has fallen apart for many reasons. One is that under the statute, Yucca Mountain and/or any other site was supposed to be a facility that would geologically protect the American people from nuclear waste. Yucca Mountain didn't work. They have learned that geologically it can't do that because of the fault lines, because of the water tables, and because of many other facts. They decided to use Yucca Mountain anyway. But they would build an encasement and put it down in the hole. They would have the waste in containers in Yucca Mountain.

The point is that now people are no longer focusing on Yucca Mountain. They are not focusing on Yucca Mountain because they have come to the re-

alization they have to get it there some way. You are not going to wake up one morning and suddenly find thousands of tons of nuclear waste from around the country from different reactors there. No. You will have to haul it there. We have learned they are going to haul it by water, by train, and by truck. They can haul all they want. But the waste is always going to be at these reactor sites. You can't get rid of it. You are producing it all of the time.

When they take a spent fuel rod out, it has to stay onsite for 5 years before they can touch it. Then they have to determine how to move it.

We have known since September 11 that we have a lot of difficulty moving anything dangerous on the highways of this country. The most poisonous substances known to man are in these spent fuel rods.

There is a Web site—[www.mapscience.org](http://www.mapscience.org). It has been up since last Tuesday. You can punch in an address—whether it is Georgia, whether it is Nevada, Virginia, Maryland, or Rhode Island. You will find instantaneously how close nuclear waste will travel to your home address or any other address you enter.

Since Tuesday, we have had about 100,000 people who have focused on that and who have made hits on that site. People from all over this country are now realizing that nuclear waste is not a Nevada problem, it is their problem.

My friends from Alaska and Idaho can come here and talk all they want. But the people who are eminent scientists and who have enough experience dealing with transportation—for example, the former head of the National Transportation Safety Board—agree that this is a bad idea. Jim Hall, the former head of the National Transportation Safety Board has done editorial boards, and he is an expert on transportation safety. He said you shouldn't do it. You can't do it. People say: OK, big shot. What do you want to do with it? That is very easy to answer. Leave it where it is, where there are storage containers, where you can encase and cover them with cement. There are all kinds of ways to protect them onsite, but you can't do those things when you haul the waste. The casks become too heavy.

The majority leader is absolutely right. He does not like this. He thinks it is wrong headed. People have been wine and dined by the nuclear power industry for 20 years. One of the great trips they take is to Las Vegas. They say: Come on. We will show you Yucca Mountain.

They whip them out to the mountain for a few hours and put them up in fancy hotels in Las Vegas for a weekend or so. They have had hundreds of staff out there to look at this. We know how powerful staff is. They come back and say there is a great repository out there.

I acknowledge that my job is easier than my friend, the junior Senator from Nevada. My job is easier because

this battle has been going on for a while. President Clinton vetoed a proposal to change environmental standards at Yucca Mountain. That veto was upheld by a vote of the Senate—33 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

They also tried to establish Yucca Mountain as a temporary place—an interim storage site. President Clinton interceded. That was soundly defeated.

My job is easier than my friend from Nevada. I am working with people who have not voted against this in the past, and who have voted for my position in the past. We had a President who, even though he had a nuclear plant in Arkansas, understood.

But my friends on this side of the aisle must do the right thing. I don't say this negatively. I get campaign contributions also. Even though I get campaign contributions, that isn't how I have to vote. They give me that money because they think I am an honorable person trying to do the right thing.

The fact that for 20-odd years millions of dollars have been given to campaigns around this country, people have to set that aside and do the right thing. It is not easy to do. But they have to do the right thing. I am not in any way trying to demagog the issue other than to say there are occasions when people have to do the right thing.

For my friend, JOHN ENSIGN, and for the people of this country, my friends on the other side of the aisle must do what is fair and understand that the transportation of nuclear waste is not safe.

The Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission said last week if this bill does not go forward and the veto of the Governor of Nevada is upheld, that it is no big deal. We can and will leave the nuclear waste where it is. That is what the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Mission said last week.

The former member of the NRC, Dr. Victor Gilinsky, said at an Energy Committee hearing: I don't understand what the rush is. They can't transport the stuff in Europe. They have tried. This week they had a big demonstration where people chained themselves to the railroad tracks. Basically, they stopped the trains from hauling it. Germany has given up on it.

The mad rush is because the nuclear power lobby is extremely powerful. But for the good of the people of this country, whether they have a nuclear reactor in their State or not, you can't haul it safely. It is better left where it is until we find the right technological solution.

I guess the reason I came down is that I have just kind of had it up to here on all of these speeches about what a righteous thing they are doing by bringing this forward. It is the wrong thing to do. It is not a Nevada issue. It is an issue that affects everybody in this country.

For anyone to even suggest or intimate that this matter should now be

reported to the Senate in a matter of a minute or two, and the Defense authorization bill should be set aside to take it up—we are talking about giving our men and women in the military additional resources to fight the war on terror and to make this country secure. To even think we would set this aside for that is, to me, distasteful.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2514, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2514) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 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.

Pending:

Feingold Amendment No. 3915, to extend for 2 years procedures to maintain fiscal accountability and responsibility.

Reid (for Conrad) Amendment No. 3916 (to Amendment No. 3915), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the fiscal year 2003 Defense authorization bill. I believe this bill provides the needed resources to compensate and to reward the men and women in uniform who are doing an extraordinary job protecting this country across the globe and here at home. I also think the bill will provide the funding and the direction to continue the transformation of our military forces so that we are able to meet the new emerging threats of this new century.

This year, I again served as chairman of the Strategic Subcommittee. This subcommittee focuses on strategic systems, space systems, missile defense, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance programs, and the national security functions of the Department of Energy. The subcommittee and the full committee held seven hearings dealing with matters in the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The issues addressed by the subcommittee cover a wide range of subjects. These issues include the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Defense Department issued in December, which covers our strategic nuclear plan; the creation of a new Missile Defense Agency, which replaced the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization; increased concerns about the security of nuclear weapons and materials; the need to substantially restructure several space programs; and proposed re-

ductions to the number of deployed nuclear weapons in the context of the new and very commendable agreement with Russia.

Let me turn, first, to the issues of strategic systems.

The strategic systems that fall within the jurisdiction of the Strategic Subcommittee include long-range bombers, the land-based and sea-based ballistic missile forces, and the broad range of matters pertaining to nuclear weapons in the Department of Defense.

In the area of strategic systems, the bill, as reported, adds \$23 million to keep the Minuteman III ICBM upgrade programs and the effort to retire the Peacekeeper on track, as has been requested by the Air Force in their list of unfunded requirements.

The Peacekeeper and the Minuteman III missiles are both land-based missile systems. When the Peacekeeper is retired, Minuteman III will be the only land-based system, so it is very important to ensure, for our nuclear deterrence, that the process of retirement of Peacekeeper and modernization of Minuteman III continues at the appropriate pace.

Under the terms of the Nuclear Posture Review, the Department of Defense plans to eliminate all 50 of the Peacekeeper missiles and download the 500 Minuteman III missiles from their current multi-warhead configuration to a single warhead. This is a significant step in reducing the threat posed by nuclear weapons and one of the major reasons that the United States and Russia were able to come to an agreement.

Reducing the number of warheads on the Minuteman III to one warhead per missile, and removing all of the warheads from retiring Peacekeeper missiles, is a key to achieving the goals of a reduced number of deployed missiles that are at the heart of the agreement with the United States and Russia.

The commitment is to reduce the number of deployed nuclear warheads to the range of 1,700 to 2,200 from the present approximately 6,000 deployed warheads.

Also, this will provide more stability, as missiles with single warheads, in the context of deterrence policy, are a more stable element than multi-warhead missiles.

These are all encouraging developments, but it is necessary to keep this process on track by the additional funds which we have added to this legislation.

The subcommittee is also concerned about ensuring that the long-range bomber fleet is modernized and maintained. These bombers, particularly the B-2 and the B-52, have repeatedly showed their usefulness in conflicts from Desert Storm to present operations. There are no plans to replace these bombers in the near future. In fact, in 2000, when the Air Force last reviewed the projected lifetime of these bombers, they determined they could rely on these bombers for an additional

30 years. The reality is, the pilots who will retire the B-52 and B-2 bombers have not yet been born.

We have to maintain these systems, upgrade their electronics and avionics, to make sure they are still a valuable and decisive part of our forces.

This bill would include an additional \$28 million to address shortfalls in the B-2 and B-52 bomber programs, and also approves the request by the Department of Defense to reduce and consolidate the B-1 fleet.

Adding these additional funds is absolutely necessary if the Air Force projections are correct, and we will have these systems—the B-2 and the B-52—in our inventory for an additional 30 years.

Turning to the area of space, another jurisdiction of the Strategic Subcommittee, we considered a variety of very important Defense Department space programs. These programs include satellite programs that provide communications, weather, global positioning systems, early warning, and other satellites for defense and national security purposes.

Space programs are critical to the effective use of our Nation's military forces, and each day they grow in importance. This is a very important aspect of our deliberations.

We also included in our consideration the ability of the United States to continue to effectively launch space vehicles by looking at the east coast ranges in Florida and the west coast ranges in California.

The bill includes funding at the requested levels for most of the Department of Defense space programs. There are some exceptions, however. The committee has added \$29 million to continue to improve the readiness and operations safety at the east coast and west coast space launch and range facilities. If we cannot launch vehicles into space, we cannot ensure that we have the appropriate constellation of satellites to communicate, to provide intelligence resources, to provide global positioning signals—all the things that are critical to the success of our military forces in the field. These ranges are important, and these additional funds will upgrade their ability to continue to play a vital role in our national security.

The bill also includes reductions in certain space programs. One of these programs is the Space-Based Infrared Radar-High or SBIRS-High satellite program. This is a satellite program which is critical to replacing an older and aging system of satellites that provides early warning of missile launches and other activities of concern to the United States.

The worldwide reach of this satellite system is key to its ability to warn of any launches and to provide other critical intelligence. But this program has been plagued with serious problems. It is overbudget and years behind schedule. It is in the process of being restructured by the Department of Defense.