



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2002

No. 107

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 4, 2002, at 2 p.m.

## Senate

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 2002

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

(Continued)

AMENDMENT NO. 4444

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 4444.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for leasing of transport/VIP aircraft under any contract not entered into pursuant to full and open competition)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for leasing of transport/VIP aircraft under any contract entered into under any procurement procedures other than pursuant to the Competition and Contracting Act.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this calls for full and open competition in the case of a lease of a transport/VIP aircraft. It would address the complaints of industry with respect to the Boeing 767 tanker lease and Boeing 737 transport/VIP lease and the first five multisensor command and control aircraft, and would replace the JSTARS E-3 AWACS and the RC-135 Rivet Joint aircraft.

Basically, it calls for full and open competition for these aircraft, in the case of four 737 transport aircraft, and,

as I understand, prospective Boeing 767 tanker aircraft.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I misspoke. This amendment does not apply to the 767, only to the 737 aircraft.

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

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. With that amendment, the managers are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4444.

The amendment (No. 4444) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4445

Mr. MCCAIN. For the benefit of my colleagues, I have one more amendment that is not agreed to and would require a rollcall vote, which I understand from the majority leader would be scheduled for tomorrow. I have a statement I would like to read concerning the pending bill and then discuss the amendment, or if the managers so choose, I would discuss the amendment first and then describe my views on the overall legislation.

Mr. President, I send amendment No. 4445 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself, and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 4445.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I object. I do not think we have a copy of that amendment yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue with the reading of the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. The Secretary of the Air Force shall not enter into any lease for transport/VIP aircraft for any period that includes any part of fiscal year 2003 until there is enacted a law, other than an appropriation Act, that authorizes the appropriation of funds in the amount or amounts necessary to enter into the lease and a law appropriating such funds pursuant to such authorization of appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask the managers of the bill if there are any further amendments that will be included in the managers' package.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, if I may respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7709

Mr. INOUE. There are no amendments left in the managers' package. However, there may be amendments brought up at this moment by others, but we do not have any.

Mr. MCCAIN. I understand there may be further amendments brought up for a vote. I was speaking directly concerning the managers' package of amendments which, as we know, sometimes are not voted on individually and included in the package. I am very interested in seeing the managers' package of amendments. I thank the managers so far that they have been very helpful in sharing these amendments with me. I would like to see the final package of managers' amendments before it is agreed to.

This amendment is a pretty straightforward amendment. It requires authorization of appropriations for the leasing of any transport/VIP aircraft. It would ensure that the Senate Armed Services Committee maintained its relevance by requiring Senate Armed Services Committee approval and authorization of any tanker lease.

The amendment basically would instruct the Secretary of the Air Force that he could not enter into a lease for transport/VIP aircraft for any period that includes any part of fiscal year 2003 until he submits a report and there is a law enacted that authorizes the funds necessary to enter into the lease.

This is a very expensive acquisition on the part of the United States Air Force. I believe it should be authorized before this transaction is entered into. It is basically a matter of whether the Senate Armed Services Committee will maintain its relevance over the acquisition of very expensive pieces of equipment. It would be appropriate for the Armed Services Committee to approve of it. That is the way we have traditionally done business around here, particularly on issues of major consequences—although it has fallen into neglect in years past.

I do not think I need to elaborate further on the amendment except I believe it should be authorized before appropriated.

I see the distinguished manager of the bill on the floor. If he would like to respond before I give my statement on the overall Defense appropriations bill, I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Congress has passed legislation, and the President has signed it, that authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to lease, for up to 10 years, these aircraft. It was a decided policy of the Congress based on our advice.

The capital costs of acquiring such equipment now would be such that it would move out of the budget other items that have to be acquired in the moneys needed for homeland defense. So we authorized the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into agreements not to exceed 10 years for these aircraft. They

are readily available for lease. We limit the time they may lease them. But it is a very successful practice in the business world and I think would be a successful practice for the Department of Defense to lease this equipment when necessary and not to have standing around equipment that is not needed.

We believe a leasing policy is the best policy for this type of aircraft. There are a series of competing aircraft available, but it is up to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force to decide which ones they want.

My advice to my friend from Hawaii, and I think he will join me, is that we oppose this legislation. It would in effect modify the legislation, the law that was passed in the last Congress that authorized the procedure for which we are making available funds in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. I concur with the statement of my distinguished friend, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator from Arizona has completed, I am prepared to offer a motion to table this amendment with the understanding that the time for the vote would be established by the leadership sometime tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is fine with me, whenever he wants to make the motion to table. I do have additional comments on the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes, there is further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise again to address the issue of wasteful spending in appropriations measures, in this case, in the bill to fund the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2003. This legislation would provide \$355.5 billion to the Department of Defense. Each year, in provisions too numerous to mention in great detail, this bill funds pork barrel projects with questionable relationship to national defense at a time of scarce resources, budget deficits, and underfunded, urgent defense priorities. This year's measure continues this alarming tradition, by adding 581 programs not requested by the President, at a further cost of \$5.2 billion.

America remains at war, a war that continues to unite Americans in pursuit of a common goal to defeat international terrorism. All Americans have made sacrifices for this war, and many have been deeply affected by it and at times harmed by difficult, related economic circumstances. Our servicemen and women in particular are truly on the front lines in this war, and are separated from their families, risking their lives, and working extraordinarily long hours under the most difficult conditions to accomplish the am-

bitious but necessary task their country has set for them. The weapons we have given them, for all their impressive effects, are, in many cases, neither in quantity nor quality, the best that our government can provide.

For instance, stockpiles of the precision-guided munitions that we relied on so heavily to bring air power to bear very effectively on difficult, often moving targets in Afghanistan, with the least collateral damage possible, are dangerously depleted. This is just one area of critical importance to our success in this war that underscores just how carefully we should be allocating scarce resources to our national defense.

Despite the realities of war, and the serious responsibilities the situation imposes on Congress and the President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has not seen fit to change in any degree its blatant use of defense dollars for projects that may or may not serve some worthy purpose, but that clearly impair our national defense by depriving legitimate defense needs of adequate funding.

Mr. President, even in the middle of a war against terrorism, a war of monumental consequences that is expected to last for some time, the Senate Appropriations Committee remains intent on ensuring that part of the Department of Defense's mission is to disperse corporate welfare. It is a shame that at such a critical time, the United States Senate persists in spending money requested and authorized only for our Armed Forces to satisfy the needs or the desires of interests that are unrelated to defense and even, in truth, unconcerned about the true needs of our military.

An Investor's Business Daily article published late last year entitled *At the Trough: Welfare Checks to Big Business Make No Sense*, stated, "[a]mong the least justified outlays [in the federal budget] is corporate welfare. Budget analyst Stephen Slivinski estimates that business subsidies will run \$87 billion [in 2001], up a third since 1997. Although President Bush proposed \$12 billion in cuts to corporate welfare [in 2001], Congress has proved resistant. Indeed many post-September 11 bailouts have gone to big business. Boeing is one of the biggest beneficiaries. . . . While corporate America gets the profits, taxpayers get the losses. . . . The Constitution authorizes a Congress to promote the general welfare, not enrich Boeing and other corporate behemoths. There is no warrant to take from Peter so Paul can pay higher dividends. In the aftermath of September 11, the American people can ill afford budget profligacy in Washington. If Congress is not willing to cut corporate welfare at a time of national crisis, what is it will to cut?"

Yet, Congress didn't get the message this year. In the FY03 defense appropriations bill we are considering today, the Senate Appropriations Committee added nearly \$1.3 billion to Boeing's

programs, constituting more than 20 percent of the total plus-ups in the bill. As Defense Week noted unequivocally on July 22, "in this bill, Boeing made out like a bandit."

Mr. President, you will recall that last year, during conference negotiations on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002, the Senate Appropriations Committee inserted into the bill unprecedented language to allow the U.S. Air Force to lease 100 Boeing 767 commercial aircraft and convert them to tankers, and to lease four Boeing 737 commercial aircraft for passenger airlift to be used by congressional and Executive Branch officials. Congress did not authorize these leasing provisions in the fiscal year 2002 National Defense Authorization Act, and in fact, the Senate Armed Services Committee was not advised of this effort by the U.S. Air Force during consideration of that authorization measure.

Again this year—without benefit of authorization committee debate or input—the Senate Appropriations Committee has added funding in the FY03 Department of Defense Appropriations bill for \$30.6 million to cover initial leasing costs for the four Boeing 737 VIP transport aircraft noted above. Furthermore, additional language in the bill modifies a provision that had been carefully negotiated by OMB with appropriators last year, and may now permit the Air Force to circumvent standard leasing arrangements and, with respect to the 100 Boeing 767s, may allow the Air Force to extend the termination liability costs over the full term of the lease.

Mr. President, I am concerned that the impact of these provisions has not been adequately scrutinized, and the full cost to taxpayers has not been sufficiently considered. In fact, after review of the Air Force's proposed lease for the four 737s and its comparison of leasing and purchase options for these aircraft, it appears that certain leasing costs are being hidden to make the leasing option appear more cost-effective.

For example, although the Department of Defense self-insures its equipment and would not take out an insurance policy if it purchased these 737s, the Air Force's comparison of the leasing and purchase options assesses at least \$17 million in insurance costs to the purchase option, thereby inflating the estimated purchase price significantly. In addition, the proposed leasing arrangement includes provisions requiring the Air Force to pay to insure the four 737 VIP aircraft and, in the event of loss or destruction of an aircraft, requiring the Air Force to pay a lease cancellation charge equal to one-year's worth of lease payments, or \$10 million. These provisions add not only the cost of insurance, but also another \$10 million to the leasing costs that would not be incurred under a traditional purchase arrangement and have not been disclosed up-front in dis-

cussions with OMB or Congress. These examples of hidden costs illustrate the lack of transparency of this transaction and strongly suggest that the Air Force's analysis of the \$3.9 million advantage to leasing over purchase is illusory.

But you do not have to take my word for it. Rather, in a July 23 letter to Representative Curt Weldon on this matter, Congressional Budget Office Director Dan Crippen advised that the Air Force's estimated purchase price of the four 737s may be too high and that:

Small adjustments in the assumed purchase price, residual value, or insurance cost would reduce the projected savings from leasing the aircraft or make the purchase alternative the less expensive option.

In its analysis, CBO notes that the cost of the purchase option is estimated and not based on any negotiation between the Air Force and Boeing. Significantly, CBO states,

Just as Boeing and the Air Force negotiated a lower lease-price from Boeing's initial offer, CBO believes it might also be possible for the Air Force and Boeing to negotiate a lower purchase price for the aircraft, if the Air Force were a willing buyer. CBO estimates that the Air Force would only need to negotiate a purchase price about \$1 million less per plane than Boeing's initial estimate in order for the cost of the purchase option to be equal to the cost of the lease option, in net present value terms. . . . Using Air Force data and a model for calculating commercial lease payments, we estimate that a purchase price of \$249 million (rather than the \$269 million price used in the Air Force's analysis) would be consistent with the lease terms. . . . We estimate that, if a purchase price for the four aircraft could be negotiated for \$249 million or \$5 million less per aircraft, then the purchase alternative would save about \$15 million compared to the lease. GAO and CBO report that it would cost the government and ultimately the taxpayers between \$13.5 to \$20 million less to purchase the Boeing 737 VIP aircraft than to lease them—but they report it could be more.

In addition, it is not clear that the Air Force has negotiated a fair lease price for these VIP aircraft. Financing experts advise that to evaluate whether leasing is the preferable option, as compared to purchase of aircraft, one month's lease payment should be equal to approximately 1 percent of the total cost of the aircraft. In GAO's current analysis of the proposed Air Force lease, on which I have been briefed, GAO contends that the Air Force's proposed lease with Boeing for four 737 VIP aircraft is \$32 million more than the norm that I have just stated. I am concerned that the Air Force appears to be going against the advice of financial experts not only by choosing to lease instead of purchase these aircraft, but also by not getting a good deal on the lease price. American taxpayers should be concerned by this behavior.

I would like to note that OMB Director Mitch Daniels has often indicated his preference to maintain scrutiny of Government leasing practices out of regard for U.S. taxpayers. Just last year, in a letter from the OMB Director to

Senator KENT CONRAD, OMB cautioned against eliminating rules intended to reduce leasing abuses. OMB's letter emphasized that the Budget Enforcement Act—BEA—scoring rules:

. . . were specifically designed to encourage the use of financing mechanisms that minimize taxpayers' costs by eliminating the unfair advantage provided to lease-purchases by the previous scoring rules. Prior to the BEA, agencies only needed budget authority for the first year's lease payment, even though the agreement was a legally enforceable commitment to fully pay for the asset over time.

OMB's letter continued by explaining that this loophole had permitted the General Services Administration to agree to 11 lease-purchase agreements with a total, full-term cost of \$1.7 billion, but to budget only the first year of lease payments. OMB's letter stated:

[t]he scoring hid the fact that these agreements had a higher economic cost than traditional direct purchases and in some cases allowed projects to go forward despite significant cost overruns. . . .

In my view, this leasing proposal for Boeing 737 VIP aircraft also puts the Air Force at risk of being unable to procure higher priority items needed to fight the war on terrorism. On March 1, 2002, the Air Force presented Congress with a list of its top priorities encompassing 38 items totaling \$3.8 billion. Within its top 10 programs, the Air Force asked for several essential items that would directly support our current war effort: wartime munitions, aircraft engine replacement parts, night vision goggles, anti-terrorism/force protection efforts, bomber and fighter upgrades and self protection equipment, and combat search and rescue helicopters for downed pilots; yet, the list also includes these four VIP aircraft. In reviewing these Air Force priorities, I don't know what to be more critical about regarding the Air Force Secretary's effort on these VIP aircraft—that he's pushing in this time of war for this deal with Boeing for VIP aircraft or that his 13th priority of the top 38 in this time of war is for VIP aircraft for Executive Branch and congressional officials. Is it lost on the Air Force Secretary that we are at war?

I have asked OMB Director Daniels to continue his strong oversight of Government leasing practices, and I ask the Senate today to closely scrutinize this unprecedented, costly leasing deal for Boeing 737 VIP transport aircraft. But, this Boeing deal is just another example of Congress's political meddling and how outside special interest groups have obstructed the military's ability to channel resources where they are most needed. I will repeat what I've said many, many times before—the military needs less money spent on pork and more spent to redress the serious problems caused by a decade of declining defense budgets.

This bill includes many more examples where congressional appropriators show that they have no sense of priority when it comes to spending the

taxpayers' money. The insatiable appetite in Congress for wasteful spending grows more and more as the total amount of pork added to appropriations bills considered in the Senate so far this year—an amount totaling nearly \$7 billion.

Mr. President, I look forward to the day when my appearances on the Senate floor for this purpose are no longer necessary. I reiterate—over \$5.2 billion in unrequested defense programs in the defense appropriations bill have been added by the Committee. Consider how that \$5.2 billion, when added to the savings gained through additional base closings and more cost-effective business practices, could be used so much more effectively. The problems of our armed forces, whether in terms of force structure or modernization, could be more assuredly addressed and our warfighting ability greatly enhanced. The American taxpayers expect more of us, as do our brave service men and women who are, without question, fighting this war on global terrorism on our behalf. But for now, unfortunately, they must witness us, seemingly blind to our responsibilities at this time of war, going about our business as usual.

Mr. President, I may be wrong. I may be wrong in all of the information I just provided to the Senate. There is legitimate room for legitimate debate. I believe OMB and GAO have clearly stated that we could save money by not leasing this aircraft. Certainly we could save money through competition and certainly we could save money to the taxpayers by negotiating a better deal with the Boeing Aircraft Company—which, by the way, although President Bush proposed \$12 billion in cuts to corporate welfare, Boeing is one of the biggest beneficiaries. In other words, Boeing as the Defense Weekly noted unequivocally on July 22, in reference to the Defense Appropriations Committee bill that we are considering today, Defense Weekly noted unequivocally on July 22, "In this bill, Boeing made out like a bandit."

I think they did. I think they did.

The managers of the bill and I could debate what is right and what is wrong as far as these numbers are concerned. I think I have compelling numbers on my side that would indicate we could either lease or purchase at a much less cost than the appropriators put in the bill. But the point here is that it should be authorized. It should not be done by the Appropriations Committee without authorization. This is what we come back to time after time after time on the floor of this Senate.

Where is the role of the Senate Armed Services Committee to authorize the purchase of aircraft worth many tens of millions of dollars? They have been bypassed.

I hope the majority of my colleagues would recognize that an issue of this magnitude deserves the hearings and scrutiny that can be conducted by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The job of the Appropriations Committee is to appropriate funds that have been previously authorized. I hope my colleagues will agree with that.

I ask unanimous consent a list of Appropriations Committee earmarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

FY2003 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS	
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	
Undistributed: Adopted legislative proposals .....	6.4
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	
Undistributed: Adopted legislative proposals .....	2.9
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	
Undistributed: Adopted legislative proposals .....	0.6
MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	
Undistributed:	
B-52 force structure .....	3.7
Adopted legislative proposals .....	4.2
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	
Other Training and Support:	
Additional AGR end strength (Transfer from BA1) .....	11.4
Sustainment of current AGR force .....	26.1
Undistributed: Adopted legislative proposals .....	1.0
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	
Undistributed: Adopted legislative proposals .....	0.1
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	
Undistributed:	
Emergency Spill Response and Preparedness Program .....	0.6
Adopted legislative proposals .....	2.1
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	
Other Training and Support: Additional AGR end strength .....	
	0.8
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	
Operating Forces:	
USARPAC C4I PACMERS .....	5.0
USARPAC C4 shortfalls .....	6.0
Hunter UAV .....	10.0
Training and Recruiting:	
SROTC-Air Battle Captain .....	2.0
SCOLA Language training .....	1.0
Ft. Knox Distance Learning .....	3.0
Administration and service wide activities:	
LOGTECH .....	2.0
Biometrics support .....	10.0
Army conservation and ecosystem management .....	4.0
Innovative Safety Management .....	5.0
Rock Island Bridge Repair .....	2.3
Yukon training infrastructure and access upgrades .....	2.0
Fort Wainwright Bldg. 600 repairs ..	4.5
Fort Wainwright Utilidors .....	10.0
Tanana River Bridge Study .....	1.5
Undistributed:	
Classified .....	41.8
Anti-corrosion programs .....	1.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	
Operating Forces:	
Shipyards Apprentice program .....	10.0
Warfare Tactics PMRF facilities ..	20.0
Hydrographic Center of Excellence Cntr. for Excellence in Disaster Management .....	3.5
MK-45 Overhaul .....	5.0
MK-245 Decoys .....	15.0
Mobilization: Ship Disposal Project ..	2.0
Training and Recruiting: Naval Sea Cadet Corps .....	5.0
Administration and Statewide Activities:	
Navy-Wide PVCS Enterprise License .....	5.0
Navy Armory Inventory and Custody Tracking .....	0.8

Flash Detection System .....	0.9
Undistributed:	
Classified .....	29.4
Anti-Corrosion Program .....	1.0
Stainless steel sanitary spaces .....	5.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	
Operating Forces: Polar Fleece shirts ..	1.0
Undistributed: Anti-corrosion programs .....	1.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	
Operating Forces:	
B-52 Attrition Reserve .....	40.0
B-1 Bomber Modifications .....	11.0
11th AF Range upgrades—fiber optics and power infrastructure .....	8.0
University Partnership for Operational Support .....	4.0
Mobilization: PACAF strategic airlift Training and Recruiting: MBU-20 Oxygen Mask .....	3.0
Administration and Service-wide Activities:	
Hickam AFB Alternative Fuel Vehicle Program .....	1.0
Eielson AFB Utilidors .....	10.0
ALCOM Wide Mobile Radio Network .....	0.4
Range Residue recycling program ..	3.0
Undistributed:	
Classified .....	81.4
Anti-corrosion Programs .....	1.0
MTAPP .....	6.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	
Operating Forces: SPECWARCOM:	
Mission Support Center .....	2.0
Training and Recruiting: Joint Military Education Venture Forum .....	0.5
Administration and Service-wide activities:	
Innovative Readiness Training .....	10.0
DLA-PTAP .....	5.0
DODEA-UNI Math Teacher Leadership .....	1.0
Galena IDEA .....	5.0
OEA CUHSC, Fitzsimmons Army Hospital .....	10.0
OEA Relocate Barrow Landfill .....	4.0
OEA Port of Anchorage Intermodal Marine Facility Program .....	5.0
OSD Clara Barton Center .....	3.0
OSD Pacific Command Regional Initiative .....	6.0
OSD Intelligence Fusion Study Continuation .....	5.0
Undistributed:	
Legacy (Programs for Naval Archaeology) .....	12.0
Impact Aid .....	30.0
Impact Aid for Children with Disabilities .....	5.0
Operation Working Shield .....	5.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	
Operating Forces: ECWCS .....	4.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	
Administration and service wide activities: Command server activities ..	
	4.0
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	
Operating Force:	
ECWCS .....	6.0
Homeland Security Training Camp Ground .....	3.8
1st Bn, 118th Infantry Brigade Rifle Range .....	3.0
Distributed battle simulation program support .....	0.9
Administration and service wide activities: Information operations ..	6.0
Undistributed:	
Additional Military Technicians ..	11.3
Distance Learning .....	50.0
Emergency Spill response .....	0.5
National Guard Youth Challenge, Camp Minden .....	1.7
SE Regional Training .....	2.0

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		Regional Medical Distributive Learning .....	8.0	E-kit modifications .....	20.0
Operating Forces: ECWCS .....	4.0	Digitization of DoD Technical Manuals .....	40.0	AN/AL-67 (V) 3&4 countermeasure ser .....	5.0
Administration and service wide activities: Information Operations ....	5.0	Tactical Bridge, Float-Ribbon: Common Bridge Transporter .....	4.0	ALQ-135 Band 1.5 .....	20.0
Undistributed: Defense Support Evaluation Group—NW .....	4.0	GRND Standoff Mine Detection System: Handheld Standoff Mine Detection System .....	5.0	APG-63 (v)1 Program .....	7.5
Montana Air National Guard: Training Range Planning and Study .....	1.0	Combat Support Medical: Hemorrhage Control Dressings .....	4.0	C-130: AAN/AYW-1 dual autopilot (ANG) ..	0.8
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		Rapid Intravenous Fusion Pumps ...	2.5	Senior Scout; COMINT system .....	3.0
Utility F/W (MR) Aircraft: 2 UC-35 aircraft .....	15.2	Mission Modules-Engineering: 2 Additional Companies .....	7.0	NP2000 propeller support upgrades ..	10.0
UH-60 Blackhawk (MYP): 9 Blackhawk helicopters .....	96.3	Logistic Support Vessel: Vessel Completion .....	8.1	MISC Production Charges: Magnetic bearing cooling turbine technology .....	5.0
Helicopter-New Training: 6 TH-67 helicopters .....	9.6	Training Devices, Nonsystem: EST 2000 .....	5.0	LITENING targeting pod upgrades (ANG) .....	24.9
AH-64 MODS: Apache engine Spares .....	64.0	Advanced Aviation Institutional Training Simulator .....	10.0	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	
Bladefold kits .....	2.0	MOUT Intrumentation at Ft. Campbell .....	4.0	AGM-65D MAVERICK: Additional Missiles .....	4.0
UH-60 MODS: Army NG Pacific CSAR Mods .....	3.0	MOUT Instrumentation at Ft. Richardson .....	4.3	Evolved Expendable Launch VEH: Mission Assurance .....	14.5
DCS-HUMS .....	6.0	172nd SIB Army Range Improvement Program .....	7.5	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	
Common Ground Equipment: HELO Maintenance Work Platform System .....	2.0	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		Sensor Fuzed Weapon: Additional Funding .....	20.0
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		MH-60R: AQS-22 Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS) .....	5.0	Flares: BOL IR MJU-52/B Expendables for ANG .....	1.0
Patriot System Summary: Additional Missiles .....	25.0	AH-1W Series: Tailboom strakes .....	6.5	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	
HIMARS Launcher: Additional Launchers .....	5.0	Night Targeting System .....	6.0	Intelligence Comm Equipment: Eagle Vision .....	25.0
WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES PROCUREMENT, ARMY		SH-60 Series: Integrated Mechanical diagnostics .....	9.0	Theater Air Control System Improvements: AN/TSP-75 .....	12.0
Bradley Base Sustainment: Electronics Obsolescence Reduction ....	4.5	Special Project Aircraft: AMOSS .....	5.0	Air Force Physical Security: Containment Air Processing System ....	4.0
BFVS Series: Bradley Reactive Armor .....	35.0	Common Ground Equipment: Direct Squadron Support Training .....	5.0	Combat Training Ranges: Mobile Remote Emitter Simulators	11.0
AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY		WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		AK Air Training Upgrade/ P4BE Pods .....	5.0
81MM Mortar, All Types: 81MM Mortar, Infared M816 .....	4.0	RAM .....	10.0	11th AF Unmanned Threat Emitter Modification Program .....	11.0
CTG, Mortar, 120 MM, All Types: White Phosphorus Facility Equipment .....	13.0	Drones and Decoys: ITALD .....	20.0	11th AF JAWSS-Scoring System Processor .....	6.7
Proj ARTY 155MM HE M107: Additional Funding .....	1.0	CWIS MODS: Block 1B .....	38.0	Base Information Infrastructure: AK Wide radio (LMR) Program .....	6.7
Bunker Defeating Munition (BDM): SMAW-D Bunker Defeating Munition .....	5.0	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		Items Less than \$5 Million: Emergency Bailout Parachute System .....	3.0
Rocket, Hydra 70, All Types: Additional Funding .....	40.0	.50 Caliber: .50 Caliber SLAP .....	0.3	Wall Style Troop Seats .....	3.0
Demolition Munitions, All Types: MDI Demolition Initiators .....	2.0	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY		Mechanized Material Handling: Point of Maintenance Initiative—POMX ..	8.0
Ammunition Peculiar Equipment: Additional Funding .....	3.0	Carrier Replacement Program: Advance Procurement .....	229.0	Items less than \$5 Million: Vaccine Facility Project .....	1.0
Provision of Industrial Facilities: Munitions Enterprise Technology Insertion .....	1.3	LCAC SLEP: Additional Craft .....	22.0	Heilbasket Technology .....	4.5
Conventional Ammo Demilitarization: Additional Funding .....	10.0	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	
Arms Initiative: Additional Funding .....	10.0	Items Less than \$5 Million: ICAS .....	8.0	SOF Rotary Wing Upgrades: ATIRCM/CMWS .....	12.0
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		Operating Forces IPE: IPDE Enhancement and PDM Interoperability .....	10.0	SOF Intelligence Systems: Portable Intelligence Collection and Relay Capability .....	6.0
Tactical Trailers/Dolly Sets: M871A3 22.5 Ton Trailers .....	3.5	PHNSY Equipment .....	15.0	LAW Trajectory Mounts (M72) .....	1.0
HI MOB Multi-Purp WHLD Vehicles: Additional Vehicles for NG .....	7.5	Weapons Range Support Equipment: Mobile Threat Emitter .....	10.0	Maritime Equipment Mods: MkV Advanced Shock Mitigating Seats .....	2.0
Additional Vehicles for Reserve .....	7.5	PMRF Equipment .....	9.8	Individual Protection: M40 Masks .....	3.0
Up-Armored Vehicles .....	29.0	Other Aviation Support Equipment: Joint Tactical Data Integration ....	15.0	M45 Masks .....	1.0
Firetrucks & Associated Firefighting Equipment: Tactical Firefighting Equipment .....	10.0	SSN Combat Control Systems: SSN Modernization .....	13.0	M48 Masks .....	0.5
Armored Security Vehicles: Additional Vehicles .....	25.0	Surface ASW Support Equipment: MK 32 SVTT Remanufacture .....	5.0	MEU Masks .....	2.5
Combat Identification Program: Quick Fix Program .....	1.0	Submarine Training Device Mods: INTERLOCKS Development Tools .....	4.0	Decontamination: M12 Decon system upgrades .....	6.0
Comms-Elec Equip Fielding: Virtual Patch Crisis Communication Coordination .....	3.2	Tactical Vehicles: Additional MTRV	35.0	M291 Decontamination Kits .....	1.0
Base Support Communications: AK Wide Mobile Radio Program .....	7.7	Other Supply Support Equipment: Serial Number Tracking System ....	6.0	M100 Sorbent Decontamination Kits .....	1.0
Information Systems: USARPAC C4 Equipment .....	6.0	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		Joint Biological Defense Program: Bio-Detection Kit storage .....	1.0
Sentinel Mods: AN/MPQ-64 .....	20.0	COMM Switching & Control System: Joint Enhanced Corps Communication System .....	25.0	JBFDS-BIDS .....	10.0
Striker Family: Additional Units .....	3.5	Material Handling Equipment: Tram Training Devices: Live Fire Training Range Upgrades .....	2.0	Collective Protection: Chem-Bio protective shelters .....	7.0
Automated Data Processing Equip: NG Distance Learning Courseware .....	7.5	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		Filter Surveillance Program .....	1.5
Rock Island Arsenal Automatic Identification Technology .....	3.0	C-17(MYP): Fully Fund Purchase of 15 Aircraft Maintenance Trainer .....	585.9	M49 Fixed Installation Filter .....	1.0
		EC-130J: Purchase 1 additional aircraft .....	11.3	Contamination Avoidance: M22 Automatic Chemical Agent Alarms .....	7.0
		C-40 ANG: Leasing costs .....	30.6	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY	
		B-52: Attrition reserve .....	25.2	Defense Research Sciences: Animal Modeling Genetics Research .....	1.0
		B-52 electronic countermeasures ....	10.0	Biofilm Research .....	1.0
		F-15: Block Upgrades .....	15.0	Integrated Desert Terrain Analysis Knowledge Management Fusion Center .....	5.0

Optical Technologies Research .....	2.0	Medical Advanced Technologies:	Casting Emissions Reductions Program .....	8.0
Prediction of Land-Atmosphere Interactions .....	2.5	Brain, Biology, and Machine Initiative .....	Transportable Detonation Chamber .....	5.0
University and Industry Research Centers:		Center for Integration of Medicine and Innovative Technology .....	Waste Minimization and Pollution Prevention .....	3.0
Armor Materials Design—Laser based material processing .....	2.5	Juvenile Diabetes Research .....	Logistics and Engineer Equipment—Adv. Dev: Composite Prototype Hull Design for Theater Support Vessel .....	5.5
Composite Materials Center of Excellence .....	0.8	Laser Fusion Elastin .....	All Source Analysis System: Non-traditional Intelligence Analysis Toolset (NTIAT) .....	1.0
Dendrimer Nanotechnology Research .....	3.5	Medical Simulation Training Initiative (MSTI) .....	Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles: HEMTT 2 Technology Insertion Program .....	16.0
Ferroelectric Materials Nanofabrication .....	1.5	National Bioterrorism Civilian Medical Response (CIMERC) .....	Future Combat Systems SDD (formerly Armored Systems Modernization): Non-Line of Sight Cannon Development .....	173.0
Institute for Creative Technologies Jidoka Project .....	5.0	Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Project .....	Combined Arms Tactical Trainers (CATT) Core: AVCATT—A Upgrade .....	1.5
University Research Coalition for Manufacturing and Design .....	4.0	Texas Training & Technology for Trauma and Terrorism .....	Aviation—Eng. Dev.: High Level Ballistic Protection .....	0.5
University Program in Mobile Robotics .....	3.0	Aviation Advanced Technology: UAV Data links-AMUST .....	Weapons and Munitions—Eng. Dev: Commonly Remotely-Operated Weapons System Station (CROWS) .....	2.0
Materials Technology:		Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology:	Mortar Anti-Personnel Anti-Material (MAPAM) .....	5.0
Advanced Materials Processing .....	4.0	Composite Body Parts—CAV Technology Transition .....	Command, Control, Communications Environmental for C3 Mobile Services .....	4.0
Electronics Components Reliability FCS Composite Research .....	2.5	Hybrid Electric Vehicles .....	Manpower, Personnel, and Training Advanced Technology: Army Aircrew Coordination Training .....	2.0
FCS Composite Research .....	3.0	IMPACT .....	Missile Simulation Technology .....	11.0
Future Affordable Multi-Utility Materials for FCS .....	2.0	Mobile Parts Hospital .....	Landmine Warfare and Barrier Advanced Technology:	
Low Cost Enabling Technologies .....	3.0	NAC Standardization Exchange for Product Data (N-STEP) .....	Advanced Demining Technology ....	5.0
Sensors and Electronic Survivability: Advanced Sensors and Obscurants ..	2.0	Pacific Rim Corrosion Project .....	Electromagnetic Wave Detection and Imaging Transceiver .....	2.5
Missile Technology:		Rapid Prototyping .....	Joint Service Small Arms Program: Objective Crew Served Weapons ....	5.0
Advanced Composite Chassis .....	2.0	Tracked Hybrid Electric Vehicle ...	Night Visions Advanced Technology: Night Vision Fusion .....	4.5
E-Strike Short Range Air Defense Radar .....	3.0	Command, Control, Communications, Advanced Technology: Networking Environmental for C3 Mobile Services .....	Warfighter/Firefighter Position, Location, and Tracking Sensor ...	3.0
Advanced Concepts and Simulation: Institute for Creative Technologies—Interactive training tech .....	5.0	Missile Simulation Technology .....	Military Engineering Advanced Technology:	
Photonics .....	5.0	Landmine Warfare and Barrier Advanced Technology:	Canola Oil Fuel Cell .....	1.5
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology:		Advanced Demining Technology ....	Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell Technology .....	5.0
21st Century Truck .....	17.0	Electromagnetic Wave Detection and Imaging Transceiver .....	Solid Oxide Fuel Development .....	5.0
Advanced Coatings Research .....	1.5	Joint Service Small Arms Program: Objective Crew Served Weapons ....	Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology:	
COMBAT .....	5.0	Night Visions Advanced Technology: Night Vision Fusion .....	IMRSV Program for Simulation Based Operation .....	3.0
Fastening and Joining Research ....	1.8	Warfighter/Firefighter Position, Location, and Tracking Sensor ...	Army Missile Defense System Integration .....	14.0
Next Generation Smart Truck .....	4.0	Military Engineering Advanced Technology:	Kodiak Launch Infrastructure, Transportation and Security .....	10.0
Chemical, Smoke, and Equipment Defeating Technology: Vaporous Hydrogen Peroxide Technology .....	8.0	Canola Oil Fuel Cell .....	SMDC Institute for Chemical Assembly of Nanoscale .....	3.0
Weapons and Munitions Technology:		Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell Technology .....	Targeted Defense for Asymmetric Biological Attack (TDABA) .....	1.0
Nanotechnology Consortium .....	2.0	Solid Oxide Fuel Development .....	Army Missile Defense Integration (DEMVAL):	
Phyto-Extraction Technology .....	3.0	Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology:	Advanced Tactical Operations Center .....	1.0
Electronics and Electronic Devices: Display and Development and Evaluation Laboratory .....	3.5	IMRSV Program for Simulation Based Operation .....	Battlefield Ordnance Awareness (BOA) .....	4.0
Flat Panel Displays .....	10.0	Army Missile Defense System Integration .....	Cooperative Micro-Satellite Experiment (CMSE) .....	5.0
Low Cost Reusable Alkaline Manganese Zinc .....	0.6	Kodiak Launch Infrastructure, Transportation and Security .....	Eagles Eyes .....	4.0
Portable Hybrid Electric Power Systems .....	2.0	SMDC Institute for Chemical Assembly of Nanoscale .....	Enhanced Scamjet Mixing .....	3.0
Countermine Systems:		Targeted Defense for Asymmetric Biological Attack (TDABA) .....	Family of Systems Simulator (FOSSIM) .....	2.0
Acoustic Landmine Detection .....	3.0	Army Missile Defense Integration (DEMVAL):	Low Cost Interceptor (LCI) .....	8.0
Polymer Based Landmine Detection .....	2.0	Advanced Tactical Operations Center .....	MTHEL .....	20.0
Environmental Quality Technology: Environmental Response and Security Protection (ERASP) Program	5.0	Battlefield Ordnance Awareness (BOA) .....	P-3 Micro-Power Devices for Missile Applications .....	3.0
Military Engineering Technology: Center for Geo-Sciences .....	2.0	Cooperative Micro-Satellite Experiment (CMSE) .....	Radar Power Technology .....	4.5
Stationary Fuel Cell Initiative .....	10.0	Eagles Eyes .....	Supercluster Distributed Memory Technology .....	4.0
University Partnership for Operational Support .....	4.0	Enhanced Scamjet Mixing .....	Tank and Medium Caliber Ammunition: MRM/TERM TM3 .....	15.0
Warfighter Technology: Chemical/Biological Nanoparticle Materials ....	3.5	Family of Systems Simulator (FOSSIM) .....	Environmental Quality Technology Dem/Val:	
Medical Technology:		Low Cost Interceptor (LCI) .....	Army Environmental Enhancement Program .....	1.0
Dermal Phase Meter .....	1.5	MTHEL .....		
EndoBiologics Vaccination Program .....	2.0	P-3 Micro-Power Devices for Missile Applications .....		
Gulf War Illness .....	1.0	Radar Power Technology .....		
International Rehabilitation Network .....	5.0	Supercluster Distributed Memory Technology .....		
Hemorrhage Control Dressings .....	3.5	Tank and Medium Caliber Ammunition: MRM/TERM TM3 .....		
Remote Acoustic Hemostasis .....	4.6	Environmental Quality Technology Dem/Val:		
Tissue Replacement and Repair for Battlefield Injuries .....	2.5	Army Environmental Enhancement Program .....		
Warfighter Advanced Technologies: Biosystems Technology .....	5.0			
Personnel Navigation for Future Warfighter .....	5.0			
Scorpion Future Combat Helmet ...	8.0			

Continuous Manufac Process for Metal Matrix Composites .....	0.5	Power Projection Advanced Technology:	SC-21 Total Ship Engineering:
MANTECH for Cylindrical Zinc Air Battery for Land Warrior Sys. ....	3.0	HYSWAC Lifting Body Development .....	Littoral Combat Ship Research and Development .....
MERWS—Phase II .....	5.7	LSC(X) .....	2.0
Army Space & Missile Defense Command: Domed Housing .....	2.0	Precision Strike Navigator .....	1.0
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY		Variable Engine Nozzle .....	3.0
Defense Research Sciences:		Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller Helicopter Tech. Demo .....	4.0
Consortium for Military Personnel Research .....	2.0	Force Protection Advanced Technology:	Solid-State Spy-1E Multi Mission Radar .....
Robotic Mine Countermeasures .....	3.0	HTS AC Synchronous Propulsion Motor and Generator .....	3.0
Power Projection Applied Research:		Wave Powered Electric Power Generating System for Remote Naval Common Picture Advanced Technology: Improved Shipboard Combat Information Center .....	10.0
Interrogator for High Speed Research .....	2.0	Warfighter Sustainment Advanced Technology:	4.0
Low-cost Fused Remote Sensors for Target Identification .....	2.0	Energy and Environmental Technology .....	4.0
Force Protection Applied Research:		Integrated Aircraft Health .....	2.0
Anti-Corrosion Modeling Software Endeavor .....	4.0	Wire Chaffing Detection Technology .....	2.0
Fusion Processor .....	4.0	Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration: Project Albert .....	7.0
Integrated Fuel Processor—Fuel Cell System .....	3.0	Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Technology: National Surface Treatment Center .....	4.0
Laser Welding and Cutting .....	3.0	Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology: University Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) .....	6.0
Miniature Autonomous Vehicles (MAVs) .....	1.5	Advanced Technology Transition: Man-portable Quadruple Resonance Landmine Detection Program .....	5.0
Modular Advanced Composite Hull Form .....	2.0	Aviation Survivability:	5.0
Small Watercraft Demonstrator .....	5.0	Modular Helmet .....	3.0
Unmanned Sea Surface Vehicles .....	9.0	Rotorcraft External Airbag Protection System (REAPS) .....	4.0
Communications, Command and Control, Intelligence, Surveillance:		ASW Systems Deployment: LASH ASW .....	5.0
Common Sensor Module .....	3.0	Surface Torpedo Defense: Anti-Torpedo .....	2.0
Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology: Innovative Communications Materials—Thick Film ..	1.0	Carrier Systems Development: Advanced Battlestation/Decision Support System .....	6.0
Common Picture Applied Research:		Shipboard System Component Development:	8.0
Modular Command Center .....	15.0	MTTC/IPI .....	3.0
Tactical Component Network Applications Integration .....	35.0	REPTILE—Regional Electric Power Tech Integration and Leveraging .....	1.0
Theater Undersea Warfare .....	10.0	Surface Vessel Torpedo Tubes-Airbag Technology .....	5.0
UESA .....	15.0	Advanced Submarine System Development:	5.0
Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research:		Electronic Motor Brush Technology .....	3.0
Advanced Fouling & Corrosion Control Coatings .....	7.0	Electromagnetic Actuator Development .....	1.9
Advanced Materials and Intelligent Processing .....	3.0	Fiber Optic Multi Line Towed Array (FOMLTA) .....	5.0
Biodegradable Polymers for Naval Applications .....	1.3	High Performance Metal Fiber Brushes .....	7.5
Bioenvironmental Hazards Research Program .....	2.0	Rotary Electromagnetic (Torpedo) Launcher System .....	2.0
Carbon Foam for Navy Applications .....	0.5	Ship Concept Advanced Design: Advanced, Integrated Low-Profile Antenna (HF, VHF, UHF) .....	4.0
Modernization Through Remanufacturing and Conversion (MTRAC) .....	4.0	Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System:	2.5
Ceramic and Carbon Based Materials .....	2.0	Innovative Stand-off Door Breaching Munition .....	2.5
Titanium Matrix Composites Program .....	2.6	Nanoparticles for the Neutralization of Facility Threats .....	3.0
Visualization and Technical Information .....	2.0	Navy Energy Program:	3.0
RF Systems Applied Research:		Proton Exchange Membrane (PET) Fuel Cell Technology .....	5.0
Advanced Semiconductor Research High Brightness Electron Source Program .....	3.0	Thermally Activated Chiller/Heater Land Attack Technology: Semi-Automated IMINT Processing (SAIP) ..	2.0
Maritime Synthetic Range .....	6.0	Nonlethal Weapons Dem/Val:	3.0
Nanoscale Science and Technology Program .....	3.0	Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Technology Innovation .....	2.0
Silicon Carbide High Power Diode Development .....	2.5	Urban Ops Environment Research ..	2.0
Wide Bandgap Silicon Carbide Semiconductor Research .....	2.5	E-2C Radar Modernization: E-2C Technical Upgrade for Optimized Radar .....	8.0
Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research:			
Hydrography Research .....	2.5		
SEACOOS—Southeast Atlantic Coastal Ocean Observing System ..	8.0		
Undersea Warfare Applied Research:			
Acoustic Temperature Profiler .....	3.0		
Low Acoustic Signature Motor (LAMPREY) .....	3.5		
SAUVIM .....	2.0		
Magnetostrictive Transduction (TERFENOL-D) .....	5.4		
			RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE
			Materials:
			Composite materials training program .....
			0.5
			Nanostructured Materials .....
			5.0
			Advanced Materials Deposition for Semiconductor Nano .....
			1.5
			Closed cell foam material .....
			1.0
			Durable coatings for aircraft systems .....
			4.0
			Free electron laser materials processing .....
			3.0
			Titanium Matrix .....
			4.4
			Metals affordability initiative .....
			7.5
			Nanostructured protective coatings Strategic partnership for nanotechnology .....
			6.0

Cost-effective composite materials for UAVs .....		Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Global Hawk lithium batteries	2.5	2.0	Ballistic Missile Defense Technology: Massively parallel optical interconnects .....	2.0
Human Effectiveness Applied Research: Human effectiveness applied research .....	9.8	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems: SYERS .....	4.0	4.0	Wide Bandgap Silicon Carbide Semiconductor Research .....	5.0
Aerospace Sensors: AFRL information and sensors directorate .....	2.5	Ultra-wideband airborne laser communications .....	3.0	3.0	Gallium Nitride high power microwave switch .....	4.0
Space Technology:		Theater airborne reconnaissance (TARS) P31 .....	13.6	13.6	Bottom anti-reflective coatings (BARC) .....	5.0
Lightweight and novel Structures ..	1.0	Manned Reconnaissance Systems: Network-centric collaborative (NCCT) .....	4.0	4.0	Improved materials for Optical memories—Phase II SBIR .....	3.3
HAARP incoherent scatter radar ...	3.0	Industrial Preparedness: Bipolar wafer-cell NIMH battery .....	2.0	2.0	PMRF upgrades .....	25.0
ICASS .....	2.0	Productivity, Reliability, Availability (PRAMPO): Modeling/Re-engineering for Oklahoma City ALC ..	4.0	4.0	ESPRIT .....	3.5
Seismic Nuclear Test Monitoring research .....	5.0	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE			Range Data monitor .....	3.5
Substrates for solar cells .....	2.0	Defense Research Sciences:			Thick Film silicon coatings .....	3.0
Carbon foam for aircraft and spacecraft .....	0.5	Advanced photonics composites .....	2.0	2.0	SHOTS .....	5.0
TechSat 21 .....	5.0	University optoelectronics .....	2.0	2.0	High data rate communications .....	5.0
Command, Control, and Communications:		Life Science Education and Research .....	5.0	5.0	Advanced RF technical development .....	4.0
Information protection and authentication .....	3.0	Molecular electronics .....	2.0	2.0	AEOS MWIR adaptive optics .....	3.0
Secure Knowledge management .....	5.0	University Research Initiatives:			Wafer scale (ultra flay) planarization .....	5.0
Advanced Materials for Weapons Systems:		Infotonics .....	4.0	4.0	High resolution color imaging .....	5.0
Low bandwidth medical collaboration .....	2.0	MEMS Sensor for rolling element bearings .....	1.5	1.5	Chemical and Biological Defense Program:	
Powdered programmable process .....	5.0	Nanoscience and nanomaterials .....	5.0	5.0	Bio-adhesion research .....	3.0
Assessing aging of military aircraft	2.0	Corrosion protection of aluminum alloys in aircraft .....	2.0	2.0	Advanced Chemical detector .....	6.0
Ceramic matrix composites for engines .....	5.0	Fastening and joining research .....	1.0	1.0	Agroterror prediction and risk assessment .....	5.0
Flight Vehicle Technology: E-SMART threat agent network .....	5.0	Secure Group communications .....	2.0	2.0	High intensity pulsed radiation facility for chem-bio defense .....	2.0
Aerospace Technology DEV/DEMO: Sensor Craft (UAV) .....	5.0	University Bioinformatics .....	2.0	2.0	Vaccine Stabilization .....	3.0
Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology: Advanced Aluminum Aerostructures .....	4.0	AHI .....	4.0	4.0	Special Technical Support: Graphic Oriented Electronic Technical Manuals .....	1.5
Crew Systems and Personnel Protection: TALON .....	5.0	Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research: DEPCOR .....	10.0	10.0	Generic Logistics R&D Tech. Demonstrations:	
Advanced Spacecraft Technology:		Chemical and Biological Defense Program:			Fuel Cell Locomotive .....	1.0
Robust aerospace composite materials/structures .....	3.5	Bug to drug countermeasures .....	5.0	5.0	Computer assisted technology transfer (CATT) .....	4.0
Thin amorphous solar arrays .....	10.0	Chemical Warfare protection .....	1.2	1.2	Microelectronics testing technology/obsolescence program .....	10.0
MAUI space Surveillance System (MSSS):		Detection of chem-bio pollutant agents in water .....	5.0	5.0	Ultra-low power battlefield sensors	25.0
MSSS Operations and Research .....	35.0	Nanomulsions of decontamination .....	5.0	5.0	Chameleon mini wireless system ...	5.0
PANSTARS .....	15.0	Bioprocessing Facility .....	7.0	7.0	Vehicle fuel cell program .....	10.0
Multi-Disciplinary Advanced Development Space Technology: Aerospace relay mirror system .....	7.0	Historically Black Colleges and Universities:			Agile Part Demonstration (CCDOT)	5.0
Conventional Weapons Technology: LOCAAS .....	7.0	American Indian Tribal Colleges ...	3.5	3.5	New England Manufacturing supply chain .....	6.0
C31 Advanced Deployment: Fusion SIGNIT enhancements to ELINT ...	4.0	Technical assistance program .....	3.0	3.0	Advanced Electronic Technologies: Defense Tech Link .....	1.5
Pollution Prevention (DEM/VAL): 02 Diesel air quality improvement at Nellis, AFB .....	1.0	Embedded Software and Pervasive Computing: Software for autonomous robots (AE-02) .....	2.0	2.0	Advanced lithography—thin film research .....	6.0
B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber: LO maintenance improvements .....	10.0	Biological Warfare Defense: Bioscience Center for Infoscience .....	2.1	2.1	Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations: Guardian portable radiation search tool .....	5.0
EW Developments: BLAID upgrade to ALR-69 .....	14.7	Chemical and Biological Defense Program: Chem-bio defense initiatives fund .....	25.0	25.0	High Performance Computing Modernization Program	
MILSTAR LDR/MDR Satellite Communications: Painting and coating pollution prevention .....	1.0	Tactical Technology: CEROS .....	7.0	7.0	Missile Defense engineering and assessment center .....	20.0
Agile Combat Support: Deployable Oxygen System .....	2.5	Materials and Electronics Technology:			High Performance visualization initiative .....	1.5
Life Support Systems:		Heat actuated coolers .....	2.0	2.0	MHPCC .....	5.0
Crew Seating .....	2.5	Optoelectronics .....	5.0	5.0	Simulation Center HPC upgrades ...	2.0
SEE-RESCUE distress streamer .....	4.0	Fabrication of 3-D structures .....	4.0	4.0	Sensor and Guidance Technology: Large Millimeter telescope .....	3.0
Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) .....	4.0	Strategic Materials .....	4.0	4.0	Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office: Rapid 3-D visualization database .....	2.0
Combat Training System: Air Combat training ranges .....	3.0	Friction stir welding .....	1.0	1.0	Joint Robotics Program:	
Integrated C2 Application: ASSET/eWing .....	3.0	WMD Defeat Technology: Deep Digger .....	3.0	3.0	Deployable/mission-oriented robots	5.0
RDT&E for Aging Aircraft: Landing gear life extension .....	10.0	Explosive Demilitarization Technology:			Tactical unmanned ground vehicle	2.0
Link-16 Support and Sustainment: 611th AOG enhanced tactical data display link .....	8.0	Explosives demilitarization technology project .....	3.0	3.0	Unmanned ground vehicles .....	2.0
Major T&E Investment: Mariah II hypersonic wind tunnel .....	10.0	Hot gas decontamination HWAD .....	3.2	3.2	CALS Initiative: CALS .....	7.0
AF TENCAP: GPS jammer deflection and location .....	3.0	Innovative demilitarization technologies .....	4.0	4.0	Ballistic Missile Defense System Segment: Maintain T&E Levels .....	10.0
National Air Intelligence Center: NAIC space threat assessment .....	1.0	Metal reduction and processing .....	1.5	1.5	Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Defense: Arrow .....	80.0
NAIC threat modeling .....	2.0	Rotary furnace—HWAD .....	0.6	0.6	Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors: Airborne infrared surveillance (AIRS) .....	10.0
Information Systems Security Program: Lighthouse cyber security program .....	7.5	Water gel explosive/program delays	0.6	0.6	Ramos solar arrays .....	10.0
		Combating Terrorism Technology Support:			Joint Service Education and Training Systems Development: Academic advanced distributed learning co-lab .....	1.0
		Asymmetric warfare initiative .....	3.0	3.0	Joint Electromagnetic Technology Program:	
		Blast mitigation testing .....	5.0	5.0	HIPAS observatory .....	3.0
		Counter-Terrorism ISR system (CT-ISR) .....	3.0	3.0		
		Electrostatic Decontamination System .....	9.0	9.0		
		NG multi-media security technology .....	2.5	2.5		

Delta Mine Training Center ..... 3.0  
 Joint Robotics Program—EMD:  
   Field testing support ..... 10.0  
   Tactical mobile robot ..... 4.8  
 General Support to C31: Pacific Disaster Center ..... 7.0  
 Classified Programs: Information Security Scholarships ..... 10.0  
 Development Test and Evaluation:  
   Big Crow test support activities ..... 5.0  
 Partnership for Peace (PFP) Info. Management: Information Systems Information Security System Program: Network, Information, and Space Security Center ..... 1.0  
 Global Command and Control System: Joint Information Technology Center ..... 4.0  
 Defense Imagery and Mapping Program:  
   Feature Level Database Development ..... 4.2  
   Intelligent spatial technologies for Smart Maps ..... 1.0  
   BRITE ..... 4.0  
   PIPES ..... 9.0  
 Defense Joint Counter Intelligence Program:  
   Joint Counterintelligence Assessment Group (JCAG) ..... 15.0  
 Industrial Preparedness: Laser additive manufacturing ..... 6.0  
 Special Operations Tactical Systems Development:  
   Joint threat warning systems ..... 1.8  
   Precision Target Locator Designator (PTLD) ..... 4.1  
   TACNAV light vehicle-mounted land nav system ..... 3.0  
 Special Operations Intelligence Systems Dev: Embedded IBS receivers ..... 1.0  
 SOF Operational Enhancements:  
   Fusion goggle system ..... 5.0  
   Nano-technology research ..... 5.0  
 OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE  
 Test 7 Evaluation Technology: Test & Eval. Science & Tech. .... 4.0  
 Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP):  
   T&E Transfers from DOD—Wide Acquisition Programs ..... 70.0  
   Joint Directed Energy Combat Operations and Employment (JDECOE) ..... 1.0  
 Live Fire Testing:  
   Live Fire Test and Training Program ..... 4.0  
   Reality Fire Fighting/Homeland Security Training ..... 1.5  
 Total FY2003 Defense Appropriations Member Add-Ons = \$5.2 billion

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
 Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.  
 Mr. REID. Has the Senator completed his statement?  
 Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.  
 Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the 5 minutes for Senator MCCAIN, we have 5 minutes for the managers of the bill to speak in favor of the motion to table. I ask unanimous consent that be the case.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was part of the request of the Senator from Arizona.  
 Mr. REID. Excellent. Perfect.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.  
 Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Arizona is understandable from the point of view of not being really cognizant of the aging aspect of our aircraft. We found, for instance, on the tankers, the tankers that were flying nightly in and out of Afghanistan averaged more than 42 years of age. If you had told this Senator in 1944 to fly a plane that was made 42 years earlier, 1902, it would have been laughable. Today, to have our people flying airplanes that were made in Harry Truman's day, is laughable.  
 Just this past trip that we took to Europe, we flew on a plane that was 28 years old. It was one of these planes for this type of purpose, of carrying personnel, not cargo.  
 We looked at this problem and we found that should we start an acquisition program for these new aircraft, which was requested by the people from the Department of Defense who pointed out in many of these statistics to us that the capital cost would be so great that it would force out of the budget items that are absolutely essential to our war against terrorism and to the modernization of our military forces in other places.  
 We still have an absolutely difficult time replacing our ships—replacing them at a rate that is far less than is necessary to maintain the number of ships in the line that we have. But we are stuck in that kind of economics where we can't lease the kind of military vessels we need for the Navy. +But in this instance we are dealing with the world of aviation, and we can lease. We can lease planes, and we can also lease engines very competitively. There is a competitive market out there for both. There is a competitive market in the private sector for the planes we are talking about. We are not entering into a market where there is monopolistic practice at all.  
 But for us to try to do what the OMB and the Congressional Budget Office might have wanted originally would have required a massive new procurement program in order to get the planes, and we would be getting them one or two a year for 20 years. We are going to lease a fleet of these to meet the needs of the Department of Defense and retire these planes which are so old that the cost to merely maintain them

far exceeds their value now. Beyond that, their reliability is so low that I have been told in many places the concept of redlining—telling the pilots they cannot fly the plane because the plane won't pass even minimum standards—is so prevalent now in the Air Force that it is, in part, a matter of morale.  
 I believe we should do everything we can to shift the acquisition of aircraft that we cannot lease into procurement accounts and try to get those planes to meet our military needs. Those that we can lease in a competitive world, we should do so. When we do so, we lease them at an asset that can be returned to the commercial market at the end of the lease.  
 That is one of the things we have not been able to get real credit for yet in terms of the people who are reviewing this matter for the Senator from Arizona. We will pursue that further.  
 But in this instance Congress and the White House agreed with us in the last year—and previously—about the concept of leasing, that there are going to be other items that have to be leased.  
 When we were looking at some of the consequences of the terrible events of 9/11, we found that the NATO AWAX planes were bought to the United States and flown over our major cities for a substantial period of time. There were 19,000 to 20,000 hours put on those planes during a period where otherwise they probably would not be getting anywhere more than 100 hours a month. The engines on those planes have been effectively worn out.  
 We are going to have to go into that process. I would invite the Armed Services Committee to do some studying of its own. If it has a better way to get us the equipment we need now without breaking the budget, I am sure the Senator from Hawaii and I would be pleased to join.  
 The money for the leasing of these planes comes from the O&M account of the Department of Defense. It competes with all other things that O&M moneys are paid for. The Department is not going to be reaching out and leasing planes that are not needed. On the other hand, it is going to have to retire the planes that are so old now that their utility is so limited they should not be in the inventory of the U.S. Air Force.  
 I hope the Senate will support the position. I am prepared to make a motion to table.  
 I understand that it will be handled under a previous agreement. I shall make the motion to table before the evening is over. But it is my understanding that the amendment is pending. We will just leave it that way, and I will ask unanimous consent that it be put aside for the consideration of other matters that will come before the Senate this evening.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?  
 Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to any vote tomorrow, at a time set by the majority, I be allowed 5 minutes and the managers of the bill be allowed whatever time they request.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?  
 Mr. REID. The unanimous consent was before final passage?  
 Mr. MCCAIN. Before the vote.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona asked for 5 minutes before the vote on his amendment.  
 Mr. MCCAIN. Could I explain my request to the Senator from Nevada? Could I be recognized, Mr. President?  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.  
 Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to speak for 5 minutes. The Senator from Alaska has indicated he will move to table the amendment. I would like 5 minutes, as the sponsor of the amendment, prior to the vote to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 4447

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 4447.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To set aside Defense-wide operation and maintenance funds for review and mitigation of domestic violence involving Department of Defense personnel)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. (a) Funds appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE" may be used by the Military Community and Family Policy Office of the Department of Defense for the operation of multidisciplinary, impartial domestic violence fatality review teams of the Department of Defense that operate on a confidential basis.

(b) Of the total amount appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE", \$10,000,000 may be used for an advocate of victims of domestic violence at each military installation to provide confidential assistance to victims of domestic violence at the installation.

(c) In each of the years 2003 through 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the recommendations included in the reports submitted to the Secretary by the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence under section 591(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 639; 10 U.S.C. 1562 note).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I think all of us were deeply concerned about the four domestic violence homicides that occurred over the past 6 weeks at Fort Bragg in North Carolina. The tragic murder of these young women by their husbands within such a short period of time is devastating. It is devastating to the families of the victims. It is devastating to their friends. It is devastating to the military where soldiers and their families should be safe on base. And they should be safe in their homes.

The Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence, which is made up of 12 military and 12 civilian members, was charged by Congress to investigate domestic violence in the military and to make recommendations for the Secretary on how to reduce the violence. In the introduction in its first report, the task force wrote:

Domestic violence is an offense against the institutional values of the Military Services of the United States of America. It is an affront to human dignity, degrades the overall readiness of our Armed Forces, and will not be tolerated in the Department of Defense.

I don't think anyone who has followed the recent events in North Caro-

lina would disagree. In fact, the North Carolina incidents, while unusual in that they are clustered within such a short period of time, are not unique. The Naval Criminal Investigative Service reported 54 domestic homicides in the Navy and Marines since 1995. The Army reported 131 homicides since 1995 and the Air Force reported 32.

This is a problem that is by no means limited to the military, but its dimensions in the military are complex and need to be addressed. I know Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz share that view. I applaud the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary for the attention they have given to this issue and for the willingness they have shown to address it.

The amendment which I offer today would help the military reduce domestic violence in the ranks. In particular, it would ensure that funds are used to establish an impartial, multidisciplinary, confidential Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team at the Military Community and Family Policy Office. The team would be charged with investigating every domestic fatality in the military.

The purpose of the investigation would be twofold: First, the team would determine what intervention and services were provided to the victim and to the offender prior to the fatality; second, what interventions and services could have been provided to the victim and offender that could have prevented the fatality.

The team would also aggregate data from domestic violence fatalities to help determine patterns so as to develop systemic responses to domestic violence and prevent some tragedy from ever happening again.

The need for such a review is clear. The Defense Department Task Force found that "fatality reviews have yet to become an important element of DOD's overall response to domestic violence."

It would recommend the use of the Fatality Review Team in order to "provide a mechanism for ongoing review of domestic violence policies and case practices that may inadvertently contribute to the death of a victim or offender with the primary objective of contributing to systemic improvements in a military community's response to domestic violence."

While the military is conducting the review in the Fort Bragg case—and this is an important first step—I believe and the task force believes that such reviews must become routine—not just at Fort Bragg but all across the country.

The second part of this amendment would help the Department ensure that there are victims advocates at every military installation who provide confidential support and guidance exclusively to victims.

The Defense Task Force expressed concern about the "stark contrast between the availability of victim advocacy services in the military and civil-

ian communities." It later asserts that "Victims should have access to a well defined program for victim advocacy." And this should be in every military installation.

The Defense Department does provide excellent family advocacy programs to victims, but the Defense Task Force and other researchers have found that the Family Advocacy Program, while serving an important function, can in many cases erect barriers to women finding safety for themselves and their children.

Women have to be able to go to somebody where there is complete confidentiality. That is extremely important.

The problem, in many cases, with the current system is that when a victim reports abuse, that abuse must be reported to Command regardless of the victim's wishes. This lack of confidentiality has a profound effect on victims' willingness to come forward and find safety.

According to the task force, victims expressed "fears related to personal safety, loss of career and the belief that commanding officers generally appeared more supportive of the service member than the spouse who is the victim."

That is important data, I say to Senators.

Caliber Associates conducted two studies that also concluded that the No. 1 barrier to reporting domestic violence for victims is the fear of the negative impact on the offender's career.

Other concerns with the current system are that "the commanding officer's lacking knowledge of the complex dynamics of domestic violence led him/her to make decisions that placed the victim in unsafe circumstances with respect to the offender" and that the family advocates often work with both the victim and the offender, leading victims to believe that their safety concerns actually get lost or actually their safety concerns become more serious.

In sum, the task force reports, "When the Military Services do not have advocates exclusively for domestic violence victims, the current system often disempowers victims." It is for these victims that a victim advocate is necessary.

This amendment does not replace the Family Advocacy Program, nor is it meant to be critical of its very good work. Rather, the amendment ensures that victims whose lives are in danger have an alternative place to turn to that is confidential and where their needs can be met without qualification. The victim advocates would aid women through counseling, safety planning, and referral to civilian and military shelter, legal counseling, and medical and other relevant services so they can provide for their own safety and the safety of their families without fear.

Finally, this amendment would require that the Secretary report to the Congress on progress in implementing the regulations of the task force. Domestic violence is something that we

in Congress must constantly work to prevent, reduce, and eventually end. Having such reporting will help us work with the military to address domestic violence in one part of our society.

Colleagues, what happened at Fort Bragg should never happen again. This amendment represents a small step toward preventing future tragedies. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I ask unanimous consent to add Senator MIKULSKI as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to the distinguished chair of the committee that I have had an opportunity to do a lot of work dealing with domestic violence, mainly because of my wife Sheila's work, and she has been my teacher. This is by no means an issue or problem just in the military. Some people say about every 15 seconds a woman is battered somewhere in our country, quite often in the home.

A home should be a safe place for women and children, but quite often it isn't. We passed the Violence Against Women Act, and we reauthorized it, and things are starting to change. It is not true, any longer, in communities, everybody is saying: Well, that's private business. It's not our business.

We do not turn our gaze away from this any longer. But, unfortunately, it is a huge problem, and also for these children who witness this violence.

I believe the Secretary Rumsfeld and Secretary Wolfowitz have shown great concern, and I appreciate that. This amendment is just an emphasis to put more focus on this and to have the Congress—the House and the Senate—working with our Defense Department. I believe it is a constructive amendment and a positive amendment.

I understand, although I wait to hear from the distinguished chair, that my colleagues are willing to accept the amendment. If that is the case, that is wonderful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. The managers wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for this amendment. And we are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I join on this. I have to say that I don't use this word too often, but I was appalled at that story about the violence. We all have tremendous respect for these young people representing our Nation abroad who get in harm's way and really are put under severe stress.

I hope it is not only associated with the concept of the victims of abuse, but we ought to find some way to have greater counseling available to our people when they come home. Those of us who have come home in the past know it is a traumatic experience for anybody, but for those who have been deeply involved in combat, it is really difficult.

We should be very moved by that story. I think this will be the first step in meeting that syndrome that has developed and trying to find some way to prevent it in the future.

So I commend the Senator for his amendment, and I, too, support it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank both my colleagues. I cannot add to the words of the Senator from Alaska. He said it better than I could.

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

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4447) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4448

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have an amendment. I send it to the desk.

Is there an amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has been set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 4448.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide certain requirements and limitations regarding the use of government purchase charge cards and government travel charge cards by Department of Defense personnel)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. (a) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD ACCOUNTS DURING FISCAL YEAR 2003.—The total number of accounts for government purchase charge cards and government travel charge cards for Department of Defense personnel during fiscal year 2003 may not exceed 1,500,000 accounts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CREDITWORTHINESS FOR ISSUANCE OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing the individual a government purchase charge card or government travel charge card.

(2) An individual may not be issued a government purchase charge card or government travel charge card if the individual is found not credit worthy as a result of the evaluation under paragraph (1).

(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall establish guidelines and procedures for disciplinary actions to be taken against Department personnel for improper, fraudulent, or abusive use of government purchase charge cards and government travel charge cards.

(2) The guidelines and procedures under this subsection shall include appropriate disciplinary actions for use of charge cards for purposes, and at establishments, that are in-

consistent with the official business of the Department or with applicable standards of conduct.

(3) The disciplinary actions under this subsection may include—

(A) the review of the security clearance of the individual involved; and

(B) the modification or revocation of such security clearance in light of the review.

(4) The guidelines and procedures under this subsection shall apply uniformly among the Armed Forces and among the elements of the Department.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 2003, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the requirements and limitations in this section, including the guidelines and procedures established under subsection (c).

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the General Accounting Office has recently completed another in a long line of studies about financial mismanagement at the Department of Defense. A GAO report shows how Government-issued charge cards were abused for the personal gain of certain civilian employees and members of the Armed Forces.

This issue is not about irresponsible use of personal credit cards so much. This is about using a Government charge card for personal use and leaving the American taxpayers on the hook. In some instances of abuse, the U.S. Government is left with only the interest on personal purchases to pay. In the worst cases of abuse, the Pentagon actually uses the funds that are appropriated for national defense to pay off the questionable charges on these credit cards.

To understand the scale of the problem, it is important to understand how many charge cards are being used. According to the Department of Defense, it maintains 1.7 million charge cards that were responsible in fiscal year 2001 for—now hold on to your hat—\$9.7 billion in spending.

Neither the GAO nor I take issue with the well-regulated use of Government-issued charge cards. In the right hands, a charge card cuts through bureaucratic redtape, reduces paperwork, and limits the administrative costs of processing purchase orders. But put a government charge card into the hands of irresponsible individuals, and they can do some real damage.

Take for example the case of a junior enlisted soldier at Fort Drum in New York. He ran up a bill of \$10,029 on three travel cards, due mostly to charges made at a casino. Despite this serious abuse of the charge card, in October 2000, the soldier was allowed to be honorably discharged without punishment.

But that horror story is just the tip of the iceberg. One soldier ran up charges of \$1,058 in personal charges, including some from the Dream Girls Escort Service. Not to be outdone, another junior enlisted soldier ran up \$2,278 in debt, including \$110 from the Spearmint Rhino Adult Cabaret. According to the GAO, neither of those soldiers received any disciplinary action. These appear not to be isolated

incidents, either. The GAO says that it found about 200 individuals who charged \$38,000 in Fiscal Year 2001 alone at questionable establishments offering "adult entertainment."

Those soldiers ought to be ashamed of themselves. They have betrayed the trust of the public by using government money to fund their dalliances. It is a disgrace not only to the uniform that they wear, but also to their superior officers who were apparently asleep at their posts.

In addition to using the cards for personal purposes, some cardholders play games with paying back the money that they owe. One soldier in south Carolina ran up \$35,883 in debt, then bounced 86 checks, totaling \$269,301, in a phoney attempt to pay off the card. It is small consolation that this soldier is undergoing a court martial for his criminal behavior.

It appears that the astonishing lack of financial oversight in the Department of Defense has created a situation where it is easy to escape any kind of punishment. The GAO found 105 cardholders who held secret or top secret security clearances who had bad debt written off of their travel charge cards. Out of this group, 38 still had active security clearances even after they had experienced serious financial difficulties.

I remind my colleagues of the serious security risks posed by individuals with financial problems. Robert Hanssen, the former FBI agent, and Aldrich Ames, the mole at the CIA, betrayed their country for money. In 1998, a retired Army officer, David Sheldon Boone, was caught and accused of selling secrets to Russia. His excuse? He claimed that financial problems led him to spying.

The amendment that I offer today with Senator Grassley proposes to curb some of the most gross excesses of the charge card programs. First, the amendment limits the number of charge cards that can be made available to service members or civilian employees of the Department of Defense to 1.5 million, a 10 percent reduction in the number of cards that are now out there. This cap will eliminate unnecessary cards and reduce the chance that the charge card numbers will be stolen.

The amendment establishes a requirement that the Secretary of Defense evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing a charge card. It is astounding that this common-sense step has not been taken before. But it has not, and as a result, the GAO found that charge cards are getting in to the hands of individuals with a history of writing bad checks, making late payments on their personal credit cards, and even defaulting on loans. This must stop.

The amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to develop uniform disciplinary guidelines, so that members of each of the military services are held to the same standard of conduct for their use of charge cards. The

amendment includes specific language on security clearances, so that security officials will be informed of the financial wranglings of individuals who have access to classified information.

Finally, the amendment keeps the pressure on the Department of Defense to continue its financial reforms by reporting to the congressional defense committees not later than June 30, 2003, on the implementation of reforms to the charge card programs.

I have no doubt that Secretary Rumsfeld is serious when he says that he wants to straighten out the financial and accounting messes at the Pentagon. He did not create these problems. They did not occur on his watch. But it is now his watch. Someone has to be held accountable for these scandals. William Wordsworth once said, "No matter how high you are in your department, you are responsible for the actions of the lowliest clerk."

Congress has an important role in making sure that the money that we appropriate for our defense is well-spent. It is the Legislative Branch, after all, that is entrusted with the power of the purse. When money is wasted, we have an obligation to step in and take corrective action. The amendment that I have proposed with the Senator from Iowa Mr. GRASSLEY, takes common-sense steps to crack down on the abuse of government charge cards in the Department of Defense. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Byrd-Grassley Amendment regarding Department of Defense credit cards. Many of my colleagues will be aware of the ongoing oversight investigation that I have been involved with for over 2 years now looking into abuses of government purchase cards and travel cards issued by the Department of Defense. Working with the GAO, Chairman Horn's subcommittee in the House, and others, we have been able to uncover a disturbing number of instances where DoD issued credit cards have been abused. We're not just talking about little abuses either. These cards have been used to purchase everything from cars to Caribbean cruises. They have been used for mortgage payments and for cash in adult entertainment establishments. The horror stories go on and on.

It is unfortunate that we are just now finding out about many of these instances of fraud and abuse, but I am pleased that Secretary Rumsfeld appears to be taking this problem seriously. The Office of Management and Budget has announced a crackdown on credit card abusers and salary offsets and other tools are being used to recover funds from unauthorized charges. However, the question remains, "How were these abuses allowed to occur in the first place?" The answer is ineffective internal controls. Receipts are not always matched with statements and inventory is not checked to make sure

that DoD got what it paid for. We also know that the Army doesn't always ask for the credit cards back when individuals leave the service. If you leave the cookie jar unguarded with the lid off, people are going to reach in and help themselves when no one is looking.

Perhaps most alarming is the lack of credit checks. It seems obvious that credit checks should be done on individuals before issuing them a government credit card, but this is not currently the case. Not only is no one double checking to make sure these credit cards are used appropriately, but no one is checking to see if the individuals they are issued to are up to the responsibility. A little diligence up front could prevent millions of dollars in fraudulent purchases that leave the bank or the taxpayer holding the bill.

It is also true that once credit card abuses have been discovered, not enough is done to follow up. I am glad that DoD is finally recovering money that has been misspent, but this shouldn't be the end of the story. Those who abuse the trust that has been placed with them should not get off scott-free. There have been individuals who have been court marshaled for fraudulent transactions, while others with similar misdeeds have been promoted. In fact, many individuals with a record of questionable purchases continue to hold a security clearance. Under existing DoD rules, a person's level of financial responsibility is a key factor in determining whether that person holds a security clearance. Beyond simply requiring repayment, DoD needs to review the positions these people hold and consider disciplinary action. Failure to do so could even put our national security at risk.

The Byrd-Grassley Amendment requires the Department of Defense to take the initial steps necessary to address many of these problems that have been uncovered in our ongoing investigation. I commend Senator BYRD for his initiative and leadership in this area and I am pleased to associate myself with this amendment.

First, the Byrd-Grassley Amendment stems the tide of DoD credit cards, which are apparently being handed out willy-nilly to just about everyone, by limiting the number of government charge card accounts that may be issued in fiscal year 2003 to 1,500,000. The amendment also requires that DoD must evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing a government charge card and prohibits DoD from issuing a card to anyone found not credit worthy. Finally, the Byrd-Grassley amendment requires DoD to establish guidelines and procedures for disciplinary actions against DoD personnel for improper, fraudulent, or abusive use of government charge cards, including reviewing and possibly modifying or revoking security clearances. The Secretary of Defense would then be required to report to the congressional defense committees on the

implementation of these requirements by June 30, 2003.

The requirements in the Byrd-Grassley Amendment are all well founded based on what I and others have been able to uncover regarding DoD credit card abuses. They are all measures that should be put in place by DoD without delay as a starting point toward getting this credit card debacle under control and preventing future abuses. This amendment shouldn't be needed as one would think all of the provisions would be implemented by DoD out of simple common sense. However, I assure you that it is needed, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator BYRD and me in this important initiative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the committee on this most appropriate and timely amendment. As a manager of this measure, I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I join the Senator from Hawaii and welcome the opportunity to vote to accept this amendment. I think it is a very modest step. The Senator from West Virginia has been restrained in terms of the abuses that we have heard about. This will start the process of putting us on a straight track.

I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank both managers.

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

If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4448.

The amendment (No. 4448) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4454

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES, and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. NICKLES, proposes an amendment numbered 4454.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4454

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

Of the funds appropriated in the Act under the heading "Operations and Maintenance, Air Force" up to \$2,000,000 may be made available for the Aircraft Repair Enhancement Program for the KC-135 at the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I have no objection.

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

The amendment (No. 4454) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the two managers withholding. The majority leader has asked me to announce that there will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4455 THROUGH 4462, EN BLOC

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I have a series of amendments. None of these amendments calls for new appropriations, and all of these amendments are either earmarking or technical in nature. I will submit them en bloc to be considered and passed en bloc.

I will explain the amendments. One is an amendment of Senator MILLER earmarking \$1 million for an information data warehouse; an amendment for Senator SNOWE earmarking \$1.5 million for the Navy pilot human resources center; an amendment for Senator GRAHAM earmarking \$2.17 million for nanophotonic systems fabrication; an amendment for Senators SNOWE and SESSIONS earmarking \$5 million for kill vehicles; an amendment for Senators WARNER and INOUE earmarking \$5 million for the common affordable radar processing program; an amendment for Senator BOXER encouraging the Department of Defense to allocate the budgeted amount for the family advocacy program; an amendment for Senators TORRICELLI and CORZINE to earmark \$2.5 million for the disposal of material from Reach A at Earle Naval Weapons Station.

I send the amendments to the desk.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment of the Senator from Hawaii to add to that list. The amendment deals with obtaining a plan for refurbishing of the AWACS plane loaned to the United States after 9/11.

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

The amendments (Nos. 4455 through 4462) were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4455

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for the Navy for research, development, test, and evaluation, \$1,300,000 for Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY", up to \$1,000,000 may be available for Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 4456

(Purpose: To set aside Navy operation and maintenance funds for the Navy Pilot Human Resources Call Center, Cutler, Maine)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the total amount appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY", for civilian manpower and personnel management, up to \$1,500,000 may be available for Navy Pilot Human Resources Call Center, Cutler, Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 4457

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for Defense-Wide research, development, test, and evaluation \$2,170,000 for the Nanophotonic Systems Fabrication Facility)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$2,170,000 may be available for the Nanophotonic Systems Fabrication Facility.

AMENDMENT NO. 4458

(Purpose: To make available for Defense-Wide research, development, test, and evaluation \$5,000,000 for small kill vehicle technology development (PE0603175C) for mid-course phase ballistic missile defense)

On page 223, between line 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$5,000,000 may be available for small kill vehicle technology development (PE0603175C) for midcourse phase ballistic missile defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 4459

(Purpose: To make available \$10,000,000 for the Common Affordable Radar Processing program under Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation)

On page 144, line 25, after the word "Forces", add the following: "Provided further, That of the funds provided under this section, up to \$5,000,000 may be made available for the Common Affordable Radar Processing program"

AMENDMENT NO. 4460

(Purpose: To provide additional resources to the Family Advocacy Program at the Department of Defense)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds provided in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide," the Department of Defense should spend the amount requested for the Family Advocacy Program, with priority

in any increase of funding provided to bases that are experiencing increases in domestic violence.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4461

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for the Navy for operation and maintenance \$2,500,000 for the disposal of materials dredged from Reach A at Earle Naval Weapons Station, New Jersey)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY", up to \$2,500,000 may be available for the disposal of materials from Reach A at Earle Naval Weapons Station, New Jersey, to an appropriate inland site designated by the Secretary of the Navy.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4462

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert: Sec. . Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Commander in Chief of the United States European Command shall submit a plan to the congressional defense committees that provides for the refurbishment and re-engining of the NATO AWACS aircraft fleet: Provided, That this report reflect the significant contribution made by the NATO AWACS fleet in response to the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and the invocation of Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty: Provided further, That the plan shall describe any necessary memorandum agreement between the United States and NATO for the refurbishment and re-engining of these aircraft.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 4463

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I have an amendment on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS to require the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the portion of former Charleston Naval Base, SC, comprising a law enforcement training facility of the Department of Justice.

The managers have looked over the amendment. We ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. HOLLINGS, proposes an amendment numbered 4463.

The amendment is as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 4463

(Purpose: To require the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the portion of former Charleston Naval Base, South Carolina, comprising a law enforcement training facility of the Department of Justice)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Notwithstanding any provision of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may transfer administrative jurisdiction of the portion of the former Charleston Naval Base, South Carolina, comprising a law enforcement training facility of the Department of Justice, together with any improvements thereon, to the head of the department of the Federal Government having jurisdiction of the Border Patrol as of the date of the transfer under this section.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. STEVENS. We accept the amendment.

Mr. INOUE. We accept it.

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

The amendment (No. 4463) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 4464

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator HARKIN to earmark \$2 million for Uniformed Services University of the Health Services Center.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], for Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 4464.

The amendment is as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 4464

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for the Defense Health Program for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Center (USUHS) \$2,000,000 for Complementary and Alternative Medicine Research for Military Operations and Healthcare (MIL-CAM))

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title VI under the heading "DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM," up to \$2,000,000 may be available to the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Center (USUHS) for Complementary and Alternative Medicine Research for Military Operations and Healthcare (MIL-CAM).

Mr. INOUE. The managers have looked over the measure and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment (No. 4464) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4465

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, and I ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. ALLARD, proposes an amendment numbered 4465.

The amendment is as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 4465

(Purpose: To set aside up to \$30,000,000 for the acquisition of commercial imagery, imagery products, and service from United States commercial sources of satellite-based remote sensing entities)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the total amount appropriated by title II under the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to \$30,000,000 may be appropriated for the competitive acquisition of commercial imagery, imagery products, and services from United States commercial sources of satellite-based remote sensing entities.

Mr. STEVENS. I believe this amendment has been accepted on both sides.

I ask it be agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 4466

Mr. INOUE. I send to the desk for immediate consideration an amendment by Senator TIM HUTCHINSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) for Mr. HUTCHINSON, proposes an amendment numbered 4466.

The amendment is as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 4466

(Purpose: To set aside 9,000,000 for RDT&E. Defense-wide, for a Department of Defense facility for the production of vaccines for protecting members of the Armed Forces against the effect of use of biological warfare agents)

On page 223, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. (a) Of the total amount appropriated by title IV under the heading "RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE", up to 9,000,000 may be

available for the development of an organic vaccine production capability to protect members of the Armed Forces against the effect of use of biological warfare agents.

Mr. INOUE. This measure has been studied by the managers. We approve it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4466) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### EPILEPSY RESEARCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that the committee report includes a \$50 million Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program. The program funds medical research projects with clear scientific merit with direct relevance to military health.

Mr. INOUE. The Senator from Nevada is correct.

Mr. REID. Since military head injury is identified as the single most significant risk factor for the development of epilepsy, I would be interested in including epilepsy research among the projects specified in the bill. Would the chairman be willing to see that the conference committee includes epilepsy research as a suggested project for the Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program?

Mr. INOUE. I would be happy to address the Senator from Nevada's concerns relating to epilepsy research in the conference committee.

Mr. REID. I thank Chairman Inouye for his consideration.

#### DUCHENNE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY RESEARCH

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss with my colleague the importance of research into Duchenne muscular dystrophy, the most common lethal childhood genetic disease worldwide. Progress on slowing the relentless progression of the disease has been nearly nonexistent, largely due to insufficient mechanisms to fund translational research. This research is closely linked to the broader investigation of muscle and nerve damage following toxin exposure, excessive exercise, and other motor neuron disease, all of which have significant implications and relevance for defense programs. For example, spinal cord injury is a major form of combat and training-related injury. Motor neurons and motor neuron disease is a potential target of bioterrorism. Muscle damage during training is a relatively common problem during basic training.

Recognizing this, the House of Representatives has included in the Defense Health Program in the Department of Defense appropriations \$4 million dollars in funding for muscular dystrophy research. While I filed and was prepared to offer an amendment to include this funding in our Senate bill,

I am willing to forgo this amendment if the chairman can assure me he supports this funding and will seek to ensure its inclusion in the bill's conference report.

Mr. INOUE. I agree with my colleague that this is an important area of research and that the House of Representatives has acted wisely in this regard. I appreciate his willingness to save us time here today, and I assure him I will do all I can to see that the House amount remains in the final conference bill.

#### MILITARY PERSONNEL MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for his foresight and leadership with the FY2003 Department of Defense Appropriations bill. I commend the Chairman for including in this bill \$50 million in the Military Personnel Defense Health Program for a Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program. Our military personnel face numerous unknown risks each and every day. Providing funding to treat, mitigate or eliminate these risks is the least we can do for those who have agreed to dedicate their lives to defending our nation and freedom.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the senior Senator from the State of Washington for her kind remarks.

Mrs. MURRAY. The bill specifically directs the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Service Surgeons General, to select medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health. Included in the list of projects that could be funded through this project is an infectious disease tracking system.

In my home state of Washington, our military community has an urgent need for such a system, facilitating the quick response to potential life-threatening events. Public health has long been focused on the ability to quickly identify epidemic diseases and intervene to protect public safety rapidly and as efficiently as possible. Preparing for and responding to a biologic crisis requires a clear understanding of such dimensions as geography, time frames, population demographics, resources, severity, and outcomes. The problem, at this point, is that the public health arena lacks the type of information infrastructure in place that is needed to guide an immediate response to a bioterrorism event. Do you agree, that an information system to track infectious diseases is a vital and worthy area of research?

Mr. INOUE. I agree this is one area worthy of investigation.

Mrs. MURRAY. I point out that great strides have been made in the area of infectious disease tracking by Paladin Data Systems Corporation in Seattle, WA. They have the background and experience in healthcare information systems and could provide a real-time data repository to aid in the detection of outbreaks of epidemic diseases as part of an overall effort to avert bioterrorism crises. Again, I thank the Chairman for this foresight and leadership.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator.

#### WAR-RELATED ILLNESSES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have before the Senate the Fiscal Year 2003 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill (H.R. 5010). This legislation makes a valuable contribution to our Nation's efforts to enhance the quality of life for our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines as well as their families, while continuing to transform our military forces to ensure that they are capable of meeting the threats to America's security now and in the future.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I agree with my good friend from Michigan about the merits of this legislation. Once again, Chairman INOUE has produced an excellent bill that will ensure that our Nation's military remains the most capable fighting force in the world. Unfortunately, this Nation has unresolved issues with regard to previous conflicts, such as Operation Desert Storm, and I believe we must continue to pursue a better scientific understanding of war-related ailments.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the Committee bill seeks to improve pay and benefits for our military personnel and makes considerable improvements in medical care that our men and women in uniform and their families receive. In addition, funding has been included to fund a "Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program" that addresses a wide-array of important medical programs.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Hawaii about the significant efforts made by the Committee bill to address the well-being of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. Of particular interest to me is peer reviewed medical research that examines Gulf War Illnesses and their relationship to Chronic Multi-Symptom Illnesses. I believe that this research, which is conducted by the Center for Chronic Pain and Fatigue Research is providing valuable insights into undiagnosed post-deployment illnesses.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, my friend from Iowa is correct. For the past several years, the Center for Chronic Pain and Fatigue Research has conducted research that is unique in its focus on the internal mechanisms and most effective treatment of Gulf War Illnesses and other undiagnosed post-deployment illnesses. This research has been funded by Congress each year and overseen by the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command and its peer review process. Continued funding for this program will enable the continuation of research into a variety of illnesses reported by personnel upon returning from the Gulf War.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, as the Senator from South Dakota has noted, many soldiers returned from the Gulf War with a variety of symptoms that have no discernible cause. Although specific environmental exposures in the Gulf War cannot be ruled out as a

cause, many believe that stresses triggering underlying conditions may have contributed to these illnesses. I hope that efforts will be made to ensure that this bill provides adequate funding to ensure the continuation of this important research.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I understand the concerns that my colleagues have regarding poorly understood illnesses that have affected military personnel in nearly every conflict since the Civil War, and most recently in the Gulf War. As Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I will work to ensure that adequate funding is provided for the Center for Chronic Pain and Fatigue Research in conference.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we appreciate the Chairman's concern and support for this work. We believe it has important implications for future generations of military personnel and we look forward to working with him and the committee as this bill moves forward to do all we can to address this important issue.

#### THE USS SCRANTON DEPOT MODERNIZATION

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair for recognition. I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. INOUE, The Chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and to Mr. STEVENS, the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, for the fine work they have accomplished in crafting this important FY2003 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill. It has been my pleasure, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, to work with them on this bill, as well as on the defense portions of the recently passed FY2002 Emergency Supplemental Bill, H.R. 4775. They certainly do a masterful job of setting priorities and balancing competing needs.

I am also pleased that the Appropriations Committee chose to specifically provide \$90 million in the FY2002 Emergency Supplemental bill to accelerate the depot modernization period of the USS *Scranton* at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard from FY2002 to FY2003, as it will result in dramatically improved fleet readiness. In addition, it will free up \$90 million in FY2003, which had been programmed for the USS *Scranton* to be used for other U.S. Navy critical submarine requirements. This could include returning back to FY2003 the important USS *Annapolis* depot modernization period at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, which the Navy was recently forced to slip from FY2003 to FY2004, because of a Navy funding shortfall.

I would like to direct a question to my friends, the chair and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Is it the Subcommittee's understanding that the appropriation of the additional \$90 million to accomplish the USS *Scranton* depot modernization period in FY2002, now gives the U.S. Navy flexibility to allocate the FY2003 USS *Scranton* funds to meet other critical submarine requirements?

Mr. INOUE. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is correct. It is the understanding of the Defense Subcommittee that the FY2003 \$90 million that the Navy had requested for the USS *Scranton*, may now be available to the Navy to meet other critical submarine depot modernization requirements.

Mr. STEVENS. I would tell the Senator from New Hampshire that it is also my understanding that the Navy now has the flexibility to reprioritize those FY2003 funds.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the Majority Leader, Senator DASCHLE, and the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, regarding the B-1 bomber.

The B-1 remains the backbone of our nation's bomber fleet by providing our military with a reliable, long-range bomber capable of delivering a large amount of munitions to targets thousands of miles away. Nowhere was the continued importance of the B-1 more clear than over the skies of Afghanistan during the major battles of Operation Enduring Freedom. Since October, B-1s have dropped more than 38 percent of the bombs in Operation Enduring Freedom while maintaining over a 78 percent mission capable rate. I am particularly proud of the accomplishments of the B-1 because a portion of the fleet is stationed at Ellsworth Air Force Base in my home state. On many occasions, I have had the opportunity to meet with the men and women who fly and maintain these planes, and each time I am struck by their dedication and professionalism.

In order to maintain the integral role the B-1 plays in our national security, the Department of Defense has committed to reinvest the savings from the consolidation of the fleet into the modernization of the remaining aircraft. Currently, the Air Force is in the midst of a multi-year plan to upgrade the B-1 to improve its reliability, survivability, and lethality.

One aspect of this ongoing effort is the Defense System Upgrade—DSUP—program which will replace the existing defensive system on the B-1 with components of the ALQ-214 Integrated Defensive Electronic Countermeasures—IDECM—system, the ALR-56M Radar Warning Receiver, and the ALE-55 Fiber Optic Towed Decoy, FOTD. Completion of this upgrade will greatly enhance the survivability of the B-1 and improve its long-range penetrating bomber capabilities.

During the course of the DSUP program, problems arose with the deployment of the towed decoy system. It should be noted that these problems were not unique to the B-1, but did slow progress on the upgrade program. However, I was pleased to learn recently that DSUP testing of the towed decoy has once again begun. On June 25, a test was conducted at Edwards Air Force Base in which two decoys were successfully deployed and towed from a

B-1. This was followed by a July 25 test in which a decoy was deployed and towed while the B-1 flew with varying wing sweep positions. It is my hope these tests demonstrate the DSUP program is back on track.

At the time the House and Senate Appropriations Committees were writing the Fiscal Year 2003 Defense appropriations bills, these DSUP problems had not been addressed. As a result, the bills currently contain reductions in funding for the B-1 program. The House version of the Defense appropriations bill rescinds \$67 million in Fiscal Year 2002 funding, and cuts the President's Fiscal Year 2003 request for the B-1 by \$82 million. These cuts would terminate the DSUP program completely and would cripple the B-1 modernization program. The Senate version of the Defense appropriations bill would rescind \$32 million in Fiscal Year 2002 funds and cut \$40 million from the B-1 request for Fiscal Year 2003. I would like to thank the Chairman for including report language that would allow the Air Force to request reprogramming of funds for the B-1 if the DSUP problems are resolved.

In the time since these bills were written, I believe we have seen progress within the DSUP program. It is my hope that we can address this funding issue within conference to restore funds for DSUP or provide additional funds for other aspects of the B-1 modernization programs.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I share my colleague from South Dakota's support for the B-1 and believe maintaining the B-1's capabilities is in our national security interests. I am concerned that the cuts proposed, particularly in the House version of the bill, are imprudent and could do lasting damage to our nation's military capabilities. Although I have not yet been able to confer with the Air Force about the newest test flights with the towed decoy, the results would seem to obviate the need to delay or restructure this program. More tests are expected in the weeks to come, and I am hopeful that in conference we will find a way to restore DSUP funding. If that seems imprudent when this matter is taken up in conference, I urge the committee to transfer the proposed DSUP funding into other B-1 modernization programs. For example, the B-1 is next scheduled to have its radar replaced with a version of the system now used on the F-16. It is important to me that we retain the funds within the B-1 upgrade program and reinforce the Administration's pledge that all savings from fleet reduction will be reinvested in B-1 modernization.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I share Senator JOHNSON's and Senator DASCHLE's continued interest in maintaining the B-1 as a long-range, penetrating bomber. This plane's recent performance in Afghanistan testifies to its ability to help the nation deal with the types of threats we face in the 21st century. I appreciate their bringing to

my attention the recent progress in the DSUP testing program. I will work with my colleagues from South Dakota to address B-1 funding issues when the defense appropriations bill goes to conference.

OPERATING ROOM OF THE FUTURE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman yield for the purpose of a colloquy concerning a program of great importance to ensuring the continued health and safety of our nation's Armed Forces?

Mr. INOUE. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, at present, the military lacks a process in which emerging medical technologies can be adapted and tested in real time emergency situations that replicate high velocity and surgical care settings. With the assistance of the Senator from Hawaii, Congress last year appropriated \$2.5 million to begin development of a national test bed to implement the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command's "Operating Room of the Future" strategy to remedy this situation. This test bed, to be based at the University of Maryland Medical Center, aims to improve the performance of these emerging technologies and expedite their transfer to medical care in the battlefield. This will be done via testing new approaches to video-assisted coordination, synchronized communications, mobile computing options, telesurgery techniques and distance learning. While spearheaded by UMMC, this program is linked via a number of collaborations with both industry and the military.

In its fiscal year 2003 Defense appropriations bill, the House has included \$3 million of the \$9 million necessary to continue work on the Operating Room of the Future initiative. The Senate bill directs the Secretary of Defense to consider the Operating Room of the Future for funding under the Defense Health Program's \$50 million Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program. I am pleased that both bills contain language supportive of the Operating Room of the Future, and I respectfully request that the Chair work with his colleagues on the conference committee to ensure that the continued funding needs of this critical program are being met.

Mr. INOUE. I certainly recognize the importance of this program and have been pleased to work closely with the Senator from Maryland on it in the past. Indeed, the Senator will recall that we recently visited the University of Maryland Medical Center to receive a briefing from both Army and hospital officials about the progress and importance of this project. You may be certain that I will continue to work on behalf of the Operating Room of the Future as we proceed to conference.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the chairman for his continued efforts on behalf of our men and women in uniform, and I look forward to continuing to work closely with him on this vital project.

CHEMICAL AGENT WARNING NETWORK

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I commend the committee's work to support very necessary research in the area of chemical and biological detection, response and defense. I also applaud the committee's recognition that there are many existing good ideas as well as ongoing initiatives worthy of consideration by the Department as it develops effective technologies for our Nation's chem.-bio defense. As you may know, one of these excellent efforts is a program that was initiated by the U.S. Marine Corps' Chemical Biological Incident Response Force, CBIRF, and authorized by the Senate in S. 2514. This program focuses on the development of emergency response technologies by first responders, the demonstration of a chemical agent warning network and the coordination of response among military and civilian assets. Will the Committee work to include in the list of programs to be considered under the Chem-bio Defense Initiatives Fund, this initiative to demonstrate a chemical agent warning network and other emergency response technologies for use by first response units?

Mr. INOUE. The Senator is correct. The committee will work to include this among the program initiatives to be considered within the Chem-bio Defense Initiatives Fund, the Marine Corps' CBIRF program to develop a chemical agent warning network and develop emergency response technologies for first responder units.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the chairman for his hard work and consideration of this initiative.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to engage my friend from Hawaii, the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations subcommittee, Senator INOUE in a colloquy on funding for the Advanced Seal Delivery System (ASDS). I am concerned over the decision to cut advanced procurement funds for this critical special operations program. This will delay this critical program. As you know this manned mini-submarine is used for the clandestine delivery of Special Operations Forces. It is a vast improvement over the current SEAL delivery system.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator from Maryland for her interest in ASDS. As you are aware the first ASDS boat has encountered two technological challenges that must be overcome: screw noise and batteries. These issues require additional research and development. Since the budget was submitted, the Special Operations Command decided to restructure this program and has delayed procurement of the second ASDS boat until these issues have been solved. The Committee therefore reduced advanced procurement funding.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am aware of the problems facing the ASDS. The Carderock Naval Research Laboratory and scientists at Penn State University are working on the solution for screw

noise. We believe a solution is well underway for this problem. A solution for the battery problem has been more elusive. The Navy has decided to develop Lithium-Ion batteries for this purpose, but funded only one Lithium-Ion battery developer and a solution has been slow at best. Is the Chairman aware that the ASDS prime contractor funded a competing effort to develop Lithium-Ion batteries? A leading U.S. manufacturer of Lithium-Ion battery technology is close to meeting the ASDS battery need. The Navy program manager is excited by this alternative. As you know, I requested that funds be added to the FY 03 Defense Appropriation bill in order to allow the Navy to fund an alternative solution to help resolve the battery issue.

Mr. INOUE. I share your concern over development of a Lithium-Ion battery for ASDS. The Committee provided an additional \$8 million for Procurement, Defense Wide at the request of the Senators from Maryland. We expect the Navy to use these funds to ensure competition to develop these Lithium-Ion batteries can take place and subsequently result in a more rapid solution to ASDS battery needs.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I appreciate the Committee's increase in procurement for ASDS batteries. As you are aware the House provided \$12 million for procurement of a Lithium-Ion Polymer battery and shifted \$22.5 million from advanced procurement to research and development. I hope we will be able to fulfill the Navy's request to move \$23.2 million from advanced procurement to research and development in Conference. Nonetheless, I am concerned that restricting the battery procurement to a Lithium-Ion Polymer battery will result in less competition.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator from Maryland for her steadfast support of this program and appreciate her concern. I will explore the possibility of increasing research and development funding for ASDS and language that facilitates competition for the Lithium-Ion battery in conference, so that we can get this new technology deployed sooner.

Mr. BYRD. I rise to engage the managers of the FY 2003 Defense Appropriations bill, Senators INOUE and STEVENS, in a colloquy on Navy Basic Research funding.

Mr. INOUE. I would be glad to discuss this matter with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. STEVENS. I, too, would be glad to join with my colleagues to review this matter.

Mr. BYRD. Earlier this year, I received information from our Appropriations Committee staff which caused me some concern about the Defense Department's budget request for Navy basic research in fiscal year 2003. The information indicated that over the past five years, funding levels for basic research have stayed at roughly the same level or have grown slightly, in real/constant dollar terms—that is,

excluding increases for inflation. Growth in funding for applied research, however, has been significant, averaging about 10% per year. Indeed, the perception and reality of a greater emphasis on applied research is common in both private and public labs. Just as we've found to be the case in the private sector, the federally funded labs have been forced to be better 'marketers' of their products. This has led to a greater emphasis on applied research because, by its very nature, the work being done in applied research is more product-oriented. For fiscal year 2003, the Defense Department proposes to cut funding for the Navy's basic research program—a cut of 1% in real terms.

This shift in emphasis to applied research is understandable. But, if this shift comes at the expense of funding basic research programs, our science and technology programs will suffer in the long run. Basic research is the fuel for the engine of invention. Without a growing understanding of the fundamentals of our physical environment—energy sources, molecular structures, materials, and biological systems, to name just a few—our scientific prowess will weaken and our technological edge will become dull.

Given these concerns, I believe it is prudent that Congress sustain funding for this important program at traditional levels. That is why I am pleased to report that this bill includes, at my behest, a \$6 million increase for the Navy Research lab. I want to thank the managers of the bill—the Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, and the Ranking Member, Senator STEVENS—for agreeing with my recommendation and for their continuing efforts to enhance our military's technology edge.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for bringing this matter to the Senate's attention and for his continuing support of America's armed forces.

Mr. INOUE. I also thank the Senator for his efforts regarding Navy basic research and the Navy Research Lab. This is an important initiative, and one that I am pleased that Senator STEVENS and I could include in the bill that we have brought before the Senate.

#### AEROSPACE WORKER TRAINING

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to thank the chairman for the tremendous job that he and the members of his subcommittee have done to craft this bill. I support their efforts to ensure that our Nation continues to have the best-trained and equipped military force in the world.

As the chairman knows, my State has a long history of achievement in the field of aviation and harbors an enormous pool of talented individuals capable of turning innovative technological discoveries into manufactured reality rapidly and efficiently. We also have one of the most highly skilled pools of aerospace workers in the world.

I believe that the security of our Nation and the future of the aviation industry will rely heavily on the development and implementation of highly advanced composite materials. But for the large-scale deployment of existing and future technologies to develop, it is critical that our Nation have the skilled workforce capable of understanding these next generation materials.

That is why I appreciate the subcommittee's support of a new initiative to train aerospace workers in the use and manufacturing of composite materials.

Edmonds Community College and Central Washington University in Washington State are developing a program aimed at improving the scientific and technical competencies of high school and college graduates in the area of materials used in manufacturing technologies. This program will develop a comprehensive curriculum to meet the growing demand for a workforce trained in materials science and will identify best practices for the industry.

We believe that this will become a model teaching and training program for the ever-changing materials technology field, and will involve future integration with advanced, cutting-edge basic research in composites materials and engineering conducted at the University of Washington. Taken together, this collaboration in Puget Sound educational resources in the material sciences will maintain and strengthen our country's foremost position in aerospace research, development and manufacturing.

This will provide a wealth of opportunities for incumbent aerospace workers to update their skills in newly developed processes, and may serve to pique the interest of students in material sciences and energize future generations to engage in math, science, manufacturing and engineering careers.

So I want to thank the chairman and the subcommittee for their recommendation that the Senate provide \$500,000 in this bill to implement the first phase of this program and confirm that it is the committee's intention that the funds provided in the Air Force Materials Science account be used for this program at Edmonds Community College. I further want to ask the chairman if he will work with me to ensure that the funding provided for this program is maintained in conference and expanded in future years to further this effort.

I thank the presiding officer and the chairman, and look forward to his response.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the Senator is exactly right, it is the intent of the legislation to provide \$500,000 for the program in Washington.

I assure the Senator that I will work with my colleagues to support these funds.

Preparing for the use of innovate materials in future aircraft designs is crit-

ical to enhancing air superiority. I will work with the Senator to address these needs in this year's legislation and will carefully consider ways to enhance those efforts in years to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 5010, the Department of Defense authorization bill, at 2 p.m., Thursday, August 1; there be 50 minutes remaining for debate divided as follows: 10 minutes each for the two leaders or their designees and the two managers or their designees, and that the only first-degree amendments remaining in order be the McCain amendment, No. 4445 and the Committee-reported substitute; that there be 10 minutes of debate with respect to the McCain amendment with the time equally divided and controlled between the managers and Senator MCCAIN; that at the use or yielding back of that time, without further intervening action, the Senate vote in relation to the amendment; that if the McCain amendment is not tabled, then relevant second-degree amendments would be in order to the McCain amendment with no time limitation on the relevant second-degree amendments; that upon disposition of the McCain amendment the committee-reported substitute as amended be agreed to, the bill then be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill; that Section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act be waived; that upon passage the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes off the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, without further intervening action or debate.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4445

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate the McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment is pending.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to table the McCain amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before the two managers leave, I don't know how enough could be said about the way this bill was managed. This is the largest Defense bill in the history of the world and the United States. Yet we started this just a few hours ago, and it is finished and no one can complain about this not having been scrubbed. Staff from all the offices have had the opportunity to come and do what they believe is appropriate.

But the good work on the bill was not only done here on the floor but in subcommittee and the full committee—which has just been topped off by the remarkable good work of these two sensational Senators.

I speak for both sides of the aisle that if a chapter had to be written on how to manage a bill, it should go to Senators INOUE and STEVENS because that is how a bill should be managed. I have never seen anything like it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I thank my leader. But I believe that much credit should go to the staff. We have one of the finest staff members in the whole Senate. I refer to Charlie Houy on the majority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I repeat that. We are blessed with probably the hardest working staff in the Congress. I am grateful to my great friend and chief assistant, Steve Cortese, for his work.

But I would say this to the Senator from Nevada. For those of us who served in uniform, I think the greatest privilege there is is being able to manage this bill because it affects the people who have followed us, being willing to take up arms to defend our country. I know of no better group to work with and no group that really needs our help more than they do.

I thank the Senator for his kindness.

We would pay you for the job. It is like flying. I used to tell people they are paying me to fly and I would have paid them to let me fly. But I would pay for this job.

It is an amazing, amazing feeling to know we can accomplish some of the things we did tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are all very proud of the men and women of the military as they have responded to the attacks of September 11 and as they continue to protect us here at home and around the world.

As we work on the Defense appropriations bill, we have an obligation to the men and women who are defending us to make sure they have the resources and the equipment they need.

Tonight, I rise in strong opposition to the McCain amendment on which this body will be voting tomorrow morning. The Senator from Arizona persists in his efforts to redefine an issue that this entire Congress has already endorsed and that the President has signed into law.

The McCain amendment addresses both the 767 and the 737 lease provisions that were endorsed by an overwhelming bipartisan margin less than 1 year ago.

Frankly, I am puzzled that this issue continues to come up. The Appropriations Committee engaged in this issue following consideration of the Defense authorization bill last year. The issue

came to light in part because of the terrorist attack on our country, the global war on terrorism, and the tremendous demand placed upon our air refueling fleet.

This issue was not a sleight of hand to undermine the authorizing committee. We acted out of necessity as our country responded to September 11 and to terrorism. We had a lengthy debate, thanks to the Senator from Arizona, and the Congress agreed to go forward using the lease option as the vehicle to give our men and women in uniform the asset they need.

Not long ago, the Senate considered the Defense authorization legislation. The Senator from Arizona sits on that committee. That was the bill to have this debate. The Senator complains that the appropriations bill is the wrong place to authorize. Yet here we are considering an authorizing amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on an appropriations bill.

I read his amendment, and I want my colleagues to understand what is really at stake.

The Senator from Arizona wants us to open the doors to the Air Force and the Department of Defense to Airbus. It is quite simple to me. One U.S. company manufactures commercial aircraft of this type. One, and only one, U.S. company can meet the Air Force's needs.

The issue before the Senate is whether U.S. workers or European workers will manufacture U.S. military aircraft. That is the bottom line. That is what the vote will be about tomorrow.

Let me also say that the Senator from Arizona has a broader agenda than the language in this amendment. Listen to his rhetoric. He interchanges the 737 and the 767 lease programs approved by the Congress. The language in his amendment is about the 737 lease, but he references, time and again, the larger issue of the 767 tanker lease.

So let's talk about the 767 tanker lease. Since September 11, one piece of equipment has become more critical than ever, air refueling tankers. These flying gas stations allow us to project our military around the globe. In fact, tankers are the backbone of our air capability.

Just look at the war in Afghanistan. Our B-2 stealth bombers had to get from their base in Missouri to Afghanistan and back. They needed to be refueled in the air nine times. Our bombers, which left the airbase on Diego Garcia, had to be refueled three times to reach their targets 3,000 miles away. So we needed the tankers to get our aircraft over there.

We also relied on our tankers to keep our planes going during the fighting. During the heaviest bombing of the Afghanistan battles, 30 to 35 tankers were in the air nearly around the clock to refuel 100 tactical jets. Even carrier-based warplanes needed the aid of air tankers to strike their targets in Afghanistan.

Here at home, many of our cities were protected by combat air patrols. Those patrols relied on air refueling tankers.

As Air Force Lt. Gen. Plummer put it:

In the opening campaign of this war, every bomb, bullet and bayonet brought into the theater got there thanks to our aging refueling tanker fleet. . . .

Our reliance on tankers has grown 45 percent from fiscal year 2001. So whether it is projecting our force around the world or supporting our aircraft in the middle of a fight or keeping our homeland safe, the men and women of our military rely on our KC-135 tankers.

But there are serious problems with these tankers. They are old. In fact, they are among the oldest aircraft in the entire service. Because they are so old, they are not reliable, they are often down for repairs, and they cost a fortune to maintain.

Just look at the figures. The average age of these tankers is 41 years. One-third of the fleet is unfit to fly at any given time due to mechanical failure. Each plane requires a full year of maintenance for every 4 years spent on duty. A 41-year-old aircraft runs on parts that are not commercially available. Corrosion is also a significant problem. In fact, KC-135s spend about 400 days in major depot maintenance every 5 years.

So what we have are old planes that cost a fortune to keep flying and that are often down for repairs. That is not what you want in an aircraft that is used to protect your military around the world in the middle of a war.

Some have suggested that we just keep repairing the existing planes, and we could do that. But it does not make sense financially. It takes those planes out of service for a very long time. It would forfeit new planes that are more flexible, more reliable, and more efficient.

Let me share with the Senate something Secretary Rumsfeld said earlier this year:

We needed to begin moving out some of the older pieces of equipment that are—aircraft and various things that require so much upkeep and maintenance and so much on spare parts, that it is unwise to continue to try to maintain them.

Secretary Rumsfeld also said:

So you end up trying to take a 1934 Oldsmobile and prop it up for another five, six years, and there's a point beyond which that doesn't make good sense.

We have reached that point.

I show you a picture of an old Oldsmobile. I think it is actually a 1939 Olds, but it proves the same point.

We could keep repairing them, but it does not make sense to keep pumping money into a 41-year-old airframe. It is expensive. If you want to keep one of these old planes going, you probably are going to have to remove the plane's metal skin because these planes, as I said before, have a lot of corrosion.

I share with my colleagues a photograph showing some of the problems with the metal on these aging tankers.

To “re-skin” this airplane costs \$26 million. Does it make sense to do that to 100 planes? Mr. President, \$26 million is an awful lot of money to fix one problem with one 41-year-old plane.

After you have replaced the skin of the aircraft, it is probably going to need new engines. That is not cheap. To put a new engine in 100, 125 tankers is going to cost \$3 billion. That is a lot of money for a 41-year-old airplane.

There are other parts that need to be replaced. It would be one thing if you could fix them all today, but it takes a long time to overhaul these tankers. Right now, we are overhauling four a year. At a certain point, it is just not worth dumping money into these old planes.

K-135s were first delivered to the Air Force in 1957. On average, they are 41-year-olds, and we are paying for it. They have been around longer than most of the people who are flying them. There is no question they must be replaced with new tankers; the only question is when.

I would love for us to be able to buy these new tankers today, but there is not enough money in the Air Force's procurement budget. So many of us in Congress have worked very hard to work out a more flexible approach, an approach that is used with commercial aircraft all the time.

In December, Congress approved, and the President signed, legislation to authorize the Air Force to negotiate with Boeing on a 10-year lease of 100 new 767 aircraft to use as air tankers. Congress has authorized the lease program for both the 767 and the 737 aircraft. My colleagues will recall that the bill to authorize these lease programs for the Air Force was approved by this Senate 96 to 4.

I also want to remind my colleagues what the Secretary of the Air Force, James Roche, wrote to me in a letter. I will quote:

The KC-135 fleet is the backbone of our Nation's Global Reach. But with an average age of over 41 years, coupled with the increasing expense required to maintain them, it is readily apparent that we must start replacing these critical assets. I strongly endorse beginning to upgrade this critical warfighting capability with new Boeing 767 tanker aircraft.

That is from Air Force Secretary James Roche.

My home State of Washington is home to the 92nd Air Refueling Wing. There are approximately 60 air refueling tankers that are based outside of Spokane, WA. I have been to Fairchild. I have visited personally with the families. I know the difficult missions these crews handle for each one of us every single day. And I know the men and women of the 92nd Air Refueling Wing need these aircraft.

The Senator from Arizona talks about leasing aircraft as if the lives of our men and women in uniform were not at stake. I remind my colleagues that we are talking about equipping young American pilots and the missions they support to go forward with the greatest opportunity to succeed.

Mr. President, I encourage the Senate, tomorrow, to table the McCain amendment.

I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, the events of the past 11 months have forced every American to become more vigilant against the threats to our nation's security. I want to commend the chairman, Senator INOUE, and the ranking member, Senator STEVENS, for bringing to the floor a bill that responds to such threats by better protecting our Nation's citizens as well as our servicemen and women.

Even before the attacks of September 11th of last year, however, our Nation's military began to see that traditional notions of warfare and defense would have to evolve to meet new and ever more dangerous threats. The bombing of the USS Cole in Yemen, for example, made clear to us that our naval forces must be equipped with the most advanced surveillance and response vessels available.

It is for this reason that I have an amendment in support of the Navy's development and demonstration of the SeaLion craft. This vessel, designed for coastal area operations here in the United States and abroad, has already begun to prove itself capable of meeting the challenges faced by our Navy today, and well into the future.

Military operations in coastal areas involve significantly different challenges from deep water operations, such as reduced operational space and environmental clutter. Accordingly, surveillance, weapon systems and naval tactics designed for deep water operations are inadequate for the complex environmental and dimensional aspects of the coastal battle space. In such areas, small boats can effectively protect coastal installations, combat blue water navies, and hinder freedom of navigation for these navies and their supply ships.

The rapidly evolving nature of maritime warfare, the threat of terrorist activities against our naval forces abroad, and the need to protect our own ports here at home: each of these challenges require that the United States make a concerted effort to maintain a solid lead in the development of advanced technologies for coastal operations.

The SeaLion craft is perfectly positioned to support this role. It is a high speed, low-radar-signature vessel whose unique versatility lends itself to a broad spectrum of mission applications, from surveillance to interdiction to engagement. The SeaLion has already received strong endorsement from the Naval Sea Systems Command for its utility in special operations, and is poised for further evaluation as part of the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship platform.

This amendment would allow \$8 million of funds appropriated by the bill to be used for the continued development, demonstration and evaluation of the

SeaLion vessel. I ask for my colleagues' support.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for 10 minutes each.

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

#### PLAYING CHESS WITH HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if I may, while the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee is completing an appointment outside the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for not to exceed 30 minutes.

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

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear at someplace in the RECORD other than in association with the Defense appropriations bill.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in response to the terrorist acts of September 11, the Bush administration—like so many other administrations before it—has chosen to demonstrate its tough stand against something. In the case of the Bush administration, it is a tough stand against terrorism and its concern for the safety and well-being of the American people by boldly maneuvering the Federal chess pieces to create a new Department called Homeland Security.

It is an impressive move, Mr. President—this reorganization of the Government. Many say that it is the greatest reorganization during the past half century. I think it could very well be said that it is the greatest reorganization since the Founding Fathers reorganized the Government in 1787.

At that particular time, the 13 colonies—by then 13 States—had been under the operation of the Articles of Confederation. And many of those who served in the Senate in 1789 had been Members of the Congress under the Articles of Confederation and had been Members of the Continental Congress, which first met on September 5, 1774. The Framers of the U.S. Constitution reorganized our Government so that when their work product had been ratified by the States—the required number of nine for ratification—we then became the United States of America. We were no longer under the Articles of Confederation. That constituted a reorganization of our Government.

But I am talking about a reorganization that is being proposed today. I say that it is the most massive reorganization that has occurred since the Framers reorganized the Government