United States and the safety of our men and women at sea.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank my distinguished colleague, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for this important clarification.

SHIP SCRAPPING PROJECT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to address my colleague, Chairman STEVENS, concerning funding for a ship disposal initiative in the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act. At my request, funds were provided in the Senate bill for this program and I'm pleased to note that the conference report has preserved the Senate funding level of $7.5 million. This initiative has been crafted to address the Department of Defense Interagency Ship Scrapping Review Panel's recommendations for a pilot program.

It was my understanding that the $7.5 million provided under Operation & Maintenance for a ship disposal initiative would be used to implement a demonstration project at the Navy's only two fresh water reserve basins, where more than 300,000 tons of ships slated for scrapping are stored, and that these funds will be distributed evenly between the two sites—the Delaware River and the James River—for the first year of this demonstration project.

Earlier this year, I spoke with Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell and officials of the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation regarding their needs as we move ahead on revitalizing the Philadelphia Navy Shipyard. A key element of their plan is to demonstrate a ship scrapping project that assures responsible environmental health and safety management while reducing government costs for managing decommissioned ships.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct that the Senate included funding for this program at his request. The Committee and conferees were silent on the specific purpose of the program. I will add, though, that I support the intent of the Senator.

PROTECTING OUR STRATEGIC AIRLIFT

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I support the defense appropriations conference report, but I would like to briefly comment on one issue - strategic airlift.

As we have learned in places like Kenya, Tanzania, Iraq, and Bosnia, the end of the Cold War has not brought stability to the world. That instability continually threatens our national security interests and has placed a high demand on our military assets.

Primary among those assets is strategic airlift. Using our military requires getting troops and equipment and weapons to strategic locations. I am very concerned that we are taking some short-cuts in this bill that directly impact that vital national security capability. In particular, I am concerned that the Senate did not fully fund the President's request for C–5 avionics modernization. Instead, this Conference Report provides only $33.7 million of $47.9 million dollars necessary to increase C–5 safety and reliability. While $33.7 million is a lot of money, we need to do more.

The $14.2 million cut delays installation of the Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) by a full-year. Other important modifications are also delayed, including the following: Enhanced Ground Proximity Warning System, Global Air Traffic Management, Flight Instrument and Engine Display System, and Automatic Flight Controls. These are the systems that navigate the plane and protect it against various forms of collision. As the skies continue to become more crowded, and as we rely on C–5s to provide airlift in all types of weather and over all kinds of terrain up-to-date avionics are critical.

The C–5 has served the nation well in all of our military actions overseas from the Yom Kippur War to current operations in Bosnia and Iraq. In Desert Storm, the C–5 delivered over 38 percent of all America's airlift. It is an absolutely essential part of the Air Force's airlift capacity. A capacity that is more critical than ever as we move to an Expeditionary Aerospace Force.

I want to point out here that it is not just me who believes the C–5 is a critical national defense priority. It is one of the Air Force's top priorities. Even now, I know that the Air Force is attempting to cobble together the needed $14.2 million from other accounts. The Air Force should not be put in this position. We should give them the money.

We have known for some time that the C–5 needs some modernization work. The Air Force is undertaking a study to determine how best to preserve and protect our strategic airlift. That larger study will look at many things—re-engining the C–5, buying more C–17s, refitting existing commercial airframes, exploring spare parts shortages and maintenance delays—but it will not change the need to modernize the avionics in the short-term. The Air Force is committed to this modernization and deserves our support.

Quite simply, the airlift of the United States military rests in the back of the C–5. In a world where threats appear in every corner of the globe, we cannot afford to shortchange the strategic airlift that protects our national security.

When we look at addressing readiness shortfalls in the military in a supplemental appropriations bill this year, I hope my colleagues will consider the need to restore $14.2 million to the C–5 Avionics Modernization accounts. The Air Force should know that we share its committment to strategic airlift.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the conference report accompanying H.R. 6.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I 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 yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) would vote ''aye.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 290 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Abraham	Enzi	Lieberman
Akaka	Faircloth	Lott
Allard	Feingold	Lugar
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Mack
Baucus	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Moynihan
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Murray
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Reed
Bryan	Gregg	Reid
Bumpers	Harkin	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Roberts
Byrd	Helms	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchinson	Roth
Chafee	Hutchison	Santorum
Cleland	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Coats	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kempthorne	Snowe
Coverdell	Kennedy	Specter
Craig	Kerrey	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerry	Thomas
Daschle	Kohl	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Domenici	Lautenberg	Warner
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Hagel	Moseley-Braun
Hollings	Sessions

The conference report was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4103.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is this a 10 minute vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) would vote ''aye.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Faircloth	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Glenn	Mikulski
Biden	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hatch	Roberts
Burns	Helms	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Coats	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kempthorne	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
D'Amato	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Warner
Domenici	Leahy	Wyden
Dorgan	Levin	
Durbin	Lieberman	

NAYS—2

Feingold	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—4

Hagel	Moseley-Braun
Hollings	Sessions

The conference report was agreed to.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provision of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 509, S. 442, the Internet legislation:

Trent Lott, John McCain, Dan Coats, Chuck Hagel, Larry Craig, Christopher Bond, Wayne Allard, Paul Coverdell, Tim Hutchinson, Jim Inhofe, Mike DeWine, Dirk Kempthorne, Strom Thurmond, Jeff Sessions, Conrad Burns, and Robert F. Bennett.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 422, the internet tax freedom bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Akaka	Ford	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Glenn	Mikulski
Baucus	Gramm	Moynihan
Biden	Grams	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grassley	Murray
Bond	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Harkin	Reed
Brownback	Hatch	Reid
Bryan	Helms	Robb
Burns	Hutchinson	Roberts
Byrd	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Campbell	Inhofe	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Santorum
Coats	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (NH)
Conrad	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
D'Amato	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Domenici	Leahy	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Durbin	Lieberman	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lott	Wyden
Feingold	Lugar	

NAYS—6

Bennett	Cleland	Gorton
Bumpers	Enzi	Graham

NOT VOTING—5

Boxer	Hollings	Sessions
Hagel	Moseley-Braun	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 6. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate begins consideration of S. 442, the Internet tax bill, the Commerce Committee amendment be agreed to; and immediately following that action, the Finance Committee substitute be agreed to and considered original text for the purpose of further amendments. I also ask that during the Senate's consideration of S. 442 or the House companion bill, that only relevant amendments be in order.

I now ask that the motion to proceed be adopted and the Senate proceed to the bill following the period of morning business at 3:15 p.m. today.

Mr. GRAHAM. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, again, the Senator from Florida has chosen to object. We just had a vote, 89–6, which probably would have been 94–6. This is not the way the Senate should function, Mr. President—1, or 2, or 3, or 4, or 5, or 6 Senators should block this important legislation. We are going to have a motion or a vote on the motion to proceed, and we are going to file cloture and we will begin the 30 hours that will bring us to final conclusion on this vote.

If the Senator from Florida wants an amendment, we will debate it. If the Senator from Florida wants to change the bill, we will discuss it. But for the Senator from Florida, with one more week to go before we leave, to continue to block consideration of this legislation, I think is clearly thwarting not only the majority of the Senate, but the majority of the American people. His own President was out in the Silicon Valley at a soft money fundraiser bragging about the fact that the Congress will pass the Internet Tax Freedom Act, as he raised $25,000 a plate in a soft money fundraiser. And he took credit for H–1B, which Senator ABRAHAM was primarily responsible for.

We are growing weary of this. It is time we move forward with this legislation. It is time we save this critical technology, which is absolutely vital to the future of this Nation.

Mr. President, I want to state my intentions again, after consultation with the majority leader. That is, on Thursday morning, there will be a vote on the motion to proceed. It will be another 89–6 or 94–6 vote. We intend to file cloture at that time, and then we will have cloture on the bill, which will then allow us 30 hours of debate. I might point out that, in this present scenario, 1 hour of debate post-cloture on the motion to proceed is allowed per Senator. We will finish this legislation and go to conference in the House and make sure that we don't choke this baby in the cradle—which is called the Internet—which is vital to the future of the economy of this Nation and the world.

I yield the floor.