We started our careers together when he served in the Marine Corps. That was back during the period of Vietnam. I was then serving—for over 5 years—as Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy. I was privileged, of course, to serve with the Presiding Officer's father, Senator Chafee. At the time he was Secretary of the Navy; I served as his Under Secretary.

Senator ROBB had served his tour in Vietnam in 1961 through 1970 and then he remained in the Marine Corps Reserves from 1970 to 1991. I was privileged to wear the marine green during the Korean conflict and served for a very brief period in the Marines. However, I assure Members that the career of Senator ROBB was far more distinguished than the career of the senior Senator, myself. I am pleased to acknowledge that. He then went on to serve as Lieutenant Governor from 1977 to 1981, and Governor from 1982 to 1986.

His two terms in the Senate began in 1988. He has been a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, a committee which I have been privileged to chair since 1993. Throughout this distinguished record, it has been my good fortune to share a very warm friendship with the Senator and with his lovely wife and his children. We all know when we take the oath of office as U.S. Senator, the family plays the key role. I could not count the number of times I have been in matters relating to the Senate, trips relating to the Senate, our frequent joint appearances throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia these many years, beginning back when he was Lieutenant Governor, and there was Mrs. Robb, a daughter of a most distinguished American public servant, former President Lyndon Johnson and a former Member of the Senate.

So I wish him well. It was a difficult task in this past election. He respects both of us as marines. We have duties to perform. I hope the RECORD reflects that I performed that responsibility I felt very sincerely was necessary, but I did it in a spirit that preserved our friendship.

When I think back on his work, I think of the many times Senator ROBB came from that side of the aisle to this side of the aisle to join others in working on pieces of legislation which he felt, and indeed others felt, were in the best interests of this country. He was a bridgebuilder. He served that purpose on the Senate Armed Services Committee. He stood by my side as chairman these past 2 years, supported me, I think, almost in every instance. And he had very keen insight into the life of the men and women of the Armed Forces who serve today. He worked very hard on their behalf.

I hope history will reflect that his contributions directly benefited those who serve today and who will serve tomorrow. He also was quite active in working with me on the retirement benefits, particularly the medical benefits, for those who have served in years past.

Virginia is privileged to have one of the greatest shipyards—we like to think the greatest shipyard—in America. We have the naval shipyard as well as private shipyards. In those yards are built some of the finest ships that sail the seven seas today on behalf of our Navy. Senator ROBB was always there to work with not only me but a strong bipartisan Virginia congressional delegation, Senate and House, on matters of national defense since our State is privileged to be preeminent in the field of national defense, having a number of the major bases and a number of men and women in uniform who are stationed there. Of course, the Pentagon is the core of this complex throughout Virginia. But there was Senator ROBB on all occasions, and particularly as it related to our naval shipbuilding program.

I am joined on the floor today by two very able members of my staff. Ann Loomis is the chief of our legislative staff; Susan Magill, with whom I consulted early this morning in preparing these remarks, is my chief of staff. They would want it known that, through the years, the staff working relationship between Senator ROBB's office and my office was always excellent. We looked upon our duties as serving the Commonwealth of Virginia and the people of that State; therefore, our staffs did everything they could to prepare the two Senators to meet that challenge and that responsibility.

He is a man of principle. I think that is unquestioned by those of us who watched him. Indeed, at times we differed on very fundamental policy issues, and that is reflected in our voting records. But he was always a man of principle and he stood by those principles. As I listened to him, my reaction sometimes bordered on disbelief because I so disagreed with him, but he stood by those principles no matter what the cost to his professional career as a public servant. He stood by what he believed.

So I say to my good friend, I shall remember him in many ways but above all for his friendship and his always senatorial courtesy. As we laugh around here and joke: The title senior Senator and perhaps a dollar or so will get you a cup of coffee. But he never tried one-upmanship and he always addressed me as his senior in the Senate. I thank him. I wish him and his family well in their next career. I am confident there are many challenges that await this distinguished American public servant.

I note my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania is on the floor. I yield the floor at this time, and I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

SENATOR ROBB

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague from Virginia for those fine remarks about Senator ROBB. I associate myself with Senator WARNER on his best wishes to Senator ROBB, acknowledging his very distinguished service in the Senate for 12 years. I might add, his distinguished wife, Lynda Johnson Robb, was a regular at the Old Testament Bible class conducted in my office over the past decade, presided over by a very distinguished Biblical scholar, Naomi Rosenblatt. But CHUCK and Lynda Robb will still be around and we will have the benefit of their company, although his Senate career, at least, is over at the moment.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about the pending appropriations bill on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, which comes from the appropriations subcommittee which I chair. There has been an extraordinarily rocky road for this bill this year. I think it is very regrettable that on December 15 we are still debating that bill and the entire package is as yet unsettled, although hopefully it will be resolved before the end of the day. But there have been many days when we have been hopeful about resolving matters before the end of the day and that has not occurred.

Without going into the background on prior years, it has been a very difficult matter to get the bill on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education to the President for signature and to resolve the controversies. This year, my ranking member on the subcommittee, Senator TOM HARKIN, and I have worked as partners on this matter. When he chaired the subcommittee, I was ranking, or when I have chaired the subcommittee, he has been ranking. Both of us understand—and have for a long time—that if you want to get something done in Washington, you have to cross party lines. That is more true today than ever. It will be even more true in the 107th Congress when we have a 50–50 split.

But we brought that bill to conclusion on the Senate vote on June 30 of this year, which tied the record going back to 1976. We completed a conference report on July 27, the last Thursday before we adjourned for the Republican convention and the August recess. We did that with a lot of extra effort, hard work by our staffs led by Bettilou Taylor on my staff, so we could get the bill to the President right after Labor Day. There is no use sending it in August, but we were prepared to submit it to the President the day after Labor Day.

We had met the President's figure of $106 billion, which was a $10 billion increase over the program authority from last year. We did that because the experience in the past had been that when we quarreled with the President about the total figure, invariably there were add-ons at the end when the issue

went beyond September 30 into October or November.

Candidly, it was difficult to get the Republican caucus to agree to $106 billion in the Senate and in the House, but we did that. But in presenting the bill, the conference report, we had some priorities which were somewhat different from those of the President. We had, for example, added $2.7 billion for the National Institutes of Health because we thought that was a very high priority item. We had also made some changes on the $2.7 billion which the President had requested for school construction and additional teachers, giving him that money but adding a provision that if the local boards of education wanted to use the money for something else after fulfilling very stringent requirements, that they could use it for local control.

When we sat down to negotiate with the White House, the President and the Democrats in the House upped the ante and asked for an additional $6 billion. From my way of thinking, that was totally unacceptable because we had provided the $106 billion which the President had initially requested. After all, it is the congressional prerogative to set the priorities on appropriations. That is spelled out in the Constitution. The President has to sign the bill but we have the lion's share of responsibility, in my view, to establish the priorities.

Those negotiations degenerated—at least in my opinion—until there was an inclination by some in the conference to pay $114 billion. I refused to be a party to that amount of money because I had fought hard to raise the figure to $106 billion and I felt there would be no credibility in what I would present as chairman of the subcommittee if I would be a will-o'-the-wisp and raise it to any figure to satisfy the demands of the White House and the House Democrats. There was a tentative agreement of $114 billion and I declined to sign any conference report which reflected that figure.

Ultimately that arrangement broke down. Now we have come to the point where the negotiations have produced a figure of $108.9 billion, which is still more than the $106 billion we had originally projected, but in the spirit of accommodation, trying to finish the business of the Congress, I am prepared to go along with that figure although very reluctantly.

There have been changes in the bill which I find totally unacceptable. The National Institutes of Health has had an increase of $2.7 billion over fiscal year 2000, which had been in all along, now cut by $200 million to $2.5 billion. I believe that the National Institutes of Health is the crown jewel of the Federal Government. It may be the only jewel of the Federal Government. We have added almost $9 billion to the funding on NIH in the last five cycles. The Senate, in one of the first years under my chairmanship, came in at the figure of a $950 million increase. The House would not go along. We compromised out at $907 million. The next year we added $1 billion; the year after, $2 billion; the year after that, $2.3 billion, which was cut a little on an across-the-board cut. This year we put in $2.7 billion, now reduced to $2.5 billion. But we have a total of almost $9 billion added in these last five cycles and they have made tremendous strides on the most dreaded diseases—Parkinson's and Alzheimer's and cancer and heart ailments and the whole range.

It is my hope in the future that whoever chairs the subcommittee will have better cooperation on all sides to present the bill to the President before the fiscal year ends. I think, had that been done, we could have mustered a very strong position that our priorities were superior to what the President had in mind, and that if he were going to veto the bill, we ought not to be fearful of his veto but we ought to accept it as his view and then take the case to the American public. I think, had the bill been submitted to the President on September 5, we would have won that fight. Or if we had not won it outright, we would have compromised in terms so we wouldn't be here on December 15, still arguing about this Labor-HHS-Education bill as the principal source of contention.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 3280 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I again thank my distinguished ranking member, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, who works collaboratively on veterans affairs matters and all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is a committee which has worked in a bipartisan way. It has a very excellent staff, with staff director Bill Tuerk. I thank the staff for their assistance and commend to the public and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the legislation which has been passed during the 106th Congress.

I know my time has expired, and I note the presence on the floor of a distinguished Senator, Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor. I was about to say ''another distinguished Senator,'' but I modified that to ''a distinguished Senator.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Pennsylvania leaves the floor, if that is his intention, I thank him for the exceptional job he has done in ensuring that we do have funding increases for critical programs such as those at the National Institutes of Health.

I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee, describe it as the crown jewel of the Federal Government, and I totally agree with his comments. He has also been an advocate for more education funding, combined with more flexibility. I wish we had followed his advice earlier this year and sent the appropriations bill down to the White House, completing his work in a very timely fashion back in July, I believe it was.

I commend the Senator for being an outstanding chairman. I am a great admirer of his and appreciate all of his hard work.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I express my thanks to Senator COLLINS. We work very closely together with a very distinguished group of Senators—Senator JEFFORDS, Senator SNOWE, and who is the fifth member? Yes, Senator CHAFEE, who is presiding. I thank the Chair and thank Senator COLLINS.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 1:30 p.m., with the time equally divided.

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

THE STEEP COST OF A MAINE WINTER

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the importance of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program known as LIHEAP in helping low-income Maine families cope with the high cost of our long Maine winters.

As Callie Parker from Little Deer Isle, Maine, so eloquently testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee earlier this year, heating your home during a Maine winter is a matter of life and death. When the cold reaches into the very marrow of one's bones, when a glass of water you left on a night stand freezes during the night should your furnace go out, you simply cannot get by without heat.

Unfortunately, not everyone has enough money to buy the fuel necessary to heat their home. Far too many Maine families have had to choose whether to buy groceries or to pay their rent or mortgage or to keep warm. These are choices that no one should be forced to make, but unless we increase funding for energy assistance now, these choices will become increasingly common.

Winter has not even officially begun, although you would not know that in the area of the country from which the Presiding Officer and I come. The high price of fuel and cold temperatures have already driven a record number of households in Maine to seek home heating assistance. Already the Community Action Program agencies in Maine have identified 28,000 households in need of LIHEAP funds to get through this winter. That compares to only 10,000 applicants at this time last year; in other words, it has more than doubled the amount of households seeking this kind of assistance. Another 19,000 families are waiting to be reviewed by the CAP agencies.