any more time. The hour of 12:30 is quickly approaching. I ask unanimous consent that we recess for our Tuesday morning conferences of the parties at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CLELAND).

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 866

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes equally divided before the vote on the Conrad amendment.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today is an amendment I offered last year that got 60 votes on the floor of the Senate. Earlier this year, it got 53 votes on the floor of the Senate. It says we should protect both the Social Security and the Medicare trust funds. We already provide some protection of the Social Security trust fund. It would strengthen those protections. We would also provide those same protections to the Medicare trust fund. Both of these trust funds deserve protection. If we don't provide it, the money will be used for other purposes.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. May I ask, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Thank you.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Conrad amendment. In fiscal year 2002, the overall Medicare Program would require over $50 billion in general tax revenues. Over the next 10 years, the Medicare Program would require over $600 billion in general tax revenues. We can't lockbox something that simply does not exist. It is a fiction.

This amendment, in my opinion, will harm our ability to reform Medicare and also harm our ability to provide a prescription drug benefit that is so long due for the American people.

Furthermore, the Conrad amendment does not contain any real teeth in terms of a Social Security lockbox. It lacks any automatic enforcement mechanism to protect Social Security. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment and against the waiver of the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, I raise a point of order that this amendment violates section 306 of the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive the applicable section of that act for the purpose of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 42, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Akaka	Dorgan	Lincoln
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Feingold	Miller
Biden	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Hollings	Reid
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Carnahan	Johnson	Sarbanes
Carper	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kerry	Specter
Conrad	Landrieu	Stabenow
Corzine	Leahy	Torricelli
Daschle	Levin	Wellstone
Dayton	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—54

Allard	Ensign	Lugar
Allen	Enzi	McCain
Bennett	Feinstein	McConnell
Bond	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Breaux	Frist	Murray
Brownback	Gramm	Nickles
Bunning	Grassley	Reed
Burns	Gregg	Roberts
Byrd	Hagel	Sessions
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Inouye	Thomas
Crapo	Jeffords	Thompson
DeWine	Kohl	Thurmond
Dodd	Kyl	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner

NOT VOTING—4

Clinton	Santorum
Edwards	Schumer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 42, the nays are 54. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained during this vote on the motion to waive the Budget Act with regard to the Conrad amendment, vote No. 221. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 865

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the Voinovich amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. May we have order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators ALLARD, FITZGERALD, and HAGEL as cosponsors, and I also thank Senators SESSIONS, HELMS, and CRAPO for their help on this amendment.

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

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask my colleagues to vote to support our Social Security lockbox amendment. Our lockbox strengthens the existing point of order against spending the existing Social Security surplus. Our lockbox makes it out of order to use the Social Security surplus in any single year of the next decade. More important, our amendment contains an automatic enforcement mechanism. If OMB reports the Federal Government will spend the Social Security surplus, an automatic across-the-board cut in spending, a sequester will be put in place. The size of this sequester will offset the use of the surplus. This is the ultimate enforcement mechanism. If the Social Security surplus looks like it will get spent, the OMB stops it from happening. This will ensure we stay the course on limiting spending and pay down the national debt as we promised when we passed the budget resolution.

Spending cuts under this amendment would impact both discretionary and mandatory spending. Mandatory spending for the most needy in society would not be affected by these cuts. My amendment would exclude Social Security, food stamps, and other programs that are excluded from sequesters under the Deficit Control Act of 1985. In reality, about $33 billion of mandatory spending is subject to sequester. Hopefully, we would never have to use the sequester.

This amendment is straightforward. It relies largely on existing law. It primarily builds upon the existing budget process. We all know Social Security is off budget and my amendment reinforces that position. Our amendment does not modify any budgetary conventions, nor does it pretend Social Security is something it is not. We must make sure history does not repeat itself. For years the Social Security surplus has been an all too readily available source of cash for Congress to spend. However, since 1999, there has been a political consensus not to return to spending of the Social Security surplus, in large part because we have had an on-budget surplus that supplied the extra money.

If, however, the economic prosperity that this Nation enjoyed recently continues to fade, although I hope this is a temporary situation, and surplus projections are likely to be revised downward, then the Social Security surplus will again be in the crosshairs. It will be in the crosshairs because of Congressional yearning for more spending.

If you want to make sure money is there to follow through on what we promised the American people, if you want to pay down the debt, if you want to control spending, and if you want to do it in an accountable, enforceable way, without gimmicks, vote for this amendment. I think everyone in this room knows this is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and urge them to vote for waiving the point of order that will be raised against it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Voinovich amendment does nothing to protect Medicare. Just a few short months ago, every member of the Republican caucus voted for protection for both Medicare and Social Security. What has occurred that would lead them now to forget Medicare?

This is not a wise course. In the name of protecting Social Security, this amendment would cut Medicare. The sequester that is provided for in this amendment says, if we are on the edge of going into Social Security, cut Medicare, cut defense. It is a one-trick pony. It does not matter whether the deficiency was caused by a tax cut, by an economic downturn, or by excessive spending, the answer to each and every one of them is the same: cut spending. It does not matter if the problem was caused by too big a tax cut: cut spending. It does not matter if the problem was caused by an economic downturn, the answer is cut spending. It is not a balanced approach.

The assertion that there is no Medicare surplus simply does not fit the facts. This is the report of the Congressional Budget Office. On page 19, under the table ''Trust Fund Surpluses,'' it shows Social Security in surplus, it shows Medicare Part A in surplus, it shows Medicare Part B in rough balance.

The argument that the Senator from Ohio is making is that because we have chosen, as a Congress, to fund Part B, in part by general fund transfers, that that means Medicare is in deficit. That is not the case. That is not the definition of the Congressional Budget Office; that is not the definition of the Office of Management and Budget. All of them assert there is a surplus in Part A and rough balance in Part B.

We, as a Congress, have made the determination to finance Part B, by premiums in part, by general fund transfer in part.

This is not an amendment we should adopt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we already have a Social Security lockbox. The pending amendment contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Senate Budget Committee; therefore, I raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant to section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I move to waive the applicable provisions of the Budget Act and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Allard	Gramm	Murkowski
Allen	Grassley	Nickles
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Campbell	Harkin	Shelby
Collins	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Craig	Helms	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Hutchinson	Snowe
DeWine	Hutchison	Specter
Ensign	Inhofe	Thomas
Enzi	Kyl	Thompson
Feingold	Lott	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Lugar	Warner
Frist	McCain	
Graham	McConnell	

NAYS—54

Akaka	Corzine	Levin
Baucus	Daschle	Lieberman
Bayh	Dayton	Lincoln
Bennett	Dodd	Mikulski
Biden	Domenici	Miller
Bingaman	Dorgan	Murray
Bond	Durbin	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Edwards	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Feinstein	Reed
Burns	Hollings	Reid
Byrd	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Johnson	Stabenow
Carper	Kennedy	Stevens
Chafee	Kerry	Thurmond
Cleland	Kohl	Torricelli
Cochran	Landrieu	Wellstone
Conrad	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Clinton	Santorum	Schumer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 43 and the nays are 54. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 873

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided before a vote in relation to the Hollings amendment. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in the first part of April when we passed my amendment authorizing a rebate, we had a $102 billion surplus. Now, as of 3 o'clock this afternoon, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, the public debt to the penny—and anybody can read it on the Internet—the debt now, instead of being a surplus, has increased since the beginning of the fiscal year to $36 billion in the red. In other words, we don't have the $41 billion for a rebate. We have to go out and borrow it.

Common sense says that rather than going out and borrowing money and throwing it to the winds, increasing the debt, the public would prefer that we pay down the debt. At least that is what we tell them we are doing.

If you look on the screen on channel 2, the Republican channel says ''abolishes a tax rebate.'' ''President Bush and Congress promise to the American people. . . .''

They didn't promise it. It was my amendment. I promised, as the financial world advised me, that it should apply to all taxpayers. What they have done is broken my promise. Nothing is in this bill for the 25 million payroll-tax payers. In other words, you and I, Mr. President, will get a rebate, unless you vote for my amendment. But the payroll-tax payers, such as Dicky Flatt—I don't know where the Senator from Texas is, but Dicky Flatt, the fellow who ''pulls the wagon and pays the taxes, and builds the country, and sits around the kitchen table'' gets nothing.

Now, come on. If there is a conscience around here, let's talk sense. Save that $41 billion. We need it for defense. We need it for education. We have increased education spending to $25 billion a year, $250 billion over 10 years. We need it for prescription drugs. Let's don't throw the money around and then cry the rest of the year here that we don't have the money.

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.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the Hollings amendment. The Hollings amendment would repeal the retroactive marginal rate cuts enacted on June 7th of this year. That is barely over 1 month ago.

My opposition to the amendment is based on both procedural and substantive grounds.

On the first problem the amendment's procedural problems, it is clear that, if adopted, this amendment will cause the underlying supplemental appropriations bill to violate the origination clause of the U.S. Constitution. If

sent to the House, the bill would certainly be ''blue slipped.'' So, this amendment, if adopted, kills the supplemental.

The second problem is the substance of the amendment. This amendment would repeal all of the retroactive marginal rate reductions in the recently passed tax bill. Those rate cuts are based principally on the new ten percent bracket for the first $6,000 of income for single taxpayers and $12,000 of income for married couples.

The retroactive new ten percent bracket is the basis for the advance refund checks of $300 for a single person and $600 for a married couple. The Hollings amendment stops these checks dead. A vote for the Hollings amendment is a way to say no to American taxpayers who now expect to receive refund checks. A vote for the Hollings amendment is a vote against the stimulus in the tax bill we just passed.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I will vote for the Hollings amendment and wish to explain my reasoning. The amendment focuses on the consequences of the massive tax cut, namely that we are facing a Hobson's choice—either raid the Social Security and Medicare HI trust funds or forgo needed spending on defense, education and other priorities. This is a choice that will bedevil us for years to come until we come to our senses regarding a tax cut we can afford.

The Hollings amendment seeks to avoid this Hobson's choice by rescinding a portion of the excessive tax cut. I would prefer that he rescinded aspects of the tax cut other than the rebates. I was an early advocate of rebates to help us with the current economic slowdown. I was disappointed in the rebate that was finally adopted in the tax bill because it is not being paid to tens of millions who filed tax returns, but I still support rebates.

If we don't face reality regarding the tax cut, however, we will be faced again and again with the Hobson's choice regarding the trust funds. We have urgent priorities to modernize our defense establishment and to fund the education reform initiative, both issues where I have expended considerable effort over the years. The problem we will face is that so much of the government's revenue base has now been spent that any national priority that requires more support, like defense or education, will have to be shelved or funded at the expense of the trust fund surpluses.

As Chairman CONRAD has explained, the President's budget plan means we may well raid these trust funds this year even if we do not go forward with these urgent priorities. We won't know for sure until the new budget estimates are provided in August and at the end of the fiscal year, but we may spend down these trust funds even if we do not exceed the budget resolution limits.

I applaud Senator HOLLINGS for raising this issue, and for seeking to avoid this Hobson's choice. While this amendment affects rebates that I support, it brings needed attention to the overall box the Administration has placed us in and the difficult choices we will have to make. This amendment attempts to avoid our dipping into the trust fund surpluses. There are other ways to accomplish the same goal and I will be exploring them as we struggle with the consequences of the tax bill, the need to defend the trust funds and fund urgent defense and education reforms. This is a Hobson's choice we did not have to face and that is why I voted against the tax bill and will vote for the Hollings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have 2 minutes. I yield 1 minute to Senator BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, with deep reluctance, I oppose my good friend from South Carolina. I must say that I compliment him because it was earlier that he suggested to me the stimulus to get the economy going. He was foresightful of that fact, and because of that recognition, we now find that the economy does need to be stimulated a little bit. I compliment him for that.

I must oppose him on this amendment, however. This is a revenue measure. It has not been before the Finance Committee. In fact, it has in a certain sense been before the committee because it was part of a larger bill and the committee voted against it.

Second, this is a revenue provision on an appropriations bill. Under the Constitution, it will be blue-slipped by the House. The House will automatically reject it.

Beyond that, we just passed a tax bill. Let's not have a yo-yo, up-and-down tax bill. We can modify it later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the American people should understand that if this amendment is adopted, it will stop the rebate checks in their tracks. It is almost as if we want to take the money back from the people before we ever give it to them.

They are saying: Congress did something right. And those who look at the American economy say: Hey, they did something right. It is about the right time to have a big tax cut.

I do not believe you will find one economist of renown and repute in the United States who will say in the middle of this downturn we should increase taxes. Ask somebody. I asked a bunch of them. They said this might not be the greatest tax plan, but cut the taxes and leave it alone.

I say to my friend, Senator HOLLINGS, he did a good thing when we had the budget resolution before us. He was ahead of us. He said put more of it in the early years. We went off to conference and followed his admonition. Now he thinks that is too much.

The checks that are in the mail, if they could get at them, knowing the post office, could even be stopped in a week if we adopted this amendment.

It is the wrong thing to do to the people; it is the wrong thing to do for the American economy, and certainly for the Congress it is absolutely the epitome of moving in the wrong direction when the country has problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 873. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 94, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—3

Hollings	Lieberman	Mikulski

NAYS—94

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Durbin	McCain
Allen	Edwards	McConnell
Baucus	Ensign	Miller
Bayh	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Nickles
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Breaux	Gramm	Reid
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Bunning	Gregg	Rockefeller
Burns	Hagel	Sarbanes
Byrd	Harkin	Sessions
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Cantwell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Carper	Hutchison	Snowe
Chafee	Inhofe	Specter
Cleland	Inouye	Stabenow
Cochran	Jeffords	Stevens
Collins	Johnson	Thomas
Conrad	Kennedy	Thompson
Corzine	Kerry	Thurmond
Craig	Kohl	Torricelli
Crapo	Kyl	Voinovich
Daschle	Landrieu	Warner
Dayton	Leahy	Wellstone
DeWine	Levin	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	
Domenici	Lott	

NOT VOTING—3

Clinton	Santorum	Schumer

The amendment (No. 873) was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers the following amendments, they be considered with the following limitations, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote in relation to the amendment:

Wellstone amendment No. 874, there will be 60 minutes equally divided and controlled in the usual form; on the Schumer amendment, No. 862, there will be 30 minutes equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum so we may examine this amendment for just a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Minnesota, we almost have this worked out so that everyone will know what is happening until the end of the day. I know my friend from Minnesota is anxious to offer his amendment. We have imposed upon him to offer his amendment out of order. If we wait another 2 or 3 minutes, everything could be done. I ask if my friend objects if we go into a quorum call for a couple more minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I was trying to accommodate Senators.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield before he puts in the quorum call?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I merely want to say, in explanation, that the Senator from Minnesota was about to proceed at my request. I did not know the state of the situation. I apologize for that. But I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, before we go into a quorum call, that very efficient staff have typed up a couple different versions of a unanimous consent request, the final one of which should be here momentarily. I have been conferring with the minority manager, and we should have it just about wrapped up, I say to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, in the words of Alexander Pope: ''Thou art my guide, philosopher, and friend.''

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, has my colleague suggested the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be the only first-degree amendments remaining in order to S. 1077; that any votes ordered with respect to these amendments occur in the order in which the amendment is debated, and that no second-degree amendment be in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendment: Wellstone amendment No. 874; Bond amendment No. 872, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled in the usual form; McCain amendment No. 869; Feingold amendment No. 863; Schumer amendment No. 862; a managers' amendment, with 5 minutes equally divided; provided further that there be 30 minutes of general debate on the bill, with Senators MCCAIN and GRAMM of Texas controlling 5 minutes each, and the remainder equally controlled by the two managers, Senators BYRD and STEVENS; that upon the use or yielding back of all time, the Senate proceed to vote in a stacked sequence, with 5 minutes equally divided and controlled between each vote, and that the votes, after the first vote, be 10-minute votes, and that the first vote in the sequence not occur prior to 7:45 this evening.

Madam President, we are hopeful and confident we can make the 7:45 time. We have spent a little time trying to come up with this agreement. This has been gone over with Senator BYRD.

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.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the 30 minutes equally divided between Senator BYRD and myself includes the 10 minutes for Senators GRAMM and MCCAIN, but we are at liberty to yield that to any person on the other amendments, if necessary; is that correct?

Mr. REID. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I have no objection.

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

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I express my appreciation to my friend from Minnesota who is his usual courteous self. He has been very patient. I yield the floor for the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 874

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 874.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, this amendment would increase funding for what is called the LIHEAP, the Low Income Energy Assistance Program. It would provide $150 million in emergency funding for this fiscal year for the LIHEAP program.

The amendment would be offset directing the Secretary of Defense to rescind $150 million in fiscal year 2001 funds out of administrative costs.

There have been many General Accounting Office Inspector General studies of the Pentagon budget that have talked about administrative waste going far beyond $150 million. Out of the whole budget, we are just saying take $150 million from all of the administrative waste—talking about tens of billions of dollars—and transfer that to the Low Income Energy Assistance Program.

This is a safety net program which provides essential heating and cooling assistance to almost 5 million low-income people, many of them senior citizens, many of them disabled, many of them working poor, many of them working poor families with children.

Let me explain why I bring this amendment to the floor. Right now, national estimates show—and this is shameful—that only 13 percent of the households eligible for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program actually receive any assistance at all. That is because since 1985, accounting for inflation, the truth is, the funding has declined by 70 percent. For many low-income families, the energy costs are as much as 20 percent of the monthly budget.

The Low Income Energy Assistance Program is a lifeline program that provides additional grants of money to people when they are in dire need of such assistance. When they don't get this help, if they are elderly, they don't buy the prescription drugs they need. They don't eat what they should be eating.

They don't have enough money for food. I am not exaggerating.

I am also talking about cooling assistance. While I come from a cold-weather State, we also have emergency cooling assistance, but for many States that is not unimportant. There are poor people, many of them elderly, who run into a lot of difficulty. We have had some summers when they died from exposure to the heat, struggling with asthma and whatnot and without any cooling assistance whatsoever.

I recognize the hard work that has been done by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In his supplemental request to the Congress, President Bush requested only $150 million of additional money for LIHEAP emergency

funding. I am sorry. I have to say it: This does not represent ''compassionate conservatism.'' It was inadequate. The President's request would not even have been enough to assist low-income families who are currently in arrears from this past year's devastating winter.

Chairman BYRD and Chairman STEVENS, recognizing the inadequacy of the administration's request, doubled it. They deserve the credit for doing so. However, while the $150 million requested by the President was inadequate, the $300 million certainly does a better job, but it is far from adequate. It doesn't meet the needs of millions of working families and seniors who are facing unbelievable energy costs no matter where one goes in the United States.

In addition, all of the LIHEAP funds appropriated for this year have been released, and nearly half the States have already exhausted or nearly exhausted their funding.

It is clear that we are currently nearing a crisis situation. A study was just completed by the National Energy Assistance Directors Association, and they found that 28 States and the District of Columbia were either out of funding or had very low balances; States reporting that they were out of funds: The District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin; States reporting very low balances: Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Utah.

This survey also found that arrearages and threats of shutoffs increased to 4.3 million households. This past winter was a living hell for a lot of low-income people. Energy costs in the State of Minnesota went up 40 percent. We have this deadly combination of our not providing the funding that is needed over the years, so that only about 15 percent, 14 percent of the people who are eligible get the help, and in addition, with the dramatic increase in energy prices, it is an even far worse situation.

Let me be specific. Alabama needs an additional $5 to $6 million for summer cooling, especially if the State experiences the severe summer that has been predicted. Colorado may have to discontinue its summer crisis intervention program and the summer fan distribution program for lack of funding. Georgia needs an additional $1 million for summer cooling and to provide assistance to the 20,000 households that owe approximately $80 million in natural gas bills alone.

The Illinois program estimates it needs $15 to $20 million for a statewide summer program and $15 million for arrearage shutoff avoidance assistance. Kansas has had to resort to prorated benefits for winter heating assistance to compensate for the higher number of applicants and fuel costs. Kentucky needs $7 million to operate a cooling program. Minnesota needs an additional $13 million to cover the applications received this year and provide the same level of services as last year. New Hampshire has responded to the increased demand for assistance this winter season. It goes on and on.

Madam President, many States need the help and, as I said before, it is the cooling assistance. It also provides the money right now over this critical period for the cold-weather States to purchase energy at a lower price than they would be able to do later. It also provides resources for States to help low-income people pay some of the bills they have not been able to pay so that they are not shut off, because right now they can be shut off by the utility companies. Again, many Senators come from States where home heating prices went up by 40 percent this past winter.

I also want to make clear to my colleagues that this emergency funding will carry over to the next fiscal year. Advance appropriations were eliminated in last year's appropriations cycle. As of October 1, 2001, States will have totally exhausted their LIHEAP funds. The carryover of this amendment will ensure that many States will be able to pre-buy heating fuels for the next heating season, and summer purchases have greatly benefited low-income households, providing them with more fuel for their money.

This amendment could be offset again by directing the Secretary of Defense to transfer $150 million from the whole Pentagon budget in administrative expenses for fiscal year 2001. I want to remind colleagues that the President has requested $343 billion for the defense budget in the next fiscal year, at a time when the Department can't even complete an internal audit. I am just saying transfer $150 million in administrative expenses.

Now, again, let me be really clear. This is a successful program. It is a lifeline program. It is for the most vulnerable citizens in our country. We have not provided the funding and the assistance that is necessary, and it is the reason I bring this amendment to the floor—recognizing the good work of the Appropriations Committee. As a Senator from Minnesota, I listed all sorts of other States that are in trouble right now either for cooling assistance or in trouble as they look to this next year.

We ought to be providing the funding. This is just one vote that calls on us to try to get our priorities straight. The President's $150 million was hardly compassionate conservatism; doubling it was good work, but it doesn't come close to meeting the needs over the next 3-month period, doesn't come close for what is needed for cooling assistance, doesn't come close for what use States can make to provide assistance to people so they don't get cut off by utilities. It doesn't provide advance funding for States such as Minnesota that are going to wind up in a real financial crunch next year because the home heating costs are going to be high and we are not going to provide the necessary funding.

At the very minimum, can't we take $150 million in administrative costs from the whole Department of Defense budget, which is well over $300 billion, and put it into emergency low-income energy assistance for poor people, working poor people, for children, for the elderly, and for the disabled?

I say to my colleagues that we know right now this has been a successful program. We also know that the program has continued to be underfunded, and we know firsthand that over half the States in the United States of America are out of money. I gave you a report on which States are almost out of money. We have a hot summer month coming up. I do not believe we should pass this opportunity to utilize the supplementary emergency vehicle, which is for emergency purposes, to bring additional relief to vulnerable citizens in this country. This amendment is a modest step in this direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Also, because I know that the chairman and the ranking minority member want to continue to move things forward, I believe I have made my case, but I also want to kind of put this into a broader context. I really worry about where we are heading. We pass these tax cuts, we pass this budget resolution, and every day you read editorials and articles and you are looking at the figures which Senator CONRAD and Senator BYRD have laid out for us, and it is becoming crystal clear that what we have done is we have not been very intellectually rigorous.

We are not going to have the funding on present course. We had these Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cuts. It is really over $2 trillion over the next decade, and it is only going to get worse. And now, at the very time when I thought we were going to have additional resources to work with, we are being told that soon we are going to be dipping into Medicare trust funds, Social Security trust funds, and that we don't have any funding. We can't help, in the year 2001, people who need lifeline assistance, low-income people who need emergency assistance.

And then I say to the ranking member, who has been such a leader on education, we were told during this debate about the ESEA that there would be the funding. Where is the funding going to come from? Where will we get the money to fully fund the IDEA program? Where is the money coming from for title I?

Then there is the prescription drug benefit. Everybody who campaigned for office campaigned on this issue. Are we going to say we have actually so little money, that the copays are so high—I don't know about the State of Washington, but I bet it is the same. The income profile of senior citizens in Minnesota is not high at all. You have too

high a copay and people—if you don't deal with the catastrophic expenses, you are not providing the help. Are we going to be told again we can't afford to do it?

Are we going to be told we can't do anything on affordable housing? Barbara Ehrenreich wrote a book called ''Nickle and Dimed.'' She is a fine writer. She went incognito and lived in different communities trying to find out what you do. She worked at Wal-Mart. She had a chapter about Minnesota, and there is a paucity of affordable housing, rental or home ownership. For many, it is just not there. But we can't do anything. We are in a straitjacket. So we have amendments proposed that will add to the Pentagon budget and take away from workforce development, take away from dislocated worker funds. On the Iron Range in Minnesota, LTV just shut down; 1,400 workers are out of work.

I say to my colleague from West Virginia, take away from the steel loan fund. What kind of tradeoffs are we getting into? This is becoming a zero-sum game. We have a strong defense, but we don't help people who are out of work. We don't help rebuild industries that are so critical, as a matter of fact, to our national defense. We put more money into education, and we don't have money for prescription drugs or for job training.

We passed the Patients' Bill of Rights. I am proud of this piece of legislation. The whole question of health security for all is still out there.

Affordable child care: We all say we are for the children. Where is the funding for Head Start, and for affordable child care, and for affordable higher education?

What about veterans? Who is going to make the commitment to a decent health care budget for veterans? Who is going to do anything about homeless veterans?

I am just telling you that this is a small amendment, but this small amendment tells a larger story. I am not raiding Medicare or Social Security. I am not doing any of that. This is just a transfer. I am just saying, out of the whole Pentagon budget—the huge, over $300 billion budget—$150 million in administrative costs can be transferred to this program so that we can do a little bit better by way of helping vulnerable citizens in our country.

That is the amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I yield time in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, the Wellstone amendment, dealing with the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, is a very noble goal. I have no quarrel with this goal but, most respectfully, this matter has been addressed in this bill.

The amendment that is proposed would cut funding for the Department of Defense by $150 million at a time when we are trying our best to increase funding. The amendment would allow the Secretary of Defense to choose which programs under his jurisdiction would be curtailed.

None of us wants to curtail readiness, but this blank check to administrative programs would force the Secretary to identify those that he considers of lower priority. I always ask myself: In a Senate of 100 Members, can we ever agree upon what is of more priority?

Most respectfully, I inform my colleagues that the Secretary could take funding from several items that this body has supported over DOD's reluctance, and we have done this for many years.

For example, we have a fund for the Youth Challenge Program which takes high school dropouts and turns their lives around. It is a most successful program that is under the auspices of the National Guard. It has saved our Nation countless millions of dollars. We have kept these young students out of prison. We have kept them out of crime. I do not think any one of us would want to cut off that program.

This amendment could very well force the Secretary to stop programs to clean up the environment. One may ask: In what environmental program is the Defense Department involved? Over the years, we have been closing bases, and all of our military bases, because of the nature of the work, are polluted. We have unexploded ordnance in the target ranges. There is oil pollution all over the place because we have had oil dumps. If the communities want to use these bases, how can they go about it under our laws? They have to be clean before people of the United States can utilize the bases that have been closed by the action of Congress. Do we want to stop that program?

Then we speak of our cultural heritage. The Department of Defense now has a Legacy Program which protects cultural heritage.

There is a program I am certain the author of this measure wants to see continued, and that is the program which supports Native American tribes. For example, at this moment, we are closing clinics and hospitals, not only here but in Europe. We constantly find that our Native Americans do not have proper hospital facilities, and so we get these old, secondhand beds, old secondhand operating tables, and old secondhand x ray machines to help the first citizens of this land. Is that high priority or low priority?

Then we come to the National Guard. This has been a battle from day one. Is the National Guard of low priority or is it of high priority?

These are the types of programs the Secretary is likely to curtail or cut out to carry out the intent of this amendment.

I argue that we are already underfunded in the Department of Defense. That is why we are hopeful this Senate will approve this measure which will add $5.5 billion to the Department.

This amendment is a noble one, but I believe it aims at the wrong target. Others can speak more knowledgeably about the adequacy of funding. I know it is a worthwhile program, but understand, it is already fully funded for this fiscal year.

I have had people ask me: Why is the Department of Defense spending money for defense when we do not use an aircraft, when we do not use the carriers, when we do not use the submarines? Thank God, Madam President, we do not use the submarines. Thank God we do not have to use the bombers. Thank God we do not have to use the carriers because if we were using them, we would be at war. But since we are prepared, potential adversaries think twice before they decide to get into action with us.

Much as I admire the purpose, much as I admire the noble goal, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back any time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 12 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will take 3 minutes, I say to my colleague. I want to respond to my good friend from Hawaii by saying three things. First, there is not a better person in the Senate. I hate disagreeing with him.

I listened carefully, and I want him to know in the language of this amendment, we make it clear:

> In determining the accounts to specify, the Secretary of Defense shall take into consideration the need to promote efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and productivity within the Department of Defense, as well as to maintain readiness and troop quality of life.

We do not talk about taking money out of any of the programs. We are not talking about cutting programs that are especially important for youth or especially important for Native American people. We are certainly not talking about anything that goes away from readiness and troop quality of life.

The only thing we are talking about is administrative expenses. The Pentagon has not even been able to complete its internal audit. We all know there is way more than $150 million in administrative waste in an over $300 billion budget. I am saying do not take it out of programs, and I am certainly saying do not take it out of anything that deals with troop quality of life or readiness. I am simply saying take it out of the administrative waste and put it into the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

The vote is about whether or not we want to take some money out of administrative expenses from over a $300

billion budget and put it into this program.

My colleague talked about this program being fully funded, but the fact is, we have only 14 percent of the families who are eligible who are able to benefit because it has been so underfunded over the years. We just went through a 40-percent increase in heating costs this past winter which has thrown everything helter-skelter with States not having the money, with not enough cooling assistance, people in arrears, people faced with utility shutoffs, with States worrying about next year. I don't think anybody from any of these States can make a point that we don't need more funding for this program. If I thought we already had the funding we need, I would not bring this amendment to the floor. I believe it is quite to the contrary.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. INOUYE. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia controls 23½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Would the distinguished Senator from Hawaii yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, this amendment would add another $150 million for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, in addition to the $300 million already included in the bill. The additional LIHEAP funds are offset by an administrative cut in the Department of Defense to which Mr. INOUYE has very ably addressed his remarks in opposition thereto.

I am a strong supporter of LIHEAP; it helps many low-income households facing rising fuel costs, pay to heat their homes. However, both the House-passed and the Senate committee-reported version of this supplemental already recommend an additional $300 million for LIHEAP, which is double the amount recommended in the President's budget request. The committee-reported bill brings the fiscal year 2001 LIHEAP appropriation to $2 billion, and with the carryover funds from the prior year, funds available for LIHEAP would total $2.155 billion in fiscal year 2001. This compares to $1.844 billion in fiscal year 2000—an increase of $311 billion.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. He makes a very compelling argument. Ordinarily I would want to support him in the position he has taken. However, the committee-reported supplemental, as I have already indicated, is a balanced bill; it is a fair bill. While I would like to provide additional resources for energy assistance to low-income people in the country, I believe the best way to quickly get supplemental LIHEAP funding to members in need is to approve the committee bill without this amendment so that the bill can be more immediately sent to conference and on to the President for his signature.

If I have any time remaining, I yield it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. On behalf of the committee, I move to table the amendment.

Mr. REID. 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 vote will occur in a stacked sequence later this evening.

The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 872

Mr. BOND. I call up amendment numbered 872.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, in recent years we have witnessed some very serious and troubling discussions in the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee. We have noticed how American fighting men and women are being committed to engagements of all kinds all around the world. We know that the budget for the Defense Department has come down dramatically.

I was one saying when the Berlin Wall fell we could probably save 30 percent or more of our military budget because we could cut back and still maintain the force we needed. We were in a position where we were supposedly able to pursue two major regional contingencies at once. That was the theory.

Unfortunately, as we went farther and farther into more assigned missions, it became very questionable whether we could even do that. We asked questions from both sides of the aisle in our Appropriations Defense Subcommittee hearings about the resources we were providing for the Department of Defense. I believe it was about 2 years ago about this time of year we had then-Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen before our committee, a former member of this body. We all respect him greatly.

I asked point blank: Mr. Secretary, do we have the money that is necessary to support our fighting men and women?

I believe his answer was something like: We do not have the resources available for the missions we have been assigned.

That was the beginning of the realization we had grossly underfunded the Department of Defense.

I am very pleased we have a defense supplemental before the Senate. I know these are tight times. There has been an effort to work with the administration, with the bipartisan leadership of both bodies, to find how we can provide vitally needed resources for the Department of Defense. My personal view is we may not have provided enough. That is why I have offered this amendment.

On May 24 of this year, the Associated Press ran a story on cannibalization, the lack of military spare parts. According to a GAO report, the Pentagon system for dispensing spare parts for airplanes, tanks, and other equipment is broken and officials are not sure how to fix it. At least 154,000 times a year a military mechanic takes a part from one airplane and puts it on another because a new spare part is not on hand, according to the GAO.

This cannibalization is a very questionable process. It is a waste of time and money. It costs 1 million extra work hours a year and risks damaging the aircraft, as well as the morale of the mechanics doing the work, several testified. Once cannibalized, a multi-million-dollar aircraft can sit idle for months or years, said Neal Curtin, GAO Director of Defense Issues. In one case, about 400 parts were removed from a plane that eventually had to be shipped by truck to the maintenance depot to be rebuilt. Witnesses said the cannibalization is widespread because the services are trying to maintain readiness on an aging fleet in a time of increased deployments.

LTG Michael Zettler, Deputy Chief of Staff for Air Force Installation, said cannibalization is only used when it is absolutely mission critical, and acknowledged in a prepared statement that it is done more than is desirable but blames some of it on design problems showing up years after abuse, resulting in a widespread need for more parts than specified, and fewer companies are making fewer parts—having left the market during the Pentagon 1990 downsizing.

Pentagon spokesman RADM Craig Quigley said: You do what you need to do given the availability of parts. It is largely an issue of funding. I use the family car as a good example. The older it gets, the more repairs you will do, but it is expensive to buy a new car.

This GAO report follows an earlier report that said the Department inventory management is ineffective and results in excessive stocks of some parts more than others. Though the problem has been under scrutiny since 1990 and the services have formed committees, study groups, and programs to fix it, no one has the statistics on how big the problem is, according to the GAO Director. Because they view cannibalization as a symptom of spare part shortages, they have not closely analyzed other possible causes or made concerted efforts to measure the full extent of the practice.

The Pentagon has been unable to document how many times it is done, the reasons, or how much time and money it has cost. It also cannot determine which cannibalizations are necessary, what alternatives are available, what improvements or changes need to be implemented, to what extent morale would be increased by reducing the workload.

My point in going through that article is simply to note that we are in a sorry situation where we are preparing to send our air men and women into combat without the spare parts we need. We grab a part from a Hangar

Queen, another aircraft that is increasingly disabled, and take that one part to keep the planes flying. That means the planes we are cannibalizing are less and less able to carry out their assigned mission.

My amendment is, I believe and I hope, a responsible amendment which adds $1.430 billion for the fiscal year to the Defense Department. I believe the money is desperately needed by forces and can be spent in what remains of the fourth quarter of the current fiscal year. The amendment is operative only if and to the extent that the President declares it an emergency. The President would have control over whether to spend these funds. They could only be spent in the current fiscal year on problems which are very serious and which we understand from our sources are in dire need.

This amendment includes funds that will be directed exclusively to operations and maintenance and personnel accounts of each of the four services. This is money the Pentagon, in our view, needs right now to ensure that critical repairs and training are not delayed further. Our troops need to believe there is truth behind our words and that help is, indeed, on the way.

Consider this pressing challenge, the parts shortages and cannibalization from other pieces of equipment to which I just referred, specifically to aircraft. It is required throughout the military to keep our aging equipment going. To give an idea of the impact of the shortages, the GAO report found that shortcomings in spare parts increase maintenance costs by forcing maintainers to do things such as cannibalize needed parts from other aircraft, taking parts from one airplane to another to get one operational, meaning it takes two airplanes to get one ready to go. That essentially doubles the maintainer workloads, turning one repair into two.

Parts swapping also pushes costs up by increasing part failure rates. Components are more susceptible to breakdown when they are removed from one unit to another. Previously-installed parts have shorter in-service life than new parts.

When maintainers cannot do what they have been trained to do—that is, to fix airplanes—that leads to lower retention rates. The people who are in the job of doing the very critical work—making sure we provide the very best machines for our pilots—leave and go into the private sector. It is demoralizing to watch the mission-capable rates of airplanes drop due to a lack of spare parts. The maintainers want nothing more than to be provided the equipment and parts they need to do their jobs.

I applaud and thank the President for his initiative in submitting this supplemental, but I do differ with the administration's view that the funding currently provided is sufficient. Saying we will solve the problem in fiscal year 2002 is not going to help the problems we currently face as a result of the circumstances we have created. Our troops are tired of hearing us say help is on the way, only to be disappointed when it never comes.

It is time for us to show them that we, indeed, want to provide them the resources they need efficiently and safely to do the missions we give them. There are far too many examples of services being forced into situations where they must borrow from operations and maintenance accounts just to keep operations going and to purchase much-needed spare parts and equipment. Meanwhile, infrastructure continues to deteriorate at an alarming rate.

I will have printed in the RECORD excerpts from testimony of our most senior military personnel before the House Armed Services Committee in September of last year. For the benefit of my colleagues, allow me to read just a few.

From Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy:

> I currently have a backlog of . . . $5.5 billion in infrastructure. . . . We are currently not funding this account sufficiently so that we arrest the growth in critical backlog and we have to do better.

General Shelton had this to say:

> We can ill afford to take away from the current readiness accounts today. In fact, in some cases I think you've heard the Chiefs say they've still got shortfalls. . . . We have got to find a way—and that means more money to be able to modernize the force.

Madam President, there are quotes from other members of the Joint Chiefs, and others, pointing out just how far we have come and how much further we need to go. This amendment before us provides $27 million for the Marine Corps. During last month's testimony, General Jones, the Marine Corps Commandant, told me he would have to find this money elsewhere by reprogramming funds if he did not receive it prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Real property maintenance shortfalls remain incredibly high. Just consider a recent report that two-thirds of the Army National Guard installations will maintain a status of C–4, which means ''significantly impairs mission performance.'' Installations continue to deteriorate because the funding we are providing is not sufficient to halt the decline.

Madam President, the current supplemental does not begin to reverse the slide in real property maintenance, and we cannot be sure future budgets will either. My colleague from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, refrained from offering an amendment to this supplemental that would have added $204 million for additional Blackhawk helicopters, but he made the point our Army aviation program is in deep trouble and is in dire need of additional funds if we are to get it back on track.

I came to the floor a month or so ago to point out that in the National Guard in Missouri, 75 percent of the helicopters are not operational. If we were running a museum, that would not be bad. But we expect our National Guard to be ready to be called on in a national emergency, and I can guarantee in our State of Missouri, and every other State, when there is a natural disaster, whether it is a flood, tornado, fire, or some other disaster, we want to be able to call on the National Guard. Three out of four planes in the Missouri National Guard are not airworthy. That means not only are they not ready, but the men and women who are supposed to fly them cannot train in them.

This is a serious situation that affects all branches of the Active and Reserve and the Guard. No matter where we turn, we find pressing needs both in our readiness accounts and in our modernization accounts. That is why I think it is essential we plus-up the current supplemental. Every dollar counts. I hope we can find support for it. I know the Members of this body understand the situation. I have been assured by people at the Pentagon that funding I seek to add could and would be used to fund current needs, and therefore I ask my colleagues to support this amendment that adds slightly more than $1.4 billion to the supplemental.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I yield myself just a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I have great respect for the Senator from Missouri. I am constrained to advise him, Senator BYRD and I gave our word to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that we would not include any emergency funds in this supplemental appropriations bill this year. We did so because we were informed that there was, in fact, a substantial increase request to be presented by the President for the year 2002. We have, as all Members of the Senate know, received that request. It is substantial—over $18 billion. This money that is in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri could not be spent before that would be available anyway.

So I hope the Senator might consider relying upon us to work with him in the future and help us honor our commitment to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

I see my good friend from Hawaii seeks some time. Would he like to comment also?

Mr. INOUYE. Yes, if I may.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to advise my colleagues that in crafting this supplemental bill we considered two criteria, and both of them were requested by the Republican administration, requested by the Department of Defense.

First, any program receiving supplemental funding must be able to execute this funding during the current fiscal year. The current fiscal year ends in 2½ months, just a few days away. Second, that the funding could not wait until fiscal year 2002. It is the view of President Bush that the supplemental request has satisfied this objective.

I believe the modest changes made by the committee have improved this measure, increasing readiness and health care funding by $229 million.

I will remind the Senate that from fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 2001, the Congress added $49 billion to the DOD budget, much of it for various programs that concern the distinguished Senator from Missouri, in some cases operation and maintenance funds appropriated for the same activities identified in the supplemental request, such as spare parts, base operations, and depot maintenance.

My point is, the Defense Subcommittee has a demonstrated record of considering both the funded and the unfunded requirements of the Department before marking up a piece of legislation. The funding provided in this bill, most respectfully, I believe meets the urgent needs of the military within the funding constraints set by the budget resolution for fiscal year 2001 approved by this body.

This act avoids emergency spending to demonstrate fiscal restraint. Much of the funding proposed by this amendment could not be spent responsibly in 2½ months. The Department would struggle to obligate the funds before the end of the fiscal year. Some would even be obligated to cover workload at the maintenance depots that would carry over to next year in violation of the Department's own restrictions.

I point out to the Senator from Missouri that the Appropriations Committee has addressed programs that he seeks to fund with his amendment. Specifically, runway repairs for the Masirah Airfield in Oman are addressed in the military construction section. The committee has addressed the Army's second destination transport costs. Those funds were reduced in the bill passed by the House. It seems that the unfunded requirement list submitted to the Senator is currently outdated.

So for all the above reasons, Madam President, I therefore must oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator from Missouri would yield 2 or 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I would be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri controls 36 seconds.

Mr. BOND. How much?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska controls 10 minutes in opposition.

Mr. BOND. How much in support?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri controls 36 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Thirty-six seconds. I would like to reserve the 36 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the Senator from Arkansas 4 or 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding a brief period of time out of order.

I express my gratitude and my appreciation to Senator STEVENS for his willingness to accept into the managers' amendment an amendment I had proposed that provides $24 million in emergency funding that is offset in the amendment but is essential for cleanup from devastating ice storms in the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma.

I also express my appreciation to the chairman, Chairman BYRD, for his cooperation in this very vital funding.

I will make my comments brief. I know there are many desiring to speak and many amendments we are considering. But while December of 2000 has come and gone, and many have forgotten those many months ago, it will not be a time that is quickly forgotten in the State of Arkansas. It is certainly a time I will never forget.

For many, it was anything but a merry holiday season. On December 12, and again on December 26, Arkansas was hit by two major winter storms. The Arkansas Department of Emergency Services said: ''These two storms combined created the most widespread and financially devastating disasters in our state's history.''

Life in most parts of Arkansas came to a halt as snow, sleet, and 2 to 4 inches of ice covered much of my State for weeks. To the Senator from Alaska, that may not sound like much, but I will tell you, the damage, the devastation that was done was unparalleled and unprecedented in Arkansas history.

As a result of the December 12 storm, more than 250,000 Arkansans lost power. At the time, that was considered the worst storm in 70 years.

By the time the first storm passed, more than 40 counties in Arkansas had been declared disaster areas. FEMA officials came in and said they would be in the State to do preliminary damage assessments on December 26, but they could not do it on December 26 because on Christmas morning Arkansans awoke to sleet, which turned to freezing rain by late afternoon and continued for 3 days. Western Arkansas was covered with more than 3 inches of ice. Power lines were down, homes and vehicles were damaged by falling limbs, and over half a million electrical customers lost their power just at the time many of them had their power restored from the first storm.

Arkansas received a Federal disaster declaration on December 29. Eventually, 65 out of 75 Arkansas counties were declared disaster areas.

Despite the recovery efforts, many scars are going to remain in Arkansas for years and years to come. It is July and the Forest Service personnel are still working to remove damaged timber, reopen roads and trails, and repair facilities.

The Ouachita National Forest in western and central Arkansas took the brunt of the damage. The weight of the ice brought down an estimated 500 million board feet of timber. Now that Forest Service personnel have fought their way into many of the most remote areas of the forest, that estimate may increase to as much as 800 million board feet.

I personally visited the forest this spring. I was shocked at the extent of the damage. All 1.8 million acres of the Ouachita National Forest were damaged to some extent. Twenty-six hundred miles of roads and six hundred and twenty-five miles of trails were closed or blocked. Roads, trails, and recreation areas in the heaviest damaged areas remain closed even to this day.

Now fire experts have evaluated the fuel loading in the forest and found that it is more than 10 times normal levels. Normally, there is about 5 tons of timber lying on the forest floor per acre. After the storms, that number jumped from 40 to 60 tons per acre. And in the hardest hit areas you get a little idea of it: The hardest hit areas have 80 tons of fuel per acre.

Wildfires on a 1.8 million-acre forest are difficult to respond to under normal conditions, but roads and trails into the most remote parts of the Ouachita are still impassable.

So as the threat of fire grows with each passing summer month, my main concern is for the 843,000 Arkansans living along and around the Ouachita National Forest. And that doesn't include the three ranger districts in Oklahoma that are of interest to Senator NICKLES and Senator INHOFE as well.

The Forest Service is doing everything it can, but if this situation does not change, in the next two summers we will see uncontrollable wildfires in the Ouachita National Forest.

So I appreciate this $24 million being included in the managers' amendment. I repeat the words of the Arkansas Department of Emergency Services: ''These two storms combined created the most widespread and financially devastating disasters in our state's history.'' It is now impacting tourism. It is impacting our entire economy.

I have been working with the Forest Service, and I believe this $24 million will provide the kind of relief to ensure the proper cleanup of that fuel in the Ouachita National Forest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank Senators STEVENS and BYRD and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 872, WITHDRAWN

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I claim the remaining time I have.

I appreciate very much the very strong statements made by the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. These are men of great experience, dedication, and understanding. I look forward to working with them to achieve what we think is vitally important in filling the readiness gap.

Madam President, I would like to have been able to pass the amendment that I have introduced, but having learned to count in third grade and having some experience counting in this body, I defer to the greater wisdom of the senior Members and request that my amendment be withdrawn.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 863

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to my amendment, No. 863.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be permitted to offer his amendment upon completion of debate on the Feingold amendment.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, be added as original cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, this amendment strengthens America's contribution to the Global Fund for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, the plagues of the 21st century, and some of the foremost threats to security in the world. To pay for this funding increase, my amendment would make additional rescissions in procurement funds for the troubled V–22 Osprey program.

The global HIV/AIDS pandemic threatens security and stability around the world in a chillingly comprehensive way.

As Dr. Donald Berwick movingly wrote last month in the Washington Post:

> The earth has AIDS; 36.1 million people at the end of the year 2000. In Botswana, 36 percent of adults are infected with HIV; in South Africa 20 percent. Three million humans died of AIDS in the year 2000, 2.4 million of them in sub-Saharan Africa. That is a Holocaust every two years; the entire population of Oregon, Iowa, Connecticut or Ireland dead last year, and next year, and next. More deaths since the AIDS epidemic began than in the Black Death of the Middle Ages. It is the most lethal epidemic in recorded history.

The International Crisis Group, or ICG, is a well-respected private, multinational organization founded to build international capacity to prevent and contain conflict. Many of my colleagues are familiar with their reports on international hot spots from Macedonia to Burundi.

The ICG recently released a report entitled ''HIV/AIDS as a security issue.'' This report states:

> Where it reaches epidemic proportions, HIV/AIDS can be so pervasive that it destroys the very fibre of what constitutes a nation: individuals, families and communities; economic and political institutions; military and police forces. It is likely then to have broader security consequences, both for the nations under assault and for their neighbors, trading partners, and allies.

The report goes on to note that the crisis also affects personal security. As was noted on this floor recently, some reports indicate that if current trends continue, 15-year-olds in some of the most severely-affected countries will actually be more likely than not to die of AIDS.

The crisis affects economic security. Analysts predict that in Botswana, the pandemic will reduce government revenues by 7 percent, while the costs of fighting the disease increase by 15 percent.

The crisis affects communal security. In Lusaka, Zambia, I visited an orphanage, of sorts, where committed volunteers worked by day with nearly 500 children orphaned by AIDS. But by night, there was space for only fifty of these children. The rest were on the streets.

By 2020, some 40 million African children will have lost one or both parents to the disease. In Zimbabwe, even the healthy find it increasingly difficult simply to attend the many funerals of their families and friends and still fulfill their job responsibilities.

The crisis affects national security. According to UNAIDS, in sub-Saharan Africa, some military forces have infection rates five times higher than those of their civilian populations.

The crisis affects international security. Sub-Saharan Africa is in the midst of an urgent crisis. Infection rates are on the rise in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, South Asia, and the Caribbean. The consequences of this pandemic at all societal levels poses a serious threat to international peace and stability. Our country's prosperity and progress cannot be divorced from the global context in which we live.

That HIV/AIDS is a security issue is no longer revolutionary thinking. In January of last year, the National Intelligence Council produced an intelligence estimate entitled ''The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States,'' a report which framed the issue in much the same fashion.

Secretary of State Colin Powell said recently that he ''know[s] of no enemy in war more insidious or vicious than AIDS, an enemy that poses a clear and present danger to the world.''

But while many have absorbed the astounding—in many ways terrifying—statistics about this crisis, and many, including our Secretary of State, appear to have grasped its terrible implications, the U.S. policy response remains woefully inadequate.

We have all talked about the need to do more. Today we have an opportunity actually to do it.

Of course, addressing AIDS takes leadership, and as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa, I am aware of the difference that energized leadership, such as that exhibited in Uganda and Senegal, makes and that it makes a critical difference when countries take on in a meaningful manner the fight against AIDS.

But America's leadership is required as well. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan has called for a global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. This is a true emergency affecting national security. The United States must answer the call.

My amendment would increase funding for this vital effort by $593 million. And the funding in this amendment is completely paid for. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this amendment is budget neutral. The amendment offsets the increased funding, dollar for dollar, with reductions in procurement of the troubled V–22 Osprey program.

Over the last 2 decades, HIV/AIDS has infected 60 million people, killed more than 20 million people, slashed life expectancies, and has left millions of orphans in its wake. We now know to a certainty the national security reality of the AIDS pandemic. But even after 20 years of research, development, and testing, we still don't know if the V–22 Osprey will work.

This amendment would not endanger the integrity of the Osprey production line, nor would it affect money that has been obligated as of April 2001.

But serious questions and concerns continue to cloud the Osprey program. Thirty Marines have died in Osprey crashes since 1991. Unanswered questions remain regarding the validity of maintenance records and the safety and viability of this aircraft.

The final report of the blue ribbon panel appointed by former Secretary of Defense William Cohen to review the program recommended a ''phased approach'' to proceeding with the Osprey program. The blue ribbon panel concluded that the Osprey ''is not ready for operational use.''

I agree with that conclusion. I also concur with the panel's recommendation that procurement should be reduced to the minimum necessary to maintain the production line until the myriad design and safety problems are addressed and further testing is done to ensure that this aircraft is safe. My amendment does just that.

The underlying bill rescinds $513 million in Osprey procurement funds—$150 million from the Navy and $363 million from the Air Force. While I am pleased that the underlying bill zeros out the Air Force procurement budget for the Osprey, it still leaves about $944 million in the Navy's aircraft procurement account for a program that has been

grounded indefinitely and that is headed back into the research, development, testing, and evaluation stage for the foreseeable future.

The committee report accompanying this bill says that this funding will be used to procure eleven of the Marine Corps version of the aircraft, the deeply flawed MV–22. This is five fewer Ospreys than were authorized for fiscal year 2002, but in my view, it is still eleven more than we should build this year.

My amendment would rescind an additional $594 million intended for the Osprey from the Navy's aircraft procurement account. It leaves enough funding in place to maintain the integrity of the production line, and it does not affect the funding that the Navy has obligated for this program as of April 2001.

Based on the formula that was used when the Navy suspended production on two other troubled aircraft programs, the T–45A and the SH–60F, the minimum required to sustain the production line for the MV–22 is about $350 million. In the case of the T–45A, the Navy maintained the production line with 28 percent of its original funding; 34 percent of the funding was maintained for the SH–60F. The $350 million that my amendment would leave in place is the average of what the Navy left in place to maintain the production lines for these two programs.

We know the Osprey is broken. The Navy and Marine Corps are working on ways to fix it. And we should allow that process to move forward. But, we should not spend scarce taxpayer resources on building new Ospreys that will require costly and extensive retrofitting later.

So I think this is a great example of where we have to make a choice, and I think the choice is clear.

My amendment would scale back funding on a troubled program that plainly needs a thorough review. And it would increase our response to the world's greatest urgent threat to human life, the AIDS pandemic.

AIDS is a security issue, but it is also unquestionably a moral one. Our response is a measure of our humanity. We are not civilized, we are not just, and we cannot lay claim to common decency, if we simply accept millions of deaths and dismiss them as simply the problem of another continent.

Sadly, we are living in a time of plague. We have an obligation to fight it. History will judge us all.

Last month, the UN General Assembly conducted a special session on the pandemic. Let us begin today to match our response to our rhetoric. This amendment is fiscally responsible, it is the right thing to do, it is in the U.S. interest, and it reflects our national values. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRD. How much time do we have, I ask the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes each under the control of the managers, and 8½ minutes is under the control of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRD. How much time does the Senator from Arkansas want?

Mrs. LINCOLN. If either the Senator from Alaska or the Senator from West Virginia will yield it, I will need about 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I am simply here to extend my heartfelt thanks to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and to Senator STEVENS from Alaska for the people of Arkansas.

Right before we broke for the Fourth of July recess, I joined with my colleague, JIM INHOFE from Oklahoma, in writing to both the chairman and the ranking member to express to them our concern on behalf of our constituents. During the winter of 2001, our home States of Arkansas and Oklahoma suffered through some of the most devastating storms in recorded history. On December 29, 2000, President Clinton declared a major disaster for our States, triggering the release of Federal funds to help people and communities recover from the severe ice storms that had blanketed our home States.

Unfortunately, the assistance provided to date has not been sufficient in getting our communities back on their feet. Farmers, ranchers, and timberland owners have been hardest hit. These ice storms added more than 10 times the normal amount of downed timber on the ground in Arkansas' Ouachita National Forest.

This year, Arkansas and Oklahoma have the potential to have one of the worst fire seasons in our history. With the massive amount of fuel on the ground, wildfires will burn extremely hot and fast, which will make it difficult to control or to contain. With the funding outlined in the emergency supplemental bill, our residents can complete the cleanup effort while also working to prevent massive forest fires this fall.

It would not be possible without the wonderful bipartisan working relationship of these two gentlemen who have worked steadfastly with both of our delegations to make sure we can provide our residents with what they need in order to keep our families, our forests, and certainly our communities safe. I thank both of these Senators on behalf of my constituents in Arkansas for the work they have been willing to put into this effort.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for her exceedingly kind remarks concerning my efforts and the efforts of my distinguished colleague, Senator STEVENS from Alaska. There need not be any doubt in anybody's mind that the Senator stands up for her constituents and ably represents them. This is just another example of that.

Madam President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 2½ minutes. The Senator from Alaska has 5 minutes. The Senator from Wisconsin has 8½ minutes.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for allowing me to proceed on this amendment. I do oppose the amendment Senator FEINGOLD has offered. I do so because of my great interest in this system.

The V–22 represents the best new technology in aeronautics adapted by the military air system that I have seen in my time in the Senate. Unfortunately, it has had some bad circumstances, and we all regret deeply the difficulty it has had.

I have spent a considerable amount of time with the Marines, in particular, on this system and have discussed them personally with the Commandant of the Marine Corps. I will be very brief in saying that I believe this amendment is untimely and it is not in the best interests of our Marine Corps system.

I do believe, as the Commandant has written to me today, that the V–22 Osprey is the Marine Corps' No. 1 aviation priority. I think we should be very slow to terminate or disturb such a system which is being developed in the best interests of our men and women in the Marines.

In particular, if it proves successful, as I pray it will, it will take our men and women across the beach. We will not see visions again in any war of our people hitting the beach and being slaughtered at the edge of the water. They will be able to fly from smaller ships and all over the place and enter into any battle zone by air, and they will have a better opportunity of survival and success in defending our Nation's interests in a time of war. It is a military asset of great value to our Department of Defense.

I intend to oppose the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent to me today by General James L. Jones, Commandant of the Marine Corps, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 10, 2001.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS, the restructuring of the V–22 program as recommended by the Panel to Review the V–22 resulted in proposed changes to the FY01 funding profile. Those changes were presented in the Administration's FY2001 Supplemental request. Your committee subsequently marked the

program, making adjustments to the Navy funding and zeroing the Air Force procurement funding. While the Marine Corps would prefer that the Air Force remain an active participant at this stage of the V–22 program restructure, we understand your Committee's mark. That mark does allow the program to remain viable.

Unfortunately, Amendment 863 of S. 1077, currently being considered on the floor of the Senate, so radically reduces aircraft procurement funding that the resultant effect is termination of the V–22 program in FY 2001.

As you know, Senator Stevens, the V–22 Osprey is the Marine Corps' number one aviation priority. It will revolutionize combat assault in a manner not seen since the introduction of the helicopter more than 50 years ago. The V–22 Osprey is the only vertical lift, assault support aircraft that provides the combination of range, speed, and payload which fulfills the Marine Corps' medium lift requirement. The Osprey met or exceeded all Marine Corps' key performance requirements and is projected to meet or exceed all Air Force/SOCOM key requirements. It carries three times as much, five times as far, twice as fast as the Vietnam era CH–46 Sea Knight it is replacing. The V–22 Osprey is a key enabler allowing Marine expeditionary forces to rapidly respond to unpredictable, unstable situations throughout the world. Additionally, the V–22 is also the only vertical lift aircraft that can rapidly self-deploy to meet USSOCOM's mission requirement—completion of the critical long-range infiltration/exfiltration mission in one period of darkness.

Senator Stevens, a better course of action would be to support the Review Panel's recommendation to restructure the V–22 program that uses a phased approach to a return to flight and tactical introduction. However, the amendment currently under consideration by the Senate would cause a production line shut down and any remaining FY01 funding would be used to terminate the contract. Other potential impacts include:

Labor rate increases due to business base reduction;

Production loss of learning due to potential layoffs (loss of experience, going back up the curve);

Inflation cost increases due to moving quantities to the right;

Material burden increases;

Material cost increases due to economies of scale impacts (quantity reductions);

Vendor elimination causing loss of learning for materials and re-qualification costs;

Obsolescence costs and other non-recurring cost;

Increased manufacturing inefficiency; and

Personnel layoff.

Should quantities change for V–22, labor wrap rates for other Bell and Boeing Programs would also be adversely impacted.

Senator Stevens, clearly these negative impacts were not intended by the Panel to Review the V–22, the Administration's restructuring of the program or your Committee mark-up of the FY2001 Supplemental bill. In a world that is often chaotic and unpredictable, the V–22 Osprey provides the Nation with an aircraft that can deal with any situation—from humanitarian relief to full combat operations. I request your support to keep this critical program viable as the FY2001 Supplemental request proceeds through the Senate.

I have provided a similar letter to Chairman Inouye, requesting his support.

Semper Fidelis,

JAMES L. JONES,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I realize that time is limited. If I may, I will quote from the letter dated July 10, 2001, from the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, GEN James L. Jones. I believe this one paragraph, the third paragraph, says it all:

As you know, Senator Stevens, the V–22 Osprey is the Marine Corps' number one aviation priority. It will revolutionize combat assault in a manner not seen since the introduction of the helicopter more than 50 years ago. The V–22 Osprey is the only vertical lift assault weapon aircraft that provides the combination of range, speed, and payload, which fulfills the Marine Corps' medium lift requirement. The Osprey met or exceeded all Marine Corps' key performance requirements. . . . It carries three times as much, five times as far, twice as fast as the Vietnam era CH–46 Sea Knight it is replacing. The V–22 Osprey is a key enabler, allowing Marine expeditionary forces to rapidly respond to unpredictable, unstable situations throughout the world.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, this amendment will wipe out the V–22 program, and if at a later time we find it necessary to revive that program, it will cost billions.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, of course, I have enormous regard for both speakers in opposition, the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, but I want them to know how carefully we crafted this amendment to avoid the consequence they both mentioned.

This amendment does not kill the Osprey program. It is not inconsistent with the statement of the Senator from Alaska that this may well turn out to be the best new technology. It is not inconsistent with the Commandant's letter where he says this is the No. 1 priority of the Marines. We do not contradict that at all.

In fact, I respect the fact there is a real effort out there to try to fix the problems with the Osprey. This does not kill the Osprey program. I understand some of our people sadly have died in these helicopters, but I also know yesterday there was an unfortunate accident involving the helicopters they want to replace.

I want to be candid about this. There may well be a need for an improved helicopter. This amendment does not kill the Osprey program, and that is the only argument that has been made against the amendment.

The amendment is carefully crafted. What this amendment allows is to have the research and the consideration that needs to be done on the Osprey actually completed, to have the tests done, to make sure people are going to be safe in this helicopter, and at the same time allow Senators to vote to do what they must do: To enhance the international effort against the AIDS pandemic. It is truly a win-win proposition that does not threaten the Osprey.

Specifically, in response to the Commandant's letter that was just printed in the RECORD, it simply is incorrect in terms of the budget implications. This amendment does not shut down the production line. That is what is being suggested, but it does not. There are still Ospreys in various stages of construction that are being built with both fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2000 resources. We do not impact those Ospreys. They will continue to be produced on the production line.

More important, the experts at the GAO have specifically stated a very different conclusion. According to the GAO, the Osprey production line is currently being maintained with the completion of between four and seven planes per calendar year. Four planes were delivered to the Marines in 1999; five were delivered in 2000; six planes have been completed since December 2000 but have not yet been delivered because the fleet remains grounded and no flight testing of those planes can take place.

Each Osprey costs about $83 million to produce. This amendment carefully leaves in place—it does not wipe out the program—$350 million in fiscal year 2001 money, plus the $102 million the Navy has already obligated, for a total of $452 million remaining in the program.

At $83 million per aircraft, this $452 million would purchase five Ospreys, and given the current production rate, as I just pointed out, no more than seven Ospreys have been delivered in any one calendar year anyway.

In my view and in the view of the blue ribbon panel, this program should be reduced to the minimum necessary to maintain production until the aircraft undergoes redesign and further testing. It is still unclear how much retrofitting will need to be done on the existing Ospreys and how much it will cost or if it will be cost-effective or even possible to retrofit the existing Ospreys. The Department of Defense has said it will take about 1 year to do the additional research and testing needed to determine the status of the Osprey program.

Clearly, if we are talking about budget prudence and caution and making sure we do not waste millions of dollars, this amendment is the way to go. It is prudent to wait and see what the results of the tests are, obviously, before we increase the rate of production above the current five to seven per year.

I reiterate, we do not kill the Osprey program. We do not stop it. We simply make sure we only use it at the minimum level that it is currently at and maintain the production line so it can be studied and so the additional resources that would have gone to it make a serious contribution to the fight against HIV/AIDS around the world.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator. I hope my colleagues who are following this debate in their offices will pause for a moment to consider what we are about. How many times have we come to this Senate Chamber and voted for resolutions, voted for ideas that say we are pledged to fighting the AIDS epidemic in Africa? Sadly, it has almost become commonplace here.

We voted for amendments and budget resolutions because, frankly, they are messages we send out for the world to read. But this amendment from the Senator from Wisconsin is real. It is an amendment which comes up with millions of dollars to deal with a crisis that faces the world; not just a crisis facing the United States, it faces the world.

This crisis is the AIDS epidemic in Africa. The Senator from Wisconsin visited Africa a week or two before I did last year. We both talked about it. It was a profound, transforming experience to visit a continent that is consumed with disease and to realize that people with whom you are having casual conversations are likely to be the casualty of those diseases. Whether it is AIDS, tuberculosis, or malaria, Africa is dying.

The question for all of us who live in this prosperity and wealth in the rest of world is whether we care, and if we care, it is not enough to pass a resolution saying we care. The important test is whether we will put our money on the table. That is the test not only for this President and this administration, it is the test for all of us.

I support this amendment. I believe the Senator from Wisconsin is showing real leadership, and if all of the Senators who have voted for the resolutions expressing their heartfelt concern about this epidemic in Africa will come forward and vote for this amendment, I think we will have shown that we are prepared to put our money where our mouths have been.

I still think back to those moments in Africa when I was visiting. I just read on the way over here some of the things I had written and about which I had forgotten. I thought about going to a clinic in Mbale, Uganda, and listening to a beautiful choir of Ugandans who were all dying from AIDS, who set up in front of us and sang a song entitled, ''Why Me, Why You, Why Him, Why Her, Why Me.''

As I looked into their eyes, I thought: I will never forget this, ever, the courage I saw in that clinic.

Their courage should be matched by our commitment. This disease, this epidemic is not just destroying Africa; it is a test for the rest of the world. Will we respond to this holocaust of the 21st century or will we turn away and say the most prosperous nation in the world cannot come up with a singular symbolic contribution to end this scourge?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Illinois not only for his tremendous eloquence but for his genuine compassion and commitment on this issue. It is moving to me to see a Senator stick to this effort and be willing to race down to the Chamber and speak in such a moving way. I thank him and hope we get the kind of vote this clear choice deserves.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, in 1983, at my request, we started the Army's infectious disease section to determine whether there could be a cure for AIDS or prevention of its transmission. Since that time, we have spent more money than all the world put together in trying to defeat AIDS. The way to help our great friends in Africa is to find a way to cure AIDS but not to take money from a system that needs protection under the Department of Defense.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator have anything further?

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the other Senators yield their time, I will yield mine.

Mr. BYRD. I have a brief statement.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I reserve my time.

Mr. BYRD. I intend to move to table if the Senator would like to speak prior to that motion.

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator wants to proceed, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I oppose the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD. This amendment provides funding to address the AIDS epidemic, which is a problem of astounding proportions affecting millions in the world today. There is a very laudable purpose behind the amendment. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the committee-reported bill which contains $100 million for the Global AIDS Program is a fair and commendable approach under the present circumstances and at the present time. The $100 million for the Global AIDS Program was included in the committee bill at my own request. I made the request at the urging of the distinguished majority leader, Mr. DASCHLE. The President did not request supplemental funds for this purpose, but we worked in committee to identify noncontroversial offsets for this important program.

I believe the committee has produced a fair bill, a responsible bill, a balanced bill. I believe the most effective way to get this essential aid to the people who need it is to approve the committee bill, without this amendment, so the bill can be taken to conference and sent to the President for his signature.

I shall move to table and I do so with apologies to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is, as I have already indicated, offering an amendment that is laudable. I think we have responded in the committee, and under the circumstances I think the committee bill should be approved as is with respect to this amendment.

I move to table the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered. The vote will be delayed until later this evening under the previous order.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized to debate his amendment numbered 869, with 2 hours equally divided. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I am not quite ready with the amendment so I suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand the time will be taken from my allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 869, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to send a modification to my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's modification of his amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, reserving the right to object—I have no intention of objecting—if we may just study the modification momentarily?

Mr. MCCAIN. Yes.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be taken from both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I remove my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 869), as modified, is as follows:

After section 3002, insert the following:

SEC. 3003. (a) In addition to the amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2001 by other provisions of this Act or the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–259), funds are hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, for purposes under headings in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, and in amounts, as follows:

(1) Under the heading ''MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY'', $181,000,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the supplemental subsistence allowance under section 402a of title 37, United States Code.

(2) Under the heading ''MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS'', $21,000,000.

(3) Under the heading ''RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY'', $1,800,000, which shall be available for enhancement of force protection for United States forces in the Persian Gulf region and elsewhere worldwide.

(4) Under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY'', $103,000,000.

(5) Under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY'', $72,000,000, of which $36,000,000 shall be available for enhancement of force protection for United States forces in the Persian Gulf region and elsewhere worldwide.

(6) Under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS'', $6,000,000.

(7) Under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'', $397,000,000.

(8) Under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE'', $21,000,000.

(9) Under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY'', $45,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003, which shall be available for enhancement of force protection for United States forces in the Persian Gulf region and elsewhere worldwide.

(b) The amount appropriated by chapter 10 of title II to the Department of the Treasury for Departmental Offices under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' is hereby reduced by $30,000,000.

(c) The matter in chapter 11 of title II under the heading ''NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT'' shall not take effect.

(RESCISSION)

(d) Of the unobligated balance of the total amount in the Treasury that is to be disbursed from special accounts established pursuant to section 754(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, $200,000,000 may not be disbursed under that section.

(RESCISSIONS)

(e) The following amounts are hereby rescinded:

(1) Of the funds appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the heading ''HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT'' in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–377), the following amounts:

(A) From the amounts for the life and micro-gravity science mission for the human space flight, $40,000,000.

(B) From the amount for the Electric Auxiliary Power Units for Space Shuttle Safety Upgrades, $19,000,000.

(2) Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Commerce for the National Institute of Standards and Technology under the heading ''INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES'' in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–553), $67,000,000 for the Advanced Technology Program.

(3) Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Commerce for the International Trade Administration under the heading ''OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION'', $19,000,000 of the amount available for Trade Development.

(4) Of the funds appropriated by chapter 1 of the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee and Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–51, $126,800,000.

(5) Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Labor for the Employment and Training Administration under the heading ''TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES'' in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–554), the following amounts:

(A) From the amounts for Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities, $41,500,000.

(B) From the amounts Adult Employment and Training Activities, $100,000,000.

(6) Of the unobligated balance of funds previously appropriated to the Department of Transportation for the Federal Transit Administration that remain available for obligation in fiscal year 2001, the following amounts:

(A) From the amounts for Transit Planning and Research, $90,000,000.

(B) From the amounts for Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants, $116,000,000.

Mr. MCCAIN. I want to explain the modifying amendment removes the offsets of title XI of the maritime subsidies and also the cut in the Export-Import Bank subsidy. So the remaining offsets will remain. I will go through those in a few minutes, but I want to emphasize that both the Export-Import Bank rescission and the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program have also been removed. There have been increases in the amounts of offsets for transit planning and research to $90 million and job access to $116 million. So I will now be glad to discuss that with the managers of the bill, if they have any additional questions.

I am pleased to have the support and cosponsorship of Senators LIEBERMAN, LANDRIEU, KYL, and CARNAHAN as cosponsors to this amendment.

Basically what it does is it adds a total of $847.8 million in additional spending, all of it for personnel, operations and maintenance, and a very small amount, $45 million, for procurement. So virtually all of this—$800 million of the $847 million—is for the men and women in the military, the Reserve personnel, including funds to remove sailors and Marines from food stamps, and operations and maintenance, which, as we all know, is very badly underfunded.

This amendment funds the bare minimum that the military services have said they need. We must prioritize our spending and, in my judgment, fully funding the readiness of our forces must be our first obligation. This amendment will add $847.8 million to the defense portion of the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001, yet it will not exceed the budget resolution caps because it is fully offset by 12 separate rescissions from non-defense programs. This amendment will increase the President's supplemental budget request from $5.5 billion to $6.34 billion. Most of the funding offsets in the amendment were added last year by Congress in the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bills and will not be obligated by this October, according to various agency heads. In other words, much of the money I propose to rescind will not be spent this year—no matter how seemingly worthy the cause.

Later this month, the President will send to Congress the Pentagon's Omnibus Reprogramming Request for Fiscal Year 2001. I am told that the reprogramming request is about $850 million. The services will have to reprogram or transfer critical money from other key readiness and modernization accounts to adequately pay and train our service men and women. Our military services, stretched thin and overworked, are raiding Real Property Maintenance readiness funding—already $16 billion underfunded—and other key accounts, just to ensure that they can pay much-needed bonuses to retain servicemembers.

We have sailors, soldiers, airmen, and marines—some still on food stamps—living in very old, dilapidated homes because the military services keep reprogramming critical funds to shore up other equally urgent needs. In Arizona, for example, there are marines at Yuma Marine Corps Air Station living in World War II-era barracks. Base Commanders tell me that they have deferred maintenance for the past 10 years because they need to fund higher priorities—and who can blame them. We should fund the services adequately, instead of forcing them to make a Hobson's choice.

Recent terrorist threats have clearly demonstrated the dangerous impact of the military funding shortfalls. In late June, U.S. Navy 5th Fleet warships in ports of the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Gulf of Oman, were ordered to sea, after several reports that Osama Bin Laden, the world's most notorious terrorist, was said to be planning a comprehensive attack on U.S. and Israeli targets in the Mideast.

The U.S. ships had to leave port, since the U.S. Coast Guard—which had primary responsibility for protecting U.S. Naval ships after the USS *Cole* attack—had to pull out its port security forces due to lack of adequate funding or reimbursement from the U.S. Navy, whose budget already is underfunded. The U.S. Navy then had to implement an emergency Presidential recall of Navy Reservists, resulting in a nearly $2 million unfunded liability not addressed in this supplemental. This amendment pays for these critical force protection efforts.

In 1998, the service chiefs confirmed many of the alarming readiness deficiencies that had been identified by countless sources.

The imperative for increasing military readiness and reforming our military is as strong today as it was then, It is my firm belief that as elected officials, providing for a strong national defense is our most serious obligation. Anyone who dismisses our readiness problems, our concerns with morale and personnel retention, and our deficiencies in everything from spare parts to training is blatantly ignoring the dire reality of this situation.

Too often in the last century, we ignored warnings from the military that our armed forces were too weak to

meet the many grave challenges they face. Today, we must listen to our commanders, so as not to repeat the mistakes of the past.

The service chiefs have indicated that they need at least $30 billion more per year for modernization and readiness accounts. Listen to detailed testimony before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees on September 27, 2000—just eight months ago—by our current Joint Chiefs on the underfunded needs of our military services, and the dramatic, harmful consequences likely to occur if we fail to adequately fund these requirements.

General Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

[C]ontinuing to improve our current readiness posture to desired levels while preparing for tomorrow's challenges will require additional resources. . . . The $60 billion projected by the QDR [for procurement] will not be enough to get the job done.

General Shelton continues:

[O]ur long-term ability to sustain our [military] equipment is slipping. One cause is due to the negative effects of a higher than planned tempo of operations on our aging equipment. This high tempo and the associated wear-and-tear require more frequent maintenance and repair, further highlighting the need for recapitalization and modernization of our forces. Moreover, we have not been able to procure enough new equipment to reduce the average age of our force structure. It is also important to note that we believe this higher maintenance tempo has also had a deleterious effect on the hardworking troops attempting to maintain this aging equipment, which directly impact retention of our quality force. At posts, camps and stations, such items as housing, fuel lines and water lines, as well as facilities where people work and live, have outstripped their useful life. . . . and this directly impacts our ability to provide a decent quality of life for our troops. . . . How much more funding is needed? . . . Well in excess of $60 billion is needed to maintain our readiness.

Gen. Eric Shinseki, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, testified that $30 billion more per year is a move in the right direction, but even that does not take into account Army transformation costs or shortages in critical ammunition needs:

We have training shortfalls in institutional training, training support, training range modernization, and combat training center modernization. Real Property Maintenance is currently funded at 75 percent of requirement, a funding level that will not slow or prevent the ongoing deterioration of existing Army facilities. . . . At this rate, it will take the Army about 157 years to fully revitalize our infrastructure.

Any of my colleagues who read the recent study conducted by the U.S. Army about the personnel situation in the U.S. Army today should be appalled and deeply disturbed by the findings of the U.S. Army about the lack of confidence amongst the young men and women about their leadership, about their future, about their lack of desire in retention. We are losing captains in the U.S. Army at a greater rate than at any time in the history of the U.S. Army.

Adm. Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations, concurred in testimony that $30 billion more in total each year is required:

I am concerned about the inventory levels of Precision Guided Munitions. . . . We are still below the current warfighting requirement. The shortfall of precision munitions is a major risk driver for our forces . . . with our current inventory, execution of a second MTW will rely more on the use of non-precision munitions, thereby increasing the risk to our pilots and the potential for collateral damage.

Madam President, I have a lot of quotes.

Admiral Clark continues:

It is critical that we begin to fund 100 percent of our manning, maintenance, ordnance, modernization, recapitalization and training requirements. . . . We have not been doing that. Improving the quality of our workspaces requires a commitment to both Real Property Maintenance and MILCON, both of which are seriously underfunded.

Admiral Clark continues:

[M]anpower is our most urgent challenge. . . . In retention we remain below our goal. [T]oday—

He is talking about last September—

I am 14,000 people short: almost 8,000 at sea, and 6,000 ashore. That has to be redressed soon. We are at war for people. It has to be reflected in our budget. . . . [A]nd we will need the help of Congress.

Gen. Michael E. Ryan, Air Force Chief of Staff, testified that the Air Force needs at least $11 billion more per year:

[A]ir Force readiness has not turned around—at best these efforts have leveled off the decline. . . . The overall combat readiness of our combat units is down 23 percent since 1996. Because we must assure the readiness of our engaged forces overseas, we have done it at the expense of our stateside units. The reasons for these readiness declines have their basis in operations tempo, past underfunding of spares, dealing with older and aging systems, and a workforce that is less experienced because of retention declines.

General Ryan also contends:

[T]he Mission Capable (MC) rates of our aircraft have continued to decline by over 10 percent since 1991. Mission Capable rates are directly proportional to how much time an aircraft is not available because of not having parts in supply or because maintenance work needs to be done on the aircraft to make it ready. Some of our units are not getting as much flying as they should get, because of our inability to generate the aircraft because of mission capability rates. We have not had enough funding to do that adequately.

He continues:

[T]he overall retention rate remains a serious concern. We fell below our end strength authorization of 361,000 active duty members by 5,300. . . . And that is probably 5,000 under what is required. So a total of 10,000 short right now.

Madam President, I am again reminding my colleagues, I am talking about testimony that was given last September to the Armed Services Committee.

Enlisted retention levels are below goal. . . . A shortage of 1200 pilots exists today, the additional bonuses have made an impact. [Moreover,] [b]ecause of funding shortfalls, we have significantly under-invested in base operating support, Real Property Maintenance, family housing, and military construction. We cannot continue to mortgage this area of our force readiness without significant long-term effects. Over the past six years we have averaged an investment in infrastructure at a 250-year replacement rate. Industry standard is 50 years. We have a $4.3 billion Real Property Maintenance backlog.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. James L. Jones, testified that the Marine Corps needs at least $1.5 billion more per year for modernization alone, including $220 million for basic ammunition:

We are at a point where failure to rectify modernization and readiness shortfalls can no longer be ignored. . . . It is readily apparent that we are fast running out of short-term fixes for budget shortfalls. One-time increases in defense spending are not the solution. A sustained period of increased funding is required in order to ensure the future readiness of your Corps.

He continues:

[T]he countless hours of maintenance on our aging ground systems directly impacts the life of our Marines. Many of our aircraft are approaching block obsolescence. The majority of our key aviation equipment is older than the Marines who use it. . . . Since 1995, the direct maintenance man-hours per hour of flight increased by 33 percent and there has been a 58 percent increase in our ''cannibalization'' rate.

''Cannibalization'' means stealing parts from one airplane to make another one operationally capable.

During the same time period the full mission capable rate, though still within acceptable parameters, has decreased by 9.45 across the force. These statistics represent data for all Marine Corps aircraft and show a declining level of readiness.

General Jones also maintained that:

[W]e continue to have a deficit of approximately 10,000 family units. Our backlog of Maintenance and Repair . . . amounts to over $600 million. Budget limitations force us to make hard choices that result in funding only our most critical construction requirements. Although we have reduced our MILCON—

Military construction—

replacement cycle to approximately 100 years, it is still twice the industry standard.

The testimony to the service chiefs is alarming. It underscores the rationale for this amendment. It seeks simply to respond to basic requirements of our military services just until the end of this fiscal year, which occurs in fewer than 75 days from now.

The amendment will help our service men and women recognize their Government's firm commitment to: Adequately provide for modernization; ensuring equipment maintenance—including reversing the deficiency in spare parts availability—is adequately funded; sufficiently funding critical training needs, including flying hours; beginning to resolve the broad pay and benefits disparity that affects our service men and women; starting to reverse the high rates of attrition across the services; continuing to take service members off the food stamp rolls; and ensuring at least minimum force protection efforts to help prevent further U.S.S. *Cole*-type terrorist attack.

I urge your support for this critical amendment.

Madam President, I outlined shortfalls and deficiencies within the Department of Defense that far exceed—far, far exceed—this $847 million amendment.

But I would point out that this administration, with my wholehearted support, and this Secretary of Defense are doing everything they can to restructure and reorganize the military and impose necessary savings. I believe a very good faith effort is being made on the other side of the river at the Pentagon. I am proud of the efforts Secretary Rumsfeld is making. I look forward eagerly to supporting him in whatever conclusions and recommendations they make because he has gathered together some of the best military minds in America to come up with these proposals.

But they have not been forthcoming yet. We have some very deep and severe short-term needs. I was fully expecting—fully expecting—when this administration came in that there would be significant increases, including in this supplemental appropriations bill. I appreciate the efforts of the managers. But I say to the managers, it is not enough, nor is this amendment enough. But I cannot imagine why these urgent needs, which are being addressed on a personnel and operations and maintenance basis, would be rejected.

There may be some questions about the offsets.

There is a $30 million offset from the Department of the Treasury ''Salaries & Expenses'' for the 2002 Winter Olympics security. In this rescission we only cut half of the money added for the Olympics by the Senate Appropriations Committee during markup of the supplemental bill. We still leave $30 million for this program, adding to the $220 million in total Federal funding in the fiscal year 2002. It is difficult to understand why the need for Federal funding for safety and security purposes for the Olympic games has more than quadrupled since the 1984 Summer Games in Los Angeles and more than doubled since the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta.

Compared to the 23 venues spread over a 500-square-mile area used for the Los Angeles Olympic Games and the 31 venues located in 8 cities that spread from Miami, FL, to Washington, DC, for the Atlanta Games, the Salt Lake Games will utilize only 14 venues located within a significantly smaller geographical perimeter. Yet the current total of Federal funding for safety and security purposes, which includes this $60 million in supplemental funding, is $220 million. The total funding for safety and security for Los Angeles, $68 million, and Atlanta, $96 million, combined was far less than what will be spent on the Salt Lake Winter Games. Last year's GAO report demonstrated that taxpayers have shelled out $1.3 billion in subsidies for Salt Lake City alone.

As to the NASA shuttle electric auxiliary power units, $19 million: This amendment would rescind the remaining $19 million of FY 2001 funds for this program, whose implementation NASA has chosen to terminate. According to NASA, the anticipated remaining funding for FY 2001 is $19 million. Following the results of the EAPU review process that found technical flaws and cost overruns in the program, NASA has determined that the prudent action at this time is to terminate EAPU implementation while NASA formulates a plan on how to proceed with this upgrade project. The electric auxiliary power unit, EAPU is one of the several upgrade programs that NASA is developing for the Space Shuttle program.

As to the NASA life and micro-gravity research, $40 million: The FY 2000 VA/HUD appropriations bill earmarked $40 million for a space shuttle mission, R–2 for life and micro-gravity research. Due to delays in overhauling the Shuttle *Columbia* the shuttle mission has been delayed and will not be launched in 2001. The supplemental appropriations bill would broaden the use of the $40 million for life and micro-gravity research that was earmarked for a special shuttle mission and other Space Station research in FY 2001. This amendment would rescind this earmark.

As to Commerce Department's ''Advance Technology Program,'' known as ATP, $67 million: This amendment would rescind the funds that the Commerce Department carried over from last fiscal year and again and expects to be left over again at the end of this fiscal year. The President's FY 2002 budget request has requested no funds for the program. Historically, I have fought this program as corporate welfare, because it has given awards to Fortune 500 companies such as General Electric, Dow Chemical, the 3M Company, and Xerox.

As to the Labor Department unspent balances in worker employment training activities, $141.5 million: This is the same amount rescinded by the other body for this program. The House supplemental appropriations bill rescinded $359 million from the $1.8 billion in advanced funding provided in the FY 2001 Labor/HHS Appropriations Act for adult and dislocated worker employment and training activities. The Senate bill only rescinded $217.5 million from these employment and training activities. We increase the amount rescinded by $141.5 million from these same activities so that we merely do the same thing as the House did and rescinded $359 million in total. Even with the rescission, States will still have $5.1 billion available to support these activities in 2001—$455 million over amounts available in 2000. The reason for this rescission is that when the advance appropriations were provided, it was not anticipated that there would be such high levels of unspent balances in these programs.

As to the Transportation Department Job Access Reverse Commute Grants Program, $76 million: This offset in the amount of $76 million represents surplus funds from the Job Access Reverse Commute Program account that remained unused at the end of FY 2000. The enacted FY 2001 budget authority for this account was approximately $100 million. When added to the surplus funds from FY 2000, this account contained nearly $176 million. I have been informed by the budget office of the Department of Transportation that this account has a current unobligated balance of $146 million, which means that in the past 9 months of the current fiscal year, only about $30 million has been spent. We are thus rescinding only $76 million out of the total amount, leaving nearly $50 million for the Transportation Department to use over the next 82 days for this purpose.

The Transportation Department transit planning and research, $34 million: The offset of $34 million is surplus funds which remained in the transit planning and research account at the end of fiscal year 2000.

As to the Commerce Department International Trade Administration, Export Promotion Program, $19 million: The International Trade Administration's trade development program helps U.S. industries export their products. This program amounts to a corporate subsidy. There is no need to burden the American taxpayers with this program. U.S. industries wishing to export goods and services should pay for this type of counseling themselves. The fiscal year 2001 omnibus appropriations bill appropriated $64.7 million to this program. According to the Department of Commerce, $21 million remains unexpended in this account.

As to the Emergency Steel Guaranteed Loan Program, $126.8 million: These are loan guarantees to qualified steel companies. There remains $126.8 million in unspent balances in the account for fiscal year 2001 out of a total appropriation of more than $129 million. I am told that none of this money will be spent in the 82 days left in this fiscal year.

As to the Treasury Department U.S. Customs Service Byrd antidumping amendment funds rescission, $200 million: The ''continued dumping and subsidy offset'' was added in the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture appropriations conference report—the wrong way to do business, I say to the managers of the bill, the wrong way to do business. However, the important point is that the entire sum of money collected during the current fiscal year under this law is not being spent. CBO scores the Byrd amendment at $200 to $300 million annually, and the chief financial officer of the Customs Service confirms this figure for fiscal year 2001. None of the money that is being collected throughout fiscal year 2001 will be disbursed to companies this year. In fact, it will not be disbursed until the second quarter of fiscal year 2002. The money that has been collected since

the law was signed in October 2000 but which will not be disbursed in fiscal year 2001 is currently sitting unused in the general treasury.

I am philosophically opposed to this program that distorts trade policy by taking antidumping duties levied to protect U.S. companies and actually redistributing duties collected to those very companies, providing them a double reward: punitive tariff rates for imports from overseas competitors, as well as a slush fund of public money.

Again, the point here is that none of the $200 million collected annually for this program will be spent this year and sufficient funds will be collected next year to meet the law's fiscal year 2002 obligations.

I have described the offsets because every one of those programs which this money is being reduced from, most of it unused at this time, pales in significance to the importance of taking care of the men and women in the military. Which is more important, decent housing for the men and women in the military or Commerce Department international trade administration export promotion programs?

We have to always set priorities. I argue that the priority that exists today and that those of us on this side of the aisle promised the American people as a result of the election last year was that we would do a much better job of taking care of the men and women in the military than had been happening in the previous 8 years.

I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield such time as the Senator from Texas may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment. I support the amendment for a lot of reasons.

The most important reason I support it is that this is an amendment where a Member of the Senate has actually gone through a $2 trillion budget, a budget that spends $7,000 per man, woman, and child in America, and found $800 million that he believes is a lower priority than the things for which he would increase funding in the military.

It never ceases to amaze me that in a government where we spend $2 trillion—that is with a ''t''—every year, over and over again, Members of the Senate stand up and offer amendments to increase spending on some favored program, and almost never, ever do they suggest that there is something in the Federal Government that is a lower priority than the thing they believe is a high enough priority to increase spending to fund.

I think you can quarrel, though I do not quarrel, but you can quarrel with almost any one of the choices the Senator from Arizona has made. But you can't quarrel with the logic of the Senator from Arizona, which is that our job is setting priorities. He argues that operation and maintenance, housing, and improved capacity in the military, exceed in value the list of the $800 million worth of expenditures he would reduce or terminate in order to fund his amendment.

I believe these kinds of amendments need to be encouraged. I am in support of the amendment and I intend to vote for it. Let me also say that it is hard for me to judge the statements being made about defense. I can't forget that many of the same people who are now saying that there is virtually no limit to what we could use in defense, either they or their predecessors, 2 or 3 years ago, were saying that everything was great in an administration that was dramatically reducing the real level of defense spending.

I believe we do need a top-to-bottom review at the Pentagon. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that a good-faith effort—perhaps the best effort in 10 or 20 years—is being undertaken by the Secretary of Defense. That effort is not going to produce results that will be uniformly happy, and I would have to say that of all of the proposals that have been looked at—and I agree with all the people who, with unhappiness and bluster, say it was done the wrong way, we weren't notified, and there are 101 explanations for being opposed to cutting one program to fund another—but the bottom line is, we had an effort underway to undo the one proposal to reprogram that had been made by the Pentagon. I think, quite frankly, that sets a very bad precedent. So I believe we do need a comprehensive review.

My dad was a sergeant in the Army. That is the extent of my knowledge about the military. I believe in a strong defense. I am proud of my record in supporting defense. I think I have a base of support for people who wear the uniform that is virtually second to none. But whether or not we need to be in a position to fight two major conflicts at once is something subject to question. I am a lot more concerned about modernization and recruitment and retention than I am about continuing to keep production lines alive. I think Eisenhower clearly was right when he warned us so long ago that even with our best intentions about defense, defense spending would be driven by political interests—something he called the ''industrial military complex.''

Let me sum up what I came over to say today. First of all, I commend the Senator from Arizona for being the first person in this Congress and the first person in a long time who really not only thought we ought to spend money on something we weren't spending it on, but who was willing to actually name things he was willing to take it away from. It is interesting that all over America every day families make these kinds of choices. The washing machine breaks down and so they have to make choices. Maybe they don't go on vacation. Or Johnny falls and breaks his arm and it has to be set and it costs money. They have to make choices, and they are hard choices. We never seem to make any of those choices. I am attracted to this amendment because it does make those choices, whether you agree with them or not.

Secondly, I believe we need more money for defense, but I think it has to come in the context of a dramatic reform of defense spending. I think one of the worst things we can do is to simply have a dramatic increase in defense spending without going back and making fundamental decisions about where the money needs to be spent. So I am not unhappy with where we are in terms of a comprehensive review. Once we have a new plan, once we set new priorities, then I am willing to do what the Senator's amendment has done, which is to take money away from lower priority uses. But I do think it is important that we know what we want to do.

So I commend our colleague for the amendment. I support it. I did want to go on record as saying that I am concerned that many of our colleagues are ready to stop the one effort the administration has made in terms of changing priorities. I think that sends a very bad signal. I think whether it affects individual States—and this is one that happens to negatively affect my State—I don't think we can take the position that every program change ought to be opposed if it affects our particular State. I think in the end you have to look at the big picture. I think we are all expected to work for the interests of our States, but, in the end, it is the interest of the common defense of the country that defense spending is about.

I thank the Senator for yielding me time and for his amendment. I don't have any doubt that, looked at in the aggregate, the $800 million of programs—no matter how meritorious any one individual might be, the merits of those programs pale by comparison to the merits of the programs he has proposed to take the money from and use for the purposes of defense funding. That is what our appropriations process ought to be about. Unfortunately, it is not, and I think our Government is diminished as a result.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder if I might yield myself 10 minutes to speak in opposition to the McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Off of whose time does the Senator wish to consume time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. In opposition to the McCain amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. There is an hour in opposition to the McCain amendment. On behalf of the chairman, I yield the Senator 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, I think we would be making a mistake to gut some important domestic programs that I think are critical to our being competitive in the global economy. I think it is critical that we make sure we also live up to the national security of our own country, which is the security of local communities where people really have the opportunity for dislocated workers to rebuild their lives, where we are able to make investments in industries that are critical to the economic life of our communities and our country.

I don't doubt the judgment of the Senator from Arizona on some of the new spending that he believes is critical for defense. I argue that I believe we should be able to find this money within DOD's budget.

I want to go over inspector general reports, which point to a very bloated, wasteful Pentagon budget, where there is more than enough money to meet my colleague's challenge. I think the amendment turns our priorities on their head, and I think it is a mistake. The Senator's amendment would rescind $141.5 million, and that is on top of the $217 million that we have already rescinded for job training programs under the Workforce Investment Act. My colleague from Arizona said the workforce investment decision was designed to bring the Senate rescission to what the House did but, in fact, the House did not rescind any funds. So I think my colleague is in error on that point.

More important, I think it is a mistake in these times. I am speaking as a Senator from Minnesota, but as I said earlier, on the Iron Range—which is a second home for me and my wife Sheila in terms of how strongly we feel about the people up there—we saw LTV Company pull the plug, and 1,300 steelworkers are out of work. These are taconite workers. These were $60,000-a-year jobs, including health care. These families are trying to recover. These workers are now dislocated. They are looking for other work. In farm country and in rural parts of the State, many people have been left behind.

I think it is simply the wrong priority to make additional cuts to additional rescissions in assistance for dislocated workers. It is just not right. It is not right. Moreover, in the Workforce Investment Act, which I wrote with Senator DEWINE in a bipartisan effort, we did things to make sense by way of streamlining and having a good public-private partnership, and by way of being consistent in terms of what our national priorities are, which I think is all about, again, the importance of human capital, the importance of education, the importance of people having the skills training and the people finding employment so they can support themselves and their families. I do not think it makes sense to make additional cuts in this priority program.

My colleague also would rescind nearly $127 million from the Steel Loan Guarantee Program. I do not know, but there are a lot of Senators, and I know there are Republicans as well, who come from a part of the country where the industrial sector is really important, where we have had an import surge, where many workers, hard-working people—you cannot find any more hard-working people—are now losing their jobs, and we are talking about how to make an investment in this industry.

By the way, the steel industry is one of those industries that is critical to our national security, in the critical role the steel industry has always played by way of contributing to defense, much less the infrastructure of highways and bridges within our own country.

Again, I find myself in major disagreement with this amendment.

Finally, if we are going to look for resources for the new needs identified by Senator MCCAIN, I think we can find it right out of this bloated Pentagon budget. I have no doubt there is at least $1 billion of waste that the Secretary of Defense can identify. Let me talk about what the Pentagon inspector general found by way of bookkeeping entries that could not be tracked or justified:

> We identified deficiencies in internal controls and account systems related to General Property, Plant and Equipment; Inventory; Environmental Liabilities; Military Retirement Health Benefits Liability; and material lines within the Statement of Budgetary Resources. We identified $1.1 trillion in departmental-level accounting entries to financial data used to prepare DOD component financial statements that were not supported by adequate audit trials or by sufficient evidence to determine their validity.

This is not a new problem. In fiscal year 1999, the inspector general reported there were $2.3 trillion in entries that could not be corroborated.

Six years ago, the General Accounting Office put the Pentagon's financial management on its list of agencies that are at high risk for waste, fraud, and abuse.

The inspector general also has uncovered many other examples of gross overcharges in the Pentagon's accounting system. A March 13, 2001, report listed the following gross abuses:

The Pentagon paid $2.10 for a body screw that cost the vendor 48 cents, a 335-percent markup.

The Pentagon paid 25 cents for a dust protection plug that cost the vendor 3 cents, a 699-percent markup.

The Pentagon paid $409.15 for a washroom sink that cost the vendor $39.17, a 945-percent markup.

The source: Office of Inspector General, Department of Defense report. This was March 13, 2001.

If we want to find the money, let's look at some of the administrative waste within the Pentagon. We can surely find that money. We can surely make that transfer instead of going after priority programs that are also all about our national defense.

I argue, again, part of the definition of national defense is the security of local communities where dislocated workers have the opportunity to rebuild their lives, to develop their skills, to find gainful employment where we have industries that have the capital that can generate the jobs on which people can support their families.

Why in the world would we want to make cuts in these programs? I believe this amendment reflects the wrong priorities, and I hope my colleagues will vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from Wyoming wishes to have time. I yield him 7 minutes from the time in opposition to Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for the fact they covered all of the expenditures. Senator MCCAIN has covered the expenditures, but before we vote for Senator MCCAIN's amendment, I ask that we give some serious concern to from where some of this money is coming.

I serve on the Small Business Committee, and we have worked on a number of ways to be sure people who lost jobs could have additional training. So I rise today to express some serious concern over the use of workforce investment funds to offset 2001 supplemental appropriations. While I do support additional appropriations for the purposes outlined in the underlying bill, dramatically reducing funding for State and local workforce development programs to pay for it does not seem prudent.

Again, I recognize the pressures placed on the appropriators, but I would have expected that the Members responsible for oversight of such programs would have been consulted as to the impact of such cuts on the program's ability to fulfill its purpose.

The programs authorized by the Workforce Investment Act were agreed to through a strong bipartisan process, led by Senators DEWINE, KENNEDY, JEFFORDS, WELLSTONE, and myself. I fear, given the apparent willingness to cut funding for the act, that we did too good of a job in 1998 when Workforce Investment Act was enacted. What I mean by that is that we successfully streamlined the often duplicative and disjointed collage of job training programs in existence prior to 1998. So now, if these rescissions are adopted, there will not be any alternative workforce investment programs for people to access. The point is, this money is the program. None of us can support this rescission and walk away thinking another workforce initiative will simply absorb our constituents.

Moreover, a retroactive cut of this size will compound the challenges that many States are already facing during the transition from the Job Training Partnership Act, which my colleagues

know as JTPA, to the Workforce Investment Act. Also—and no one is really talking about this part—since States were due a portion of their annual allotment on July 1, they now are going to have to turn around and send a large portion of that back to Washington in the form of a rebate check. This just does not seem right to me.

I do not have any formulas at hand to demonstrate the value of workforce development programs in the face of a slowed economy. It is simply too early too soon, but what I can offer my colleagues is common sense. Now is not the time for us to scale back basic skills training, re-training of displaced workers, or innovative initiatives designed to spur long-range economic development in struggling communities. It is these communities that need our help, and that is help that we promised last year in the ''regular'' FY 2001 appropriations bill.

Again, I know the dilemma facing our appropriators is not easy. There is consensus that we need to provide immediate additional resources to our military, our farmers and others whose distress is our responsibility. I also recognize that identifying unobligated current year appropriations in July is like finding a needle in a haystack, but rescinding funds from people who are trying to make themselves employable, to make themselves contributing members of their community is not exactly skimming fat off the top. This cuts to the bone in Wyoming and in countless other States. My State, for instance, was due to receive $555,420 on July 1 for dislocated workers. I know this does not sound like a lot to those of you from larger States, and it is not a lot even in Wyoming, but it is crucial in Wyoming in the effort to address the counties that have been hard hit by unemployment. So now instead of $555,000, we will receive 62 percent of that, or $345,000. That is a 38-percent cut of already appropriated money. We are not talking about cutting a request; it is already appropriated and should have been sent.

I can assure Members it will have an adverse impact on the progress we have made in the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act and will impact getting people retrained for currently useful jobs. My concern over this rescission is clear, and I will not belabor my opposition. I ask that the able managers of the bill reconsider using workforce investment funds to offset supplemental spending. I am happy to work with them and their House counterparts as they reconcile the two bills in conference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska for yielding time. I wish to remind my colleagues, in crafting this supplemental bill the Department of Defense considered two criteria. These requirements were that any program receiving supplemental funding must be able to execute this funding during the current fiscal year, and the current fiscal year has just about 2½ months remaining, and that the funding cannot wait until fiscal year 2002.

I also wish to remind the Senate that from fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 2001 the Congress of the United States added $49 billion to the Department of Defense budget, much of it to the very programs that concern Senators from Arizona. Some of the unfunded requirements addressed by the Senator in this amendment were identified by the services in January and February before the Bush administration began its own defense review. And some of these items are funded in the fiscal year 2002 request.

We are committed to working with the Defense Department to avoid a supplemental next year and fund all legitimate requirements. Many of the items identified by the distinguished Senator will be funded in fiscal year 2002 or through the omnibus reprogramming request.

We understand the Senator's amendment seeks to fund anticipated costs that DOD expects to materialize later this year. I wish to underline ''anticipated costs'' because the intent of the Senator's amendment to cover this cost is very meritorious. However, the committees of jurisdiction, the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, have yet to receive this request. We have not received a request from the Department of Defense. The increases in question have not been scrutinized by either of these committees. Therefore, we cannot validate to our colleagues this day that the amounts identified by the distinguished Senator from Arizona are the ones that the Department of Defense truly needs. We understand and support the concept that the Senator offers in the amendment, but we do not believe we can support the amendment until the committees have had a chance to study, to scrutinize the specific details of the request.

Until such time, we cannot advise our colleagues that this is what DOD really needs. Therefore, I must stand in opposition to the McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will read from an article in the Washington Post dated May 31, 2001, titled ''Bush Eyes Additional $5.6 Billion For Military: Increase Is Far Less Than Services Expected,'' by Robert Suro and Thomas Ricks, Washington Post staff writers.

In part it states:

> The supplemental budget request . . . does not include any new money for ballistic missile defense which [Bush] has depicted a top priority, or for the weapons systems and operating costs that he said the Clinton administration had grossly underfunded. Some senior military officers and defense experts said yesterday the president's request is so small that it will not fully cover the Pentagon's current expenses.
>
> ''This request is the barebones, just the items that are absolutely to get by, and no one has any illusions that it is anything more than that,'' said a senior military officer speaking on the condition of anonymity.

The article goes on to say:

> In the early days of the new administration, top military officials said they hope to get much more, at least $8 billion to $10 billion, in a supplemental that would, in effect, be the first installment of a Bush buildup. But the White House and Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld decided they would take care of only immediate needs in modifying this year's defense budget. . . . The new priorities will not be fully felt until the 2003 budget is unveiled next winter . . .
>
> Although relatively small sums are at play, compared to the size of the defense budget, some senior military officers have complained. ''On the campaign trail he said over and over, 'Help is on the way,''' said a flag officer . . . ''Well, we are going to need help when the fourth quarter of this budget year rolls around, and it is not going to be there.''
>
> In principle, supplemental spending requests are meant to provide relatively small amounts for contingencies that arise after the Federal budget is enacted. But the Pentagon, unlike other Federal agencies, has regularly used supplementals to fill out identity funds for basic operations, maintenance, and supplies. Rumsfeld has warned that he intends to put an end to this practice, beginning with a crackdown this year.

I certainly hope that will be the case.

I challenge a Member of this body to find any member of the U.S. military leadership, any chief petty officer or sergeant who would tell them this is enough, that what is in the supplemental is enough.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I don't intend to be an expert in military matters, and I yield to those who do understand those matters. But I have to rise to oppose Senator MCCAIN's amendment with respect to one of the offsets he has created that would cut the provisions in the supplemental in half for those funds that would be appropriated in support of the Olympics.

I understand concern about the Olympics. I understand the sense that this is a sporting event. What is the Federal Government doing with respect to a sporting event? But I have to point out a few things with respect to the Olympics that take it out of the realm of the pure sporting event.

The Senator from Arizona has talked about the Olympics in Atlanta as well as the Olympics in Los Angeles. I attended the Olympics in Los Angeles because I was living there, and I recognize that we live in a very different world than we did in 1984. The Olympics in Atlanta was the first Olympics at which we had a bomb in the United States, and as a result of the bomb that went off in Atlanta and the scare that came following that, President Clinton issued Presidential Decision Directive No. 62, PDD 62, designating this as a Presidential event, changing

the security arrangements of the Olympics forever. The whole circumstance surrounding the Olympics, now, as a result of PDD 62 are focused on international terrorism in a way that they were not in the more simple days of the Los Angeles Olympics in 1984 or certainly even in Atlanta.

Now, as a result of PDD 62 creating this as a Presidential event, we as a government are now faced with these circumstances. And $52 million of the $62 million called for in the supplemental go to the Treasury Department and the Secret Service for a variety of functions surrounding PDD 62 and its requirements. The first deals with the core mission of the Secret Service which has to do with protecting the President, protecting foreign dignitaries, and dealing with counterterrorism. We are going to have an unprecedented number of foreign dignitaries attending these Olympics. That goes with every new Olympics. Every time there is a new Olympics, more foreign dignitaries show up than 4 years before.

We must understand that the venues for these games, they being winter Olympics, are not focused around a stadium or a swimming pool. We are talking about a 900 square mile area, including some of the most mountainous territory in the United States. To protect all of that area requires a tremendous amount of effort on the part of the Secret Service. That is what the money is going for.

There is a question of customs. We are getting people from all over the world to come to the Olympics—people who, as we saw in Munich, can pose as athletes and turn out to be terrorists, as well as athletes, their coaches, families, and, of course, spectators.

Dealing with customs in the Treasury Department is where part of this money will go. The ATF, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, energized obviously by the experience in Atlanta where there was a bomb that went off, is now making sure that a great deal more activity is done to prevent that than was done in Atlanta. It is only prudent to do this. That is $52 million of the $60 million we are talking about in this supplemental going to the Treasury Department for those kinds of functions.

The other $8 million goes to the Justice Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Interior Department. You would ask: What does Agriculture and Interior have to do with the Olympics? The fact is that a very large portion of the Olympics will take place on Forest Service land, which is policed by the Department of Agriculture, and BLM land, which is policed by the Department of the Interior. These agencies have the adequate facilities to deal with this, but, in the heightened activity surrounding the Olympics, they will have to pay their people overtime. They will get their people there. They have the trained people to do it, but they will have to pay airfare. There will have to be lodging. They will have to pay overtime. These agencies have been putting together this information.

We can complain maybe this should have been done in the previous bill, it should have been taken care of in the 2001 appropriations bill and we should not have it before us as a supplemental, but the fact is, if we do not get it prior to the end of this fiscal year, the proper preparations will not be able to be made.

This money is in the 2002 bill. The full $60 million is in the 2002 bill, which, in the normal course of governmental activity, that would be the proper way to do it. The fact is, however, we cannot change the time of the Olympic games. That is set in concrete, and if we do not do the money in a more readily available upfront manner, we will find we are facing the challenge of trying to have the money in the pipeline while the games are taking place.

It seems in this situation, in the middle of the summer when the Sun is shining and it is hot outside, that this may not be a matter of that much pressing urgency. But if we have an international incident at the Olympics in Utah in 2002—if a foreign dignitary is attacked; if a terrorist attack goes on to try to embarrass any country—ours or any other—if there is a lapse in security and the fingers start to be pointed as to where were the Americans, why weren't they prepared—it will be a little difficult to say we wanted to put it off, we wanted to take it out of the supplemental and have it take place in the 2002 budget; we were only saving 4 or 5 months, but we wanted to use the money for something else for that 4- or 5-month period. I do not want to run that risk. I do not want to have the opportunity handed to an international terrorist that says the American Secret Service is underfunded, the Forest Rangers and others involved with policing the public lands have not been able to get their overtime in the right appropriations bill; we waited too late; the preparations were not made; therefore, we had this event.

I respectfully suggest we reject the amendment of the Senator from Arizona and, instead of having this money come in the 2002 bill, have it stay where it is now, in the supplemental bill. It will be easier to get a delay on some of these other things for 4 months, things that do not have a firm time scale connected to them, than it will be to have this money delayed for the Olympics.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to speak against Senator MCCAIN's amendment to the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations legislation. I fully appreciate the sentiment underlying this amendment. The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve nothing but the best in living conditions, pay, and working environment. I understand that this amendment would enhance the operations and maintenance of the services. I have always supported legislation that provides for our soldiers, airmen, and marines. However, I find that one of the offsets to Senator MCCAIN's amendment is totally without merit.

I am vehemently against section 3003, paragraph (b) in Senator MCCAIN's amendment which reduces the salaries and expenses in the Department of Treasury by $30 million. The amendment does not address what the $30 million is for, but I will tell you this funding is for security for the 2002 Winter Olympics. It pays the salaries and expenses of law enforcement personnel.

Senator MCCAIN's amendment seeks to add funding to the military that would not dramatically improve our national security but the $30 million that he takes away from the Treasury Department's budget can have a dramatic impact on safety at this international event.

For several years now we have worked very hard to ensure the public safety of this major international event. The law enforcement budget has been carefully planned, fully justified, and endorsed by this body. Any reduction to this budget would have a severe impact on the security of the Olympics and impose unacceptable risks. I am sure my colleagues agree that the safety of the Olympic athletes and spectators is of paramount importance, and a national responsibility when this Nation agreed to host the 2002 Olympic Games.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise to express my serious concern about a provision in Senator MCCAIN's amendment which I believe would significantly undermine the commitment we made in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, (TEA–21), to address our citizens' mobility needs. This provision would rescind funding for two crucial programs run by the Federal Transit Administration: the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program, and the Transit Planning and Research Program.

TEA–21 created the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program to provide transit grants to assist states and localities in developing flexible transportation services to connect welfare recipients and other low-income people to jobs and other employment-related services. In addition, the program provides support for transportation services to suburban employment centers from urban, suburban, and rural locations—''reverse commutes''—for all populations.

Even in a time of low unemployment, a person who cannot get to the workplace cannot hold a job. Not everyone can afford access to an automobile, especially those who are looking for employment. Public transportation can be a vital component in helping these individuals leave the welfare rolls and enter the workforce.

In fact, investment in public transportation benefits all Americans. As

the numbers emerging from the 2000 Census show, the shape of America has changed in recent years. The fact is that two-thirds of all new jobs are now located in the suburbs, while much of the workforce lives in the city. For millions of Americans, transit is the answer to this spatial mismatch. And as cities and towns across America are discovering, public transit can stimulate the economic life of any community. Studies have shown that a nearby transit station increases the value of local businesses and real estate. Increased property values mean more tax revenues to states and local jurisdictions; new business development around a transit station means more jobs.

I am therefore quite concerned to see that the McCain amendment would take over $200 million away from transit programs. This amendment would be a significant setback in our efforts to make transit services more accessible and improve the quality of life for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President I rise today to further explain my opposition to the pending amendment offered by my good friend from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN. The Senator's amendment seeks to address worthwhile objectives such as providing for the operation and maintenance of our armed forces and increasing funding for personnel needs. I support these goals and believe they should be addressed.

However, the offset for this amendment troubles me for two reasons and it is because of these reservations that I cannot support the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN. The first issue concerns the specific funding recissions in the designated offset. For example, the amendment rescinds $141,500,000 in Department of Labor funding earmarked for Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities and Adult Employment and Training Activities.

This funding is critical for my home State of Montana because we are in the midst of an energy crisis that has to date been responsible for over 1000 lost jobs. Retraining dollars are essential for helping these newly laid-off workers develop new skills and learn new trades so they can more quickly rejoin the workforce in a state that is already struggling economically.

The second issue is the lack of separation between non-defense and defense funding that this amendment proposes. The separation of defense and non-defense spending has served us well in meeting our nation's budget priorities and making fiscally responsible decisions. Utilizing non-defense funding to offset the additional spending of this amendment sets a precedent that I do not believe we should set. We should fund the priorities, laid forth by Senator MCCAIN, in a timely manner, but we should not use existing funding in non-defense programs to accomplish our goal.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to provisions in the McCain amendment, and in underlying bill, S. 1077, which rescind funds from programs supported under the Workforce Investment Act, including the Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Program and the Adult Employment and Training Activities.

The underlying bill rescinds funds from WIA in order to pay for important increases in funding for title I education services and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I support the need to increase essential funds for students in our highest-poverty schools and for low-income individuals who are being hardest hit by increasing energy costs. Indeed, I signed on in support of the increases for title I and LIHEAP. I do not think, however, we should increase funding for these, defense or any other programs by taking money away from New York workers at a time when these employment and training programs are most in need and are beginning to meet their potential.

At this time when upstate New York is facing more notice of layoffs, we should not be cutting back our support for dislocated workers. Last year, over 25,000 New York workers received notices warning them of layoffs—an increase of over 7,000 workers from 1998.

Over the past several months, we have learned that hundreds of workers at the Xerox facility in Webster, NY, will soon find themselves out of work; several hundred more New Yorkers who have spent years working for Nabisco in Niagara Falls also recently received notice that they would no longer have a job. Corning announced just yesterday that it will have to close three factories, resulting in a loss of nearly 1,000 jobs.

At a time when we see signs of our economy weakening, this bill would reduce funds specifically designated to assist workers who are victims of mass layoffs and plant closures. With the rescission in the base bill alone, New York can expect to lose approximately 29 percent of its dislocated worker funds. I have received hundreds of letters from New Yorkers—not only from concerned workers, but also from businesses who need trained workers.

Why are my colleagues suggesting that we should rescind WIA funds at a time when our economy is weakening and many of our workers will need these critical funds to be retrained and relocated in new jobs?

They are claiming that States are not spending and obligating funds quickly enough. I agree. But, I also agree that States and local communities have made tremendous progress in implementing the Workforce Investment Act.

Let's get the facts straight. States were not required to implement the Workforce Investment Act until July 1, 2000. Beginning July 1, 2000, States had 2 years to spend funds and were required to obligate 80 percent of their funds. Many counties in New York are doing a tremendous job—Chautauqua County, for example, has obligated 95 percent of its dislocated worker funds, as well as 95 percent of adult funds; the Town of Hempstead has allocated 90 percent of both its dislocated and adult worker funds; as has Erie County—all of which can expect to lose funds under this rescission.

I do know that there are at least eight counties in New York that have struggled in their implementation—working to get up to 19 Federal partners at the local level to offer services in One Stop training centers—and, as a result have obligated 70 percent or less of their funds. These counties need to do better and the State needs to do better in supporting their efforts. But, the way to do so is not to take funds away from a fledgling program that is aimed to assist our workers most in need of training and assistance.

I oppose these efforts to undermine the new Workforce Investment Act. I agree with accountability of Federal dollars, but I do not agree that we should unnecessarily punish workers before allowing the program to get up and running.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, may be mistaken. In fact, $359 million was rescinded in the House supplemental from the programs. I think he was inaccurate in his statement that none was rescinded.

I am sorry the Senator from Utah may have to leave the floor. The Senator from Utah fails to mention that we have already shelled out $1.3 billion—''b,'' billion—in subsidies for the Salt Lake Olympics, far more than any other Olympics in history, far more, for all kinds of pet projects.

I asked 3 years ago, a simple request of the Senator from Utah, if he would give us an assessment of how much in Federal dollars would be needed. Of course, I never got an answer. In fact, we had a little dialog on the floor of the Senate.

Never once, never on any occasion has the Commerce Committee, of which I am the ranking member, had a request for authorization for funds for the Salt Lake City Olympics—never once. Not on any single occasion, even though I have requested time after time, the committee of oversight that authorizes the funds and what may be required has never, ever been approached.

Why not? Perhaps one of the reasons might be because we found out in a GAO report that the taxpayers have shelled out $1.3 billion already for the Salt Lake City Olympics for every kind of imaginable thing—I will include the GAO report—every imaginable kind of project, none of which—or very little of which had to do with security. It had to do with land acquisitions; it had to do with all kinds of things. Of course,

we have never yet had a request for an authorization.

What do we find? We find a supplemental appropriations bill for $30 million for security. It sounds good. Why was the request not made a long time ago? Perhaps, if the Senator from Utah had complied with the simple request that I made as chairman of the oversight committee, that we could get some kind of estimate as to how much it would cost the taxpayers, we would not be going through this drill we are going through now.

I, again, urge the Senator from Utah to tell us how many of the taxpayers' dollars are going to be needed to fund the Olympics, No. 1; and, No. 2, seek authorization through the authorizing committee for those funds—which happens to be the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

I point out on this amendment that the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Defense have not voiced objections. In the interests of straight talk, they have not expressed support for this amendment either. But there has not been any objection raised by the Office of Management and Budget or by the Department of Defense to this amendment. I hope Senators will take that into consideration.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 34 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I share many of the concerns that have been expressed by my colleague from Arizona. I am sure he understands I join him in the desire that we assure the adequate protection and support for our men and women in the armed services. I do think the amendment of the Senator is well intentioned. It is consistent with the priorities identified by Secretary Rumsfeld in his budget request for the fiscal year 2002. That request provides for a substantial increase, which I shall discuss further, in defense spending, commencing with October 1 of this year—82 days away.

By the time this bill gets to the President, probably it will be 75 days; by the time he signs it, it will be about 70 days; by the time the money could be released by the OMB, and then released by the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, that is about 60 days later. So we are talking about the same time because their machinery over there is designed to follow through on the amendment that has already been submitted by the Secretary.

I believe it is my duty to join the Senator from Hawaii, and others, in stating that we think this matter is better addressed in the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization and appropriations bills.

The Senator from Arizona talks about authorization. This matter is before the Armed Services Committee now. The Secretary has testified before that committee. They may come up with different priorities. I believe the Senator is right; we have a role in helping to determine the priorities for defense spending.

We share that with the House of Representatives. Congress has the power of the purse. I do believe we should use it. But with the situation going on now, Secretary Rumsfeld and the Joint Chiefs are working on a comprehensive effort to redefine defense priorities. He has submitted this amendment for 2002.

We are just now reviewing the details of the total request that was received just prior to the Fourth of July recess. I do not think there is any way we can determine the merit of Senator MCCAIN's amendment until we better understand what the Secretary of Defense and the services have presented to us in the amendment to the budget for 2002.

Several items in this amendment are likely to be accommodated in the Department's annual omnibus reprogramming. Every year, as we get down to this last quarter, the Department comes to us with reprogramming requests which are approved, under existing law, by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. That shifts considerable money. We gave the Department of Defense, this year, through the Defense Appropriations Act, the authority to shift $2 billion from one fund to a fund of higher priority. We have to approve that, of course, but that lifted the ceiling considerably. Annually, the Department presents to Congress reprogramming requests that shift from one purpose to an alternative higher priority. That is what we should do. We should let the Department shift these funds and tell us where they want them shifted to, if they wish to do so.

But I am constrained to point out that the budget resolution for this fiscal year contains what we call a wall. It is a wall between defense and nondefense spending. The amendment by the Senator from Arizona calls upon us to make moneys available from a substantial number of nondefense accounts for defense spending.

I want to assure you if the amendment were the other way around, suggesting we should take money from defense and put it in nondefense, I am certain the Senator from Arizona would join me in vigorously opposing such an amendment. I think, in my role on the Appropriations Committee, it is my duty to vigorously oppose this amendment because of the attempt to shift money from nondefense accounts to defense accounts for this fiscal year.

Later this month we are going to review the $330 billion spending proposal of the Department of Defense for 2002. I am sure that as a member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator MCCAIN will work very hard on these matters. I am certain he will assist in determining whether the priorities are correct as submitted by the Secretary, with the approval of President Bush.

I do not believe we should shift funds from the nondefense priorities until we are certain that the funds are in excess of those programs' needs. As a matter of fact, I do not think we should do it at all because that was our commitment, that we would keep a wall between defense and nondefense spending. The budget resolutions for the last 4 years—I believe 5 years—have spelled that out. And we have adhered to it. We, in the Appropriations Committee, have been quite clear about that.

I have to confess, I did suggest that some of the defense moneys go to the Coast Guard, but I made that request because I believe they are a semimilitary agency. They carry out some military functions, and they have to have military equipment, military training, and military assets on board their ships. But we have vigorously defended the concept of the wall. Those people who vote for the McCain amendment are, for the first time, going to set the Senate on record as abandoning the concept of the wall.

I have asked the Parliamentarian if this is subject to a point of order because of this fact, and I have to ascertain that later. But I, for one, believe in the wall because we put it up to protect defense spending, not the other way around.

I don't want to get political here, but in the last few years the President was not as much in favor of defense spending as the Congress, and therefore we protected the defense spending with the wall. I do not see any reason now for us to turn around and renege on the commitment we have made to protect that concept of separating defense and nondefense spending.

We should not shift these funds from other nondefense priorities. It is a matter of fact that there are substantial needs out there for the Department of Defense. I do not argue about that at all. I have to confess, if I were the Secretary of Defense, I would be among those who would be asking for even more than has the Secretary of Defense. I have every reason to believe the Secretary of Defense has asked for more money than OMB has submitted to us because the OMB, with the overall problem of controlling expenditures and meeting objectives in the nondefense area, has limited the Secretary of Defense in his request for 2002. I think we understand that.

We are going to push that envelope as far as we can. But clearly the moneys that have been requested now put this administration on record of requesting more moneys—I think almost $80 billion more—than the level of 2001 that will be spent in 2002 for defense. And that is—what?—less than 3 months away.

I really have objection to the McCain amendment because of where the money comes from. It cuts $41.5 million from the dislocated workers assistance program. It rescinds $100 million from the job training program. The committee bill already took some money

from this dislocated workers program, but ours is from unexpended balances of the program. This rescission takes it from the program, actually cuts job training programs for dislocated workers. And I will vote against that as a separate amendment.

Senator MCCAIN's amendment also makes substantial reductions, significant reductions, in the international space station account. This is at a time of extreme need. I have been spending some time looking into the space program because of my extreme confidence in the Administrator there and his demonstrated interest in pursuing the space program.

I am told the space program has some $4 billion in potential cost overruns already to meet the full promise of the first-class orbiting space laboratory. The rescissions in this amendment would impact needed upgrades to the space shuttle, critical upgrades needed to ensure the safety of our astronauts. I do not think we can afford to make a snap judgment because of a perceived need in the Department of Defense—perceived because I think those needs have been already met by the submission by the Department.

Why should we take moneys from the space account? We do not have any justification for that that I can find, that I can see. I think it is a critical juncture now in the future of the space station. I believe we should demonstrate our continued support for it.

There are a great many items in the Senator's amendment that disturb me. I hope other Members will take a look at it to see where these moneys are coming from. They start on page 3 of the amendment. Not only are the funds reduced from the space account I just mentioned, there are funds from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, under the heading ''Industrial Technology Services,'' that are reduced by $67 million for the Advanced Technology Program. There is another $19 million from the Department of Commerce for the International Trade Administration. There are moneys that were provided under the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee and Emergency Oil and Gas Guarantee Loan Act.

I do appreciate the fact that the Senator has deleted the suggested reductions in the Maritime Guarantee Loan Program Account.

We also have a suggestion to take from the Department of Labor for the Employment and Training Administration under the heading ''Training and Employment Services'' and for the dislocated worker account, as I mentioned, $41.5 million; adult employment and training activities, $100 million. Then from the Department of Transportation—here again, I think this would be subject to a point of order—as I understand TEA–21, there is a wall in that, too. That money cannot be used for other purposes, but the amendment of the Senator from Arizona would take $90 million from the transit planning and research and $16 million from job access and reverse commute grants under the Federal Transit Administration.

All of this, to me, means that I appreciate the attempt of the Senator from Arizona to increase the amount of money for defense. If we had money that would be free under the budget for 2001 as it exists now, I would support the Senator's amendment to do so. But the Senator's amendment takes money from other accounts. I am being redundant now. These are nondefense accounts. And it takes the money to put it into the defense accounts to meet needs already covered by a budget submission delivered to the Senate prior to the Fourth of July recess which will for approximately the same time as this money could be made available, it will be made available under the 2002 bill.

I cannot support it. I hope the Senate will not support the Senator's amendment. At the appropriate time, I will make a motion to table the Senator's amendment. I do not wish to do so at this time because he still has time remaining.

I ask how much time do I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes 30 seconds. The Senator from Arizona has 12 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the expenditures that have been made according to the GAO for the Olympics.

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

APPENDIX III.—FEDERAL FUNDING AND SUPPORT PLANNED AND PROVIDED TO THE 2002 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES IN SALT LAKE CITY

[1999 dollars in thousands [1]]

Federal organization	Project or activity	Planning and staging the 2002 Winter Games			Preparing the host city of Salt Lake City		
		Planned [2]	Expenditure	Designated by Congress [3]	Planned [2]	Expenditure	Designated by Congress [3]
Department of Agriculture		$7,242	$2,901		$8,887	$5,473	$4,546
U.S. Forest Service	Olympic planning and increased services	7,242	2,901				
	Forest improvements				8,887	5,473	4,546
Department of Commerce		205		92			
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Increased weather forecasting services for Olympic events	205		92			
Department of Defense	Safety- and security-related services	24,691	45	45			
Department of Education	Paralympics	876	44	876			
Department of Energy	Safety- and security-related services	1,586	194				
Department of Health and Human Services		9,494					
Food and Drug Administration	Public health safety- and security-related services	598					
Centers for Disease Control	Safety- and security-related services	1,923					
Office of Emergency Preparedness	Public health safety- and security-related services	6,973					
Department of Housing and Urban Development		3,172					
	Housing for media	1,894					
	Housing for security personnel	1,278					
Department of the Interior		1,270	153				
National Park Service	Increased park services	1,252	153				
Bureau of Land Management	Increased Bureau services	5					
	Safety- and security-related services	13					
Department of Justice		47,060	14,960	16,950			
Federal Bureau of Investigation	Safety- and security-related services	21,486	767				
Immigration and Naturalization Service	Safety- and security-related services	2,431	3				
Office of Community Oriented Policing	Grants for safety- and security-related services	10,417	10,417	10,417			
Office of Justice Programs	Grants to local law enforcement	8,806	3,692	3,692			
Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys	Safety- and security-related services	1,027	81				
Community Relations Service	Assess racial tensions	52					
Counter terrorism fund	Safety- and security-related services	2,841		2,841			
Department of State	Increased agency services	663	3				
Department of Transportation		83,854	26,838	36,896	998,275	257,318	318,783
Federal Highway Administration	Olympic transportation planning	10,227	5,785	5,682			
	Accelerated road and bridge projects				645,315	199,678	18,541
	Olympic event access road: Snow Basin	14,962	14,962	14,962			
	Olympic event access road: Winter Sports Park	4,106	3,162				
Federal Transit Administration	Olympic Transportation System (OTS) [4]	47,348	1,402	2,788			
	Olympic infrastructure improvements	(5)	465	9,291			
	Olympic park and ride lots	(5)	1,024	4,173			
	Light rail: Downtown to University of Utah line				91,369	5,019	91,369
	Light Rail: North/South line				228,598	48,850	202,919
	Olympic intelligent transportation system deployment				3,788		
	Commuter rail				3,788	1,849	3,776
	Intermodal centers				9,470		2,178
Federal Aviation Administration	Safety- and security-related services	6,098					

APPENDIX III.—FEDERAL FUNDING AND SUPPORT PLANNED AND PROVIDED TO THE 2002 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES IN SALT LAKE CITY—Continued

[1999 dollars in thousands [1]]

Federal organization	Project or activity	Planning and staging the 2002 Winter Games			Preparing the host city of Salt Lake City		
		Planned [2]	Expenditure	Designated by Congress [3]	Planned [2]	Expenditure	Designated by Congress [3]
	Facility improvements				15,947	1,922	
Federal Railroad Administration	Safety- and security-related services	388					
U.S. Coast Guard	Safety- and security-related services	407					
Office of Secretary of Transportation	Safety- and security-related services	318	38				
Department of the Treasury		58,693	71				
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	Safety- and security-related services	8,811					
Internal Revenue Service	Safety- and security-related services	1,520					
U.S. Secret Service	Safety- and security-related services	13,704	46				
U.S. Customs Service	Safety- and security-related services	19,320	21				
Wireless Program	Safety- and security-related services	15,285					
Office of Enforcement	Safety- and security-related services	53	4				
Department of Veterans Affairs	Safety- and security-related services	2,746	1				
Environmental Protection Agency		2,961		2,083			
	Olympic venue-related sewer construction	2,083		2,083			
	Planning and increased services	473					
	Safety- and security-related services	405					
Federal Communications Commission	Communications systems improvements	137					
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Safety- and security-related services	6,107					
General Services Administration	Safety- and security-related services	1,472					
U.S. Information Agency	Education, cultural affairs	80					
U.S. Postal Service	Increased postal services	1,894			4,673		
	Facilities improvements				4,673		
	Increased postal services	1,894					
Total		254,203	45,210	56,942	1,011,835	262,791	323,329

[1] 1999 dollars were calculated by dividing 2002 dollars by 1.056, a conversion factor derived from chain-type price indexes for gross domestic product.
[2] Planned includes funds already expended.
[3] "Designated by Congress" refers to funds that were specifically designated for an Olympian-related purpose in appropriations acts or committee reports accompanying those acts.
[4] In July 1998 the SLOC requested $137 million in FTA funds for the Olympic Spectator Transit System (OSTS). In February 2000, the SLOC revised this request to $91 million. On March 3, 2000, FTA proposed a maximum contribution of $47.3 million for the 2002 Olympics and Paralympics. However, a current bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 4475, provides $56.8 million for Olympic buses and facilities and $9.5 million for the Olympic Infrastructure Investment.
[5] Included in above for OTS.

Mr. McCAIN. It includes things such as land acquisition, Olympic infrastructure, Olympic park-and-ride lots, light rail downtown to the University of Utah, Olympic intelligent transportation system, commuter rail, intermodal centers, the list goes on and on of the $1.3 billion that has already been spent before we tack some more onto this supplemental appropriations bill.

I hope the Senator from Alaska will also work very hard to remove the nondefense appropriations from the defense appropriations bills.

I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut and reserve the remaining 4½ or 5 minutes for me before all time expires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by my friend from Arizona. I do so because I think this amendment makes two very important points. Those are points that have strength and with which I want to identify whether or not this amendment has any possibility of passing.

The two points are these: First, that we are not spending enough on our national security; second, Congress has recently adopted and the President has signed a tax cut package that will make it increasingly difficult for us in the months and years ahead to find the resources to meet the needs of our defense systems and structures and forces. Those are the two critical points.

We have in recent years tried in Congress, and succeeded on a bipartisan basis, to significantly increase the recommended budget levels to sustain real growth in our defense spending. Beginning in the mid 1980s and going through about 2 or 3 years ago, every year spending on defense dropped in real dollars. That was a peace dividend, people said. In fact, when you look at the constriction of spending in the Federal Government over the last decade or so, most of it comes at the expense of defense; some of it obviously justified by the end of the cold war.

At the end of the cold war, America emerged in a very different world as the one superpower with extraordinary responsibilities for maintaining the peace in our own interest and the world's interest around the world.

As I say, we began to turn that around. In real dollars we began to increase defense spending 2 or 3 years ago.

Continuing this support must be a priority. We have to provide for immediate needs in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental and to commit to funding levels to maintain current readiness, as well as to modernize and transform our forces in the coming defense budget. I am deeply concerned that if we do not, we may jeopardize our capacity to defend our interests here and abroad.

I have heard what my friend from Arizona has said. I couldn't agree with him more about the statements made last year that "help is on the way." In some sense, it appears that the check may have been lost in the mail because although there are increases in defense in this supplemental appropriations and in the budget President Bush has recommended, they are inadequate to the needs of our defense. That is where I hope we in this body and Members of Congress, the other body, will join together on a bipartisan basis to give the Department of Defense the funds it needs to protect us.

The defense supplemental for fiscal year 2001, as has been said, is $5.6 billion, which, as I understand it, is about half of the amount that the service chiefs asked for. Although the fiscal year 2002 budget request from the administration is an increase, again, I don't think it is enough to meet our national security needs.

For instance, by my calculation, both procurement and research and development for the Army are less than that appropriated last year.

Navy procurement is lower by almost $2 billion than last year. As Admiral Clark, the Chief of Naval Operations, testified at the Armed Services Committee today, we are now a 314-ship Navy and on a course to head to 240 ships. It wasn't so long ago that we thought we needed 600 to protect us in the waters of the world. We are not meeting the needs of the Navy.

Air Force research and development, the investments in the ideas and technologies that will maintain our dominance in a high-technology world are lower in this budget than they were last year.

It is all that which brings me to join with Senator McCAIN in this amendment to make a statement not only about the short-term needs of the military this year, which respectfully are inadequately met in this supplemental appropriations bill, but also to raise an alarm about the inadequate funding in the budget submitted for fiscal year 2002 and about the ever more difficult problems we will face in the years ahead as a result of the national resources that have been squandered in the adoption of a tax bill that gives most to the few and leaves little for the broad national needs of our Nation.

This amendment adds $847.8 million to the amount requested by the President, a reasonable amount, mostly targeted toward short-term needs in the personnel and operation and maintenance accounts that must be fixed within the next 3 months. This is not extra, surplusage.

This money will be put immediately to critical national security uses, including $1 million to remove additional

sailors and marines from food stamps—a national disgrace—and for the protection of our forces in the Arabian Gulf. To do this, this measure includes offsets. So it is, in that sense, balanced.

I realize that every dollar has an advocate and every cut here will pain someone. In fact, some of them pain me. Senator MCCAIN has chosen some programs that I have supported and identified with. But the point is that there is a larger interest here, and that is that the short-term military needs of our country are a higher priority now.

I believe the short-term military needs are a higher priority now. But this, of course, is more than an issue of short-term spending. It is also a question of long-held values and responsibilities.

One of the most fundamental responsibilities we have under the Constitution is to provide for the common defense of our Nation. To fulfill that obligation, I am convinced we will have to significantly increase defense spending over the next decade. This amendment is a small, but significant, step in that direction; immediately, it is a large statement of what is to come. I hope that together we will meet our obligations to our men and women in uniform and, therefore, meet our responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 20 minutes under the Senator's control.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The McCain amendment provides $848 million for defense that the President has not requested, is not assumed in the budget resolution and is not authorized. Many of the items that would be funded in the McCain amendment will be considered as part of the annual DoD omnibus reprogramming request. DoD will cover many of these costs with their own offsets rather than through cutting non-defense programs.

Many of the non-defense offsets contained in the amendment are objectionable:

Job training: The McCain amendment rescinds an additional $141.5 million from the FY01 job training funds, $41.5 million from dislocated workers and $100 million from adult job training. This is in addition to the $217.5 million rescission already included in the bill. Increasing the rescission above the $217.5 million risks actual cuts on job training services.

Security at Winter Olympics: The McCain amendment would cut $30 million from the Committee bill. The committee approved the funds to provide security for participants and visitors to the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympics. The federal government is mandated under Presidential Decision Directive 62 to provide security for officially designated National Security Special Events. These funds were requested and fully paid for.

Advanced Technology Program: The amendment would rescind $67 million from the National Institutes for Standards and Technology Advanced Technology Program. ATP is a valuable and well-managed innovation program. From the telegraph to the Internet to biomedical research, government investment has spurred the development of new technologies and new fields, which have had great impact on and held enormous benefit for the American people. According to the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council, ATP's approach is funding new technologies that contribute to important societal goals.

International Trade Administration, Trade Development: The amendment would rescind $19 million. TD is responsible for negotiating and enforcing industry sector trade agreements such as these on autos, textiles and aircraft. TD's mission is extremely important in the era of trade agreements such as NAFTA and the African Free Trade Agreement.

Oil/gas: $114.8 million has already been rescinded from the Emergency Oil and Gas Loan Guaranteed Loan Program to help pay for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, RECA, and Global AIDS. This funding is no longer available for rescission.

Steel: The amendment would rescind $126.8 million from the oil and gas and steel loan guarantee programs. The committee bill already rescinds $114.8 million from the oil and gas program. If the entire $126.8 million rescission came from the steel loan guarantee program, then the ability of the steel loan guarantee board to help the steel industry receive needed capital would be eliminated. This reduction would come at a time when a record number of steel companies have filed for bankruptcy (eighteen companies) and steel prices have fallen below levels that prevailed during the depths of the 1998 steel crisis.

Access to Work: The McCain amendment would rescind over 80 percent of Access to Work funding. This program has been very successful at starting new programs at transit agencies to get welfare recipients to employers that want to hire them. Many studies have shown that one of the biggest problems in getting welfare recipients off the welfare roles and on to payrolls is transportation—getting them to work.

Antidumping: In the last 4 years, continued dumping or subsidization has been found in roughly 80 percent of all administrative reviews conducted by the Department of Commerce. Industries affected include many parts of agriculture, chemicals, consumer goods, industrial goods and components, and metals. The amendment would rescind $200 million from the Treasury program established last year to assist companies impacted by unfair foreign trade practices. This rescission would eliminate the program just when it is anticipated that the first offset disbursements will be made by Customs toward the end of November 2001.

NASA: The amendment would rescind $40 million from Life and Micro-Gravity research. In FY 2000, Congress fenced $40 million for a life and microgravity mission aboard the space shuttle. However, due to delays in overhauling the Space Shuttle *Columbia*, and the need to accelerate the Hubble space telescope servicing mission, NASA was forced to reschedule the launch date May 2002. As a result of the delay, the committee included bill language that lifts a restriction on the use of the funds to give NASA the flexibility to reprogram the funds for a Shuttle mission that will include a life and microgravity research experiment. Rescinding these funds will prohibit NASA from conducting a life and microgravity research experiment as directed by Congress, and put in jeopardy future research missions by threatening the viability of NASA's contractor.

NASA electric auxiliary power units: The Senate should not rescind $19 million from the electric auxiliary power units. As part of the space shuttle safety upgrades program, NASA initiated an effort to develop an electric auxiliary power unit in FY 2000 to upgrade the existing power units to make them safer and more reliable. However after the initial development phase, it became clear that there were significant technical hurdles that could not be overcome without a significant increase in the budget.

While this particular program was canceled by NASA, the overall Space Shuttle Safety Program remains a top priority. NASA will redirect the remaining funds to address other key safety and reliability upgrades for the space shuttle. There is no higher priority than protecting our astronauts.

Transit research and planning: The McCain amendment would virtually eliminate funding for transit planning and research −$90 million, provided in the FY 2001 Transportation Appropriations Act.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will oppose and defeat the amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I gladly yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will someone get Senator MCCAIN? He wanted to close. He has about 4 minutes remaining.

I want to spend a little time speaking tonight before we have these series of votes. Floor staff has been kind enough to gather for me some information. Since the leadership has changed in the

Senate, we indicated we were going to try to stick to 15-minute votes and extend the time for 5 minutes, to make it a 20-minute vote, and with 10-minute votes, extend it to 5 minutes to make it a 15-minute vote.

In the 13 days we have had votes, we have spent 179 minutes over those times for a total of 3 hours. If one multiplies that out, over 1 month it will probably be about 5 hours. We are in session 9 or 10 months, so it is 45 or 50 hours we waste waiting for Senators to vote because committees are not adjourned in time—the excuses are unbelievable why Senators cannot get here within 20 minutes.

I hope everyone will respect other people's time. We are going to do our very best to stick to the 20-minute time limit. I have spoken with Senator DASCHLE. He agrees. Everyone will acknowledge that it is time wasted for everyone.

Since June 6, 179 minutes have been wasted. There are a lot of things each of us can do in 45 or 50 hours a year in wasted time. We, of course, could answer mail probably more precisely than we do if we had an extra 45 or 50 hours. We could review our mail more closely. We could visit with constituents who come here. A lot of time we are waiting for other Senators to vote and we are not able to see our constituents or, if we do see them, we give them the bum's rush. We could participate in congressional hearings more deliberately with an extra 45 or 50 hours. We could make telephone calls we simply do not have time to make. We could do something such as go home and visit with our families and have dinner.

I hope everyone understands, there will be people who are going to miss votes, but in fairness to everyone here, that is the way it has to be. I hope committee chairs will allow members to leave early. It is very difficult for us to say: Turn in the vote.

What we are doing is not partisan. Democrats and Republicans are just as responsible for the standing and waiting around. I wish it were just the Republicans and we could blame them for it, but it is us. We are just as bad as they are.

There are going to be Democrats who will complain: Why did you terminate the vote? I had something real important to do. I was having dinner with my son; I was at a key point in the hearing. The excuses, most of them, are very valid. But in fairness to all 100 Senators, we have to have a time limit that is enforced.

I say that the staff, which is very good about this—they hate to turn in a vote when there are people not here because people yell at them, but we need to move along and do this.

It is going to be bipartisan. We are going to do our best to make sure it is fair to everybody. Remember, we are talking about 50 hours a year wasted just in not having our votes, not in 15 minutes, but in 20 minutes; not in 10 minutes—sometimes we have 10-minute votes—not having those votes in 10 minutes but 15 minutes. I am talking about the time wasted over the 20-minute time limit.

I hope people will not be upset about this. I know some will. Maybe if we get in the habit of calling the votes on time, Senators will come on time.

I thank Senator BYRD for yielding me time.

Senator MCCAIN is not yet here. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains on the McCain amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes for the Senator from Arizona; 7 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Alaska, Senator MCCAIN asked to close. What we could do is reserve his time and the motion to table and go on to Senator SCHUMER to save time. Would that be appropriate?

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding the Senator from Missouri wishes 5 minutes of the time in support of the McCain amendment.

Mr. REID. There are not 5 minutes. There are 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 minutes left for Senator MCCAIN.

Mr. STEVENS. We will be glad to accord the Senator from Missouri 5 minutes of our time. The Senator is right; let's hold the time and let Senator SCHUMER start his amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the McCain amendment be set aside, and that the 4 minutes be reserved for Senator MCCAIN and 4 minutes be reserved for Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD, and we go to the Schumer amendment, which is the last amendment in order tonight.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving that right to object, I wish the Senator would allocate that time to the Senator from Alaska. I have 2 minutes; Senator MCCAIN has 4; the Senator from Missouri has 5 minutes.

Mr. REID. That will be taken from the Senator's time?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify the request?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New York is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 862

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe it is by the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend, the Presiding Officer. Amendment No. 862 is an amendment I have sponsored with Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator REID of Nevada, Senator DODD, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator CORZINE, and Senator JOHNSON.

It is a very simple amendment. It rescinds in this emergency supplemental $33.9 million for advance mailings from the IRS to the General Treasury.

I ask for the yeas and nays if they have not been ordered. Have they been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair. I believe I have 15 minutes to debate on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14½ minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask the Chair to notify me after I have consumed 7 of those minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this amendment is a simple one. There is money in this supplemental appropriation to send out a notice within the next week to 112 million taxpayers telling them they will get a rebate. The amendment is a simple one. It rescinds that money and gives it back to the committee. It does not spend it on any other specific purpose, but rather at this time when we are all desperate for money—we just spent 2 hours on Senator MCCAIN's amendment cutting money from domestic programs so we can fund defense—this $33.9 million is needed.

Why do I think this money should be rescinded? Because the notices they will fund are unnecessary, they are inappropriately political, and they cost money that can be spent on other things, and I will talk about each. Unnecessary. It makes no sense that we send each taxpayer a notice that they are going to get a rebate. The rebate is self-explanatory. It has been in all the newspapers. More people will have read it in their newspapers than a notice they get from the IRS. And if, indeed, we thought it so necessary to do, which I don't think we should, it is certainly unnecessary to do it as a separate notice which will cost all this extra money.

The idea that we have to notify taxpayers that they are getting a rebate doesn't make sense. We have never done it before—not in the 1975 rebate, not when we have changed other tax laws. We have never done it.

Second, I am against it because it is a political message. The message in this notification of the rebate says: We are pleased to inform you that the United States Congress passed, and President George W. Bush signed into law, the Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Relief Act of 2001 which

provides long-term relief for all Americans who pay income taxes.

It sounds to me a bit like a political ad. The IRS has always had a reputation for being apart from politics. When the IRS gets too political we try, justifiably, to pull it back. Yet here from the IRS is a notice. We don't send notices out to people when bad things happen: We are happy to let you know because of laws that the President proposed and the Congress passed that you will get a lien on your property, that your property will get a lien because you haven't paid your taxes. We just put on the lien. We don't send out notices about all the other changes in the law. We publish them in the Register and then we go forward.

Finally, of course, I support this amendment because we are in very tough times. How many Americans would make it their highest priority to spend this $33.9 million on sending a notice of a rebate?

My colleague from Nevada, when I yield time to him, will give examples of the alternatives on how we could spend the money. Clearly, there are better purposes.

Secretary O'Neill wrote me that it wasn't feasible for mechanical reasons to include notification with the check itself. I take that to mean that, despite a quarter of a century of dramatic technological advances and the impressive stewardship of Commissioner Rossotti, hailed as a world-renowned technology expert, the IRS is unable to get two pieces of paper into the same envelope—or less able than it was in 1975 because they did it then.

Now, to boot, 523,000 taxpayers will receive an inaccurate notice, erroneously informing them that they will receive a larger rebate than they will actually get. Some have said if we don't send this notice, there will be lots of phone calls deluging the IRS. We are not in tax season. I think they can handle the phone calls. I argue that knowing a small percentage of these notices are erroneous will trigger more phone calls than if we didn't send this false message at all.

The bottom line is simple: We know why this mailing is being sent. We now see political figures on television, Governors and mayors, putting their faces on, saying: Come to my State for tourism; or, sign up for our children's health care plan.

We all know what the purpose is, but never before has the Federal Government stooped to this level. And never before has the IRS, which I think we all agree must remain above politics, been used for such a message. This notification is unnecessary and can be accomplished in other ways. It is political, in an agency which should remain above politics. And it wastes a badly needed $33.9 million.

This amendment was narrowly defeated in the House. I hope this body has its usual good sense, higher sense than the House, and passes this amendment.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We are hearing a great deal about politics in the debate regarding this amendment of the Senator from New York. We hear the notices in the mail to inform taxpayers of the rebate checks are somehow about ''politics.'' We hear the language used in a notice is about politics.

Let me assure that the only thing that is about politics is the amendment before the Senate. I make very clear the notices are being issued, being sent by Congress, because we gave that direction in the legislation we passed. I read from the conference report of the recently passed tax cut bill. Page 127 of the report says:

> The conferees anticipate that the IRS will send notices to most taxpayers, approximately one month after enactment. The notices will inform taxpayers the computation of their checks and the approximate date by which they can expect to receive their check. This information should decrease the number of telephone calls made by taxpayers to the IRS inquiring when their check will be issued.

That is a quote from the conference report of the Congress of the United States, directing the Treasury Department to do what has been labeled as pure politics. This is a statement of the conference report. That is why these notices are being issued.

We are seeking to reduce confusion of taxpayers and minimize the burden on IRS employees. That is why the National Treasury Employees Union, the union that negotiates with the Treasury Department, representing those employees, supports the issuance of the letters being criticized.

I read from the last paragraph of the letter I have received from the National Taxpayers Union:

> On behalf of the employees of the IRS who are charged with implementing the decisions of Congress with regard to the tax code, I urge you to oppose efforts to cut funding for the mailing of a notification to taxpayers with regard to their tax rebates.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

NTEU,
THE NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2001.

I am writing with regard to funding included in the FY 2001 supplemental funding bill, H.R. 2216, that will allow the IRS to mail notices to taxpayers informing them of the timing and amount of tax rebate they will be getting. While NTEU has no position on the wording of such notice, we strongly believe that a notice will significantly reduce the amount of telephone calls coming into the IRS with questions about the tax rebate and ultimately reduce the costs associated with administering the rebate.

The IRS already has great difficulty responding to all of the telephone calls from taxpayers with questions. The volume of calls will increase dramatically as anticipation of rebate checks grows, thereby making it even more difficult for taxpayers with other questions to get their calls answered. Providing taxpayers with a notice in advance will hold down the increase in calls and prevent a significant decrease in the IRS' ability to provide customer service.

It is my understanding that the IRS has indicated that it may go forward with a notice on the tax rebate even if funds to mail it out are cut. Such a move would inevitably cause erosion of customer service levels that are already suffering from underfunding.

On behalf of the employees of the IRS who are charged with implementing the decisions of Congress with regard to the tax code, I urge you to oppose efforts to cut funding for the mailing of a notification to taxpayers with regard to their tax rebates.

Sincerely,

COLLEEN M. KELLEY,
National President.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, these concerns about the impact on services at the IRS are very real. The newsletter, Tax Notes, reported on June 9, 2001, that when Minnesota issued rebate checks, the U.S. West Company had to cut off phone service to the tax agency in Minnesota because the volume of calls brought down the system for the entire Minnesota State capital exchange.

In addition, notices are important to prevent taxpayers being subject to con games. The USA Today newspaper reported on July 5, 2001, that taxpayers are receiving solicitations from con artists offering to calculate their refund for $14.95. These letters being found fault with will go far in preventing frauds and cons such as reported in USA Today.

Some want no notices at all sent, and some want the words of the notice changed. Why are they upset? Because the letters start out by mentioning that we, the Congress, passed a bill that cuts taxes—the bill that provides long-term tax relief for all Americans who pay income taxes and was passed by the Congress, in fact, and was signed by the President of the United States.

That is the only way you increase or decrease taxes. It is not done by some magic wand being waved by somebody in Washington, DC. But this comes as a shock, supposedly, to my colleagues. Some people are a little too busy with their lives to be thumbing through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after work, like maybe we do, but our constituents don't do this.

So this letter provides a little overview and guidance, so people have some contact as to what the letter discusses.

It should be clear this is not the first time the President by name has been mentioned in some IRS notice. For example, a little less than 2 years ago the IRS sent out a notice mentioning President Clinton. Can you believe that? They sent out a notice mentioning President Clinton.

I have searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in vain to find any complaints from any Senator about that specific notice.

Also, if this notice were only about politics, why would the administration also send out a notice to 32 million taxpayers, informing them they will not receive a refund check? That hardly seems a political thing to do. It is said we often find our own faults in others.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do not think I will yield. The last time I yielded to you on the bankruptcy bill I did not get through my speech. I want to finish my speech and then if you want to ask me a question, I will do it.

Mr. SCHUMER. A 10-second question.

Mr. GRASSLEY. No, I will not, please. I appreciate the man, he is a friend of mine, and I do not have any ill will towards him, but I just do not want to yield at this point.

Would I suggest this amendment is about politics? I could not suggest this amendment is about politics. But here is what we have to do. We have to think of the reality of it. We are trying to make Government work. When you are sending out $60-some billion in checks, you want to make sure they go to the people they are supposed to go to, and you want to know that the people know this is happening and what they are supposed to do with it.

Some suggest we should have the notices, but the wording should be changed. As stated earlier, I believe the wording is important to better inform taxpayers. Further, to rewrite and reprint the notice will cost millions of dollars and delay the notices by weeks. Delay would undermine the whole point of the notice: To better inform the people prior to checks being issued.

Remember, you want to get the checks out on time because of the stimulus benefit that comes from this. That is not just my saying this as a Republican because you want to remember, the last week of March people on the other side of the aisle said we ought to have an immediate tax rebate to help the economy. So that is something we both agreed ought to be done.

This notice, the Treasury Department informs me, will actually be cost-effective. If there is no notice, the IRS will be flooded with calls and will not be able to perform other valuable and important activities. The language regarding notices is in the conference report because of concerns about the impact of issuing checks on IRS operations.

Finance Committee staff has met with the Treasury Department several times to ensure that the notice and check effort is performed with minimal trouble.

In addition, Senator BAUCUS and I have asked the GAO to oversee the notice and check effort to ensure it is properly managed.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to a cosponsor of the amendment, the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New York for the fiscal responsibility he is exhibiting with this amendment. The amount of money to be saved, again, is $34 million, roughly? Mr. President, $34 million—this is astonishing, $34 million to send out a mailing? This doesn't pass the laugh test, frankly.

If I were to go home to my home State of South Dakota and talk to people in the street to tell them we are going to send some checks—by the way, which I voted for; I voted for the stimulus package, but we are going to add $34 million to the cost, from the taxpayers, to brag about what we did in advance—they would not know whether to laugh or whether to cry.

This is just astonishing, $34 million for a mailing. Are we going to do this now when we do Patients' Bill of Rights? Are we going to send out a $34 million mailing? How about ag disaster payments? What else are we going to pass this year about which we are going to send out to everybody in the country what a wonderful job we are doing for them, thanks to your dollars?

Here we are in this body talking about, well, it doesn't look as if we can afford to do as much as we should with school construction; probably not enough money to advance Head Start where it ought to be; our GI bill enhancement, where we are trying to catch up with inflation so our military can get the education opportunities they should have, we might not have the money; prescription drugs, we probably do not have enough to set aside to do what we need to do. But wait, we are going to take $34 million of your money and send you a letter telling you what fabulous things we are doing for you.

I don't know whether or not it is political. What I care about is if you are going to carefully mind the people's money, this is not how you ought to go about doing it.

I congratulate the Senator from New York for a little common sense, something I see all too seldom in the course of some of these political debates.

Thank you to the Senator from New York. It seems to me this amendment deserves support. Let's save $34 million, put it back in the kitty where the American people can have it for their benefit.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield 6 minutes, or the remainder of my time, to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator who is just leaving the floor needs to know that $34 or $33 million represents about 30 cents a letter. I think both he and I wish we could send out any kind of campaign solicitation for 33 cents or 30 cents a letter. It seems to be a pretty efficient operation to me. But here is what the IRS is saying today. Even though the Senator from New York is talking politics, the IRS is talking fraud. The IRS is talking scam. The IRS is trying to warn the American taxpayer, who may or may not receive a rebate check, that they better beware that there is somebody out there who wants to take $14 or $15 or $20 of their money.

Let me refer to a scam operation known as Revenue Resource Center in Boca Raton, FL. Send in your check for $12.95 and an extra $2, and we will calculate for you what your rebate is going to be.

The IRS is already going to calculate for you what your rebate is going to be. The Senator from New York knows that. What the Senator ought to be saying is: Bravo, IRS, you may be stopping a multi-multimillion-dollar scam operation.

The IRS has identified scams in four other States: in Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Oklahoma, and they are anticipating there will be a good many others before this is over with.

What does the IRS do in its letter? Not only does it say the Congress and the President provided this, on an effort on their part, but it says here is how the calculation was made. If you have a question, make a phone call. Here is the phone number.

That sounds pretty responsible to me. I suggest that is the kind of government we ought to have. Is it political? I don't think it is. The Senator from Iowa mentioned that President Clinton was mentioned in an IRS letter. I have a copy of that IRS letter. Bravo. Bravo. Whether we take credit for it—in fact, it was the Senator from New York who, in 1995 said: When you do something you ought to tell your constituent about it. So he quoted himself in the New York Daily News.

Is there anything wrong with what is going on? There is nothing wrong with what is going on, in fact. I think what the Senator from New York and I know is you take this form right here; it is called 2001 Form 16–D. It looks like an official IRS form. Let me tell you it is a scam form provided by this group from Boca Raton, FL.

Right here it says:

Processing fee $12.95. Rush service add $2. Total payment [$14.95].

If you got $14.95 from a few hundred thousand or a few million taxpayers, my guess is you walk away with a bundle because you have a mailing address and you have a computer and you have a printer.

What the IRS is saying when they notify the taxpayer is: You are going to get your check and here is how it is going to be calculated.

They are even saying to some taxpayers: You are not going to get a check, and here is why you are not going to get a check.

My guess is this may have a lot less to do with politics, at least from the standpoint of the IRS, and a great deal more to do with efficiency of government. But most important, should not

we go the extra step so we avoid the scams that the great genius of the human mind creates when they see an opportunity to take advantage of an older person, or an innocent person who might be concerned that somehow they are not going to get their appropriate check? So they are going to fill out this form and send it in to a group in Boca Raton, FL?

That is what the issue is all about. So we are going to use $34 million at a cost of about 30 cents a letter to about 130 million Americans to notify them that all the information they need is right there available to them, even how their check was calculated, and all of that is going to be made available by the IRS. And, oh, by the way, yes, you are right, Senator from New York. The front paragraph says: And this tax relief was provided for you by the Congress—I believe that is Democrat and Republican—and by the President of the United States, George W. Bush.

Let's stop the scam artists. Let's notify the American people when they are going to get it, how they are going to get it, and how it is calculated. It seems like the right thing to do—not the political thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the cosponsor of this legislation, the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this legislation has nothing to do with scams. It has nothing to do with partisan politics. It has everything to do with saving $34 million of taxpayer money.

As the Senator, for whom I have the greatest respect, and the 19 members of the Finance Committee say, this will provide a little review and guidance. Yes, it will, for $34 million.

There are a lot of domestic programs in need of funding. Thirty-four million dollars would do so much for education. We could do something that deals with dropouts. Three thousand children are dropping out of school every day.

We could do something about the national treasure of Nevada and California called Lake Tahoe. It is deteriorating every day because of pollution. We could stop it if we had the money. It is a program that we need to help. There are water systems all over America, in rural America, that need help. We could do part of that with this money.

Our Nation is facing an energy shortage. The Energy and Water Subcommittee will fight for money to provide research and development for energy. Thirty-four million dollars would mean a lot to our subcommittee.

We ought do so many things.

Veterans: There has been a cutback in the veterans' budget this year by $30 million. We could take $343 million and provide help to the veterans. Grants are provided to the States for extended care facilities, specifically talking about veterans.

On Medicare prescription drugs, we could do a little bit. But that would certainly be something we could do.

Senator CHAFEE and I have a bill that gives centers of excellence $30 million a year so they can study links between breast cancer and the environment. That is certainly more important than a $34 million notice that is going to go out.

There are disasters happening all the time. We used to have $250 million for Federal safe project impact grant programs. That was deleted. It is wrong. The State of Washington found out how much that program helped.

This is something for which I don't blame the President. I don't blame the Finance Committee. I don't blame anybody. I think what we should do, though, is recognize that dollars are very scarce. We should do everything within our power to provide additional money for the programs that are desperately needed; $34 million would do that. It is more than the letter that would give a little bit of review and guidance, as my friend from Iowa said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor has 3 minutes 5 seconds. The opposition has 1 minute, 17 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish a minute?

I will reserve the remainder at the conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment. I don't know how it got to this point. But I was a tax administrator before I came to the Congress. It is not, in my judgment, necessary to send out a letter to say: By the way, here is what you are going to get. And then you get it. Maybe afterwards they will send a letter to them saying: Here is what you got.

That doesn't make any sense to me. It is $34 million. There are a whole host of important things that can be done with $34 million.

The tax bill stands on its own. It was passed. It is now law. The American people will be receiving a rebate. There does not need to be a substantial amount of money spent to tell them: By the way, this is what you will get in the mail very shortly. Send the check in the mail. They would be much more appreciative of receiving the check than receiving a letter saying they are going to get a check. Do not send them a letter saying they are going to get a check. They will get a check. And maybe people will come to the floor asking to send them a letter saying they got a check.

None of this makes sense. This doesn't pass the test. Let's not do this. This is a waste of money.

I will support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is it not the case that we must finish the Schumer amendment before we go back to the McCain amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Is the Senator from New York willing to yield the remainder of his time?

Mr. SCHUMER. No. Mr. President, I believe I have 2 minutes. I would like to conclude. If the other side would like to use their 1 minute remaining, I would then yield. I will wait for them.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining time.

There are three things to remember:

Remember that the union members working this issue for the Treasury Department to make sure the Government's work is done right and done on time said it is very important that these notices be mailed out. That letter is a matter of record and is printed in the RECORD.

No. 2, remember that Congress ordered these letters to be sent. It is a conference report from which I have already quoted. But remember we said that.

No. 3, these letters are already printed and in the envelopes. There was a lot of labor put into this process. There was a lot of effort put into it. If you want to waste that money, you waste that money by voting for this amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, in reference to the debate we have heard, give me a break. This letter, if you read it, is not going to reduce fraud. In fact, if we want to reduce fraud, we contain it right with the check—not a letter that people are going to read through a month and a half in advance and then get the check. That is a bogus argument.

Second, President Clinton put his name on the notice that was on 527. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury is wrong. All that was printed in the RECORD. President Clinton did not send out 112 million pieces of paper bragging about what he was going to do.

The bottom line is simple. We all know what is going on here. This is not an attempt to help the taxpayers; this is an attempt to pat ourselves on the back because we did something good. We could spend billions of dollars doing that. We all know that the same goal could be accomplished by putting the same notification in the same letter as the check. We are not doing that either.

At a time, I appeal to my colleagues, when we are scrounging around for $5 million here and $10 million there, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member are trying their best as the members of the

committee to find the dollars we need, give me a break. This is not the best, the second best, the third best, the hundredth best, or the thousandth best way to spend $34 million to send a notification patting ourselves on the back that you are going to get a rebate check and there is going to be a long-term tax reduction. It is an absurdity.

If any of us cares about fiscal responsibility and balancing the budget, we will vote for this amendment.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the amendment has expired.

The question occurs on the McCain amendment.

The Senator from Arizona withholds 4 minutes. The Senator from Missouri withholds 5 minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alaska is giving time to the Senator from Missouri. Is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that is correct—in order to accommodate the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the McCain amendment. Our military has a number of pressing needs that simply are not being met this year. I have seen this first hand in my home State of Missouri. Senator MCCAIN has done the hard work by requesting that Federal agencies identify funds that are not being spent in this fiscal year. These funds should be available and can be put to good use for basic military operations and supplies.

This amendment will provide $200 million for quality-of-life improvements for our military personnel, $600 million for operations and maintenance of our military equipment, and $45 million for force protection of our fleet in the Arabian Gulf. Senator MCCAIN has identified these needs, and he has uncovered the resources to relate to them.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time to Senator DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. President, I want to take a couple minutes to speak. I know others have spoken at length about this underlying supplemental appropriations bill.

I say to the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Missouri yielded me her remaining time.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii. It is a hard job. It is not easy. We are talking 80 days. And those days are shrinking as long as we take to resolve this in the supplemental.

There are a number of amendments that have been offered that under normal circumstances I would probably support. The LIHEAP amendment is a very important amendment for those of us who come from the Northeast. I find many down the list that are very appealing.

I think our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee have done a good job. I do not suggest that my good friend from Arizona, and others, are not making a good case that additional resources may be necessary to help our service men and women to improve equipment, but it seems to me that we are just a few days away from dealing with a larger issue, the budget issue, in which these matters could be addressed. So when it comes to the pending amendment, I am going to reject the additional spending that is being proposed and support the committee's desire to adopt this supplemental, if we can.

I notice, as well, there are arguments being made that some of these funds have been unexpended. I appreciate that. That is true. That is the case, but it is also the case that we are not yet at the end of the fiscal year.

One of the things I want to see us discourage is agencies rushing out to spend dollars so that they will not face the kind of arguments they get here, where we are a few months away from the end of the fiscal year and we start demanding that agencies spend money quickly because an amendment may be offered to take any unexpended funds. That is irresponsible spending, it seems to me.

So there are a number of areas here that are being targeted as resources to pay for some of these amendments that I hope my colleagues will take some note of.

Worker training is one. Again, all of us understand the benefits of worker training. We have just heard news in the last few days that there has been a loss of some 125,000 jobs in the month of June alone in the United States. I do not need to tell anyone in this Chamber how job training and worker training programs can make a difference for those people. Those people getting new jobs, getting the skill levels, also contribute to the strength of America. Certainly, the job access program is another one that has been tremendously helpful to so many millions of Americans across the country.

So while all the money has not yet been expended in job access or job training programs, we are still several months away from the end of the fiscal year. In light of some of the new unemployment figures, those dollars may be very necessary before the end of the fiscal year.

So again, my compliments to those on this committee crafting this supplemental appropriations bill. It is not perfect. They have not argued it is perfection. But I think it has done a good job in providing additional resources for our military needs. And, in the weeks to come, we will be given the opportunity to debate the authorization bill and the appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year, at which point we can best address the matters raised in this debate.

So my hope would be that my colleagues would applaud the work of the Appropriations Committee here and adopt this supplemental bill. The temptation to support a number of these amendments is strong. But I think we ought to resist that temptation and support the work of this committee, and then get about the business of dealing with the various appropriations bills as they come to this Chamber.

If there is any time left, I will be glad to yield it to those who may want to debate this amendment further. But if not, I would yield back whatever time may remain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have 4 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to simply urge the support of my colleagues for the amendment that my colleague, Senator McCain, has brought forward. We have to care about the lives and the safety, as well as the ability to carry out the mission that we have entrusted to them, of the young men and women in our military.

What Senator MCCAIN is doing is nothing more than taking the word of the military—the chiefs and the other military leaders of our country—about what they need, and providing a small amount of that as a part of this supplemental appropriations bill—$847 million worth.

All of that money is offset from programs, frankly, that either can be deferred or from funds which are not going to be spent before the beginning of the next fiscal year. So there is very little in terms of loss of any program from the offsets. But this money would make a huge difference to the men and women of our military, if we can get it into the pipeline before October 1.

So I hope my colleagues will support the amendment of Senator MCCAIN to help the folks in our military and enable them to do the job we have entrusted them to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield myself what time is remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I outlined in some detail the testimony of the service chiefs last September: The need for $30 billion more than the current defense budget dollars. In a few days, the Department of Defense will come over with a reprogramming request. That will be for $850 million, which is really what this request is all about.

What is a reprogramming request? It is a requirement to take money out of one category and put it into another because the wheels are about to come off. They are going to have to take money from existing programs and put it into what this amendment is all about: Personnel, readiness, operations and maintenance, and the lives of the men and women in the military. This amendment puts money in the right accounts, and that is readiness and personnel.

Nothing is more important than the men and women in the military and national defense. The Department of Treasury salaries and expenses isn't more important than defense. The NASA Shuttle Electric Auxiliary Power Units are not more important than defense. The Life and Micro-Gravity Science Research is not more important than defense. The Advance Technology Program is not more important than defense. The Job Access & Reverse Commute Grants Program is not more important than defense, nor is Export Promotion Programs or Emergency Loan Guarantees.

Nothing is more important than the security of this Nation. I hope this modest amendment, which does have offsets, will be agreed to by this body. It does not have an objection from the Office of Management and Budget nor from the Department of Defense.

So, Mr. President, the men and women of our military are suffering. They need help. I promised them that help during the last campaign. This is one very small way of beginning to deliver.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am constrained to point out to the Senate that part of the Budget Act gives us the power, in the Appropriations Committee, to make allocations to specific portions of the budget. We have 13 separate bills.

The allocation to the Defense Department under the Defense appropriations bill for 2001 I made when I was chairman—and Senator BYRD from West Virginia has modified that slightly, but it is still a limitation—it is a limitation that prevents us from transferring money from one bill to another without the consent of the Senate.

The amendment of the Senator from Arizona would increase the amount allocated to the Department of Defense for 2001 in excess of the current budget allocation that both Senator BYRD as chairman, and I, when I was chairman, submitted to the Senate. The amendment by the Senator from Arizona has the unfortunate consequence of exceeding our allocation.

I make a point of order against the McCain amendment under section 302(f) of the Budget Act. If adopted, this would exceed the allocation for the Department of Defense for 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I am deeply, deeply disturbed that the Senator from Alaska would not allow an up-or-down vote on this amendment, which is paid for—which is paid for. And if we are going to play that kind of parliamentary game, the Senator from Alaska can plan on a lot of fun in the ensuing appropriations bills.

I move at this point to waive all points of order that may lie against this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. STEVENS. I raise a question about this.

All points of order?

Mr. MCCAIN. That may lie against this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Parliamentary inquiry: Is that in order under the Budget Act? This is a specific point of order. There are other points of order I may want to try, too.

Mr. MCCAIN. There are other points of order, and I might want to try them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make a motion to cover all Budget Act points of order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. The vote will be delayed under the current sequence.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of general debate on the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, don't we have a managers' amendment still on the agenda?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Now that Senator MCCAIN's time has expired, that is in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be appropriate at this time.

AMENDMENT NO. 876

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk a managers' amendment. It consists of a package of amendments. These have been cleared on both sides, and I believe there is no controversy on them.

The first items are amendments by Senator STEVENS, Senator LINCOLN, and Senator HUTCHINSON for storm damage repair and relief in Arkansas and Oklahoma and emergency response and firefighting needs in Alaska. The amendment provides a total of $26,500,000 with the necessary offsets.

The next amendment is offered by Senator INHOFE concerning the Education Impact Aid Program. No additional funds are involved.

Next is an amendment by Senator BOXER to provide $1,400,000 for the so-called ''sudden oak death syndrome''. This is from within existing funds in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Next is an amendment by Senators DORGAN and CONRAD to provide $5 million for emergency housing for Indians on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation in North Dakota. It, too, is fully offset.

Next is an amendment by Senator MCCONNELL making a slight modification in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act. No funding is involved.

Next is an amendment to establish the new Senate committee ratio for the Joint Economic Committee as a result of the recent change in the Senate majority. This requires an amendment to the underlying law;

An amendment concerning the B–1 bomber for Senators ROBERTS, MILLER, CRAIG, CLELAND, CRAPO, and BROWNBACK;

An amendment for Senator PATTY MURRAY and Senator CANTWELL providing $2 million for drought assistance in Yakima Basin in the State of Washington. It is fully offset.

Finally, an amendment by myself to provide $5 million for providing relief from the severe recent flooding in my State of West Virginia. This amendment is also fully offset.

Over the last several days and nights, thousands of West Virginians have been digging out from the mud and muck left behind from severe flooding over the weekend.

Throughout southern West Virginia, especially, the rain fell hard and fast, dropping 8 inches of rain across the region before the clouds finally let up. By then, the damage was done. The Guyandotte River was measured at 18 feet at Pineville, 5 feet above flood stage and above the 1977 record of 17.76 feet. The Tug Fork was at 17.5 at Welch, 7.5 feet over its banks and more than 4 feet above the previous high.

It is an almost indescribable scene for many families who have watched their homes and their belongings washed away by the torrent of flood waters. For many families, this latest flood comes just a few weeks after they finished cleaning up from May's heavy rains that prompted a Federal disaster declaration from President Bush.

Today West Virginia's streams, creeks, and rivers are carrying refrigerators, stoves, cars, and trucks. Tree branches are filled with ruined clothing and debris. Water and sewer systems are washed out. Roads and bridges are buckled. Power is out. More than 3,000 homes have been damaged or destroyed.

In the McDowell County town of Kimball, the community is covered with thick mud. One woman described it aptly when she said: ''This whole town is gone.''

For everyone, there is a feeling of disbelief at the devastation. But there is also a strong determination to recover.

In an effort to speed Federal assistance, the managers' amendment contains $5 million to boost the recovery effort. This is the amount that the Natural Resources Conservation Service has stated that it needs to remove debris and obstructions to waterways that pose a threat to private property or human safety. This is just a small step in the recovery process, but it is an important step to make.

I personally thank the thousands of National Guardsmen, local firefighters, sheriffs' departments, police officials, Red Cross volunteers, State Office of Emergency Services personnel, and the countless others who have worked to save lives over the last few days. Their efforts have helped to prevent this disaster from taking an even larger tool on West Virginia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself and Mr. STEVENS, proposes an amendment numbered 876.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRD. I am asking that they be considered, not adopted.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object. I want the amendment read.

Mr. BYRD. I didn't understand the Senator.

Mr. MCCAIN. I want the continued reading of the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

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

The legislative clerk continued the reading of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the reading of the amendment. The clerk will continue the reading of the amendment.

The legislative clerk continued the reading of the amendment.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Arizona be withdrawn and insert in lieu thereof a motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back time on the managers' amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the name of Senator PATTY MURRAY was inadvertently omitted from the sponsorship of the $2 million drought assistance in the State of Washington. I add that name at this time. So it will read: An amendment by Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARIA CANTWELL providing $2 million for drought assistance in the Yakima Basin in the State of Washington. It is fully offset. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURRAY's name be added.

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

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be amended to add a million dollars for FEMA for the disaster storm Allison. I will present an amendment to the desk in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I object. Is the amendment debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator has 5 minutes under the time agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes in general debate time. He may use it now.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is this concerning the amendment on the B–1 that is included in this, or is this in addition to the 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BYRD has 5 minutes of general debate on the bill. There are 5 minutes evenly divided between the two managers on the managers' amendment. Senator BYRD has 5 minutes in his own right.

Mr. MCCAIN. On the managers' amendment, none of us had ever seen it. It was just presented. I notice that it is now an emergency for an additional amount for State and private forestry, $750,000 to the Kenai Peninsula Borough Spruce Bark Beetle Task Force for emergency response and communications equipment, and $1.75 million to be provided to the municipality of Anchorage for emergency firefighting equipment and response to respond to wildfires in Spruce bark beetle-infested forests. Provided, that such amount shall be provided as direct lump sum payments within 30 days of enactment of this act.

That is an unusual amendment. There are forest fires all over the West, including in my State. But, again, here is a managers' amendment worth many millions of dollars which none of us had seen or heard about, but we will go ahead and pass it by a voice vote.

On the issue of the B–1, I believe very strongly that what we are doing is micromanaging the Department of Defense. The amendment is led on this side. I think the communications could have been and should have been established with the Secretary of Defense. I believe strongly that this amendment, which is going to be accepted, will not allow the transfer of one B–1 bomber from one base to another—not one will be allowed to be transferred from one to another.

The sponsors of the amendment at least removed the preparation and planning clause that was also preventive. I think it is a very dangerous precedent for us to start at the beginning of a new administration and pass an amendment that says not one single airplane that is a B–1 can be transferred from one place to another. Yes, there should have been better communications. Yes, the affected Senators whose bases have B–1 bombers in that State should have been better informed. All of those things.

But for us to act in this Draconian fashion is something I think sets a very bad precedent. We all know the Department of Defense needs to be restructured and reorganized. This message being sent by this amendment—don't tamper with our planes in our State—is not the right message to begin this very important period of restructuring and reorganizing our Nation's national security capabilities.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for working with us on the amendment he has just discussed. It is a question of notification. We have not blocked—nor would we want to block as a Senate—the ability of this Defense Department to plan. What we do want them to do is plan with us in the process. We think the notification point does that, and the amendment directs this in that order.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers' amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 876) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining amendments be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will file the amendment I referred to for the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on the bill?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am informed that we have just made an error. I ask unanimous consent that in section 210(f) of the managers' amendment the figure ''$38.5 million'' be ''$39.5 million.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modification is as follows:

On page 48, after line 3, insert the following:

''FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
DISASTER RELIEF

''For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended for costs related to tropical storm Allison.''

On page 14, after line 25, insert the following:''

''SEC. 2106. Of funds which may be reserved by the Secretary for allocation to State agencies under section 16(h)(1) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to carry out Employment and Training programs, $39,500,000 made available in prior years are rescinded and returned to the Treasury.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all general debate time yielded back?

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

AMENDMENT NO. 874

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. There are 5 minutes of debate evenly divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my amendment takes $150 million and adds it to LIHEAP. This is a lifeline program for low-income families, many of them with disabilities, many elderly, many working poor with children.

Unfortunately, right now, only about 13 percent of households are able to benefit because this program is so severely underfunded. The money comes from administrative expenses in the whole Pentagon budget. It does not come from any programs. It does not come from readiness or quality of life for our armed services. It comes out of administrative inefficiencies, and believe me, from inspector general to the General Accounting Office, there is way more than $150 million when it comes to administrative inefficiency.

A study by the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association says that 28 States and the District of Columbia are out of money or about to run out of money. These are our States that are telling us: We do not have the money for cooling assistance this summer; we do not have the money to help for those in arrears and could be faced with utility shutoff; we do not have the money as we approach this winter.

Last year, energy prices went up 40 percent. The very least we can do is to give this program, which is so important to the most vulnerable citizens in this country, an additional $150 million to help us over the next 3 months. It is not taken out of any significant program.

I am going to vote for this bill, but I certainly think, in the overall Pentagon budget of over $300 billion, we can find the $150 million in administrative inefficiencies.

I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield back the time in opposition to the Wellstone amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 874. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Edwards	McCain
Allen	Ensign	McConnell
Bayh	Enzi	Mikulski
Bennett	Feinstein	Miller
Biden	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bond	Frist	Nelson (FL)
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Gramm	Nickles
Bunning	Grassley	Reed
Burns	Gregg	Reid
Byrd	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Carnahan	Helms	Sessions
Carper	Hollings	Shelby
Chafee	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Inouye	Specter
Collins	Johnson	Stabenow
Craig	Kyl	Stevens
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Leahy	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Voinovich
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—22

Baucus	Feingold	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Harkin	Sarbanes
Boxer	Jeffords	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Torricelli
Conrad	Kerry	Wellstone
Corzine	Kohl	Wyden
Dayton	Lincoln	
Durbin	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We will have order in the Senate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, all the rest of the votes will be 10-minute votes. We were able to stick with our 20 minutes on this one. We will stick with 15 on the others and move this along as quickly as possible.

AMENDMENT NO. 863

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Feingold-Durbin-Kerry amendment would increase funding for the Global Fund for AIDS, TB, and Malaria by $593 million, and it would offset that increase in funding by rescinding funds from the Navy V–22 Osprey aircraft procurement account.

This is a chance for this body to move beyond rhetoric and take action in a fiscally responsible fashion to address the greatest health crisis of our time, a pandemic that has killed 22 million people and may infect 100 million by the year 2005.

U.S. leadership in the fight against AIDS is desperately needed now. Obviously, there are problems with the Osprey program. Thirty Marines have died in Osprey crashes since 1991. This troubled program is currently suspended, pending the outcome of investigations and further research, testing, and evaluation.

My amendment does not endanger the integrity of the Osprey production line. Let me repeat this. This amendment does not kill the Osprey program and does not affect the ongoing construction of planes that are being built with money from fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

What we have here is a clear choice, to use funds that are currently allocated somewhat irrationally and to redirect them towards fighting AIDS, an unquestionably worthwhile purpose that reflects our values, serves our interests, and may well be the greatest challenge confronting the world today.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and oppose the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, this amendment will wipe out the V–22 Osprey program. One of the best-kept secrets in the United States is the role the U.S. Army has played in the battle against AIDS. The U.S. Army, Department of Defense, has spent more money than all the moneys spent by other countries on the battle against AIDS. Our research has come closest to victory. We have, in the next fiscal year, 2002, the full amount requested by the administration.

We have not forgotten the problem. Yes, the United Nations has passed a resolution, but we are still waiting for other countries to come forth with their moneys. Our country will come forth with our money but not at the expense of the V–22 Osprey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 863.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Akaka	Allen	Bennett
Allard	Bayh	Bingaman

Bond	Frist	Mikulski
Breaux	Graham	Miller
Brownback	Gramm	Murkowski
Bunning	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Burns	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Byrd	Hagel	Nickles
Campbell	Harkin	Reed
Carnahan	Hatch	Reid
Carper	Helms	Roberts
Chafee	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cleland	Hutchinson	Santorum
Clinton	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inhofe	Schumer
Collins	Inouye	Sessions
Conrad	Johnson	Shelby
Craig	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Crapo	Kyl	Snowe
Daschle	Landrieu	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Stevens
Domenici	Lieberman	Thompson
Dorgan	Lincoln	Thurmond
Edwards	Lott	Voinovich
Ensign	Lugar	Warner
Enzi	McCain	
Fitzgerald	McConnell	

NAYS—20

Baucus	Durbin	Murray
Biden	Feingold	Smith (OR)
Boxer	Feinstein	Stabenow
Cantwell	Jeffords	Torricelli
Corzine	Kerry	Wellstone
Dayton	Kohl	Wyden
DeWine	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 869

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the McCain amendment. There are 5 minutes of debate evenly divided.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment is not objected to by the Department of Defense or the Office of Management and Budget. The amendment adds a bare minimum to fund defense readiness and personnel programs. It is $850 million. There are offsets. Whenever there are offsets, there are some objections.

Nothing is more important, I believe at this time, than national defense. And this money is earmarked for the men and women in the military and their operations and maintenance accounts.

Very soon the administration will come over with a reprogramming request for $850 million, meaning that the wheels are going to come off unless they devote more money to exactly these accounts.

I hope we can vote to take care of the lifestyle, the readiness, and the operations of the men and women in the military.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment would mean that we would exceed the budget allocation for defense. There are 82 days left in this fiscal year. The Department of Defense has already sent us, with the President's approval, a request for $18.4 billion for 2002. That money will be readily available. This amendment is redundant in that respect.

I have always supported defense in my day. I cannot remember ever disagreeing on a defense amendment, but on this occasion it violates the commitment we made to stay within the amount of the President's budget. It takes funds from nondefense accounts and puts them in defense accounts violating the wall concept that we have followed now for 4 years. For 4 years, we have agreed to the amount to be spent for defense and the amount to be spent for nondefense.

This amendment takes money exclusively from nondefense and puts it in defense. If the tables were turned, I would obviously be violently opposed to taking money from defense and putting it into nondefense. I feel obligated to defend the process which has saved the defense accounts over the past 4 years, and I urge that the McCain amendment be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table was previously made.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 869.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Akaka	DeWine	Lincoln
Allen	Dodd	Lott
Baucus	Domenici	McConnell
Bayh	Dorgan	Mikulski
Bennett	Durbin	Miller
Biden	Edwards	Murkowski
Bingaman	Enzi	Murray
Bond	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Fitzgerald	Reed
Brownback	Frist	Reid
Bunning	Graham	Roberts
Burns	Grassley	Rockefeller
Byrd	Gregg	Santorum
Campbell	Harkin	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hatch	Schumer
Carper	Helms	Sessions
Chafee	Hollings	Shelby
Cleland	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Hutchison	Snowe
Cochran	Inouye	Specter
Collins	Jeffords	Stabenow
Conrad	Johnson	Stevens
Corzine	Kennedy	Thurmond
Craig	Kerry	Torricelli
Crapo	Kohl	Voinovich
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dayton	Levin	

NAYS—16

Allard	Ensign	Hagel
Carnahan	Gramm	Inhofe
Kyl	McCain	Warner
Landrieu	Nickles	Wyden
Lieberman	Smith (NH)	
Lugar	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 862

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 5 minutes of debate evenly divided with respect to the Schumer amendment.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Schumer amendment. Earlier today, we had a 3–94 vote on the Hollings amendment. You will remember the vote of 3–94 earlier today when the Senate rejected the Hollings amendment on repealing the tax decrease of a month ago. I think that was a vote of this body saying send the checks. The conference report on that same bill directed the IRS, for very good reasons, to issue these notices that the Schumer amendment wants to repeal. We have had the Treasury Employees Union saying send out a notice to inform the taxpayers so that the Treasury employees would be able to do their job well, without always being on the phone informing the taxpayers of what their tax refund might consist.

So if this amendment would pass, it would keep the taxpayers in the dark. It would help the scam artists preying on the poor and elderly, as we have been told before. It would play havoc with the important work of the IRS. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this amendment is simple. It has nothing to do with the tax cuts and getting back your checks. It has to do with perhaps the most foolish exercise that is part of this bill: $33 million so we can send people a notice that they are going to get a check. Well, if we were awash in money, maybe we should do that. But we are scrounging. I have such great respect for our leaders from West Virginia and from Alaska who are looking for $5 million here and $10 million there. And here we are going to spend $33 million to notify people that they might get a check. Why not put the notice in the same envelope as the check and save the money?

We all want to practice some form of fiscal conservatism—some of us so we might have a little money to spend on other programs, and some so there might be more tax cuts. But no one from one end of this country to the other can justify spending $33 million to send a notice out ahead of time saying: Your check is in the mail. It

doesn't stop fraud; it doesn't serve a purpose. At a time when we are desperate for finding dollars, to waste money on this is a disgrace.

I urge all of my colleagues, regardless of party, to give our appropriations leaders some help and a little more money so they might be able to do their jobs better. If you had to make a list of 10,000 things we would want to spend the money on, this would not be it. I urge my colleagues to make this bill just a little bit better by cutting out this $33 million waste of money and use it for something better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 13 seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let me take advantage of that time. I will take advantage of the opportunity to say, first of all, that all of these notices are already printed and ready to go. Do you want to throw that money away?

No. 2, it is only part of the story that there is a message going out to tell people they are going to get a check and to expect it. There is also a notice going out to 32 million people that they are not going to get a check, and that is a very important notice to go out, so that the IRS is not bothered by phone calls wondering whether or not they are going to get a check. I think it is very important that we do this right.

I ask for the defeat of the Schumer amendment and I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the Schumer amendment No. 862.

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 Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Durbin	Lieberman
Allen	Edwards	Lincoln
Biden	Ensign	McCain
Bingaman	Feingold	Mikulski
Boxer	Feinstein	Murray
Cantwell	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Carnahan	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Carper	Hollings	Reed
Cleland	Inouye	Reid
Clinton	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Collins	Johnson	Schumer
Conrad	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corzine	Kerry	Torricelli
Daschle	Kohl	Wellstone
Dayton	Landrieu	Wyden
Dodd	Leahy	
Dorgan	Levin	

NAYS—50

Allard	Bayh	Bond
Baucus	Bennett	Breaux
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Bunning	Gregg	Rockefeller
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Byrd	Hatch	Sessions
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Chafee	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Craig	Inhofe	Snowe
Crapo	Kyl	Specter
DeWine	Lott	Stevens
Domenici	Lugar	Thompson
Enzi	McConnell	Thurmond
Fitzgerald	Miller	Voinovich
Frist	Murkowski	Warner
Gramm	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The amendment (No. 862) was rejected.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. That is all the amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FORT GREELY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I would like to ask the Senator from Alaska to confirm my understanding of the intent of the provision regarding Fort Greely, AK, in section 1205 of this supplemental. I understand this provision will allow the Secretary of the Army to modify a previously made determination that the property in question was excess to the needs of the Army and surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. Modifying this decision will allow the Secretary of the Army to retain this property until such time as a determination is made as to whether this property is needed for any defense purpose.

Is that the intent of this provision?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from Florida is correct. Clarifying the ability of the Army to retain this property will allow the Secretary of the Army to heat and otherwise maintain the buildings through the Alaska winter so that they are not irreparably damaged. This will allow the buildings to be preserved until a future decision is made.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Senator from Alaska for this clarification. I was concerned that this provision was an attempt to predetermine a missile defense deployment decision.

Mr. LEVIN. I, too, thank the Senator from Florida for this clarification.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT DISLOCATED WORKER FUNDING

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to enter into a colloquy with my good friend from Iowa, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and my friend from Pennsylvania, the ranking member of that subcommittee. I wonder if they will respond to a few questions regarding job training programs under the legislative jurisdiction of a subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Employment, Safety and Training.

Mr. HARKIN. I will be delighted.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know my friend agrees with me that the supplemental appropriations bill before us presents a difficult situation affecting programs funded by his Subcommittee. We both are very strong supporters of the $300 million in low-income energy assistance funding and the $161 million in title I education spending in the bill. That spending is urgently needed. The problem is that we must try to pay for that supplemental spending from a pot of money that is simply too small. The bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee thus would offset a portion of that important new spending by making a rescission from unspent funds in a job training program for dislocated workers. I know my friend is also a supporter of that important program, and I appreciate that the full Committee reiterated its support for the program in the committee report.

Mr. HARKIN. Yes, my good friend is correct. We are now having to make some very, very difficult choices—really impossible choices—because the pot of resources we are working with is too small. And you have correctly stated both what the committee has done as well as the committee's strong support for the job training program for dislocated workers under the Workforce Investment Act. Our intent is to carefully monitor the need for dislocated worker assistance to ensure that this commitment is met and to take that need into account as we take up funding for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator. As I understand it, one of the factors that the committee observed was a variation among the States in the rate at which each State was drawing down their dislocated worker funding allocations. My State of Minnesota, for example, has obligated virtually all of its dislocated worker funding for this program year and will have expended nearly 85 percent of its funding. Other States—for a number of understandable reasons—are predicted to have significant unexpended balances by the end of the fiscal year. To avoid undue hardships for States, such as Minnesota, that have been expending funds at the expected pace, my understanding is that the bill contains a ''hold harmless'' provision. That is, it provides a mechanism for excess unspent funds to be re-alloted to States that have reached their limits up to the levels these States would have received but for the rescission. Is this correct?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. That is correct. In addition, subsequent to our full committee action, we received Congressional Budget Office scoring that has allowed inclusion of language postponing the rescission until the Secretary of Labor reallots the excess unexpended balances to the States. Our goal with respect to the Dislocated Worker Program has always been to try to ensure that no state finds itself

without the resources to meet its obligations. We believe that is accomplished through the ''hold harmless'' provisions.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania. Now I want to clarify how it is we find ourselves in this situation of having to make such difficult choices. Am I correct that at least part of the reason we are faced with a pot of resources that is so small is because of decisions made during the budgeting process to cap supplemental discretionary spending at $6.5 billion, to avoid triggering a governmentwide sequester during fiscal year 2001?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. My friend is absolutely correct.

Mr. WELLSTONE. And, of course, it is also true that a huge portion of the supplemental appropriations is going to support defense spending; am I not correct? So, another part of the reason that we are faced with these difficult choices on where to find the resources to support urgently needed programs that provide a safety net for American families is because of the priority being given to defense spending; is that correct?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Is it fair to say this is just the tip of the iceberg? That the truly perverse choices we are being asked to make today between educating our children, heating our homes, and training dislocated workers are ominous harbingers of things to come as the full impact of the $1.3 trillion tax cut is felt? Is that fair to say?

Mr. HARKIN. Again, my good friend is absolutely correct. Many of us predicted during the debate on the tax cut that we would be facing precisely these impossible choices. It is upon us and it will only get worse.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my good friend. This is not a happy day, and I agree with the Senator's predictions that it will only get worse. I think we need to look for some solutions to this larger problem. It seems to me inevitable that we must re-visit the unfortunate fiscal and budgetary priorities that have been set.

CRISIS IN ARMY AVIATION

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I had planned to offer an amendment to this supplemental appropriations that would have alleviated the emergency shortages of utility helicopters in the Army National Guard. Senators LEAHY, BOND, CARNAHAN, DODD, LIEBERMAN, and CARPER were cosponsors of the amendment and some have short statements that they will enter.

Our amendment would have procured 20 new Blackhawks for those Guard units in States with the most serious shortages of modern lift helicopters. It is my understanding that there are between seven and nine States that are at a critical level, having no modern aviation assets.

Delaware is one of those States. The people of my State expect the Army Guard to be there when emergencies hit. Unfortunately, the Army Guard may not be there because they do not have lift helicopters that are flyable. Let me repeat that and be more specific. Since January, the Delaware National Guard has had no more than two UH–1 Huey helicopters that were flyable—two out of a fleet of twenty-three, and they have had two only rarely. The norm has been one. One vintage Vietnam-era helicopter out of a fleet of twenty-three is all they have had to fly for 6 months—6 months. This is absolutely insupportable. Pilots cannot fly and stay proficient and the people who depend on the Guard can no longer be sure of their assistance in emergencies.

A week ago, the Secretary of Defense released his amended budget for 2002. Unfortunately, there was only enough funding for 12 new Blackhawk helicopters for the Army. This is incredible. It is completely insufficient to deal with this problem. Over the next 5 years, the Army is retiring over 700 Vietnam-era helicopters that are no longer safe to fly, but nothing is replacing them. Instead of the 330 Blackhawks that are needed—130 for the active duty and 200 for the National Guard—less than 70, or about twenty percent of the requirement, are funded.

I have a copy of a letter sent to all of the leaders of the congressional defense committees and the appropriations committees that details this critical problem. It describes the concern these generals have that their ability to do their national security missions today is severely impaired and that the situation will only get worse and qualified pilots and technicians leave the Guard because they are not able to do their missions or even train for them. The letter was signed by the 50 Adjutant Generals of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2001.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INOUYE: The FY2001 Army Aviation Modernization Plan requires the Army National Guard to significantly reduce its aviation force structure by retiring over 700 grounded Vietnam vintage utility aircraft by FY2004. These aircraft have been replaced by requirements for 330 UH–60L utility and HH–60L MEDEVAC helicopters. However, less than 20% of these helicopters are funded from FY2002 through FY2007. Virtually every state is currently short of its required H–60 helicopters, and many states' capability to perform their national security mission including protecting our nation against the threat of weapons of mass destruction is severely impaired by the lack of flyable aircraft.

The H–60 helicopter is the number 1 unfunded equipment requirement in the Army National Guard. As the Defense Committees discuss the FY2001 supplemenal and the FY2002 defense budget, we request your support in two areas. First, to add the procurement of 20 additional UH–60L Black Hawk utility helicopters ($204 million) and 6 HH–60L (formerly UH–60Q) MEDEVAC helicopters ($95.4 million) for the Army National Guard to the budget. This will help alleviate an immediate shortfall within the Army National Guard. Second, to fix this problem in the long term we need your support for a multi-year procurement of H–60s at a rate of 60 aircraft per year for the next five years.

This problem has reached a critical phase. Without the procurement of additional H–60 aircraft for our aviation force to train and utilize, we will soon face a significant loss of valuable pilots and technicians. Your support in funding will assist in our efforts to continue to modernize the aging National Guard fleet and provide our nation with the best equipped and most relevant National Guard force.

Sincerely,

Major General Ronald O. Harrison, The Adjutant General of Florida and President, National Guard Association of the United States; Major General Stephen P. Cortright, The Adjutant General of Oklahoma and President, The Adjutants General Association; Brigadier General Randall Horn, The Adjutant General of New Mexico; Brigadier General Giles E. Vanderhoof, The Adjutant General of Nevada; Brigadier General Martha T. Rainville, The Adjutant General of Vermont; Major General Warren L. Freeman, Commanding General Washington, DC; Major General Paul D. Monroe, Jr., The Adjutant General of California; Major General Mason C. Whitney, The Adjutant General of Colorado; Major General David P. Poythress, The Adjutant General of Georgia; Major General Benny M. Paulino, The Adjutant General of Guam; Major General Edward L. Correa, Jr., The Adjutant General of Hawaii; Major General Ron Dardis, The Adjutant General of Iowa; Major General Eugene R. Andreotti, The Adjutant General of Minnesota; Major General John D. Havens, The Adjutant General of Missouri; Major General John E. Prendergast, The Adjutant General of Montana; Major General Gerald A. Rudisill, Jr., The Adjutant General of North Carolina; Brigadier General Michael J. Haugen, The Adjutant General of North Dakota; Major General William A. Cugno, The Adjutant General of Connecticut; Major General John H.V. Fenimore, The Adjutant General of New York; Major General Philip G. Killey, The Adjutant General of South Dakota; Major General Jackie D. Wood, The Adjutant General of Tennessee; Major General Daniel James III, The Adjutant General of Texas; Brigadier General Brian L. Tarbet, The Adjutant General of Utah; Major General Claude A. Williams, The Adjutant General of Virginia; COL (P) Cleave A. McBean, The Adjutant General of the Virgin Islands; Brigadier General Roger P. Lempke, The Adjutant General of Nebraska; Major General Paul J. Glazar, The Adjutant General of New Jersey; Major General Timothy J. Lowenberg, The Adjutant General of Washington; Major General Walter Pudlowski, Commander, 28th ID Pennsylvania National Guard; Major General Alexander H. Burgin, The Adjutant General of Oregon; Major General Francis D. Vavala, The Adjutant General of Delaware; Major General Edmond Boenisch, The Adjutant General of Wyoming; Major General Allen E. Tackett, The Adjutant General of West Virginia; Major

General James G. Blaney, The Adjutant General of Wisconsin; Major General John F. Kane, The Adjutant General of Idaho; Major General Don C. Morrow, The Adjutant General of Arkansas; Major General Willie A. Alexander, The Adjutant General of Alabama; Major General E. Gordon Stump, The Adjutant General of Michigan; Major General James F. Fretterd, The Adjutant General of Maryland; Major General John R. Groves, Jr., The Adjutant General of Kentucky; Major General Robert J. Mitchell, The Adjutant General of Indiana; Major General John H. Smith, The Adjutant General of Ohio; Major General David P. Rataczak, The Adjutant General of Arizona; Major General Phillip E. Oates, The Adjutant General of Alaska; Major General James H. Lipscomb III, The Adjutant General of Mississippi; Major General Joseph E. Tinkham II, The Adjutant General of Maine; Major General Bennett C. Landreneau, The Adjutant General of Louisiana; Brigadier General Gary A. Pappas, Deputy Commander, Massachusetts National Guard; Major General Gregory B. Gardner, The Adjutant General of Kansas; COL (P) Francisco A. Marquez, The Adjutant General of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BIDEN. I have repeatedly asked the Army how it plans to address the immediate needs of States like Delaware and the larger issue of a clear crisis in Army aviation. A crisis that impacts the readiness of our Army today and in the future. It was my hope that we would have a plan early this year. Nine months later, I am still waiting for a comprehensive plan from the Army and I see no evidence that the new budget addresses this problem.

I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, who I know has long supported adequate funding for our National Guard units, to seriously consider the problem this amendment was intended to address. Twenty new Blackhawks this year is only the tip of the iceberg, but I believe we have a genuine crisis on our hands. It was an emergency nine months ago and it has only gotten worse today. Certainly, that is true in the state of Delaware and I have heard nothing from the Army to make me think that the same is not true in aviation units throughout the nation.

If, as I understand to be the case, the distinguished managers of this bill believe that this funding cannot be designated as emergency funding, then I hope that they will pledge to adequately address this issue within the fiscal year 2002 defense budget. I cannot go home to Delaware and tell them that we are aware of this crisis, have been for almost a year, and yet did nothing and have no plans to do anything. This problem must be addressed this year.

Mr. INOUYE. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense has consistently been a strong supporter of, and advocate for, the National Guard. We have historically provided significant additional funding for the National Guard where critical shortfalls were identified.

As my distinguished colleague from Delaware is aware, we have only recently received the budget request for the Department of Defense and there are ongoing discussions as to what the top line will ultimately be for fiscal year 2002. However, we have appropriated additional funding for National Guard Blackhawks for several years; for example, in fiscal year 2001, the Defense Appropriations Committee added funding for the purchase of 6 additional Blackhawks for the Guard and for 11 aircraft in fiscal year 2000. I agree with you that the National Guard must be provided sufficient funding to carry out their important responsibilities and aviation missions and we will do all that we can to address your concerns in the fiscal year 2002 Appropriations bill.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank my colleague, and with his assurances, I will not offer this amendment. I do so only because of his assurances that we will deal with this aviation crisis in the fiscal year 2002 defense bill and because I believe this supplemental is so vital to our military that I do not wish to endanger its speedy passage.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support Senator BIDEN'S colloquy. As a cochair of the Senate Guard Caucus, I find it alarming that of the 1,885 Army National Guard helicopters nationwide, over a 1,000 were recently reported as grounded because of a lack of spare parts. As recently as May it was reported that only 40 percent of the fleet of Army National Guard helicopters were flying.

Our skyrocketing maintenance costs require ever increasing resources just to maintain our aging fleet. Consequently our modernization accounts remain insufficient to replace aging aircraft, creating a viscious cycle. Senator BIDEN's effort today draws needed attention to the alarming trends that we have seen in Army aviation within the past few years.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to lend my support to the spirit and intentions of the Biden amendment. The National Guard suffers from a serious shortage of helicopters, and it is critical that the Senate do more to address this threat to the readiness of the citizen-soldier force.

The National Guard needs at least an additional 200 helicopters. This is not a number pulled out of thin air. It is the minimum number of aircraft needed to carry out the Army Aviation Modernization Plan, which was developed by the office of the Chief of Staff of the Army. It is the road map for the entire Army's helicopter inventory for the next 50 years. The plan will streamline the Army's aviation regiments. It reduces the overall number of helicopters in the Army's inventory, including the National Guard, while increasing capabilities through technological advances. Specifically, the service will retire 700 Vietnam-era UH–1 Hueys, in exchange for 330 advanced UH–60L Blackhawks.

In streamlining and modernizing this force, the plan reaffirms the critical role of our citizen-soldiers in our Nation's defense. It recognizes that the National Guard is doing more than ever to defend the Nation, whether at home or abroad. Indeed, every Member of the U.S. Senate will can tell you what a difference advanced helicopters have made in a flood or medical emergency, while every field commander will similarly point out the critically important role of National Guard aviation assets in a combat environment.

But the plan also has a much more practical bent. It seeks to avoid a looming crisis in National Guard aviation. The Guard's current inventory of UH–1 Blackhawk and AH–1 Cobra helicopters is old, expensive, and increasingly unsafe to operate. Units that possess upwards of 15 aging Huey and Cobra helicopters, may have only 2 to 6 aircraft actually flying. By legislative mandate, the National Guard must remove all of these obsolete aircraft from the flight-line by 2004. Even when these units take full advantage of additional Kiowa helicopters, they will be hard-pressed to maintain qualified pilots and an acceptable state of readiness when newer aircraft do not arrive to replace them.

Given the Army's sensible plans and the looming dangers to National Guard aviation readiness, I have been surprised and disappointed by the Army's reluctance to buy more UH–1's. For the past several fiscal years, the Army has requested only 10 helicopters a year. In this fiscal year, the service has asked for a 12. It will take well over 20 years to complete the plan at that pace.

I am especially disappointed by this meager request because the National Guard Caucus, including members with helicopter units in their States, have expressed its concern to the Army several occasions. At every one of these briefings, meetings, and extended discussions Army leaders have admitted that a serious problem exists. Yet, when the budget request moved forward, we get this paltry number.

I recognize that fiscal realities limit what Congress can do to rectify this situation on the supplemental. Nonetheless, I urge the Senate to examine this situation closely when it reviews the fiscal year 2002 defense budget. I look forward to working with the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, fellow Guard caucus cochair Senator BOND, and longtime caucus member Senator BIDEN on this issue. I thank Senator BIDEN in particular for offering this amendment and bring further attention to this problem.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill to increase funding for the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and malaria. My amendment was an attempt to get this Senate to put its money where its mouth is, and in a fiscally responsible fashion to make a

significant contribution to the multilateral effort to fight the AIDS pandemic—a contribution that could leverage more funds from other donors. In the wake of the recent U.N. special session on AIDS, it seemed especially appropriate to take concrete action rather than rely on mere rhetoric.

The amendment failed, but I do not want that vote to leave anyone with the impression that there is no will in this Senate to address the global AIDS pandemic. Some were uncomfortable with the offset, which involved rescinding funds from the troubled V–22 Osprey procurement program for the remainder of the 2001 fiscal year. I believed that the offset was reasonable. Some were uncomfortable with the emergency designation in the amendment. The emergency designation was necessary, because the bill was already up against the cap on non-defense spending. It was also accurate. The AIDS pandemic is, unquestionably, an emergency.

While these issues may have led my amendment to defeat today, I do believe that this Senate will take meaningful action to address this crisis. The very fact that the supplemental contains $100 million for the Global Fund is a testament to the efforts of the appropriators and the leadership. Indeed, I suspect that many Senators, including many colleagues who opposed my amendment, are left uneasy by the AIDS-related consequences of the vote on my amendment, and I believe that unease will only strengthen our collective resolve to work together, in a bipartisan and inclusive fashion, to make certain that the U.S. takes meaningful action to strengthen prevention efforts, improve AIDS awareness and education, increase global access to treatment, support vaccine research, improve health infrastructure, provide services to orphans, and support the Global Fund at an appropriate level—one far exceeding $200 million.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of language which was included in the manager's amendment to S. 1007. I am pleased that Senators BYRD and STEVENS have agree to accept my language which will extend compensation to Department of Energy employees and DoE contractor employees who suffered kidney cancer due to exposure to radiation while working at a DoE defense nuclear facility or nuclear weapons testing site.

Last year, Congress passed the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act as part of the FY 2001 Department of Defense Authorization bill. This measure provides $150,000 lump sum payments as well as payments for medical coverage to Department of Energy Workers who were made ill as a result of exposure to radiation. Unfortunately, when the final version of the bill was drafted the list of covered diseases mistakenly did not include kidney cancer. This was unintentional, and the amendment I have offered will correct this oversight.

The EEOICPA is well on its way toward implementation. Just last week, the Department of Labor opened a resource center in Paducah, KY which will assist workers and their families who were made sick from exposure to radiation while working at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. As many have pointed out, the employees who worked at these facilities producing the technology which helped America win the Cold War deserve a grateful Nation's support and appreciation. This must include compensation for those workers and their families who may have contracted cancer as a result of their employment.

Again, I thank the managers for their agreement on this important issues of fairness.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the supplemental appropriations bill's inclusion of $84 million for the bankrupt Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund.

From the 1940s through 1971, uranium miners, Federal employees who participated in above-ground nuclear tests, and downwinders from the Nevada test site were exposed to dangerous levels of radiation. As a result of this exposure, these individuals contracted debilitating and too often deadly radiation-related cancers and other diseases.

These folks helped build our nuclear arsenal—the nuclear arsenal that is responsible, at least in part, for ending the cold war. In 1990, Congress recognized their contribution by passing the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to ensure that these individuals and their families were indemnified for their sacrifice and suffering.

However, the RECA Trust Fund ran out of money in May, 2000. Consequently, for over a year most eligible claimants have been receiving nothing more than a five-line IOU from the Justice Department explaining that no payments will be made until Congress provides the necessary funds. Some of these claimants are dying while awaiting their payments.

Frankly, this is unconscionable. Those who helped protect our Nation's security through their work on our nuclear programs must be compensated for the enormous price they paid. Anything less is unacceptable.

The $84 million in supplemental appropriations would help rectify this grave injustice by paying all of last year's approved claims as well as the estimated claims for fiscal year 2001.

Passage of this appropriations bill does not end Congress' work. We must also pass the Domenici-authored S. 448 or the Hatch-Domenici bill, S. 898. Both of these bills would make all future payments to approved RECA claimants mandatory and, thus, not subject to the annual appropriations process.

It is imperative that America not forget those who have tragically suffered from their work on our Nation's behalf. This supplemental bill is a good step in the right direction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I take this opportunity to express my support of the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill. This bill contains funding, not only for the defense and security of our country, but also funding for the health and well being of American citizens.

This bill contains funding I supported in committee for two issues that are vital to many in my home State of Colorado. I am referring first to the funding for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, RECA. Far too many people, especially in the West, now suffer from terminal illnesses that are the result of their work as miners who collected and transported uranium ore that was used in the production of weapons for our Nation's defense. For many, the risk of working with radioactive materials was unknown, hidden or minimized. The $84 million included in this bill will pay the IOU's our Nation made to these terminally ill workers in lieu of money. We, as a Nation, have a history of issuing IOU's a shameful practice of which I am sure I don't need to remind my colleagues. As a Nation we can and must do more than issue IOU's. Hundreds of these beneficiaries live in Colorado and they are in desperate need of that money that was promised to them last year. Dying has a way of making people desperate, especially when the money promised them in useless IOU's could be used for their care. There are many times we in this body act because we can. In this matter, we have the opportunity to act because we ought to.

I thank my friends and colleagues, Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN, for their assistance and support with this, as many of their constituents are claimants as well.

I would also like to express my strong support for additional funding for USDA's Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). The $35 million included in this bill will allow APHIS to strengthen border inspections and improve monitoring of emerging animal and plant diseases, including Mad Cow disease, Foot-and-Mouth disease, and other livestock diseases. There has never been a case of Mad Cow disease in the United States, and there has not been an outbreak of Foot-and-Mouth Disease since 1929. But, considering the potentially disastrous effects if either disease spreads to our country, we must do everything we can to protect the American food supply. As a rancher myself, and having heard from fellow cattlemen, I share their growing concern about the potential devastating impact of these diseases. Colorado is home to 12,000 beef producers and 3.15 million head of cattle—more than the human population of 20 of our States. We must do all we can to protect them. I would like to thank my friend and colleague Senator KOHL for his support and assistance in this effort.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Chairman BYRD and Senator STEVENS for their leadership and

support of this bill and particularly for their support of funding for RECA and APHIS.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important funding bill.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I want to first express my appreciation to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his work on the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill. It is only through his persistence and determination that we are able to bring this bill to floor within the spending limits proposed by the President.

I want to specifically thank Chairman BYRD for his work on an issue of great importance to California. This bill includes $20 million in disaster assistance to crop growers in the Klamath Basin of northern California and southern Oregon who are faced with a total loss of income resulting from a lack of water. I am very grateful that Chairman BYRD saw the true emergency in this situation.

This year, the Klamath Basin is facing one of the worst, if not the worst drought in the Klamath River Project's 90-year history. Federal disaster declarations have been issued by the USDA for Modoc and Siskiyou Counties in California and Klamath County, OR. Economic losses to the farming communities have been estimated at up to $220 million.

Over 200,000 acres of farmland are irrigated in the Klamath River Basin. There are roughly 1500 farming families in the Klamath Irrigation Project.

The Endangered Species Act requires the Bureau of Reclamation to review its programs with consultation from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, with the obligation to protect endangered species. In Klamath this includes two species of suckerfish, the coho salmon, and the bald eagle. In addition to the Endangered Species Act, the Bureau of Reclamation must protect tribal fishing and water rights.

What little rainfall that has occurred this year must be first applied to minimize endangered fish species losses and then to mandatory Tribal Treaty obligations. This leaves literally no water for about 85 percent of the Klamath Project-dependent farmers. And this problem is not going to go away. Based on Bureau of Reclamation estimates, there will not be enough water for all users in 7 out of the next 10 years in the Klamath Basin.

Lack of water in the Klamath Basin is a problem that requires a long term solution. I am committed to working with the administration and my colleagues here in the Senate to develop that solution.

Unfortunately, a long-term solution will not help the farmers today. That is why this assistance is so critical and so necessary. I am grateful that Chairman BYRD recognizes this need. I want to again thank the chairman for making this assistance possible.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to clarify a provision of the fiscal year 2002 supplemental appropriations bill regarding human space flight funding within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration NASA. In its report, the Appropriations Committee included language removing a restriction placed on $40 million in fiscal year 2000 Human Space Flight funding. The restriction required these funds to be used for a dedicated shuttle research mission. With various delays in the shuttle manifest, the STS 107 mission has been rescheduled for May 2002. Removing the restriction will allow NASA to use the $40 million to cover costs associated with the delay of STS 107 mission and for research to be conducted abroad the International Space Station.

The followon shuttle dedicated research mission, also known as ''R 2,'' is now not expected to fly until at least 2004. This mission was intended as a ''gap-filler'' to support the scientific community during construction of the International Space Station. At the same time, the agency is proposing to decrease funding for Space Station research in order to pay for cost overuns associated with building the vehicle itself. The life and microgravity science community is already under funded. Continuing to delay the ''R 2'' mission will only exacerbate the research community's already strained situation.

While I do not oppose this reprogramming request, I agree with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee about the need to balance such requests with maintaining life and microgravity research conducted aboard the shuttle and space station. While NASA certainly needs to meet its obligations, I am concerned that the redirection of these funds will ultimately preclude NASA from pursuing the dedicated research flight entirely. The Senate language associated with the supplemental appropriations bill directs NASA to consult with Congress on the research planned for the R 2 mission in the context of the future funding required to support space station research. I expect NASA to continue to work on the R 2 mission, or a suitable equivalent, and look forward to working with NASA and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in receiving and reviewing these research plans.

ISRAELI PURCHASES OF U.S. GRAIN

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill regarding the purchase of U.S. grain by Israel. This issue is of concern because Israel has stated its intention to cut its U.S. grain purchases by more than 22 percent in the current year.

Historically, in every year since the Camp David Accords of 1978, Israel has agreed to purchase 1.6 million metric tons of grain grown by American farmers and to ship at least half that amount in United States-flag commercial vessels. These are purchases important to American agriculture and to the U.S. citizen merchant mariners critical to our national security. Every year, these purchases have been consistent, until now.

Starting in 1979, and in every year since then, Israel has entered into a side letter agreement with the United States for the purchase of grain, recognizing that the cash transfer economic assistance Israel has received replaced, in part, a previous commodity import assistance program for Israel.

Despite a level of U.S. aid in every year since 1984 that has been higher than the 1979–1983 level, Israel never increased grain imports. Had proportionality been the test, Israel's purchases should have reached 2.45 million tons at least at one point. The commitment to purchase never grew as Israel's economic support fund assistance grew. America, in generous friendship, didn't push for those purchases to grow. And, as economic assistance to Israel has recently decreased, Israel's commitment to purchase didn't change until now.

The Government of Israel has announced its intention to reduce grain purchases by more than 22 percent this year, from 1.6 million tons to 1.24 million tons. This is not proportional, but disproportional. U.S. economic assistance to Israel has declined only 12.5 percent this year. If Israel's purchases of U.S. grain were not tied to increasing levels of U.S. economic aid, then those purchases should not be tied to a recent downward fluctuation in economic aid. Such an overreaction ignores history, is disappointing in view of our long-term friendship and overall relationship, and ignores the express intent of this Congress in providing aid in the past. Several times in recent years, Congress has enacted laws providing that, in administering assistance, the President would guard against an adverse impact on such exports from the United States to Israel.

The amendment I offered this week simply would have reiterated for fiscal year 2001 the past Congressional commitment that this year's side letter agreement should be in accordance with terms as favorable as last year's agreement. I was prepared to pursue that amendment further. I remain concerned and disappointed over this year's side letter. However, with most of fiscal year 2001 past, with the need for this supplemental bill to move quickly for the benefit of our national defense and our men and women in uniform, and based upon discussions with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I would be willing to withhold at this time. I would like to yield to those two colleagues for a discussion on this matter.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator is correct in stating that Congress, and our subcommittee, has had a longstanding interest in this area and has consistently monitored this issue. We are prepared

to turn very shortly to consideration of the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriation bill. I believe that would be the best vehicle for consideration of this issue, in the regular order, when we can consider all the policy ramifications for the entire, upcoming year. I can assure the Senator of our continued attention to this matter, and of thoughtful, thorough consideration.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I appreciate the Senator of Idaho's concerns, and give him my assurances that we will work together on this issue. Coming from a farming State myself, I fully understand his interests in the purchase of American grain by Israel. Senator LEAHY and I anticipate that within the next few weeks the Subcommittee will mark up the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations bill, and we look forward to working with the Senator toward an acceptable resolution of this matter.

Mr. CRAIG. I appreciate my colleagues' comments and their willingness to address this issue again. I withdraw my amendment and thank them for their consideration.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to comment specifically on Chapter 1 of the supplemental appropriations legislation, S. 1077, and the provision of funding for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, or RECA as it is more commonly known.

Since the enactment of RECA in 1990 and the subsequent amendments in 2000, thousands of Americans have received compensation based on their unknowing exposure to harmful radiation caused by the government's nuclear production and testing activities.

As many of my colleagues will recall, last year, Congress passed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Amendments of 2000, S. 1515. This law made important changes to the original 1990 Act by updating the list of compensable illnesses—primarily cancers—based on scientific and medical information gathered over the past decade.

However, even before the enactment of RECA 2000, the Trust Fund became financially depleted. Starting in the Spring of last year, approved claimants began receiving ''IOUs'' from the Department of Justice rather than their checks.

Many of us are totally dismayed that the RECA Trust Fund is depleted. It is totally unfair for the government to issue IOUs rather than checks to the hundreds and potentially thousands of individuals who are expected to be approved for compensation.

I know that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee agree, and that is why they have included $84 million for RECA claims in this bill. It is my understanding that these funds are the amount necessary to cover all approved claims pending at the Justice Department through the end of this fiscal year. And that is good news.

The bad news is that we still face a shortfall in funding over the course of the next 10 years. That is why I introduced legislation, S. 898, along with my distinguished colleagues Senator DOMENICI and Senator DASCHLE to provide permanent funding for the RECA trust fund. Such action would provide certainty to the thousands of claimants for whom the program was enacted 10 years ago.

As I am sure my colleagues recognize, for the Federal Government to promise compassionate compensation to the RECA downwinders and workers and then not honor that commitment is simply unacceptable. It is inexcusable for the government to pledge this compensation and then issue nothing more than a simple IOU. This strikes at the very heart of our citizens' ability to have confidence in their government.

I have met with many of the RECA claimants in my state. It does not take long to see the pain and suffering they have endured over the years. This pain and suffering, I would add, has taken a toll on their lives and the lives of their families as well. Most of these individuals are now retired; they live on modest incomes and fear that their declining health will only exacerbate their limited family finances.

And let us not ignore the overwhelming and personal human tragedy that many of these individuals already have died as a result of the injuries they sustained while working for the government's nuclear production program. Today, we have the opportunity to right a wrong through passage of this legislation, and I hope that we do so at the earliest opportunity.

In closing, I particularly want to thank my good friend Senator DOMENICI, and his excellent staff, for their work on the Appropriations Committee in securing these funds. Senator DOMENICI and I have worked together since 1990 on RECA. We have done so in the name of thousands of individuals across many states who were literally innocent victims of our nation's nuclear weapons program. I am appreciative for all Senator DOMENICI has done to make this program the success it has been.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my amendment to the bill will redesignate Building 1500 at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, VA, as the Norman Sisisky Engineering and Management Building. I am joined by my Virginia colleague, Senator GEORGE ALLEN.

As a Navy veteran of World War II, Congressman Sisisky was proud to be a part of one of the most extraordinary chapters in American history, when America was totally united at home in support of our 16 million men and women in uniform on battlefields in Europe and on the high seas in the Pacific—all, at home and abroad, fighting to preserve freedom.

During our 18 years serving together, Congressman Sisisky's goal, our goal, was to provide for the men and women in uniform and their families.

The last 50 years have proven time and again that one of America's greatest investments was the G.I. Bill of Rights, originated during World War II, which enabled service men and women to gain an education such that they could rebuild America's economy. The G.I. Bill was but one of the many benefits that Congressman Sisisky fought for and made a reality for today's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines.

His strength in public life was supported by his wonderful family; his lovely wife Rhoda and four accomplished children. They were always by his side offering their love, support, and counsel.

He worked tirelessly throughout Virginia's 4th District, however, there was always a special bond to the military installations under his charge. As a former sailor, the Norfolk Naval Shipyard was high among his priorities. He knew the workers by name and the monthly workload in the yard. In consultation with his family and delegation members, we chose this building at the shipyard as a most appropriate memorial to our friend and colleague.

I waited until the special election was concluded so the entire Virginia delegation could join together on this legislation.

Norman Sisisky was always a leader for the delegation on matters of national security. We are honored to join in this bi-partisan effort to remember Congressman Norman Sisisky and his life's work; ensuring the Nation's security and the welfare of the men and women in uniform and their families.

Along with my remarks, I would like to include the remarks of the Commander Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, Admiral Bob Natter. Admiral Natter worked very closely with Norman Sisisky throughout his career and joins me and the entire Virginia delegation in supporting the naming of Building 1500; the Norman Sisisky Engineering and Management building.

Admiral Bob Natter, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet writes:

It is highly fitting to name the Norfolk Naval Shipyard's Engineering and Management building at the Navy's oldest and most historic shipyard after Representative Norman Sisisky. Mr. Sisisky was on hand in 1983 for the dedication and ribbon cutting of this building, which has become the most recognizable building on the shipyard. His dedication and service to our Navy, this great shipyard, and its many employees mirror the Norfolk Naval Shipyard motto of ''Service to the Fleet, any ship, anytime, anywhere.''

From improvements in quality of life to technology that have made Norfork Naval Shipyard one of the finest yards in the nation, Mr. Sisisky strongly supported the best interests of our Navy and our Nation. Among a wide range of projects at the shipyard, he supported a new bachelor enlisted quarters which today houses 300 Sailors and served as a model for the entire Navy. He was an ardent supporter of a waterfront improvement project that significantly

expanded shipyard capabilities, including the capacity to conduct simultaneous repairs on two DDG 51 class ships. He was personally dedicated to keeping this great public shipyard competitive, in cost and in unparalleled quality.

Perhaps most of all, the Sailors of the Atlantic Fleet and the dedicated men and women of the Norfolk Naval Shipyard who work tirelessly on our ships and submarines knew Norm Sisisky was their strongest supporter and would fight for their best interests. His presence at nearly every important Navy event in the community made him a popular, recognizable and appreciated friend among uniformed Sailors and civilians alike. He has made an indelible mark on this community and a lasting contribution to the Atlantic Fleet. We are honored to have this centerpiece of the Norfork Naval Shipyard named after Norman Sisisky, a great patriot who will forever be remembered as a great friend of the Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the supplemental appropriations bill which we will vote on today includes much needed funding for education.

Federal support to improve the educational opportunities of disadvantaged students is provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Earlier this year, the Department of Education announced the allocation of title I funds for qualified schools. The Department was forced to make cuts in the expected funding for all of these school districts, due to a shortfall in the amounts appropriated for this purpose last year.

This bill provides $161 million to cover that shortfall; $2.4 million of these funds will be allocated to schools in my State. With this funding, schools in Mississippi will be able to continue to provide essential learning resources to students from preschool through 12th grade.

In April of this year, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, Senator SPECTER authorized me to chair a hearing in Mississippi to examine the effectiveness of title I in my State. Our panel of witnesses included Mississippi Department of Education officials and local school superintendents. The resounding message from the hearing was that title I funds are vital to making good learning opportunities available to all of Mississippi's students.

One of the most compelling statements was that of Yazoo City School Superintendent, Dr. Daniel Watkins who told of his experience at Montgomery Elementary School in Louise, MS. I want to share with the Senate some of his testimony, which I quote here:

I began my educational career in 1964 in Louise. My mother was a single parent with 7 children.

My first 3 years at elementary school, I had a severe speech impediment that allowed me to be quiet when I knew answers. But I do remember, through title I funding, a speech pathologist, to bring me out of my shyness. Again, I grew up in a small delta town called Louise, with my mother being the mother, the father, a provider and whatever else she needed to be. Besides school, our work consisted of working in the cotton fields.

My mother drove a school bus and worked in the school's cafeteria. One of the happiest days of my mother's life was when she received her GED. Needless to say, she stressed education daily and yearly throughout my grade school life. There were many needs in our school system back then, to the extent that I did not quite understand, but I have since learned that through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Federal Government reduced many of these needs. In later years, I have seen the happiness of my mother as she observes her daughter working with a parenting program in Louisville, Mississippi, and two of her sons receiving Ph.D's. Without the increasing help of title I, none of these could have been achieved in the lives a poor Delta family.

Hearing Dr. Watkins' personal experiences is helpful in understanding the real life consequences of title I and what it can do to broaden the horizons of a young student. Dr. Watkins' story is, I think, a marvelous testimony to the success of title I.

Dr. Watkins and the other witnesses at that hearing went on to tell in just as riveting testimony newer stories of title I providing the resources to reduce dropout rates, provide tutoring, increase literacy of parents and students, enhance teachers' skills, and overall increase the likelihood of high achievement among the most disadvantaged students.

I am happy to provide the Senate with some of the good news about title I and I am very pleased that this bill will allow the continuation of the much needed services it provides.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I sincerely thank Chairman BYRD and his staff, Galen Fountain and Chuck Kieffer, for all their hard work and consideration on this bill. I would especially like to thank the Chairman for his understanding the needs of my constituents in the Klamath Basin and thereby including these much needed payments in this bill. I would also thank Senator STEVENS and his staff, Rebecca Davies, for their understanding and support.

This amendment provides $20,000,000 for the farmer families in the Klamath Basin. While the Secretary has the discretion to disseminate this money as she sees fit, I am pleased that we have an understanding with the Bush administration that this money will be distributed as grants or direct payments but not as loans.

The Klamath Basin stretches between southern Oregon and northern California. The water in the Basin is managed primarily by the Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation. The management of this water has assured the continuation of a significant agricultural community in the Basin. But this growing season the Basin is home to 1,500 growers and their families whose farms are parched. It is home to three National Wildlife Refuges and fish bearing lakes and rivers that are also parched. There is not enough water to go around.

I, and several colleagues, fought so hard for the $20,000,000 contained in this bill for these farmer families because this money provides our farmers the assurances they need to get through this season. It provides the Basin farmers with the safety net they need as the tightrope between agriculture and the environment is traversed. This $20,000,000 safety net is necessary to keep these folks alive while the larger natural resource issues evident in the Klamath Basin are debated and ecological balance in the Basin is pursued. There is a balance that can and should be struck and this money is, unfortunately, a necessary step on that long and arduous journey.

There is a precedent for this appropriation in other USDA conservation programs. For instance, this money may be able to be used by the Secretary to purchase, under short term contracts, water easements for the sake of water conservation in the Basin. In this way, the money will get directly to the farmer much like land easement payments under the conservation Reserve Program are made directly to the farmer.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleague and friend from Oregon, Senator SMITH, and my colleagues and friends from California, Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER, in thanking the Chairman and Senator STEVENS for their inclusion of this important provision in this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to speak out on the Air Force's decision to substantially cut America's B–1 Bomber force. As many of my colleagues know, as part of the 2002 Defense budget amendment, the Air Force announced its intentions to remove the B–1 Bomber from the Air National Guard Wings at McConnell Air Force Base in Kansas, and Warner Robins Air Force Base in Georgia, and consolidate the remaining bombers at two active duty Air Force bases in Texas and South Dakota.

The Air Force intends for this proposal to take effect immediately after funds become available following the passage of the 2001 supplemental appropriations bill, and desires that the entire project be completed in a year or so. The Air Force justified this announcement to Congress by stating that this cut was a good way to realize cost savings in 2002 Defense Budget.

The decision to cut and realign the B–1 force has been mishandled from the start. I support and have cosponsored this amendment in an effort to urge and allow the Air Force to give due consideration to important decisions.

I guess if you are not familiar with the men and women of the 184th Bomb Wing, or if you just are not a student of defense policy, you might be wondering what the big deal is. I think the best

way to explain what happened with this decision is to offer an analogy.

If a family decided to remodel their old house, the first thing they would do is sit down with an architect and sketch out their ideas of what they want their house to look like. The architect would then take these sketches and form a blueprint, the final plan that gives the instructions to the carpenter who would in turn remodel the house.

The carpenter would never dream of deviating from this blueprint. After all, his job is to follow the architect's instructions, and respect the family's wishes. It really wouldn't matter if he thought his ideas were better than the family's. No family in their right mind would ever hire a carpenter who wanted to re-design their home according to his whims and wishes.

This is exactly what happened with the announcement to pull the B–1's from the Air National Guard. The Air Force is now on the verge of reversing a longstanding policy by saying that our national defense needs would be better served if the B–1's were flown exclusively by the Active Duty forces. This decision was made in spite of the fact that the blueprint for our national defense policy, the Quadrennial Defense Review, has yet to be completed by the Secretary of Defense.

It is as if the carpenter has decided to begin construction before he has been handed the plans. This questionable practice has raised other questions: One, how can the Air Force make a decision to remodel the Air Force to meet future threats if the plans for meeting those threats are still works in progress? Two, in some of his previous statements, Secretary Rumsfeld has acknowledged that future combat missions will depend on long range, precision strike bombers which are capable of reaching their targets from airbases within the United States. How can the Air Force make a decision to cut the B–1 Bomber fleet when such a decision seems to run contrary to Secretary Rumsfeld's previous statements?

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I fully agree with this assessment. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the U.S. to rely on other country's airstrips to stage our Air Force operations. We must look to platforms that enable us to conduct missions from the safety of America's shores.

No other bomber in today's Air Force can match the B–1 for accomplishing these missions. The B–1 has more payload capacity than the Stealth B–2, and is much faster than either the B–2 and B–52.

While I agree that stealth technology is important to our Air Force, we should be cautious about becoming overly reliant on it. If we cannot always depend on stealth for surprise and protection, we will have to return to speed and maneuverability. The B–1, is the only bomber today that meets this requirement.

So if the Air Force still needs the B–1, why cut the fleet from 93 to 60? One excuse is that it will be cheaper, and that the Active Duty can accomplish this mission better than the Air National Guard.

But according to figures released by the Guard Wing at Mcconnell, the Air Force is simply wrong in this estimation. Consider just a few simple facts.

The average B–1 Mission Capable rate for the Air National Judd is 61.5 percent. The active component only rates 53,4 percent.

The average Total Mission Capable rate for the Air National Guard is 19.9 decent, compared to the Active Duty's rate of 24.6 percent.

The Kansas Air National Guard opetes one of the Air Force's two Engine Regional Repair Centers and the Georgia Unite Provides avionics systems repair for all the B–1's providing high-level expertise in reducing costs.

When confronted with these figures, how can the Air Force conclude that the Active Duty can accomplish this mission in a more cost-effective manner than the Air National Guard? I am pleased that Senators ROBERTS and CLELAND will be calling on the General Accounting Office to see if this decision would make more economic sense that keeping the Guard flying the B–1.

A force structure decision should never have been made without the guidance of a new national security blueprint. Even more important, such a decision should never have been made on false economic assumptions. We cannot afford to make hasty decisions.

Today, I join a bipartisan group of Senators consisting of Senators ROBERTS, CLELAND, MILLER, CRAIG, and CRAPO in offering an amendment to the 2001 Defense Supplemental Bill that will prohibit 201 funds from being used to carry any orders to cut or transfer the B–1. In spite of the Air Forces announcement, we offer this amendment to put the Air Force on notice that hasty decisions regrading our national security are unacceptable to Congress.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I understand the very difficult job the Appropriations Committee has faced in producing this supplemental appropriations bill and I commend the leadership of the committee for its work.

However, it is very unfortunate that it was necessary to rescind $217 million in critical dislocated worker funding. I hope that this will be a short-lived reduction and that it will be possible to eliminate this cut in conference. Further, I urge the committee to also reject the administration's proposed further $600 million reduction in training programs in the fiscal year 2002 appropriations.

In the 105th Congress the Workforce Investment Act was overwhelmingly supported on a bipartisan basis. Few issues that we debate in Congress are as important to the future of this country as the lifelong education and training of our workforce. We live in an era of a global economy, emerging industries and company downsizing. It is imperative that our delivery of services meet the employment and educational needs of the 21st century.

We now are embarking on the creation of a streamlined and vitally necessary workforce development system. More authority is given to State and local representatives of government, business, labor, education, and youth activities. There is a true collaborative process between the state and local representatives to ensure that training and educational services provided will be held to high standards.

Our global economy is creating wonderful opportunities for American workers, but also great stress and anxiety. Today, the knowledge and skills workers must have on the job changes very rapidly. Companies and even industry segments enter and leave our States and communities with unprecedented speed.

Layoffs are announced throughout the country every week as a result of business consolidation, financial re-organization, a changing marketplace or a slowing economy. For many years, the Connecticut economy was dependent on defense-oriented industries. Training programs under the Workforce Investment Act ensure that employees who are adversely affected by military and other downsizing will have access to job training and supportive services in order to acquire the skills needed for employment in the technology driven economy of the 21st century.

Last week, Challenger, Gray and Christmas reported that U.S. companies cut nearly 125,000 jobs in June. The Department of Labor reported that new claims for unemployment benefits increased by 7,000. On one day alone at the end of June three separate companies announced plans to eliminate 800 jobs in Connecticut. In the technology sector alone, almost 1,000 jobs cuts have been announced in Connecticut since the beginning of the year.

I urge the committee to re-evaluate these cuts to the dislocated worker program. Now is not the time to be short-changing our workers or our communities.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this is the first bill that Senator BYRD has handled now as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I in my new role as ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I thank Senator BYRD for his courtesy. I have not seen the supplemental handled as fairly and evenly as this has been. We have responded to almost every request made by Senators from either side. I congratulate the Senator for this night and for the fact that the bill presented by the Appropriations Committee has been sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I tender my thanks to my friend, Senator STEVENS. Without his able cooperation and

assistance all the way, we would not have completed this bill today.

Mr. STEVENS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays will be required after the clerk reads the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third time and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2216, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause of H.R. 2216 is stricken, and the text of the Senate bill S. 1077, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. BYRD. 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. Under the previous order, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dayton	Kohl
Allard	DeWine	Kyl
Allen	Dodd	Landrieu
Baucus	Domenici	Leahy
Bayh	Dorgan	Levin
Bennett	Durbin	Lieberman
Biden	Edwards	Lincoln
Bingaman	Ensign	Lott
Bond	Enzi	Lugar
Boxer	Feinstein	McCain
Breaux	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Brownback	Frist	Mikulski
Bunning	Graham	Miller
Burns	Gramm	Murkowski
Byrd	Grassley	Murray
Campbell	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Hagel	Nelson (NE)
Carnahan	Harkin	Nickles
Carper	Hatch	Reed
Chafee	Helms	Reid
Cleland	Hollings	Roberts
Clinton	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Cochran	Hutchison	Santorum
Collins	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Conrad	Inouye	Schumer
Corzine	Jeffords	Sessions
Craig	Johnson	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Daschle	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Snowe	Thompson	Warner
Specter	Thurmond	Wellstone
Stabenow	Torricelli	Wyden
Stevens	Voinovich	

NAYS—1

Feingold

NOT VOTING—1

Thomas

The bill (H.R. 2216), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. GRAHAM. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move the Senate insist on its amendment to H.R. 2216 and request a conference with the House of Representatives, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. COCHRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member for their work on the supplemental. We have come a long way since we closed prior to the Fourth of July recess. We had indicated our desire to finish our work on the supplemental by Tuesday night. We have done so. I am grateful for that.

We will now be taking up the Interior appropriations bill. It was my hope to be able to move to proceed to the appropriations bill tomorrow at 9:30. Some of our Republican colleagues have objected to going to the bill until matters pertaining to certain nominations could be clarified. As a result, we will not have a specific time we can announce that we will be going to the bill. I am hopeful we can clarify this matter involving nominations at the earliest possible time so that there will not be any objections on the other side to moving to the Interior bill. My hope and my expectation is that we can finish the bill by Thursday night. Obviously, if we have to be here on Friday to finish it, we will do that.

I indicated to Senator LOTT that if we have finished with the Interior bill on Thursday night, my expectation would be we would not have any rollcall votes on Friday.

I will shortly make a unanimous consent request with regard to the schedule tomorrow. We are not quite prepared to do that at this time. But until that time, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 1

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.R. 1, the elementary and secondary education bill, the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer (Mr. NELSON of Florida) appointed Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HUTCHINSON of Arkansas, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOND, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. ENSIGN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Committee assignments be printed in the RECORD.

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

AGRICULTURE

Senator Harkin, Chairman; Senators Leahy, Conrad, Daschle, Baucus, Lincoln, Miller, Stabenow, Ben Nelson, Dayton, and Wellstone.

ARMED SERVICES

Senator Levin, Chairman; Senators Kennedy, Byrd, Lieberman, Cleland, Landrieu, Reed, Akaka, Bill Nelson, Ben Nelson, Carnahan, Dayton, and Bingaman.

APPROPRIATIONS

Senator Byrd, Chairman; Senators Inouye, Hollings, Leahy, Harkin, Mikulski, Reid, Kohl, Murray, Dorgan, Feinstein, Durbin, Johnson, Landrieu, and Reed.

BANKING

Senator Sarbanes, Chairman; Senators Dodd, Johnson, Reed, Schumer, Bayh, Miller, Carper, Stabenow, Corzine, and Akaka.

COMMERCE

Senator Hollings, Chairman; Senators Inouye, Rockefeller, Kerry, Breaux, Dorgan,