



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1996

No. 106

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, knowledge of You is our purpose and our passion. It is also our greatest need and our most urgent desire. We really want to know You, not just as some distant creator and sustainer of the universe but as our Father and our Friend. We confess that often our lack of knowledge of You is the cause of our insecurity, our inconsistency, and our insufficiency. It also accounts for our vacillation in our prayers. We commit this day to seek to know You better. We open our true selves to You; we want to be real, honest, and vulnerable with You; we invite You to invade every aspect of our relationships and our responsibilities today. Show us Your will and give us the strength and courage to follow Your guidance. We dedicate ourselves to make knowledge of You our first priority. Show us Your grace and goodness, righteousness and power. We place our total trust in You, and we will live by faith in You today. Be the unseen but undeniable presence in every moment of this day.

Gracious Lord, as we seek to know You and understand You, we wonder why good people face difficult and painful things. We wonder about the crash of the TWA aircraft. We think of the young people and the sponsors who were with them from Montoursville, PA. We realize that Your most difficult decision was to allow this world to be free in which accidents can happen, wrong choices can be made. And we turn to You for Your strength and courage in the midst of questions that seem to be without answers. But we also know that in spite of everything, You are in control, and so we trust You as our Lord and Savior. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader, Senator STEVENS, is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will immediately resume consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Under a previous order, the Senate will proceed to a series of three rollcall votes on the remaining amendments and passage of the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Following passage of the defense bill, the Senate will then proceed to the reconciliation bill, S. 1956. That matter will be considered under a 20-hour statutory limitation, and the majority leader is hopeful that under the 20-hour statutory time limitation, some time can be yielded back. Senators can expect rollcall votes throughout the day on amendments to the reconciliation bill and a late-night session is anticipated by the majority leader in the hopes of completing action on that matter today.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1894, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1894) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Harkin/Simon amendment No. 4492, relating to payments by the Department of De-

fense of restructuring costs associated with business combinations.

Levin amendment No. 4893, to strike funding for new production of F-16 aircraft in excess of six, and transfer the funding to increase funding for anti-terrorism support.

### AMENDMENT NO. 4492

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to rollcall votes with respect to amendments offered on Wednesday, July 17, with 2 minutes for explanation equally divided prior to each vote. The first amendment is No. 4492, the motion to table. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we have a minute on each side to explain the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, all I can say is:

Remember the \$600 toilet seat and the \$500 hammers that had taxpayers up in arms during the mid-1980's. Today's subsidized mergers are going to make them look like bargains.

That is not my quote. That is a quote of Lawrence Korb, President Reagan's Under Secretary of Defense.

In 1993, DOD changed its policy to allow payments to defense contractors for the costs of mergers and acquisitions. The GAO and inspector general have both recently issued reports that seriously question DOD's purported savings.

This amendment simply puts a 1-year hold on merger costs while the GAO, the IG, and OMB put together a mechanism to make sure that future payments actually result in savings. It does not affect Government assistance to laid-off workers. It does not prohibit payment of any merger costs which DOD is contractually obligated to pay in the fiscal year 1997.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment would prevent severance

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S8065

pay for employees under a restructuring plan. It would eliminate early retirement incentive payments for employees, employee retraining costs, relocation expenses for retrained and retained employees, placement services for employees, and continued medical-dental-life insurance coverage for terminated employees. In the past 3 years, the Department of Defense has reimbursed contractors \$300 million in restructuring costs and will save \$1.4 billion, a 450-percent return on the investment.

Mr. President, it is my understanding this will be a 20-minute vote, regular vote, and the following votes will be 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Abraham	Frahm	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Bradley	Gregg	Nunn
Breaux	Hatch	Pell
Bryan	Heflin	Pressler
Burns	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inhofe	Roth
Coats	Inouye	Santorum
Cochran	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cohen	Johnston	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simpson
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kyl	Specter
DeWine	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenici	Levin	Thomas
Exon	Lieberman	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner
Ford	Lugar	

NAYS—27

Akaka	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Grassley	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Brown	Hatfield	Pryor
Byrd	Hollings	Reid
Daschle	Kennedy	Simon
Dorgan	Kerry	Thompson
Feingold	Kohl	Wellstone
Feinstein	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Bumpers      Dodd

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 4492) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Does the Senator from Michigan wish to proceed?

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4893

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment would transfer money that the Air Force did not ask for for two F-16's and transfer it into an antiterrorist emergency account which we created yesterday which the Department of Defense very much needs and wants.

The original budget request asked us for four F-16's. Then when we asked the Air Force, if they had additional funds, what would they spend those funds on? They said, well, if they had about \$2 billion extra, they would add two more F-16's, for a total of six. In this appropriations bill, there are eight, four more F-16's than the Air Force requested in their original budget request and two more even than they asked for on their wish list.

So what this amendment would do is transfer that \$48 million not requested by the Air Force for F-16's and move it into an antiterrorism emergency fund.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, after the event of last night, this is a very serious matter. I want to start off by assuring the Senate that we have money for counterterrorism in the Commerce bill, in the Treasury-Post Office bill, in the Transportation bill. I want to tell you as chairman of this committee, there are significant—very significant—sums in the classified portions of this bill for counterterrorism. So the counterterrorism issue should be set aside.

The question is, are the two extra F-16's—the F-4 Wild Weasels are being retired. The F-16's can take their place in that role. The F-16's—it is true what the Senator said, they first asked for two. When we looked at it, and the authorization bill authorized four, we went into it in depth. I personally talked to General Fogleman, Chief of the Air Force, about the need. He said they do in fact need this. As a matter of fact, General Ralston who is now the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, has said that we are short 120 airplanes if the F-16's are to carry out the two contingency roles.

I believe we need these extra two F-16's. That is the issue, not counterterrorism. I moved to table this amendment. This will be a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the Levin amendment No. 4893. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Frahm	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Pressler
Brown	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Heflin	Shelby
Chafee	Helms	Simpson
Coats	Hollings	Smith
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Cohen	Inhofe	Specter
Coverdell	Inouye	Stevens
Craig	Johnston	Thomas
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Thompson
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Dodd	Kyl	Warner
Domenici	Lieberman	
Faircloth	Lott	

NAYS—41

Abraham	Glenn	Mikulski
Baucus	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hatfield	Nunn
Bradley	Jeffords	Pell
Bryan	Kennedy	Pryor
Byrd	Kerrey	Reid
Conrad	Kerry	Robb
Daschle	Kohl	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Exon	Leahy	Simon
Feingold	Levin	Wellstone
Feinstein	Lugar	Wyden
Ford	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Bumpers

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 4893) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

B-52 MODIFICATIONS AMENDMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, yesterday during consideration of the defense appropriations bill, the Senate adopted my amendment allocating an additional \$11,500,000 in Air Force aircraft procurement funds for modifications to B-52 bombers. I want to explain the source for these funds.

In reporting out its version of the fiscal year 1997 Defense Appropriations Act, the committee added operations and maintenance funds to maintain the current force structure for B-52 bomber attrition reserve aircraft.

My amendment allocated funds from within the aircraft procurement account to modify these aircraft. These modifications are required to maintain the combat effectiveness of these aircraft should they be called upon to fly combat missions.

The funds for the bomber modifications are to be offset by a decrease of funds allocated for the F-15 fighter data link modifications in the same appropriations account.

The fighter data link funds are excess to program requirements due to a delay in a projected contract award. The fighter data link program remains fully funded for fiscal year 1997.

## HARRISBURG INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to alert my colleagues to an environmental restoration center at the Harrisburg International Airport, formerly Olmsted Air Force Base, located in Pennsylvania. My colleague, Congressman GEORGE GEKAS, has shown great leadership on the issue of environmental restoration.

In 1984, this former Air Force base was designated an Environmental Protection Agency Superfund site. For the last 13 years, an intense effort under the guidance of the EPA, has been undertaken at the local, State, and Federal level to determine the nature of the origins, locations, and the proper remediation of the waste left by the U.S. Air Force. A database established at the site will enable all future site users to have an understanding of the remediation efforts undertaken. By the time all the current participants have left the site, the only remaining reliable reference source will be this database.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts in keeping the committee informed of his actions on this matter. I will work with my colleagues during conference to examine this matter more closely.

## SACRIFICES FOR DEFENSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to congratulate my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE, on their efforts to complete action on the Fiscal Year 1997 Defense Appropriations bill. Their management of this complex bill is masterful and executed with their customary efficiency. The bill is within the 602(b) allocations and it is consistent with the amount recommended by the budget resolution.

This bill addresses legitimate defense needs and provides support for the men and women in our military. It contains a 3-percent raise in pay for military personnel and a 4-percent raise in the basic allowance for quarters, both effective January 1, 1997.

It fully funds the initiative included in the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill to support the operations of, and enhanced modifications for, the SR-71 reconnaissance aircraft. The rationale for including this system in the fiscal year 1997 budget is that it is an invulnerable proven system, available day or night, in all-weather, regardless of cloud cover. It is available for our commanders in the theater, on an on-call basis, to provide near-real-time imagery of the battlefield or area of interest to those Commanders. As such, it is now available as America's premier tactical reconnaissance airborne system. Furthermore, it is inexpensive, compared to the costs incurred for the development of our unmanned aerial vehicles now being funded. I am a strong supporter of developing UAV's as rapidly as prudent development schedules allow, but it will still be years before a proven system can be fielded. When that occurs, I would sup-

port retiring the Blackbird aircraft, but it would be foolish to throw away this unique system before it is fully replaced. Therefore, I congratulate the managers for their support of continuing the SR-71 in service. The funding includes \$30 million for 1 year of operations, and \$9 million in modification costs which enhance the real-time downlink from the aircraft directly to our commanders on the ground. I hope and certainly expect that our commanders in the field, in Korea, in Bosnia, and in other regions of interest will call upon the system frequently to provide the unique data for them that is now available.

My concern regarding this bill is not with the many worthy provisions contained with it. I do not want a weak military, unable to defend our legitimate and vital national security interests. But neither do I want a weak nation, sapped of its vitality, worn down and shabby because legitimate domestic needs have been neglected in favor of greater spending on defense. I do not want to see in America a street person, dirty, dressed in rags, but carrying a shiny new pistol. I want to see in America a hard-working, educated, prosperous homeowner, with a well-kept yard where bright-eyed and well-fed children play.

I know that this bill is within its allocation and consistent with the budget resolution guidelines, but I believe that the budget resolution guidelines are out of balance with American priorities, skewed toward military spending at the expense of education, infrastructure, and other domestic necessities. I would rather rebuild bridges over mighty rivers than build bridges on unneeded ships. I would rather spend funds on domestic airline safety measures than on unrequested fighter aircraft. I would rather support more police on our city streets stopping bullets than futuristic missile-stopping missiles aimed at a flimsy threat.

This bill is \$10.2 billion over the administration's request for defense. Some have argued that defense spending has declined in real terms over the last 10 years, and that buying weapons now rather than later in the decade saves money. But the funding for domestic programs has also declined, and continues to decline. If we are to make good on our promises to reduce the deficit and to bring spending in line with reality, every program, domestic and defense alike, must share in the sacrifice. Right now, domestic programs are being cut more deeply in order to support defense spending that is above the administration's request. For instance, the Department of Agriculture, as part of its Water 2000 initiative to provide safe, affordable drinking water to every home in the United States by the turn of the century, estimates that \$9.8 billion is needed to accomplish that goal. This \$9.8 billion is needed to provide nearly 3 million U.S. households—176,114 of them in my own State of West Virginia—with clean drinking

water. For less than the amount added to the Department of Defense for 1 year, we could provide clean, safe, drinking water to 8 million suffering Americans.

The budget resolution, which passed without my support, deliberately chose to sacrifice safe drinking water, education, highways, medical research, police, children's programs, and other peaceful domestic programs, in order to spend more on weapons and war. I regret the choice and the path that we have taken. This defense appropriations bill is the result of that decision, and reflects the largess bestowed upon the Defense Department at the expense of the Departments of Education, Labor, Agriculture, Environment, Health and Human Services, Interior, and others. It reflects the decisions taken in the defense authorization bill, which I voted against. Therefore, I must regretfully vote against this bill.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to S. 1894, the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This bill suffers from the same fundamental defect as S. 1745, the national defense authorization bill, a bill I also opposed.

The appropriations bill adds \$10.2 billion to the President's budget request. The \$10.2 billion is spent partially funding programs not requested by the administration for which we will pay billions in the outyears. For example, the bill adds \$856 million for ballistic missile defense research, of which \$300 million is added to the national missile defense account. The bill also adds \$525 million in unrequested funds for the DDG-51, \$701 million in unrequested funds for the new attack submarine, \$300 million in unrequested funds for the V-22, \$489 million in unrequested funds for the F/A-18 C/D, \$760 million in unrequested funds for National Guard and Reserve equipment, \$204.5 million in unrequested funds for the C-130, \$107.4 million in unrequested funds for the F-16, and \$210 million in unrequested funds for the JSTARS program.

I have been a long time supporter of our efforts to ensure our national security. However, Mr. President, this is the second time in my Senate career that I have felt that I must oppose a Defense Appropriations bill. I cannot support adding billions and billions of dollars for programs that I am not convinced and the Pentagon does not believe we need. It is true that I would support additional funding for some of these programs but adding \$10.2 billion in unrequested funding is simply too much particularly when we are cutting funding for critical programs elsewhere in the budget.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which is responsible for recommending sound, fiscally responsible funding legislation to the Senate, I am deeply disturbed about the spending levels contained in the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense appropriation bill.

This bill provides over \$244 billion in budget authority for the coming year. This reflects the recently passed national defense authorization bill, which authorized nearly \$11.3 billion more than the administration requested for military spending for 1997. Included in this legislation are billions of dollars worth of weapons the Pentagon says it does not want and cannot afford to maintain in the future. Meanwhile, vital domestic programs are being critically underfunded or terminated. Fiscally, this is unwise; morally, it is unconscionable.

Despite all the debate about balancing the Federal budget, it is apparent to me that we are not yet ready to break off our addiction to excessive military spending. Of even more concern, is the continued failure of this body to define national security in a truly comprehensive and meaningful way. As I have stated many times before, true national security consists of more than our arsenal of military weapons, it also includes the health and welfare of our population.

Many years ago, the cabinet agency tasked with protecting the national security of the United States was renamed from the Department of War to the Department of Defense. This is an important distinction. The definition of war is a state of open and hostile conflict between states or nations. The definitions of defense and security carry with them much broader connotations. Defense, or to defend, is to drive danger or attack away from. While security means freedom from danger, freedom from fear or anxiety, freedom from want or deprivation.

The mission of the Department of Defense is to protect the citizens of the United States against threats to our security. Let us recognize that these threats can take many forms, that they are internal as well as external. The American people are under attack today. The attacks are not as obvious as tanks rolling down Constitution Avenue or nuclear submarines sailing up the Potomac River. The enemies aren't as easily identifiable as a soldier pointing a gun, rather they are often subtle and insidious. But, make no mistake, we do have formidable enemies threatening our population. The enemies I speak of are disease and disability.

In one year, more Americans will die from disease than from all the military battles fought in the twentieth century. The number of Americans killed in battle during World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Panama, the Persian Gulf, and Somalia total 426,175. Certainly a horrendous number and a tragic loss of life. In contrast, however, approximately 500,000 people will die of cancer this year alone. Lung cancer will kill 115,000 Americans, breast cancer 48,000, and prostate cancer 41,000. I could go on and on. Heart disease will kill over 743,000 people, diabetes 53,000, and AIDS 37,000. The list of casualties from disease is endless.

Make no mistake, there are thousands of tiny wars being fought in

America today. The battleground is the human body. The command centers are clinical research laboratories and our weapons are test tubes and microscopes. The Generals and Admirals leading the fight are the medical researchers, physicians, and nurses all around the country searching for new treatments and cures for disease.

But in this war, the front line troops are civilians as well as soldiers. This battle is as ugly and painful as any military conflict. Every day men, women, and children are being killed, maimed, and ravaged by disease. No mortars are being launched, but limbs are being amputated as a result of diabetes. No napalm has been dropped, but skin is destroyed and bodies are disfigured by EB. No nerve gas has been released, but brains and central nervous systems are disabled by Alzheimers and Parkinsons diseases. It is time to declare war on disease and disability. This is a battle which is worthy of the full commitment and resources of our Federal Government, including the Department of Defense. In fact, this is one war which I fully support.

The Department of Defense also has the responsibility to care for the men and women who sacrifice to serve and protect our country. In devoting a small portion of its considerable resources to medical research and treatment, the Pentagon invests in the health and welfare of our troops, as well as our military retirees, veterans, and family members.

Several years ago, Congress appropriated funds for and directed the Department of Defense to establish a peer-reviewed breast cancer research program. This program has been a tremendous success and is a vital component in the effort to find a cure for breast cancer. We have continued funding for that program in 1997. In this bill, we have also provided \$100 million to establish a similar program for prostate cancer research.

Prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men. Yet, it has largely been overlooked by the general public and research has been grievously underfunded by the Federal Government. In 1996, over 317,000 men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer and 41,400 will die from it. Yet, with early detection, 9 out of 10 men can be successfully treated for prostate cancer. Clearly, an investment in research to improve detection and treatment of this disease will yield a tremendous return.

Medical research is the key to winning the war against disease and disability. I am pleased that the Senate has included some funding for this critical effort in this legislation. In my view, however, the amount of resources devoted to life-destroying technologies compared to life-sustaining endeavors is still critically out of balance. The health and well-being of our population is every bit as vital to the Nation's security as our arsenal of military weapons. Until this imbalance is recognized

and corrected, the people of our Nation will continue to be vulnerable to these destructive enemies and true national security will not be achieved, no matter what our level of military might.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill, S. 1894, will be read for the third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall proceed immediately to the House companion bill, H.R. 3610; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1894, as amended, if amended, be inserted, and that H.R. 3610 be read for the third time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read for the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly today's vote on the defense appropriations bill. I will be voting for this bill, because it includes provisions that do support our national defense. But I have some serious concerns about the overall level of spending, as well as some other issues that I feel should be addressed in negotiations during the conference.

On the positive side, this bill contains \$150 million to fund the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici amendment, which will strengthen the Nunn-Lugar program. As I have said a number of times on this floor, Nunn-Lugar is exactly the kind of investment in our security that we should be making. It is far cheaper to destroy Russian missiles and bombers now than to make new expenditures on a strategic deterrent or a missile defense system against them later.

The strengthened Nunn-Lugar program will also help us prevent the spread and use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists. A terrorist nuclear, chemical, or biological attack is perhaps our worst security nightmare today.

Moreover, this defense bill contains \$69 million for operating, maintaining, and upgrading the Nation's full fleet of B-52 bombers. The defense authorization bill rightly prohibited retirement of B-52's before Russia ratifies the START II Treaty. I am hopeful that the House will agree to the Senate's very modest investment. It will enable the Air Force to abide by the authorization bill's directive to retain this combat-proven force of long-range bombers.

On the other hand, given our bipartisan commitment to a balanced budget, the overall funding level in this bill is not sustainable. It exceeds the President's budget request by \$10 billion. The \$6 billion downpayment for unrequested ships and aircraft alone in the bill will create a funding crunch in

the years to come. To make expansive procurement decisions as if they have no consequences for deficit reduction is not responsible.

Second, my colleagues will not be surprised to learn that I am troubled by the bill's commitment of \$808 million for national missile defense, \$300 million above the administration's request. This additional funding is unwanted, unneeded, unfrugal, and unwise.

So I will reluctantly vote for this bill in order to move the appropriations process forward. Yet I will closely examine the conference report on the bill. I urge the conferees to make it more fiscally responsible than the versions passed by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 5 minutes, equally divided, under the control of the two managers.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of this bill. I wanted to use this opportunity to advise my colleagues of my complete support of this measure. Yes, this bill provides more funding than sought by the administration, but it is at a level approved by the Congress in the budget resolution. Furthermore, while it is \$1.3 billion more than appropriated last year, it still falls short in keeping up with inflation.

Mr. President, it is a very good bill. It funds the priorities of the administration. It contains no controversial riders on social policy. It redresses shortfalls identified by our military leaders. It provides funding to cover overseas contingencies, and it meets the needs of our field commanders, who have identified many items that they require to improve the quality of the lives of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. President, it is a bipartisan bill. Yesterday, the Senate agreed on approximately 60 amendments and, by my count, nearly half were Democratic amendments. This should come as no surprise to my colleagues. The Appropriations Committee, particularly this subcommittee, has a long tradition of bipartisanship.

If I may, I would like to take my hat off to our chairman, who has done an extraordinary job in preparing the recommendations in the bill and managing it on the floor. Mr. President, there is no finer floor manager in the Senate than my friend from Alaska, TED STEVENS.

I thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their help in this very difficult legislation. A particular note of thanks to the staff director, Steve Cortese, for his leadership. On my staff, a special thanks to Lt. Col. Tina Homeland, who kept her eye on health programs for me this year. Also Emelie East of the subcommittee who provided tireless energy in keeping track of all of the

amendments and assuring their adoption.

So, Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this bill does reflect the partnership that the Senator from Hawaii and I have shared for many years. I can assure all Senators that this approach is a bipartisan approach and will be followed throughout the conference on this bill with the House.

I will make further statements after the vote, if I may. At this time, I yield the remainder of my time and ask for final passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMBERS] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frahm	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Bingaman	Gorton	Mikulski
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Breaux	Grams	Murray
Bryan	Grassley	Nickles
Burns	Gregg	Nunn
Campbell	Hatch	Pell
Chafee	Heflin	Pressler
Coats	Helms	Reid
Cochran	Hollings	Robb
Cohen	Hutchison	Roth
Conrad	Inhofe	Santorum
Coverdell	Inouye	Shelby
Craig	Jeffords	Simpson
D'Amato	Johnston	Smith
Daschle	Kassebaum	Snowe
DeWine	Kempthorne	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Leahy	Thompson
Dorgan	Lieberman	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lott	Warner

NAYS—27

Baucus	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Harkin	Moynihhan
Boxer	Hatfield	Pryor
Bradley	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Brown	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kerry	Simon
Exon	Kohl	Specter
Feingold	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Glenn	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Bumpers

The bill (H.R. 3610), as amended, was passed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for this overwhelming bipartisan support of this bill. It is a bill that I think meets the needs as best we can of our defense forces and maintains the defense of this country. This year we had a record number of requests to our subcommittee from Members of the Senate and, I might say, also from Members of the House that we had to consider. Were it not for this fine working relationship that the Senator from Hawaii and I have, it

would be impossible to deal with a bill of this magnitude in a 24-hour period.

But we have done that, and there are a number of people who deserve to be identified now who have worked hard in the preparation of this bill. The Senator from Hawaii has mentioned the people on his side of the aisle. This team works together on a bipartisan basis on the staff level, too. So I want to note the contributions of the subcommittee staff on our side. We have this long record of bipartisan work together: Steve Cortese, who is our staff director; Charlie Houy, staff director on the other side; Peter Lennon, Jay Kimmitt, Mary Marshall, Jim Morhard, John Young, Sid Ashworth, Susan Hogan, Mazie Mattson, Justin Weddle, Candice Rogers, and Emelie East.

This year we were assisted by two individuals who were loaned to our committee. As I said, we have just had a tremendous workload this year. We have Darrell Roberson from the Air Force and Mike Gillmore from GAO who worked with us. During the floor debate yesterday, I was pleased to be able to have two of the high school interns from my office who have observed our work and were helpful to me yesterday, Brad Brunson from Fairbanks and Meegan Condon of Petersburg.

This was my first opportunity to manage a bill in the Chamber since the retirement of Senator Dole, and I want to express my thanks to our new leader, TRENT LOTT, for his unwavering efforts to help us get this bill passed. I thank the Senate for its patience.

Additionally, we have received full consideration from many Members. We started out yesterday morning, I believe, with about 150 amendments, and they have all been handled in one fashion or another in order to get to where we are today. I do thank Senator MCCAIN and Ann Sauer of his staff, who have worked with us this year to review amendments to make certain that we would not meet objections to them in terms of their presentation to the Senate here on a unanimous-consent basis. Today, I have Megan Curry of Juneau and Beth Pozzi of Anchorage with me in the Chamber.

I am pleased to once again thank the Senate for the support of this bill. I do think the American people should know that we have firm support here in the Senate now on a bipartisan basis to maintain the level of expenditures which we believe are necessary. I hope we can get the bill into conference and back as soon as possible, because we want time to work with the White House to make sure that the executive branch is willing to share with us this burden of maintaining the funding of our military throughout the world.

Mr. President, I now move to reconsider the vote the Senate has just taken to pass this bill.

Mr. INOUE. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House.

The Chair appointed Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. HARKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S. 1894 shall be returned to the calendar.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Before the two managers of the Department of Defense appropriations bill leave the Chamber, I want to say again today, as I did yesterday, how much I appreciate the outstanding work that they did. We have just seen an unbelievable accomplishment, for this bill to have been completed in 24 hours, with tremendous effort yesterday. They obviously are two of the very best managers we have in the Senate, and on behalf of the Senate I thank them for their good work and hope that their example will be followed on other appropriations bills and with the bill that we are about to begin consideration of.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY,  
WORK OPPORTUNITY, AND MED-  
ICAID RESTRUCTURING ACT OF  
1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall now proceed to the consideration of S. 1956, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1956) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we are now ready to go to the reconciliation bill. The chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Delaware, Mr. ROTH, is here, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. DOMENICI, is here, and we have the ranking member, the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. EXON, here also. So we are ready to begin the debate.

I hope we can make progress and reach some agreement on limiting time. We need to complete this legislation by noon tomorrow. We have 20 hours of debate under the rules, plus amendments that could be voted on even after that 20 hours. So we have a lot of work to do between now and 12 o'clock tomorrow. But if we can continue to cooperate as we have been doing this week from both sides of the aisle, I am convinced we can do it, and that is what we should do. We have the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee here, the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, here.

I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 1 p.m. be equally divided for opening statements only and that the majority leader be recognized at 1 p.m.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first let me say to the distinguished majority leader, we will be working together with the Agriculture Committee and Finance Committee leadership, and we will try to live up to the Senator's desire that we finish this bill by noon tomorrow. I want to say, frankly, I do not see why we cannot.

When the majority leader gets the floor, I assume one of the early items of business will be to strike the Medicaid provision. That might be debated, but there is an hour limit even on that, and then the bill will be a welfare bill.

I think everybody should know that we have not seen very many amendments. Neither has the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. But this is a reconciliation bill, so it is not so easy to put an amendment together that meets the test of an amendment to a reconciliation bill. For those who have them, the sooner we can see them, the sooner we can analyze them from the standpoint of points of order, or we may be helpful in some respects. So that is how I see the ensuing time. I thank the majority leader very much.

Having said that, I want to publicly first thank the two distinguished chairmen, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman ROTH, and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Chairman LUGAR, and the ranking members. These two chairmen and their committees have crafted the legislation that meets the spending requirements given in the 1997 resolution adopted earlier this spring. Both of these chairmen will be here during the consideration of this legislation and will help manage amendments that might be offered in their respective parts of the bill.

I also thank Senator EXON, ranking member of the Budget Committee, who voted with all the Republicans on the Budget Committee on Tuesday to report this bill from our committee to the Senate floor. I am fully cognizant of the qualification he attached. That was that in fact the Medicaid provisions were going to be stricken. I have, just once again, to the best of my ability indicated we are pursuing that. The Senate will have to vote nonetheless, and the Senate will make that determination. I assume it will be almost unanimous that we do that; perhaps not unanimous, but overwhelming.

Mr. EXON. If I may speak there for just moment?

Mr. DOMENICI. Certainly.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend for his kind remarks. I think it is important

we move this matter along. I would like to add my plea to those on this side and those on the other side as well, to please give us the amendments that you have in mind as early as possible, hopefully maybe before noon. If we can get a list of the serious amendments that are going to be offered, then we are going to be in a better position, not only to fashion this bill that may eventually receive a substantial number of votes if some amendments can be agreed to, but also expedite the process. So I pledge my cooperation to every extent I can to the chairman of my committee, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee. I think the four of us working together with our usual understanding and cooperation can move this matter along. That is my desire.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank my colleague.

Finally, I want to thank our former colleague and former Republican leader of the Senate, Senator Dole, who tried not once, not even twice, but three times in this Congress to get welfare reform enacted. I believe his leadership will be felt even in his absence from the Chamber today, as this legislation moves forward and, hopefully, this time secures the signature of the President of the United States after these earlier vetoes by the President of the United States.

First, for those who may be watching this process, let me briefly explain what we are about to do today. After the President vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 last winter, and after the failure to find common ground on a plan to achieve balance in our budget, the process moved on and Congress again put together another budget blueprint that achieved balance in 2002. The blueprint, known as Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1997, was adopted early in June. The budget resolution does not go to the President for his signature, but rather directs the action of the authorizing and spending committees on how to proceed for the remainder of the year to come into compliance with that budget blueprint and resolution. The budget blueprint also included instructions to 11 Senate committees to make changes in legislation in entitlement programs within their jurisdiction to cause fundamental reform of these programs, but also at the same time to slow the spending and achieve the deficit reduction envisioned in that budget plan.

Today we begin debate on the first of three reconciliation bills that were prescribed by that budget resolution. The reconciliation bills are very special because they have protections and procedures that the Budget Act established for their consideration. And because of the need to have them enacted to implement that budget blueprint, they receive some very special consideration and are immune from some of the rules, and some of the privileges