VOINOVICH, and I ask that it be numbered and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. VOINOVICH, proposes an amendment numbered 591.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', up to $500,000 may be available for a study of the costs and feasibility of a project to remove ordnance from the Toussaint River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is numbered and laid aside.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 592 THROUGH 601, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments that I ask be adopted at this time: A Bond-Santorum amendment, $4 million for MTAPP; Senator HELMS amendment, $5 million for visual display environmental research; Senator BYRD, $10 million for addressing exposure to chemical warfare agents; Senator BYRD, $10 million for biometrics; Senators ASHCROFT and BOND related to the B–2 bomber; Senator SMITH, $10 million for U–2 upgrades; Senator HARKIN, $6 million for Gulf War syndrome; Senator GRAMM, $17.5 million for the F–15 data link; and Senator COLLINS, $3 million for MK–43 gun conversion; Senator INOUYE for Ford Island. I ask that these amendments be considered en bloc and adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes amendments numbered 592 through 601, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 592

(Purpose: To set aside $4,000,000 for the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'', up to $4,000,000 may be made available for the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 593

(Purpose: To set aside $5,000,000 of Army RDT&E funds for visual display performance and visual display environmental research and development)

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $5,000,000 may be available for visual display performance and visual display environmental research and development.

AMENDMENT NO. 594

(Purpose: To increase by $10,000,000 the amount provided for the Army for other procurement for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements, and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', $51,250,000 shall be available for the Information System Security Program, of which up to $10,000,000 may be made available for an immediate assessment of biometrics sensors and templates repository requirements and for combining and consolidating biometrics security technology and other information assurance technologies to accomplish a more focused and effective information assurance effort.

AMENDMENT NO. 595

(Purpose: To set aside $10,000,000 of Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide funds for carrying out first-year actions of the 5-year research plan for addressing low-level exposures to chemical warfare agents)

On page 107, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'' for the Office of the Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Gulf War Illnesses, up to $10,000,000 may be made available for carrying out the first-year actions under the 5-year research plan outlined in the report entitled ''Department of Defense Strategy to Address Low-Level Exposures to Chemical Warfare Agents (CWAs)'', dated May 1999, that was submitted to committees of Congress pursuant to section 247(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1957).

AMENDMENT NO. 596

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress commending the men and women of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, for their ongoing contributions to Operation Allied Force over Yugoslavia)

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The B–2 bomber has been used in combat for the first time in Operation Allied Force against Yugoslavia.

(2) The B–2 bomber has demonstrated unparalleled strike capability in Operation Allied Force, with cursory data indicating that the bomber could have dropped nearly 20 percent of the precision ordnance while flying less than 3 percent of the attack sorties.

(3) According to the congressionally mandated Long Range Air Power Panel, ''long range air power is an increasingly important element of United States military capability''.

(4) The crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, deserve particular credit for flying and supporting the strike missions against Yugoslavia, some of the longest combat missions in the history of the Air Force.

(5) The bravery and professionalism of the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base have advanced American interests in the face of significant challenge and hardship.

(6) The dedication of those who serve in the Armed Forces, exemplified clearly by the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, is the greatest national security asset of the United States.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the skill and professionalism with which the B–2 bomber has been used in Operation Allied Force is a credit to the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, and the Air Force;

(2) the B–2 bomber has demonstrated an unparalleled capability to travel long distances and deliver devastating weapons payloads, proving its essential role for United States power projection in the future; and

(3) the crews of the B–2 bomber and the personnel of Whiteman Air Force Base deserve the gratitude of the American people for their dedicated performance in an indispensable role in the air campaign against Yugoslavia and in the defense of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 597

In the appropriate page in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title III under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force,'' up to $10,000,000 may be made available for U–2 aircraft defensive system modernization.

AMENDMENT NO. 598

(Purpose: To set aside $25,185,000, the amount provided for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses, of which $4,000,000 is to be available for continuation of research into Gulf War syndrome that includes multidisciplinary studies of fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome and $2,000,000 is to be available for expansion of the research program in the Upper Great Plains region)

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

SEC. 8104. Of the amount appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', $25,185,000 shall be available for research and development relating to Persian Gulf illnesses, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for continuation of research into Gulf War syndrome that includes multidisciplinary studies of fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome, multiple chemical sensitivity, and the use of research methods of cognitive and computational neuroscience, and of which up to $2,000,000 may be made available for expansion of the research program in the Upper Great Plains region.

AMENDMENT NO. 599

(Purpose: To set aside $17,500,000 for procurement of the F–15A/B data link for the Air National Guard)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. 8109. Of the total amount appropriated in title III under the heading ''AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE'', up to $17,500,000 may be made available for procurement of the F–15A/B data link for the Air National Guard.

AMENDMENT NO. 600

(Purpose: To increase funds for the MK–43 Machine Gun Conversion Program)

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY,'' up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the MK–43 Machine Gun Conversion Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 601

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

SEC. . DEVELOPMENT OF FORD ISLAND, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Navy may exercise any authority or combination of authorities in this section for the purpose of developing or facilitating the development of Ford Island, Hawaii, to the extent that the Secretary determines the development is compatible with the mission of the Navy.

(2) The Secretary may not exercise any authority under this section until—

(A) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a master plan for the development of Ford Island; and

(B) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may convey to any public or private person or entity all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property (including any improvements thereon) or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is excess to the needs of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A conveyance under this subsection may include such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may lease to any public or private person or entity any real property or personal property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in the State of Hawaii that the Secretary determines—

(A) is not needed for current operations of the Navy and all of the other Armed Forces; and

(B) will promote the purpose of this section.

(2) A lease under this subsection shall be subject to section 2667(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and may include such others terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) A lease of real property under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the lessee shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the real property covered by the lease if the property is then conveyed under subsection (b).

(4)(A) The Secretary may provide property support services to or for real property leased under this subsection.

(B) To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, any payment made to the Secretary for services provided under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriation, account, or fund from which the cost of providing the services was paid.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LEASEHOLD INTEREST BY SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary of the Navy may acquire a leasehold interest in any facility constructed under subsection (f) as consideration for a transaction authorized by this section upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate to promote the purpose of this section.

(2) The term of a lease under paragraph (1) may not exceed 10 years, unless the Secretary of Defense approves a term in excess of 10 years for the purpose of this section.

(3) A lease under this subsection may provide that, upon termination of the lease term, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to acquire the facility covered by the lease.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall use competitive procedures for purposes of selecting the recipient of real or personal property under subsection (b) and the lessee of real or personal property under subsection (c).

(f) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance of real or personal property under subsection (b), or for the lease of real or personal property under subsection (c), the Secretary of the Navy shall accept cash, real property, personal property, or services, or any combination thereof, in an aggregate amount equal to not less than the fair market value of the real or personal property conveyed or leased.

(2) Subject to subsection (i), the services accepted by the Secretary under paragraph (1) may include the following:

(A) The construction or improvement of facilities at Ford Island.

(B) The restoration or rehabilitation of real property at Ford Island.

(C) The provision of property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy may not carry out a transaction authorized by this section until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a notification of the transaction, including—

(A) a detailed description of the transaction; and

(B) a justification for the transaction specifying the manner in which the transaction will meet the purpose of this section; and

(2) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed following the date on which the notification is received by those committees.

(h) FORD ISLAND IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the ''Ford Island Improvement Account''.

(2) There shall be deposited into the account the following amounts:

(A) Amounts authorized and appropriated to the account.

(B) Except as provided in subsection (c)(4)(B), the amount of any cash payment received by the Secretary for a transaction under this section.

(i) USE OF ACCOUNT.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts, funds in the Ford Island Improvement Account may be used as follows:

(A) To carry out or facilitate the carrying out of a transaction authorized by this section.

(B) To carry out improvements of property or facilities at Ford Island.

(C) To obtain property support services for property or facilities at Ford Island.

(2) To extent that the authorities provided under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, are available to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary may not use the authorities in this section to acquire, construct, or improve family housing units, military unaccompanied housing units, or ancillary supporting facilities related to military housing at Ford Island.

(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the following funds:

(i) The Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(ii) The Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(2) of that title.

(B) Amounts transferred under subparagraph (A) to a fund referred to in that subparagraph shall be available in accordance with the provisions of section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, for activities authorized under subchapter IV of chapter 169 of that title at Ford Island.

(j) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LAWS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, transactions under this section shall not be subject to the following:

(1) Sections 2667 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

(3) Sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483, 484).

(k) SCORING.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive the applicability to any lease entered into under this section of the budget scorekeeping guidelines used to measure compliance with the Balanced Budget Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(l) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2883(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(i) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to that Fund pursuant to section 2862(i)(3)(A)(ii) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''.

(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' has the meaning given that term in section 2801(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''property support service'' means the following:

(A) Any utility service or other service listed in section 2686(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Any other service determined by the Secretary to be a service that supports the operation and maintenance of real property, personal property, or facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 592 through 601) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider that action.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time has now arrived when no more first degree amendments will be cleared to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I inquire from the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to address the Senate at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment restores $3.1 billion in operations and maintenance and procurement funding that is cut by section 108 of the bill. It reduces various accounts to eliminate funding for low-priority, unnecessary and wasteful spending by an equal amount. The amendment doesn't change the total amount for defense in this bill. It simply redirects the cuts to eliminate pork barrel spending rather than high-priority readiness and modernization funds.

I find it staggering that the committee would cut funding for readiness and modernization by $3.1 billion when this bill contains nearly $5 billion in spending for unrequested, low-priority, unnecessary and wasteful spending programs that have not been scrutinized in the normal merit-based review process.

Congress recently passed an emergency spending bill that contained nearly $11 billion in defense spending to pay for the costs of ongoing operations in Kosovo. I believe the administration request was around $5 billion. As the chairman of the committee stated on the floor yesterday, we will very likely need to act later this year on another supplemental bill to pay for continued offensive operations against Serbia or to enforce a peace agreement and protect the Kosovars who return home.

Why, then, would we want to cut funding from this bill that would be needed to carry out these operations into the next fiscal year?

Why wouldn't we instead cut some of the $5 billion in pork barrel spending that has been put in this bill principally for the benefit of Members and their constituents?

Here is the list of unrequested programs included in the bill that I have accumulated.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of unrequested and unwanted projects be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions

[In millions of dollars]

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	
Army	
Fort Wainwright utilidors	$7
Air Battle Captain Helo. Flight Training Program	1.2
Joint Assessment Neurological Examination Equip.	1.5
Army Conservation and Ecosystem Management	3
BOS-Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	5
UC–35A Basing and Sustainment	17.8
Rock Island Bridge Repairs	5
Fort Des Moines—Historic OCS Memorial	2

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Directive Report Language: Directs the Army to consider conveying firefighting equipment to the Bayonne Local Redevelopment Authority and the City of Bayonne;	
Recommends that Rock Island Arsenal be included as a priority facility for the Department's Total Asset Visibility Implementation Plan.	
Navy	
Operational Meteorology and Oceanography	10
Shipyard Apprentice Program	12
Ship Depot Operations Support, Phila. Naval Shipyard	23
Warfare Tactics PMRF facilities improvements	5
UNOLS	3
Professional Development/Education Asia Pacific Ctr.	1.7
Barrow landfill	3
Directive Report Language: Directs the Navy to establish a pilot program for purpose of verifying cost savings that can be achieved through the use of a west coast propeller overhaul facility. Specifies characteristics that result in one possible candidate site.	
Marine Corps	
Initial Issue	15
NBC Defense Equipment	1.1
Air Force	
B–52 attrition reserve	35
Civil Air Patrol Corporation	12.5
University Partnering for Operational Support	5
TACCSF upgrades	10
Eielson utilidors	9.9
Tinker and Altus base repairs	25
Defense-Wide	
DoDDS Math Teacher Leadership Program	.4
Technology innovation and teacher education	5
OEA; Fitzsimmons Army Hospital	10
Charleston Macalloy site	10
OSD; Pacific Disaster Center operations	4
Clara Barton Center, Pine Bluff	1.3
Jefferson Project	5
Civil-Military Programs	
Youth Challenge	62.5
Innovative readiness training	20
Starbase Youth Program	6
National Guard and Reserve	
Directive Report Language: The Committee encourages the Army Reserve to expend resources on the Modern Burner Unit.	
Distance Learning Project	45
Addtional full-time support technicians	26
School house support	10
Project Alert	3.2
Fort Belknap Training Range	2
Defense Systems Evaluation, White Sands Missile Range	2.5
PROCUREMENT	
Aircraft, Army	
UC–35 aircraft (5)	27
UH–60 helicopter (11)	175
AH–64 helicopter mods	45
C–12 airplane mods	3
Kiowa Warrior helicopter mission trainer	6.6
Kiowa Warrior switchable eyesafe laser rangefinder	2.6

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Aircraft survivability equipment: advanced threat infrared countermeasures/common missile warning system	8.1
Night Vision Imaging Systems	5
Aircrew integrated systems	8
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	
Command and control vehicle	6
Heavy assault bridge mods	15.5
MK–19 automatic grenada launcher	5
Items less than $5 million	15
Ammunition Procurement, Army	
40mm CTG	8
60mm mortar	9
120mm HE mortar CTG	3
120mm WP smoke CTG	5
105mm CTG artillery	10
Wide area munitions	10
ARMS Initiative	14
Other Procurement, Army	
Tactical trailers/dolly sets	6
Army Data Distribution System	15
SINCGARS family	20
AN/TTC–56 warfighter information network (ACUS)	40
Secure terminal equipment (ISSP)	12.5
Worldwide Technical Control Improvement Program (Multi-purpose Range Targetry Electronics)	5.1
Information systems	45
LTWT Video reconnaissance system	1.5
Firefinder radar system mods	8.1
Striker command and control system	10
LOGTECH Army Automatic Identification Technology (AIT)	5
Ribbon bridge equipment	13.5
Lightweight Maintenance Enclosure	3.2
Water purification system	3
Combat medical support equipment	4
Combat training centers support (incl. Ft. Polk)	10
Improved moving target simulator upgrade program	3.5
Commercial Construction Equipment SLEP	8
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	
F/A–18E/F advance procurement (6)	14
EA–6 aircraft transmitters	25
EA–6 night vision devises	15
SH–60 helicopter AQS–13F	7.5
UH–1 helicopter infrared radar system	10
UH–1 helicopter engine torque pressure system	2.5
P–3 aircraft AIP kits	24.2
C–2A aircraft propeller	5
Common ground equipment direct support sqdrn, readiness training	3
High Pressure Pure Air Generator	2.5
Weapons Procurement, Navy	
BQM–74 aerial targets	30
Improved tactical air launched decoy (ITALD)	20
Weapons industrial facilities	7.7
MK–45 gun mount mods	28
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	
LHD–8 advance procurement	500
Other Procurement, Navy	
Other navigation equipment	19
Items less than $5 million (Distance Learning)	6.5
AN/BPS–15H surface search radar	8
AN/SPS–73 radar	8
SSN acoustics	2.6

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

JEDMICS	9
Information Systems Security Program (ISSP)	3.5
Passive sonobuoys	3
AN/SSQ–62	3
AN-SSQ–101	3
Weapons Range Support Equipment	11
Retrofit OMNI IV/V night vision goggles	18.1
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy	12
Procurement, Marine Corps	
LAV mortar test program sets	4
Tracked vehicle modification kits	60.5
K-Band test obscuration pairing system	2
Radio systems	10
D–7G bulldozer	10
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	
F–16C/D (2)	50
F–16C/D advance procurement (12)	24
EC–130J (1)	87.8
C–130J spares and mods	24.2
F–15 E-Kit engine upgrades for Air National Guard	20
F–16 fuel tanks; oxygen generating systems; digital terrain system; theater airborne recon. system	34.5
C–17 maintenance trainer	3.5
C–12 spare parts	5
Common support equip.: multiplatform boresight equip	10
Missile Procurement, Air Force	
Minuteman III mods	40
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force	
Sensor Fuzed Weapon	8
Other Procurement, Air Force	
Combat training ranges: unmanned treat emitter	28
C3 countermeasures	5
Theater Deployable Communication	35
Radio equipment	3.7
Laser eye protection	2.4
Mechanized material handling equipment	10
Procurement, Defense-Wide	
Automatic Document Conversion System	50
Patriot PAC-3 procurement	60
Chemical decontamination	5
National Guard and Reserve equipment	300
RDTE ARMY	
Defense Research Sciences: Cold Regions Military Eng.	1.0
University and Industry Research Centers:	
Basic Research In Counter Terrorism	15.0
Electro And Hyper Velocity Physics Research	3.0
Advanced And Interactive Displays	1.3
National Automotive Center	3.0
Materials Technology: AAN Materials	2.5
Missile Technology:	
Scramjet Technologies	2.0
Computational Fluid Dynamics	9.2
Modeling and Simulation Technology: Photonics	5.0
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology:	
''Smart Truck'' Initiative	3.5
Alternative Vehicle Propulsion	10.0
Chemical, Smoke, and Equipment Defeating Technology: Optical Spectroscopy	2.0
Electronics and Electronic Devices:	
Hybrid Fuel Cell	1.5
Improved High Rate Alkaline Cell	1.0
Low Cost Reusable Alkaline Manganese-Zinc	1.4
Re-Usable Coin Cells	0.6
Lithium Carbon Monoflouride Coin Cells	0.4
''AA'' Zinc Air Battery	0.7
Countermine Systems: Nonlinear Acoustic Technology	1.0
Human Factors Engineering Technology: Emergency Medical Team Coordination	3.4
Environmental Quality Technology:	
Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (PEPS)	8.0
Phyto-Remediation In Arid Lands	3.0
Texas Regional Institute for Env. Studies	1.0
Military Engineering Technology:	
University Partnering For Ops Support	3.0
Cold Regions R&D	1.3
Medical Technology:	
Disaster Relief And Emergency Medical Services	5.0
Center For Innovative Minimally Invasive Therapy	10.0
Osteoporosis And Bone Disease	2.5
Medical Advanced Technology:	
Center For Prostate Disease Research WRAMC	7.5
Intravenous Membrane Oxygenator	1.0
Volume Angio CAT	6.0
Joint Diabetes Project	10.0
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology:	
Future Combat Vehicle Development	5.0
Improved HMMWV Research	8.0
Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology: Innovative Sensor Enhancement And Integration	10.0
Manpower, Personnel and Training Advanced Technology: Army Aircrew Coordination Training	3.0
Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology: Future Missile Technology Integration (FMTI)	5.0
Joint Service Small Arms Program: Objective Crew Served Weapon (OCSW)	5.0
Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology: Digital Situation Mapboard	2.0
Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (DEM/VAL):	
Missile Defense Flight Experiment Support	14.7
Tactical High Energy Laser	15.0
Acoustic Technology Research	4.0
Radar Power Technology	4.0
Family Of Systems Simulators (Fossim)	1.5
Small Fast ChemBio Detectors	1.0
SMDC Battlelab	5.0
Armament Enhancement Initiative: XM 1007 Precision Guided Kinetic Energy Munition	15.0
Aviation—Adv Dev: Virtual Cockpit Optimization	5.0
Medical Systems—Adv Dev: Combat Trauma Patient Simulation	5.8
EW Development: ATIRCMS/CMWS	4.0
Brilliant Anti-Armor Submunition (BAT): TACMS 2000	10.0
Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System: JSTARS	10.0
Weapons and Munitions—Eng Dev:	
Motar Anti-Personnel/Anti-Material (MAPAM)	7.2
50 Caliber Quick Change Barrels	2.0
Sense and Destroy Armament Missile: Program Increase	10.0
Firefinder: TBM Cueing	7.9
Threat Simulator Development:	
Threat EO/IR Simulator	2.5
Threat Mine Simulator	1.2
Virtual Threat Simulator	4.0
Concepts Experimentation Program: Digital Information Technology Testbed	3.0
Army Test Ranges and Facilities: White Sands Missile Range	7.5
DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility: HELSTF	14.0
Munitions Standardization Effectiveness and Safety:	
Contained Detonation Technology	3.0
Bluegrass Army Depot	2.5
Management Headquarters (R&D): Akamai research project	23.0
Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs: M–1 Large Area Flat Panel Displays	8
Digitization: Fort Hood Digitization Research	2.0
Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2): FBCB2	21.7
End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities:	
Instrumental Factory For Gears (INFAC)	4.0
Totally Integrated Manufacturing Enterprise	10.0
Directive Report Language: Directs the Army and Marine Corps to develop a plan, and report on its implementation, for including the Rock Island arsenal in all aspects of howitzer design, development and production.	
RDTE NAVY	
Air and Surface Launched Weapons Technology: Pulsed Detonation Engine Technology	5.0
Ship, Submarine and Logistics Technology: Stainless Steel Double Hull	5.0
Marine Corps Landing Force Technology: Non-Traditional Military Operations	5.0
Communications, Command and Control, Intel Surveillance:	
Hyperspectral Research	4.0
UESA Signal Processing Support	5.0
Human Systems Technology:	
Coastal Cancer Control (MUSC)	5.0
Retinal Pigment Laser Damage	0.2
Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology:	
Heatshield Research	2.0
Thermal Management Materials	2.0
Photomagnetic Material Research	0.5
Silicon Carbide For Electronic Power Devices	2.0
Innovative Communications Materials	2.25
Advanced Material Processing Center	5.0
ADPICAS	1.15
Electronic Warfare Technology:	
Free Electron Laser	10.0
Waveform Generator	3.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology: Distributed Marine-Environment Forecast System 2.4
Undersea Warfare Weaponry Technology:
Computational Eng. Design 3.5
SAUVIM 1.5
Surface Ship and Submarine HM&E Advanced Technology:
Composite Helo Hangar 5.0
Reconfigurable Ship Simulation 2.5
Power Node Control Centers 3.0
Virtual Testbed For Advanced Electrical Systems 5.0
Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ADT):
BURRO 5.0
Advanced Light Weight Grenade 1.0
Project Albert 4.0
Vehicle Technology Demo 1.0
Medical Development (Advanced):
Naval Dental Research Institute 3.0
Prostate Cancer Immuno- therapy 1.5
Manpower, Personnel and Training Adv Tech Dev:
Integrated Manufacturing Studies 3.0
T-Star 1.5
Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Technology: Visualization Of Technical Information (VTI) 3.0
Navy Technical Information Presentation System: Joint Experimentation 15.0
Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology: Terfenol-D 2.5
Mine and Expeditionalary Warfare Advanced Technology: Ocean Modeling 9.0
Advanced Technology Transition:
Low Observable Stack 10.0
Vector Thrusted Dusted Propeller 6.0
Advanced Trailer Research 6.0
Mine Countermeasures Ship 12.0
C3 Advanced Technology: National Technology Alliance 10.0
Surface and Shallow Ater Mine Countermeasures: Integrated Combat Weapons Systems (ICWS) 18.0
Shipboard System Component Development: Advanced Water Jet Technology 2.0
Pilot Fish 2.5
Advanced Submarine System Development: Enhanced Performance Motor Brush 2.3
Ship Concept Advanced Design: STEP Development—Navy CAE Technology 2.0
Advanced Surface Machinery Systems: Naval Ship Survivability 2.5
Combat Systems Integration: Common Command And Decision Systems 5.0
Cooperative Engagement: CEC Space 15.0
Environmental Protection: Asbestos Conversion Pilot Program 4.0
Land Attack Technology: Continuous Processor, NSWC 6.3
Land Attack Technology: Extended Range Guided Munition 10
Non-Lethal Weapons—Dem/Val: ..
Innovation Initiatives 3.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Arch/Eng Support: NAVCIITI 4.0
Other Helo Development:
Sentient Sensors 1.0
Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar 15.0
H–1 Upgrades: EMD Program 26.6
Aircrew Systems Development: Aircrew Systems 3.5
Surface Combatant Combat System Engineering: AEGIS Interoperability 25.0
Airborne MCM: CH–60 Upgrades .. 2.0
Air Control: ECARS 7.0
Enhanced Modular Signal Processor: ARCI/MPP 11.0
Swath (Small Waterplane are Twin Hull) Oceanographic Ship: SWATH 9.0
New Design SSN: Non-propulsion Electronic Systems 10.0
Ship Contract Design/Live Fire T&E: Smart Propulsor Product Model 2.0
Ship Self Defense—EMD: NULKA 4.4
Distributed Surveillance System: Advanced Deployable System ... 22.0
Major T&E Investment 5.0
Marine Corps Program Wide Support:
ChemBio Individual Sampler (CBIS) 4.8
Consequence Management Information System (CMIS) 1.2
Small Unit Biological Detector (SUBD) 4.0
F–18 Squadrons: Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System 5.0
Consolidated Training Systems Development: Battle Force Tactical Training System (BFTT) .. 7.5
Surface ASW Combat System Integration: High Dyn. Range, Towed Array Rec. & Sonar 8.0
Navy Science Assistance Program:
Lash 12.0
Airship/LASH Study for Range Enhancements 1.0
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems: Hyperspectral Modular Upgrades 4.0
Modeling and Simulation Support: SPAWAR Modeling and Simulation Initiative 3.0
Industrial Preparedness Mantech 10.0
RDTE AIR FORCE
Defense Research Sciences: National Solar Observatory 0.65
Materials:
Structural Monitoring of Aging Aircraft 1.5
Friction Stir Welding 2.0
Thermal Management For Space Structures 2.5
Titanium Matrix Composites ... 2.2
Materials—High Temperature Ceramic Fibers 2.4
Resin Systems For AF Engine Applications 2.0
Metals Affordability Initiative Consortium 9.0
Electrochem Fatigue Sensor Dev & Field Use Tests 3.0
Human Effectiveness Applied Research:
Solid Electrolyte Oxygen Separator 6.0
Behavioral Science Res Under AFRL 5.1
Aerospace Proulsion:
High Thermal Stability Fuel Technology 1.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

KC–135 Variable Displacement Vane Pump 4.0
High Power, Advanced Low Mass Systems Prototype 6.0
More Electric Aircraft Program 3.0
Thermophotovoltaic (TPV) 2.0
ISSES/AFRL 0.775
Hypersonic Technology Program:
Restore Hypersonic And High Speed Propulsion 16.0
Phillips Lab Exploratory Development:
HAARP 10.0
Radio Frequency Applications Development 5.0
Tropo-Weather 2.5
Space Survivability 0.6
HIS Spectral Sensing 0.8
Command, Control and Communications: Electromagnetic Technology 9.3
Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems: Composite Space Launch Payload Dispensers 4.5
Aerospace Structures: Polymeric Foam Core 4.0
Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology: More Electric Aircraft Program 0.25
Personnel Training and Simulation Technology: Behaviorial Science Research & AFRL 1.8
Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology:
Helmet Mounted Visual System Comp. & Mini-CRT 5.0
Panoramic Night Vision Goggles (PNVG) 3.0
Advanced Spacecraft Technology: Scorpius 5.0
MSTRS:
Upper Stage Flight Experiment 15.0
Space Maneuver Vehicles 25.0
Advanced Weapons Technology:
Laser Spark Missile Countermeasures Program 5.0
Field Laser, Radar Upgrades 6.0
Environmental Engineering Technology: E-Smart Environmental Monitoring Tool 5.0
Space Control Technology: Program Increase 5.0
Joint Strike Fighter: Alternative Engine Development 15.0
Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (Dem/Val): Quick Reaction Launch Demonstration Under RSLP 19.2
Space Based Laser: SBL Plan, Eng. And Design Of SBL Test Facility 10.0
B–2 Advanced Technology Bomber: B–2 Upgrades And Maintainability Enhancements 37.0
EW Development: Precision And Location & ID Prog. (PLAID) Upgrade 10.0
Submunitions: 3–D Advanced Track Acquisition And Imaging System 4.5
Life Support Systems: Life Support Systems 2.5
Computer Resource Technology Transition (CRTT): Asset Software Re-Use Program 2.8
Major T&E Investment: MARIAH II Hypersonic Wind Tunnel Program 6.0
Program Reduction: Big Crow Program Office 5.0
Space Test Program (STP): Micro Satellite Technology 10.0
F–16 Squadrons: ADV Identification Friend Or Foe (AIFF) For F–16 ..... 6.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

F–117A Squadrons: Pre-EMD And EMD Efforts On Block 3 Upgrades	20.0
Compass Cass: TRACS–F Upgrade	8.0
Theater Air Control Systems: Theater Air Control Systems (TACS)	6.0
Theater Battle Management (TBM) C41: Theater Battle Management Core Systems	5.0
Cobra Ball: Advanced Airborne Sensor	4.0
Information Systems Security Program: Lighthouse Cyber Security Program	10.0
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems: JSAF LBSS And HBSS	10.0
Manned Reconnaissance Systems: Prototype Pre-Processor	4.5
U–2 Dual Data-Link II Upgrade	8.0
Industrial Preparedness: Nickel-Metal Hydride Replacement Battery For F–16	1.33
Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain, Program OFC:	
Aging Aircraft Extension Program	7.0
Blade Repair Facility	7.0
Support Systems Development: Integrated Maintenance Data Systems	9.0
DEFENSE–WIDE, RDT&E	
Support Technologies—Applied Research:	
Wide Band Gap Materials	14.0
POAP	8.0
Laser Communications Experiment	3.0
Support Technologies—Advanced Technology Dev.	
Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT)	30.0
Excalibur	5.0
Scorpius	5.0
Silicon Thick Film Mirror Coatings	2.0
Joint Theater Missile Defense Program:	
Liquid Surrogate Target Development Program	5.0
PMRF TMD Upgrades	10.0
Optical-Electro Sensors	5.0
Kauai Test Facility	4.0
BMD Technical Operations: SMDC Adv. Research Center	3.0
Threat and Countermeasures:	
Comprehensive Advanced Radar Technology	4.0
Phase IV of Long Range Missile Feasibility	3.0
Patriot PAC–3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition-EMD: Program Cost Growth	152.0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	
Defense Research Sciences: Spectral Hole Burning Applications	2.0
University Research Initiatives:	
Anticorrosion Studies	1.5
Advanced High Yield Software Development	1.5
Active Hyperspectral Imaging Sensor Research Program Chemical And Biological Defense Programs: Chemical And Biological Detection Programs	4.0
Medical Free Electron Laser	2.281
Re-Use Technology Adoption Program	3
Chemical And Biological Defense Program: Chemical And Biological Detection Programs	10.0
Tactical Technology: CEROS	7
Integrated Command And Control Technology: High Definition System (HDS)	10.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Fabrication of 3–D Micro Structures	2
Biodegradable Plastics	1.5
Strategic Materials	2
WMD Related Technology:	
Thermionics	3.0
Nuclear Weapons Effects	7.0
Deep Digger	5.0
Explosives Demilitarization Technology: Explosives Demilitarization Technology	7.0
Counter Terror Technical Support:	
Facial Recognition Technology	3.0
Testing Of Air Blast And Improvised Explosives	4.0
Special Technical Support: Complex Systems Development	5.0
Verification Technology Demonstration: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Verification	1.5
Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations:	
Microelectronics	3.0
Computer Assisted Technology Transfer	6.0
Strategic Environmental Research Program: Biosystems Technology	6.0
Cooperative DOD/VA Medical Research	10.0
Advanced Electronics Technologies:	
Change Detection Technology	3
Defense Techlink	1.5
Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices	4
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations: Magnetic Bearing Cooling Turbine	4.0
High Performance Computing Modernization Program:	
Multi Thread Arch. System For High Per. Modem	4.0
High Performance Visualization Center	3.0
Large Millimeter Telescope	2
Joint Wargaming Simulations Management Office: Synthetic Range Study	1.0
Joint Robotics Program: Lightweight Robotic Vehicles	5.0
Advanced Sensor Applications Program:	
HAARP	5.0
Solid State Dye Laser Applications	6.0
CALS Initiative: CALS—Integrated Date Environment (IDE)	4.0
Chemical and Biological Defense program—Dem/Val:	
Bioadhesion Research To Combat Biological Warfare	2.0
M93 Al For Chemical Simulation Training Suites	5.0
Humanitarian Demining: Demining Technologies For Unexploded Land Mines	3.0
Joint Robotics Program EMD: Vehicle Teleoperations	5.0
Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization: Support Jamming AOA	10.0
Defense Technology Analysis: Commodity MGT System Consolidation	5.0
Information Systems Security Program: Trusted Rubix Database Guard	1.8
Defense Imagery and Mapping Program:	
Pacific Imagery Program for Exploitations	2.8
NIMA View Joint Mapping Tool	8.0

Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 2000, objectionable provisions—Continued

Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (Space): Pacific Disaster Center	6.0
Defense Health Program	
Operation and Maintenance:	
Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership	1.4
Graduate School of Nursing	2.3
Tri-Service Nursing Research Program	6.0
Pacific Island Health Care	5
Center for Disaster Management	5.0
Military Health Services Information Management	10
Brown Tree Snakes	1
PACMEDNET, Hawaii	12.0
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines	7.5
Outcome Driven Health Care and Info Systems	6.0
Research, development, test and evaluation:	
Breast Cancer Research Program	175.0
Prostate Cancer Research Program	75.0
Acute lung injury, advanced soft tissue modeling, alcohol abuse prevention, alcoholism, brain injury, childhood asthma, cognitive neuroscience, diabetes, digital mammography imaging, disease management demonstration, enzymatic wound disinfectants, neurofibromatosis, osteoporosis and bone disease, ovarian cancer, polynitroxylated hemoglobin, smoking cessation, stem cell, tissue regeneration research	50.0
Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities	
National Guard counterdrug support, New Jersey	20.0
Gulf States counterdrug computer upgrades in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana & Mississippi	10.0
Marijuana eradication	6.0
Counterdrug intelligence and infrastructure support	50.0
R–OTHR radar study	1.0
Northeast Regional Counterdrug Training Center	2.0
Counternarcotics Center at Hammer	8.0
Total	4.887B

Some Examples of Protectionist Legislation

''Buy American'' anchor chains.

''Buy American'' carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate.

''Buy American'' ball and roller bearings.

''Buy American'' computers.

''Buy American'' coal for municipal district heat, Germany.

''Buy American'' food, speciality metals, hand tools, measuring tools, clothing, and fabrics (Berry Amendment).

BILL LANGUAGE

Operations and Maintenance, Army

Not less than $355 million shall be available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance.

Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract for an LHD–1 Amphibious Assault Ship which shall be funded on an incremental basis.

Chemical Agents and Munition Destruction, Army

$1 million shall be available until expended each year only for a Johnston Atoll off-island leave program.

Intelligence Community Management Account

$27 million shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center.

Kaho' olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund: $35 million.

Section 8022: $500,000 shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capitol Region.

Section 8029: Prohibition on the use of funds to reduce or disestablish the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, Keesler Air Force Base.

Section 8033: $26.4 million shall be available only for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation.

Section 8070: Restrictive employment practices for contractors that could increase the cost of the work to be performed.

Section 8071: The Army shall use the former George Air Force Base as the airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin.

Section 8083: Authorizes the Defense Department to waive reimbursement costs associated with the conduct of seminars, conferences and other activities at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Section 8098: Authorizes $255,333 for payment to Trans World Airlines to replace lost and canceled Treasury checks.

Section 8103: $5 million shall be transferred to the Department of Transportation to realign railroad track on Elmendorf Air Force Base.

Section 8105: Requires procurement of malt beverages and wine sold by nonappropriated fund activities of the Defense Department from commercial entities within the state in which the military installation resides.

Section 8107: Amends the Communications Act with respect to the bidding process involving the sale of the frequency spectrum. Mandates such bidding process be initiated during fiscal year 1999.

Section 8108: Reduces the amount available for national defense by $3.1 billion.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it totals $5 billion. Self-restraint in fiduciary matters is a virtue, especially for a party that rose to majority status with the promise of reducing this type of practice.

But every year it is the same old story: More money for NULKA antiship decoy systems; more money for the plethora of laser projects that have proliferated at every lab in the country; more money for unrequested and unneeded aircraft; more money for automatic grenade launchers—we have got to have a stockpile of these things that will last forever—more money for research into double-hull technology, which shipbuilders are supposed to provide themselves per the requirements of the Oil Pollution Prevention Act.

There are millions every year for hyperspectral research that is not requested by the military. Earmarks like the one that requires the Army and Marine Corps to make the Rock Island arsenal the center of all future design, development and production activities related to artillery do not represent good public policy. What is it that forces us to designate Rock Island arsenal as a center for this? That's not public policy.

Medical research and environmental matters unrelated to combat ought to be carefully scrutinized when funded in the defense budget. We do just the opposite: we use the defense budget to fund pet projects that should be funded through nondefense agencies in nondefense spending bills. Osteoporosis is a serious problem, but in the defense budget? $3 million to fund phyto-remediation research and arid lands? In the defense budget? How can we take ourselves seriously—how can the public take us seriously, when we demonstrate absolutely no willingness to curtail the very spending practices that put this country so heavily in debt?

At the very time a consensus has formed around the proposition that the armed forces are being stretched perilously thin, a situation that will get worse when we send more than a brigade's worth of ground forces into Kosovo, it is incumbent upon those of us elected to represent the interests of the nation that we act with a modicum of self-restraint where the public treasure is concerned. Failing to do so will not only damage the treasure, it will most assuredly cost lives. This is, after all, national defense.

Let's review some recent examples of readiness shortcomings, shortcomings that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly emphasized pose a serious threat to both near and long-term readiness:

The nuclear carrier *U.S.S. Enterprise* (CVN–65) recently deployed to the Persian Gulf and Kosovo, undermanned by some 800 sailors.

We are losing pilots to the commercial airlines faster than we can train them.

The Navy has one-half the F/A–18 pilots, one-third of the S–3 pilots, and only one-quarter of the EA–6B pilots it needs.

Only 26 percent of the Air Force pilots have committed to stay beyond their current service agreement.

The Army says that five of its ten divisions lack enough majors, captains, senior enlisted personnel, tankers and gunners.

Again, the world watches as the Air Force's main bomber, the B–52, once again is called to duty to delivery air launched cruise missiles in combat. How many times has the Air Force called upon this 40-year old workhorse to deliver devastating firepower? The B–52 bomber was already old when I saw it fly in Vietnam, and yet the Air Force plan will carry the current bomber fleet through the next 40 years, with a replacement to the B–52 tentatively planned in 2037.

The Navy is struggling to maintain a fleet of 300 ships, down from over 500 in the early 1990s. The fiscal year 2000 budget will not support a Navy of even 200 ships.

The Marine Corps saves money in spare parts by retreading light trucks and Humvees, so as to afford small arms ammunition for forward deployed Marines.

Mr. President, the cumulative effect of these types of readiness problems will most assuredly translate into higher risks for the young men and women we send into harm's way to defend us and our country.

Mr. President, I understand what is going on here. We have a problem, and that is the existence of stringent budget caps designed to keep government spending in check. I support those who are resisting the urge to bust the budget by exceeding the spending allowed by the 1997 budget agreement.

I also understand that the Appropriations Committee has to balance the interests of those who favor domestic spending over defense spending, and I realize that compromises have to be made.

But we shouldn't be stuffing appropriations bills, defense or otherwise, full of pork-barrel spending. And we shouldn't be cutting defense, like this bill does, to set aside money to cover the excess pork-barrel spending that will inevitably show up in other domestic appropriations bills later in the process.

And I would just like to make the point that the money that was taken from this bill for later pork-barrel spending could just as easily be reallocated back into this bill, when this amendment is adopted.

We shouldn't be jeopardizing the readiness of our Armed Forces by cutting high-priority funding just to stay within the budget caps. We should do the right thing, and cut the pork instead of potentially putting our men and women in harm's way without the training and tools they need to defend themselves and our nation.

I was going through this list here. Some of them are interesting and some are amusing:

Under Defense Health Program is $1.4 billion for the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership; Tri-Service Nursing Research Program, $6 million—remember, this is out of Defense. I don't even know where the Tri-Service Nursing Research Program is. Then there is Pacific Island Health Care, $5 million; brown tree snakes—the perennial tree snakes—is only a million dollars this year. I would have thought that with all the millions and millions we have spent on brown tree snakes over the past years, we would have at least been able to defend a nation from them. Unfortunately, the spending for brown tree snakes continues, and probably will for a long time—at least in my lifetime.

Outcome Driven Health Care and Info Systems, $6 million; Breast Cancer Research Program, $175 million; Prostate Cancer Research Program, $75 million; Acute lung injury, advanced soft tissue modeling, et cetera, et cetera, $50 million. Then, of course, we have the usual protections in this legislation that requires us to ''buy American'' anchor chains, carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate, and ball and roller bearings. We have to buy American for computers this time. That is interesting. We have to buy American coal for municipal

district heat in Germany. Talk about the old line about bringing coal to New Castle. Then, of course, we have to buy American food, specialty metals, hand tools, measuring tools, clothing and fabrics.

Then we have Ship Depot Operation Support at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, $23 million. I am very curious about that expenditure up in Philadelphia, which was supposed to be opened and going to be in private hands. Barrow landfill, $3 million; Professional Development/Education Asia Pacific Center, $1.7 million. I wonder whose profession is being developed there. Let's see. The list goes on.

I think I have made my point, as usual. Here is Counternarcotics Center at Hammer. Since I don't know where Hammer is, I probably should not comment on it. The list goes on. Here is one the military didn't request: A smart truck initiative. Perhaps we will have trucks that gas themselves, because $3.5 million is a pretty hefty sum to spend on smart trucks.

Here is Plasma Energy Pyrolysis system and Phyto-remediation in Arid Lands. Not to mention one of our important defense items, Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies. Then there is the University Partnering for Operations Support and Cold Regions R&D.

The list goes on. The point is that we now have 11,000 enlisted families that are on food stamps. We now have a shortage of air launch cruise missiles, which everybody knows about. We now have an incredible increase in the wear and tear of our equipment because of the dramatically increased operations regarding Kosovo. What do we do? We think that we spend the money the military needs for modernization and operations and maintenance? No, Mr. President. We spend $5 billion in unnecessary and unwanted things, which is up, by the way, from the supplemental. I think I only identified a little over $2 billion that was in the ''emergency'' supplemental, such as Dungeness crab fishermen, reindeer, and other ''vital emergencies'' that required our immediate attention.

So, I have very little confidence that this amendment will carry. I think it is important, however, that the American people know where their tax dollars are going, and sooner or later—perhaps later—they will demand that we stop doing this with their hard-earned tax dollars. It may be later, as I say. But I also have to say to my dear friends on the Appropriations Committee, I see increases in this kind of wasteful and unnecessary spending, not decreases. There is going to have to come a point where we are going to have to start having recorded votes on all this stuff. I am worried about brown tree snakes like everybody else, but I am much more worried about the men and women in the military who happen to be subsisting on food stamps today. I think a lot of Americans are growing rather weary of this procedure.

Mr. President, I will be glad to have a tabling motion vote or an up-or-down vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I regretfully must oppose Senator MCCAIN's amendment. I understand the amendment, but it takes a different approach to funding critical Department of Defense priorities for fiscal year 2000 than the committee has approved in this bill before the Senate.

Based upon the amounts that we provided in the fiscal year 1999 emergency supplemental appropriations for Kosovo and funds that were remaining from the 1999 supplemental for Bosnia, the committee determined—and I add that it was at my request—that at least $3.1 billion now available to the Department of Defense can and should be carried over to the year 2000. As a matter of fact, on the floor of the Senate I stated that our intent was to try and take care of some of the year 2000 obligations in that supplemental to best reflect the needs of the Department and the pressures across the discretionary accounts under the 1997 budget agreement.

Our committee adjusted the totals in this bill to reflect those specific amounts that carry over from the 1999 appropriation into the year 2000. Having done so, having brought $3.1 billion more into this account, we then removed some of the moneys that we previously allocated to the account into the nondefense area. The discretion to do that gave us the ability to meet critical needs in the nondefense area.

We believe that we did address critical readiness problems in the supplemental, and we specifically anticipated some of those needs which could possibly have been incurred—the costs incurred—before September 30th of this year. Those now appear to be funds that will be required in the year 2000, and we have met those demands by moving forward with the money.

I know this has caused some anxiety to people within the Department of Defense who believe that we have cut the bill. We have not cut the bill. The bill is exactly the same amount of money originally under consideration by the committee, but we have found the moneys to pay those bills by carrying forward into the year 2000 some of the 1999 appropriations.

We believe we have met the needs of the military under this bill. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona strikes from the bill $3.1 billion, rather than carry forward with the money from 1999. I think that will have a detrimental impact on the priorities established by the committee and the priorities that some Members have presented not only in committee but on the floor.

For instance, the Senator's amendment would reduce nearly $270 million from the service operation and maintenance accounts, including $53.5 million from the Army National Guard alone. In procurement, the amendment pending would reduce or eliminate funding provided to replace the aging UH–1, the Huey helicopters, built in the 1960s, with the Army's modern standard, the UH–60 Blackhawk.

The amendment reduces funding for advance procurement of one of the Commandant of the Marine Corps' top priorities, the LHD–8 amphibious assault ship.

For the Air Force, funding for additional F–16, EC–130J and JStars aircraft would be deleted.

In research and development, funds added for the SBIRS satellite, national missile defense and the third arrow battery for Israel would be reduced.

For the Defense Health Program, the additional amounts provided for breast cancer research and prostate cancer research would be cut also by the Senator's amendment.

In response to Members' requests that the committee provide additional funds to fight the war on drugs, the committee did add funding for the gulf states counterdrug initiative, the National Guard counterdrug missions, and $50 million in response to the proposed Drug Free Century Act. Senator MCCAIN's amendment would delete $61.6 million of the funds added to the bill for those efforts.

The Senator from Arizona and I have discussed on many occasions that we do have different approaches to addressing the funding needs for the Armed Forces. I know Senator MCCAIN is a stalwart proponent of the men and women of the armed services and their families, and I believe I am also. We are just approaching the job from a different direction.

I believe that I must, on behalf of the committee, oppose the amendment. I truly believe the flexibility provided by the committee to the Department of Defense best accommodates the needs of the military, and ensures that funds are available in the accounts where necessary to accommodate readiness, quality of life, modernization and technology priorities. I can state categorically the accounts that are here to accommodate readiness, quality of life, modernization and technology priorities of the Department of Defense have been met by our bill.

The Senator mentioned some of the items in this bill that affect my State. The Point Barrow landfill was created by the Department of the Navy. It operated in Point Barrow for many, many years. As that installation was closed down, the Department of Navy did not remediate the landfill. It is a terrible problem in the Arctic, particularly in the summertime when that landfill becomes just a morass. The local people have asked, using Defense Department funds, that the job be completed. This bill does, in fact, provide moneys for that purpose.

The Senator mentioned the joint Federal telemedicine project that is going on in my State. Again, this is an initiative by the Department of Defense that has a substantial amount of

communications capability in our State to deal with Federal agencies' needs and the needs of the services they provide throughout the State of Alaska to coordinate a delivery system for medicine using telemedicine techniques. We believe that is going to result in reducing the cost of health care delivery to Alaska Native people and the Indian Health Service to the military people throughout our State who serve on military bases and those who receive the benefits of Federal programs. It is not a general program for the population as a whole.

I say to the Senate, I understand the Senator's approach and I respect it, but I believe and our committee believes that there are instances where activities, which originated on military bases or caused by military occupation of specific portions of land within the individual States, do affect the local population and that those obligations of the Federal Government should be met with defense funds.

The basic problem, though—I go back to the beginning—we did not cut from other accounts in order to get the moneys to shift to other appropriations bills. For instance, we have shifted a substantial amount of money now through what we call the deficiency subcommittee—which was a subcommittee created specifically for that purpose—moneys from these accounts from the Department of Defense into the agriculture appropriations bill, but the way it was done does not reduce the amount of money that will be spent by the Department of Defense in the year 2000. A portion of the moneys really are carried over to be spent in the year 2000 rather than being spent in 1999, and that is what we intended when we asked the Congress to approve that supplemental appropriations bill. I hope the Senate will agree with us and will oppose this amendment and defeat it. It is a significant vote for us to determine.

Members will note the reports in the papers and in the media concerning the meetings that are taking place in the House of Representatives. They are deciding on an approach quite similar to ours to reduce the amount of money that will be spent through the fiscal year 2000 process and carry over some of the funds from 1999 to meet the obligations in the year 2000.

I think that is a legitimate way to use the money that is available to us and will enable us hopefully to stay under the caps in treating all of the bills that have to be passed by our committee. Thirteen separate bills have to be brought to this floor, and ours is the only committee which faces a point of order under the Budget Act if we exceed the caps. We are trying our best to live with that Budget Act. I think we will.

There is still a serious gap in money, but we will find that money somewhere within the agencies, either by reducing carryover funds or by eliminating funds that are now no longer high priority so we can meet the obligations of the year 2000 with the funds that will be available under the budget agreement. If we cannot do that, we will come to the Senate in September, and we will have to work out a way to solve our problem.

Right now, our goal—and I think it is a bipartisan goal—is to live with the Budget Act, stay within the caps, yet meet our obligations. What we have done in this bill is the initial key to opening up the door down that long corridor to comply with the Budget Act. I urge the Senate to disapprove the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

I yield to my friend if he has any comments to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I join my chairman, Mr. STEVENS, in opposition to the McCain amendment. In the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, he mentioned a brown tree snake, $1 million to either control or to rid the State of Hawaii of this menace.

The history of the brown tree snake is a rather simple one, and it has been documented. It was found in Solomon Islands and during the war, army transport vessels accidentally or otherwise carried several brown tree snakes from the Solomon Islands to Guam.

Within 2 years, seven species of birds have been wiped out on Guam, babies have been threatened, and there is a brownout almost once an evening because of brown tree snakes.

The State of Hawaii has no snakes unless they are brought in. It has been documented that the brown tree snake was brought in from Guam via the Air Force aircraft. Therefore, the Department of Defense, assuming some responsibility for this, has not disapproved this amount of $1 million to help the State of Hawaii rid itself of the brown tree snakes.

Hawaii's environment is such that it is rather fragile. We have no natural predators to control the snakes, and if it ever gets loose in my State, then all the beautiful birds of paradise will disappear.

I think the amount we have put in this bill represents the position on the part of the Department of Defense in assuming responsibility is a rather small one.

I hope my colleagues will join us in opposing the McCain amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my hope the Senate will agree that we can proceed on other amendments.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be set aside and hopefully we will vote on it sometime between 3:30 and 4. I request there be 2 minutes equally divided so the Senator from Arizona can state to the Senate again the purpose of the amendment before the final vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. 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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 549 AND 550 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have authority to withdraw Byrd amendments Nos. 549 and 550. They were modified and accepted in the managers' package to which we previously agreed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are withdrawn.

The amendments (Nos. 549 and 550) were withdrawn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 581 be taken up at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] proposes an amendment numbered 581.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert:

SEC. . (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Veterans Administration and Federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by Federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of government services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of these sections, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people, who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by both sides and the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. I ask that it be considered and passed.

With Chairman STEVENS' agreement, included in the managers' package of amendments is bill language that would provide authority to replicate the Federal Health Care Partnership that is now operating in the State of Alaska.

Pursuant to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, the Department of Defense (DoD), the Veterans' Administration (VA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS) have entered into memoranda of understanding in order to make the most efficient use of resources that are made available to each of these Federally-funded health care systems in the provision of health care services to their respective eligible beneficiaries. Initiated in April of 1995, under this partnership, health care services are being provided to eligible DoD, VA and IHS beneficiaries without regard to the designation of the health care service facility, and telemedicine technologies are being employed to provide access to health care services in remote rural areas.

The proposed bill language would provide authority for the Department of Defense to establish a similar arrangement with the Veterans' Administration and Federally-funded health care agencies providing health care services to Native Hawaiians in the State of Hawaii. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

The proposed bill language also provides authority for the Department of Defense to develop a consultation policy with regard to programs and activities which affect the Native Hawaiian community in Hawaii.

On May 14, 1998, President Clinton issued Executive Order 13084, directing every Federal agency to establish an effective process to provide for meaningful and timely consultation and coordination with Native Americans and Native American governments in the development of policies and practices that significantly or uniquely affect their communities. On October 20, 1998, the Secretary of the Department of Defense announced the issuance of the Department's consultation policy affecting two of the three constituent Native American groups—American Indians and Alaska Natives. The proposed bill language authorizes the Department of Defense to develop a similar consultation policy for the third constituent group of Native Americans—Native Hawaiians—for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community, consistent with the following findings of the Congress——

The United States recognizes and affirms that American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian people, as the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States have a continuing right to autonomy in their own affairs and an ongoing right of self-determination and self-governance.

The Constitutional authority of the Congress to legislate in matters affecting the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States includes the authority to legislate in matters affecting the Native Hawaiian people, as aboriginal, indigenous, native people who have a special relationship with the United States.

The Federal policy of self-determination and self-governance of the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of the United States is intended to maximize the participation of native people in the direction and administration of governmental services to their communities in order to make those services more responsive to the needs of the native people and their communities. In accordance with that policy, the Congress encourages Federal agency consultation with the aboriginal, indigenous, native people of Hawaii, Native Hawaiians, with regard to agency actions that uniquely or significantly affect them or their communities.

For purposes of these sections in the proposed bill language, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, ''occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.''

I thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, for his willingness to assure that the Department of Defense has a consistent policy as it relates to all Native Americans.

Mr. STEVENS. We are in agreement, Mr. President.

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

The amendment (No. 581) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chair, and 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. WELLSTONE. 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, though I see on the floor Mr. INOUYE and Mr. STEVENS, two Senators for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect, I rise to speak in opposition to the proposed increases in military spending contained in this defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

I have, I believe, been a strong supporter of our women and men in uniform, especially our veterans. I think we should provide the best possible training, equipment and preparations for our military forces. I understand and know full well that our forces have been asked in recent years to carry out a number of peacekeeping, humantarian and other missions.

I voted to support the airstrikes in Kosovo. I have raised questions throughout this conflict. I hope there will be a diplomatic solution, and I hope the Kosovars will be able to go back home. I think we are at the beginning of a huge challenge. In particular, I want us to remember the Kosovars and continue especially with humanitarian assistance.

So I think we need to adequately support these activities, and I also supported the supplemental budget for the cost of the campaign in Kosovo. But I am troubled—and I think I am probably one of only a few in the Senate, but I have the opportunity and the honor of being able to speak as a Senator from Minnesota, and so I will—by what I see as a stampede in this Congress toward even greater increases in Pentagon spending. I think the increase in spending in this legislation goes way beyond what we need to spend in the conflict in Kosovo and way beyond what I think a post-cold war defense budget should reflect.

This appropriations bill totals $264 billion, and we also appropriated a considerable amount more in the supplemental bill, the emergency bill. If you look at the cost of Kosovo, it will be a relatively small percentage of this overall budget. In terms of manpower or womanpower, even if we participate—and I believe we will—in the KFOR peace enforcement process, we will be contributing about 7,000 troops. The total armed force of the United States is roughly 1.5 million. So this is not a question of whether or not we go on and live up to our commitment in Kosovo. I think we can support that mission without this Pentagon budget at the level called for.

I fear that using Kosovo and also some vaguely defined set of ''threats'' will end up—and I want to talk about some of the doctrines that undergird this budget—giving a blank check to the Pentagon this year and in the years ahead. This budget accounts for a little over half of the discretionary spending in the annual budget. That is what troubles me. If you look at the peak of the cold war, currently we are spending, roughly speaking, just thinking about real dollar terms, close to 90 percent—about 86—of the cold war budget, and that is during the height of the cold war.

Now, most of the funds in this budget go to maintaining a force structure that is shaped by the requirement to fight two simultaneous, major conflicts and to counter what defense analysts refer to as ''uncertainty scenarios.''

I recognize that the United States faces a number of threats around the world and that those threats have changed during the cold war period—in particular, the threat of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. If we look carefully at those threats, we can see that in this budget too much of the spending is not directly related to meeting those threats but, rather, continues with what I define as cold war priorities.

We continue to pour billions of dollars into unnecessary cold war era weapons programs. We continue to maintain a nuclear arsenal that is completely disproportionate to the arsenals maintained by our potential adversaries—an arsenal that could be substantially cut, resulting in dramatic savings, still providing for as strong a defense as we could ever need.

Congress has also skewed spending priorities by refusing to close military bases that the Pentagon acknowledges are unneeded and obsolete and which the Pentagon itself has pressed to close.

What is especially troubling about the spending in this budget is the Strategic Concepts—the two major regional conflicts concept and other uncertain scenarios—that are, I think, implausible and unlikely. I want to draw here on some excellent work done by analyst Carl Conetta and Charles Knight of the Project on Defense Alternatives in Cambridge, MA.

Beginning in the 1980s, the focus of defense planners moved away from ''clear and present danger'' of the Soviet power to the intractable problem of ''uncertainty.'' Along with the shift has come a new kind of Pentagon partisan—the ''uncertainty hawk.'' The uncertainty hawks are engaged in worst-case thinking. Among the sort of nonstandard scenarios, worst-case scenarios that are, for example, talked about with this kind of doctrine are defending the Ukraine or the Baltics against Russia, civil wars in Russia and Algeria, a variety of wars in China, contention with Germany, and wars aligning Iraq and Syria against Turkey, and Iraq and Iran against Saudi Arabia. The Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review, QDR, uses unnamed ''wild card'' scenarios to help define these requirements.

Now, although both the 1993 and 1997 Defense Reviews link the two-war requirements to the Korean and Persian Gulf scenarios, these were also described merely as examples of possible wars. Officially, the two-war requirement—that we have to be able to fight two wars simultaneously—is generic. It is not tied directly to Korea or the gulf. As the Quadrennial Defense Review puts it, ''We can never know with certainty when or where the next major theater war will occur'' or ''who our next adversary will be.''

It is important to recognize, as opposed to appropriating moneys based upon this kind of strategic doctrine, that since 1945 the United States has fought only three major regional conflicts—one every 15 or 20 years. The regional great powers and peer competitors that currently enthrall planners are only hypothetical constructs, and the world changes all of the time.

I will give an example of a little bit more of this doctrine. The prime candidates, in addition to these uncertainty scenarios, worst-case scenarios, for future peer rival status, given current doctrine, are Russia and China. A dozen years of dedicated investment might resuscitate a significant portion of the Russian Armed Forces, but that certainly is not what we are looking at right now—a major military competitor, Russia. The Chinese ''threat,'' even given all of the developments we have been talking about over the last several weeks, is even more iffy. If China's economy holds out, in 30 years it might be able to mount a ''Soviet-style'' challenge.

Surveying the prospects worldwide, a Defense Intelligence Agency analyst concludes that ''no military or technical peer competitor to the United States is on the horizon for at least a couple of decades.''

As I have said, I believe we should maintain a strong defense. We face a number of credible threats in the world, including terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. But let's make sure we carefully identify the threats we face and tailor our defense spending to meet them. Let's not continue to maintain military spending based on hypothetical threats that may not arise for decades—if at all.

I will argue as we look at this budget, which again makes up about one-half of our discretionary spending, that we ought to consider this vote in the context of where we are heading with these budget caps. I say yes to a strong defense but no to some of the unnecessary spending that is in this budget; no to some of the scenarios that are laid out in this budget and some of the doctrines that undergird the spending in this budget, especially when we are talking about over 50 percent of discretionary spending going into this area.

Whatever happened to the discussions we once had about national security at home? If we are going to spend 50 percent of our discretionary budget on the Pentagon—and we are not going to do anything about these budget caps, and we will have to, in my view, take these caps off; there is no question about it. But on current course within this context of the budget we now have before us, we are going to spend over 50 percent of discretionary spending on the Pentagon. And, as a result, what are we not doing? We are not looking at the other part of our national defense. I argue that part of our real national security is the security of our local communities.

Whatever happened to the idea that we were going to focus on early childhood development? Whatever happened to the priority that we were talking about as being so important to our country that we had to invest in the health, skills, intellect, and character of our children? Whatever happened to the importance of affordable child care? Whatever happened to the importance of decent health care coverage for people?

In my State of Minnesota, 35 percent of senior citizens—that is it, 35 percent of senior citizens—have some prescription drug coverage. The other 65 percent have no coverage at all. Many of them are spending up to 40 percent of their budget just on these costs. Where is the funding going to be for that? Where is the funding going to be for the 44 million people who have no health insurance at all?

Yesterday, we had a White House conference dealing with mental health. I would add substance abuse. I have been doing work with Senator DOMENICI—and proud to do so—on trying to deal with some discrimination and making sure that people get decent mental health coverage.

How are we going to move forward to make sure there is decent health care coverage for people? How are we going to make sure there is affordable child care? What about affordable housing? How are we going to take the steps in our communities to reduce the violence and to be able to get to the kids—I think of the juvenile justice bill that we passed not more than a couple of weeks ago—before they get into trouble in the first place? How are we going to make sure that higher education is affordable? How are we going to make sure we have the best education for every child?

I just simply want to say I am going to vote against this bill, and I am going to vote against this bill for two reasons, neither of which has anything to do with the two very distinguished Senators who are managing this bill.

First of all, as I said, I think much of it goes beyond Kosovo. Much of it goes beyond our real national defense. I think too much of it is still based upon a cold war doctrine. I believe we can make cuts in the Pentagon budget and still have a strong defense. I have tried to lay out that case.

Second of all, I am going to vote against this bill—I don't think too many Senators are—because I view the vote on this appropriations bill in the context of the overall budget and where these appropriations bills are going. I view some of the dollars spent on the Pentagon as being dollars that we are not going to spend for affordable child care, that we are not going to spend to make sure there is decent education for our children, that we are not going to spend to make sure there is affordable housing.

I argue that somewhere in the debate in the Senate we have to also look at

real national security as not just being a strong defense as defined in this budget, which I am for, although I think a strong defense doesn't necessitate all of the money we are spending, but, in addition, we have to think about real national security as the security of our local communities where—one more time, and I will finish on this—there is affordable child care—when are we going to get to that?—there is affordable housing, there is decent education, there is decent health care, where we don't have one out of every four children under the age of 3 growing up poor in our country, where we don't have one out of every two children of color under the age of 3 growing up poor in our country, and make sure that every child, no matter color of skin, or income, or rural, or urban, or boy or girl, can grow up dreaming to be President of the United States of America.

I think that has to be part of the definition of our real national security. I think we have to make more decisive investments in these areas of public life in our Nation.

I believe this appropriations bill, in the context of the budget, where these appropriations bills are going to, subtracts from that very important agenda as well.

Let me finish one more time by being one of the Members of the Senate—I don't know whether others will say—I think others will say this eventually—who says that right now we are in a fiscal straitjacket. We will not be able to live with these caps. We will be making a huge mistake if we don't make some of the decisive investments I am talking about on the floor today. This will be a very shortsighted vision. We need to do much better as a nation going into the next century. And it can't be just Pentagon spending; it always has to be to make sure that there is a peaceful opportunity for every child in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is about time to vote on the McCain amendment. We thought we would have another amendment offered by this time. But it has not been offered. I believe it is time we start voting on these amendments.

I will state for the Chair that it is my intention to find some way to call up these amendments in the order they were presented and dispose of them now as quickly as we can. There is a vote on cloture tomorrow on the Y2K proposition. I assume that will carry. We certainly do not want to have this defense bill waiting around for the completion of a long process that is related to cloture.

I urge Members to cooperate with us. I will inquire of Members as they come to the floor now on this vote as to when they will be able to present their amendments to see if we can find some way to get some time limitations. It is possible, I believe, to finish this bill tonight with the cooperation of Members of the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 589, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. I call up amendment No. 589.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I send to the desk a second-degree amendment. It will modify this amendment in a way that is acceptable to both sides. I ask that this amendment, as modified, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 589), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test And Evaluation, Navy'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant 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.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 588 AND 591, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate amendments Nos. 588 and 591, and I ask they be considered en bloc.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments (Nos. 588 and 591) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the chairman and ranking member spoke eloquently about the merits of several projects in this bill that affect their States. As I have said before, I don't pretend to judge the merit of each and every project on the list of objectionable materials. I do, however, object to the process by which these projects were added to this bill, the process that circumvented the normal and appropriate merit-based review for determining the highest priority not only in defense but across all appropriations bills.

I want to clarify something the chairman said: In this list, it does not—repeat, does not—include funding for the SBIRS program on the Israeli arrow missile defense program. There is no reduction in funding for those programs.

Finally, my colleagues know the military service chiefs testified to Congress earlier this year that they need more than $17 billion every year in order to redress several readiness shortfalls. This bill falls about $6 billion short of that goal. This amendment would restore $13 billion in high-priority readiness and modernization funds to help meet the services' needs, offsetting every time with low-priority spending cuts.

I emphasize they came over and said they needed $17 billion. We are not meeting that minimal request.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I must oppose the Senator's amendment. I think it will change the direction we are going in terms of how to meet the pressing needs of the Department of Defense and, at the same time, balance those needs against the rest of the needs of the country.

I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. 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 New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent due to a death in the family.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 81, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Allard	Gramm	McCain
Bayh	Grams	Robb
Brownback	Hagel	Torricelli
Edwards	Kerry	Wellstone
Feingold	Kyl	
Graham	Lugar	

NAYS—81

Abraham	Baucus	Bond
Akaka	Bennett	Boxer
Ashcroft	Bingaman	Breaux

Bryan	Harkin	Murkowski
Bunning	Hatch	Murray
Burns	Helms	Nickles
Byrd	Hollings	Reed
Campbell	Hutchinson	Reid
Chafee	Hutchison	Roberts
Cleland	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cochran	Inouye	Roth
Collins	Jeffords	Santorum
Conrad	Johnson	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kennedy	Schumer
Craig	Kerrey	Sessions
Daschle	Kohl	Shelby
DeWine	Landrieu	Smith (NH)
Dodd	Lautenberg	Smith (OR)
Domenici	Leahy	Snowe
Dorgan	Levin	Specter
Durbin	Lieberman	Stevens
Enzi	Lincoln	Thomas
Feinstein	Lott	Thompson
Fitzgerald	Mack	Thurmond
Frist	McConnell	Voinovich
Gorton	Mikulski	Warner
Grassley	Moynihan	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	Gregg

The amendment (No. 584) was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bill Adkins, a legislative fellow on Senator ABRAHAM's staff, be granted privileges of the floor during the Senate's consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there are so many fellows being admitted that I am going to ask on the next one that comes up that all fellows that are working with Senators be limited to not more than 1 hour each on the floor during the consideration of this bill. Those chairs in the back of the Senate are for people who are working with us on this bill.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 541

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will take a little time to explain this amendment and to say that the primary coauthor of it is Senator HARKIN from Iowa. A cosponsor is Senator WYDEN.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator FEINGOLD also be added as a cosponsor of the amendment and that his statement be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am happy to listen to the comments of the Senator. On the second page, it says, ''. . .and the relevancy of the missions of aircraft to warfighting requirements.''

It is the position of the committee that the aircraft we are talking about are for basically multimission functions and are really not designed for warfighting requirements. They are designed for transportation, basically to meet normal needs. If the Senator would delete that last clause, we will be happy to accept the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. I just want a moment, if I may confer with my friend.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been told there is an objection to my suggestion, so I withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President. I will look at this because I have not asked for the yeas and nays at this time. We may well delete that particular part of the amendment. As a matter of fact, we will probably take care of that problem.

Mr. President, this amendment is a very important amendment. We basically say that the provision in the bill for leasing six luxury executive jets for military generals will be essentially deleted. These are the same kinds of executive jets that are used by, frankly, billionaires, CEOs of the biggest multinational corporations. I think providing additional executive jets to the military's fleet of over 100 Gulfstream, Lear, and Cessna jets sends the wrong signal to our young men and women in the military and reflects misguided spending priorities by this Congress.

I want to tell you—and I know the Senator from Iowa would agree—it wasn't easy to find this gold-plated pork. To say it was buried in this bill is an understatement. It was like finding a needle in a haystack. It is so disguised, there is no direct mention of the Gulfstream aircraft anywhere in the bill. They are being leased for the first time, I think, because it disguises the cost, which is enormous—when I get into it, I will tell you. It is about $39 million for one of these executive jets, compared to the executive jet that is in the fleet now that costs $5.4 million, which is very fancy, and that one is the Cessna Citation Ultra. This one is the Gulfstream; this is the gold-plated version.

The New York Times points out that leasing these jets costs taxpayers about $145 million more than buying these jets. But I have to tell you, if you lease them, it is hard to find them in the bill.

In order to find out what is going to be leased, we had to call the Air Force and get a fact sheet that clearly says the jets will be leased, and they will be top-of-the-line Gulfstream V jets. Again, nowhere in this bill do you see Gulfstream V or a description of these jets. If you read page 142—that is where the authority comes from—this is what it says. This is literally the last page of this bill, page 142:

> Aircraft leasing. Inserts a provision to provide the Air Force the necessary authority to negotiate leases for support aircraft.

That is it. Support aircraft. No one would know that these were the Gulfstream jets that were stripped out of the emergency supplemental bill. You could not tell. But the Air Force told us right upfront and very honestly. They sent us over a fact sheet and we found out that is what these were about.

Many of us here in the Senate—myself included—have said we are willing to provide additional funds for the Defense Department to improve recruitment and retention to fix shortfalls in training and spare parts and address quality of life issues, including family housing and health care for our military personnel. I think the Senate has done a commendable job in addressing many of these shortfalls: A 4.8-percent pay increase, improving the retirement system, increasing retention benefits.

I strongly supported each and every one of those initiatives. However, we have more to do. It is shocking to some people to know that we have military people on food stamps. The Senator from Iowa led the fight in the authorization bill to point out that our personnel overseas needed to be part of the WIC Program—the Women, Infants and Children Program—to give their children cheese and milk to survive. So how do we now come up with almost, I might say, $½ million over the 10-year period to lease the fanciest executive jets that you can find? Until we are totally convinced—and from my point of view not even then—should we even consider this kind of an expenditure?

What is it for? So four-star generals can travel throughout the world in the greatest of comfort. I love to fly in comfort. I fly across the country almost every week. It is hard. I fly commercial and sometimes I sit in coach and sometimes I use my upgrades and sit in business class. It is wearing and hard, but it is fine. You don't need to spend $39 million on a plane, or lease it at even a higher cost to do the business the military requires you to do. It is really a question of priorities. We have done a lot for our enlisted personnel, but still we need to do more. Yet, we are doing this in this bill. I am very hopeful that the chairman—if we remove that one part from our amendment—will be able to join us in support of this amendment.

There may be some objection. But I hope we can agree to drop this.

Our military personnel often live in family housing that needs replacement or repair. This is a priority.

I was looking at the amendment offered by the Senate from Arizona. I almost supported it until the chairman explained to me exactly what was happening. Sometimes Members understand these things. We look in our own areas. We see the deficiencies. I think that if Members want to put something in to improve the quality of life of the people they represent in the military, it is appropriate. But I don't think this is appropriate.

Let me quote from the May 24 issue of Defense Week. This is talking about the emergency supplemental.

> The New York Times has exposed the bills' buried aircraft language . . . this raised lawmakers' concerns that appropriators would appear even softer on pork than they already seemed.

If the committee thought this was pork and did not belong in this emergency appropriations bill, then I say it is still pork now. It is just in another vehicle. But pork is pork.

What is especially troubling is that this leasing authority could cost more than buying the six aircraft outright. Again, the New York times says that leasing the jets costs $476 million—that is almost $.5 billion over 10 years—while buying them would cost $333 million. I do my subtraction. That is a $143 million difference.

Here is how the Gulfstream company described these particular jets. This is the company that would get the sale of these jets:

> The Gulfstream V includes an evolution in cabin design that minimizes the inherent strain of long-range travel. From the 100-percent fresh air control system, to the comfortably maintained 6,000-foot cabin altitude at 51,000 feet, to cabin size—the longest in the industry—the Gulfstream V provides an interior environment unmatched in transoceanic business travel.

Make no mistake, this is the top of the line in executive jets—$37 million per plane. For $30 million less per plane—for example, a Cessna Citation Ultra at $5.4 million—we could save a tremendous amount of money.

My amendment replaces this authority to lease executive jets with the request that the DOD provide some basic information about these aircraft. I will be happy to work with the chairman if he wants me to change some of that language. But we basically called for, in essence, a study to tell us why we would need these planes and what other planes could do the job that these planes do.

By the way, in Defense Week, they called this the ''Go to Meetings Plane.'' These planes are used to go to meetings. It is described that way in Defense Week.

We want to ask these questions:

How many of the missions require a top-of-the-line executive jet?

What wartime requirements make the number of jets needed so high?

We will be glad to drop that, if the chairman doesn't like that language, but a GAO study looked at the gulf war and found very few were used in that theater.

What is the cost comparison if we lease less expensive jets?

Are there existing aircraft in the fleet that can meet these mission requirements or that can be modified to meet these requirements?

On another level, and without having to bring it to the Senate, I am going to personally send GAO a letter to look at this as well.

I think we need to step back and reexamine our priorities. The 106th Congress is increasing defense at a fast rate. There are many people who make the case as to why that should be so. But I think since we are increasing the defense budget while we are decreasing the domestic budget, it really falls on us to make sure that what we spend is necessary.

I don't have to tell Chairman STEVENS, because he has to deal with the aggravation of these nondefense discretionary program cuts overall of $21 billion. I serve on the Budget Committee. I know how hard it is going to be when you get to the civilian side of the budget. Right now, a 9-percent decrease in domestic spending is going to be facing the appropriators. What does that 9-percent cut mean? It means devastating cuts in many programs. The Labor-HHS bill is cut 13 percent. This could hurt programs. We don't know where they are going to cut. But it could hurt programs like Head Start; the Centers for Disease Control; Job Corps; summer jobs, which helps keeps kids out of trouble in the summer months; and dislocated worker assistance.

The point is that we are cutting in other areas. We shouldn't be expending this kind of money—$.5 billion—over 10 years, on these jets.

The transportation bill already reported cripples the Federal Aviation Administration's program to increase safety and capacity. The bill cuts the modernization program by $273 million from the President's request, meaning that automation in radar systems will be delayed, at best, and perhaps will never happen at our civilian airports.

In addition, the Transportation Subcommittee rescinded $300 million from prior year funding for FAA modernization.

What am I saying?

On the civilian side, we are seeing America fail. We are not going to be providing the highest level of safety for our airports. But what do we do? We spend this kind of money.

I see my friend from Iowa is on his feet. I am going to finish in 60 seconds.

What do our veterans tell us? Our veterans tell us that they need more national cemeteries. The VA-HUD bill is cut by 15 percent.

I will tell you right now, I think it would be a wise thing if we cut these leased aircraft out and looked at these needs on the civilian side of Federal aviation and if we looked at the need to build new veterans cemeteries. It is actually reaching a crisis point. We note the D-Day invasion. We commemorate that anniversary. Yet, we don't do all we should in that area.

I think we should get real with this budget. I commend my colleagues on the committee. I am very fond of them. They do a good job. But I think this is one area where we could really save some large dollars, and I think we can do better things with those dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am joining with Senator BOXER in offering this amendment to strike the provision that allows the Pentagon to lease six of these executive aircraft. The military designation is C–37A. We know them as Gulfstreams in the civilian world. They are very lavish and very nice aircraft. In fact, I will show you what we are talking about.

This is a Gulfstream V. It is a very nice airplane. I am sure that millionaires who have made a lot of money in the stock market probably have those. Billionaires have them. I am sure they fly them around. It is a very nice, luxurious aircraft. All of the statistics are very good on that aircraft. It is quiet. It flies high. It goes long distances nonstop. It is quite luxurious on the inside.

As you can see, this is a very nice business executive jet. I wouldn't deny that it is a good tool for a lot of businesses to use in fact. I am not here to say that Gulfstream V is a bad aircraft, or that it shouldn't be built, or that there is no reason to have this in anybody's inventory—not in the least. This aircraft serves a very valuable purpose for a lot of businesses here and around the world. In fact, the Gulfstream corporation has to be a good corporation, for all I know, and builds a pretty darned good airplane. That is not our point.

Our point is—the more I have looked into this the more it has become apparent to me—that all branches of the military have become top-heavy, not only top-heavy in terms of the command structure itself but top-heavy in the number of executive jets they have to ferry them around from place to place. I am beginning to wonder if these are really all that necessary. Are they really for wartime use, or are they really more for just convenience?

For example—I will get more into this in detail later—we are told that a lot of these executive jets such as this can go 4,000 or 5,000 miles without refueling, as necessary to get to theaters of operation around the world. But the fact is, during the gulf war operations very few of these were used. We have to ask the question: Is it really for the benefit of generals to use for rapid movement during war, or is it more for convenience in peacetime?

As the Senator from California said, we have a lot of budget problems here at the military. I, for one, have been trying to do something about getting WIC programs, as the Senator said, for our military personnel overseas. It is a blot on our national character and on our military that we have military personnel on food stamps. That is not right. It is not right that we have enlisted personnel who need the Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Feeding Program.

Last year, the Senator from California and I tried to offer an amendment here that would say at least when they go overseas they get the same WIC Program as they got here. If I am not mistaken, I think it came to the grand total of right around $5 to $20 million. The military said they couldn't afford to do it, but they can afford $40 million for six of these aircraft. Something is wrong when the military says they can't afford it, that the Department of Agriculture has to

pay for it; the Defense Department can't, but they can afford a business jet such as this. That got me when I saw that. Something has to be done about this.

I understand they want to lease several of these Gulfstream V aircraft. I would like to have one to go back and forth to Iowa. I wouldn't have to go through Chicago anymore—probably nonstop right to Iowa. The Senator from California could use one, get on the jet right here and go to any airport in California nonstop.

Let me show you the interior of the aircraft: A nice, luxurious interior. Lean back, have your own personal TV set, a glass of wine. That is pretty nice travel.

Again, I am not saying that we have to strip down everything, that a general has to ride in a harness on a side bucket strapped onto a C–130. That is not what I am saying. There probably is a need for some of these aircraft to transport these people rapidly. My question has to do with the number of aircraft.

For example, I note that there are now over 300 aircraft in inventory, over 150 jets. I can't quite get an accurate count. Last time I counted, there were 154 jets, 70 Learjets. Regarding the C–9, the same as a Douglas DC–9, the Navy has 27, the Marines have 2, and the Air Force has 5. Gulfstreams, we have 16 already. We have some Gulfstream IIIs and IVs, the predecessor to the Gulfstream V. They are about as nice, but they can't go as far. They are a good airplane. We have 70 Learjets total; 727s, we have 3. I am reading just the jets. And I didn't realize we already have two Gulfstream Vs in our inventory. Cessna Citation 560, which is pictured here, is a pretty nice jet, not quite as big as the Gulfstream V and doesn't go as far, but we have 14 of those. The old Saberliners, we have three still in existence. We have seven 707s in our inventory.

There are quite a lot of jets to be flying around. Again, I am wondering, with the inventory that we have, why do we have to lease seven more? Or are we cutting back on some of the aircraft? Again, they may serve a legitimate purpose, but I am wondering, and I go back to a GAO report that the Senator referred to from 1995, ''Travel by Senior Officials,'' dated June 1995. One of the their recommendations in that report was to develop the appropriate mechanisms to ensure the availability of each service's aircraft to help fulfill the OSA, operation support needs, of other services. The third recommendation, reassign or otherwise dispose of excess OSA aircraft.

Now, the chairman and ranking member may know better than I, but it seems to me that a lot of the services have the aircraft and they just don't go from one service to the other. It seems to me what we really need is an effective structure in DOD that puts these business jets and other aircraft under one operational command that really works. If a senior officer in the Navy needed one for something, they should go to this command to get it; Marines the same, Air Force—all this would be the same. The Navy/Marine should go to one central structure to get the aircraft and have them assigned from that structure. That is how it should work.

It looks as though we are in the same old military gamesmanship: Air Force, ''I got mine''; Navy, ''I got mine.'' The Navy has Navy markings and the Air Force has Air Force markings and the Army has Army markings and never the twain shall meet.

I am curious as to how much money we waste and how much operational support aircraft we waste because we don't have that one effective integrated command structure working as it should. That was the suggestion made by GAO in 1995. If nothing else comes out of this, I hope we might move ahead in some way to provide an effective overall operational structure.

I said earlier that there is a DOD Directive 4500.43 that requires that OSA aircraft inventories must be based on wartime needs. However, few OSA aircraft were used in theater during the Persian Gulf war.

From the GAO report:

> Actual use of OSA aircraft during the Persian gulf war suggests that the primary role of OSA is not wartime support but peacetime support.

Again, I quoted that from the GAO report of June of 1995.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. I know the Senator was a pilot in the military and I know he understands aircraft.

Mr. HARKIN. I think I do.

Mrs. BOXER. And I know he understands that these jets we are talking about are not fighting machines; they are go-to-meetings machines.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might interrupt, these are what in common nomenclature would be called executive business jets, converted. For example, in military terms, they call it a C–37 but it is really a Gulfstream V.

Mrs. BOXER. My friend showed a couple of photos of the Gulfstream and then a photo of the Cessna Citation.

Mr. HARKIN. Cessna Citation Ultra. By the way, it is a very good plane.

Mrs. BOXER. It is my understanding that the Cessna Citation Ultra costs $5.4 million a copy, according to the Appropriations Committee, and that the cost on the Gulfstream V is about $39 million.

This is transportation for the highest level of military officers. My friend pointed out that we have a gap growing here between those at the bottom of the economic ladder in the military and those at the top. We know that will always be the case, but it seems to me it is exacerbated with this kind of situation.

I want to ask my friend if he believes that a top general could fly comfortably in a $5.4 million plane as opposed to a $39 million plane?

What we are doing is simply asking for a study to see if we can accommodate the needs of the generals in a cheaper way.

Mr. HARKIN. The basic answer to that is, yes—depending on the mission, of course.

Now, if a general or a four-star wanted to fly from here nonstop to Europe, they couldn't take this airplane which only has about a 2,000-mile leg. However, I might add, it could fly to Reykjavik and refuel. It can fly to Shannon and refuel. It will take an hour and a half or more; you have to land, refuel, and get out of there. But it is perfectly capable of doing that. A lot of businesses fly these overseas all the time. You just have to stop and refuel in one place, that is all. It even has a bathroom on board.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may ask my friend, isn't it possible to base some of these planes in Europe, base them in different places, which is what they do anyway, so it is more convenient to make the switch?

Mr. HARKIN. I appreciate the Senator asking that question because I think it points up—first of all, I am not saying we do not need any of this; I am saying we do need some of these planes. I was talking with the chairman about this. Let's say a four-star officer has to go from Washington to Florida to Texas to Chicago for a series of meetings. He possibly cannot do it with a civilian plane. I understand that, if one has to go overseas for a certain meeting and get back. There are times when you cannot use civilian airplanes. But this type of a jet could be used for any kind of domestic travel in the continental United States. You might have to land and refuel. That does not bother me a whole heck of a lot.

I am saying with the Gulfstream Vs that we have now—which I said we have two or so right now in inventory, plus we have a number of Gulfstream IVs and Gulfstream IIIs—let's say a general needed to get from the Pentagon to someplace overseas in a big hurry for something. OK, requisition one of them and use it for that. But if they have to go to Florida and then to Texas and then to California and make all these meetings, use one of these smaller aircraft because they are going to land anyway, while they are at the meeting, they can refuel, take off and go. It is a much cheaper way of operating.

I seriously question whether we need six Gulfstream Vs for whatever purpose they are asking—I really question that—and I question whether or not other versions of aircraft like this or others can be used more for domestic travel.

I have a letter to Chairman STEVENS dated March 8, 1999, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Hamre, and General Ralston, U.S. Air Force. I was reading it over and was struck by a paragraph. It is an assessment of CINC support aircraft. This was required by the Senate Appropriations Committee

report last year. I was struck by this paragraph which says:

This study evaluated all military and representative commercial aircraft to determine which aircraft would both be configurable and available for CINC support airlift.

It goes on. This is the paragraph:

The study revealed that when CINC—

Commanders in Chief—

requirements, combined long, unrefueled range—4,200 to 6,000 nautical miles—more than 18 passengers and short runway capabilities—5,000 to 7,000 feet—a modern commercial aircraft was needed.

I find it interesting. If you go to the CINCs and ask, ''What are your requirements?'' and they define their requirements, guess what. They meet the requirements of the Gulfstream V. If you ask me what my requirements are to fly around the United States, I bet I can come up with a set of determinants that I need a Gulfstream V: I travel a lot; I go to the coast once in a while; I am always in Iowa; sometimes I have to be in one place for a meeting and then another place for a meeting. I would love to have a Gulfstream V. And I have short runways, too, sometimes.

It is not surprising that we ask the CINCs, ''What do you need?'' and they then define their needs and come up with Gulfstream Vs. It seems to me we ought to have someone else defining the needs rather than the commanders in chief, because they are the ones who use the aircraft.

They said:

Based on historical CINC support aircraft usage and future requirements, and discounting the probable need of backup aircraft inventory, seven C–37A aircraft—

that is the Gulfstream V—

should minimally satisfy the existing CINC requirements.

What I cannot figure out—does the Senator from California know?—is, how many CINCs are there? Do we know how many CINCs there are?

Mrs. BOXER. Nine.

Mr. HARKIN. There are nine CINCs, so we are getting seven Gulfstream Vs for nine CINCs.

Mrs. BOXER. Plus all the other aircraft that are in the inventory.

Mr. STEVENS. Regular order, Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. HARKIN. I asked the Senator to answer a question. I asked the Senator to respond to a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor, and he can only yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. I can ask a question of the Senator from California, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That requires the Senator from Iowa to yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask a question of my friend, since that is the rule and that is being strictly enforced today, and I appreciate that. Does the Senator not agree that adding six more of these luxury planes, which would give us a total of nine Gulfstream Vs—we would have nine Gulfstream Vs; that is, one for each of the commanders, plus an inventory of other planes that include Learjets and Cessnas—does he not believe that this is going overboard in terms of the priorities we should have?

I agree with my friend, and I ask him this question as well: We are saying that we are very willing to give the generals what they need, but it is a matter of whether you get the gold-plated version or a very solid version, and isn't that what we are really talking about?

Mr. HARKIN. I think the Senator has put her finger on it: We are willing to give the generals what they need but not what they want.

Mrs. BOXER. Interesting.

Mr. HARKIN. They may want to travel in this kind of luxury, but I am not certain we ought to just give it to them. There are nine CINCs. Each one now would have their own Gulfstream V. Do we know what the per-hour operating cost is of a Gulfstream V? As best I can determine, the per-hour operating cost is over $2,000. I think it is actually higher than that, because I do not think that takes into account depreciation; I think that is just fuel and other requirements.

Let's just say it is $2,000 an hour. A four-star officer gets on one of those Gulfstream Vs and flies 2 hours someplace for a meeting and 2 hours back; that is 4 hours, $8,000 just to go to a meeting someplace and come back. That is a good use of taxpayers' dollars?

I will lay you odds that 7 times out of 10 that four-star officer could go right out here to National Airport or Dulles, get on an airplane, and get a first-class ticket—How much is a first-class ticket?—fly to that meeting, and fly back for less than $1,000.

I ask you: When is the last time you ever got on a commercial aircraft in the United States flying anywhere and saw a general or admiral on that plane? I cannot remember when. I see a lot of lieutenants and commanders and captains, but I never see an admiral or general. Then again, why would you? They are on their Gulfstream Vs, jetting around.

I am not saying there is never a purpose—there may be—but I think this is just a little bit too much. There are about 36 four-star officers in the U.S. military, I am told—about 36 four-star officers—and for that, we have over 154 jets in inventory to fly people around. What is going on here?

In fact, I know our proposal only deals with the Gulfstreams, but if I am not mistaken, the bill also provides for the purchase of five additional C–35s.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Those are the Cessnas. We are already going to buy five of these, and we are going to lease six more of the Gulfstream Vs. So it is not just the Gulfstream Vs. The Navy already has six Gulfstreams, the Air Force already has Gulfstreams, and, as I said, 70 Learjets, C–21s.

I remember one time when I went on a congressional trip—was I still in the House or the Senate? I can't remember. I may have been in the Senate. We went to Central America. It was during that war in Central America.

We flew from here to Florida, to MacDill, refueled, and we were in a little Lear. There were about six or seven of us crammed into that thing with no bathroom. But obviously, because of my Senate duties, I had to get down there to go on a trip that could not be done commercially. So we went from here to MacDill, refueled, then went to Guatemala and Honduras; and then I think we went to El Salvador; then we went to Panama City, had to refuel again, fly to MacDill, refuel again, and then fly home.

I tell you, it was not that comfortable a flight if you are one of those in a little Lear, six or seven people crammed in there. For a Senator, that is fine. I bet you a general or admiral would never do that. But we had staff. We had committee staff along with us.

I am just saying, sometimes if you are going to do these things, sometimes you have to put up with that. There is no way I could have done it commercially, so I had to take a military aircraft. You do not have to go in elaborate luxury every single time.

That is my point. I do not think there is a critical shortage of these executive jets that should take precedence over the immediate needs of our military.

Besides the sheer numbers of aircraft in each of the armed services indicating there is no shortfall, again, I repeat from the 1995 GAO report that said the armed services should ''develop the appropriate mechanisms to ensure the availability of each service's aircraft to help fulfill the OSA needs of the other services.'' In other words, the GAO concluded the armed services needed to learn to share. This is a simple concept that should be used to relieve any conceivable strain on the number of executive aircraft.

The Pentagon counters this sensible solution by claiming that existing aircraft are being fully used. However, the GAO also found that DOD's operational support aircraft fleet ''far exceeds any possible wartime requirement.''

The Defense Week article that the Senator from California referred to of May 24, 1999, had some interesting things in it. They said:

In particular, the article said, ''There are about 600 to 800 users in the DC area authorized to request SAM [VIP Special Air Mission] support for missions'' which meet prescribed criteria.

As I understand, that does not include Senators and Congressmen. At least that is what I am told. When I first read there are 600 to 800 authorized users for VIP special air missions, I thought that must include the 435 Members of the House and the 100 Senators. I am told that is not so.

I am wondering, who are these 600 to 800 people? I am wondering if some of

these jets are being used for less than really vital needs and perhaps could be used to meet the needs of the military CINCs.

Again, quoting from the Defense Week article of May 24:

Brig. Gen. Arthur Lichte, the Air Force's director of global-reach programs, says these support aircraft are all meeting other requirements [all these other aircraft that we have in inventory] so [they] could not be used by the commanders.

Again, I am wondering, why not? What are these other requirements? If the commanders cannot use them, who is using them?

Hamre says most of these support aircraft are too small for commanders' staffs. Plus, the four-stars need to be able to fly non-stop intercontinental trips while staying in contact with the president.

I am not so certain about that. I am not certain that a refueling stop in Shannon is all that burdensome.

The article goes on to say:

Some on Capitol Hill respond that the CINCs could get by with smaller staffs on board and could live with refueling stops, but Hamre and Lichte don't agree.

I do not know why not. I know a lot of times we go on congressional fact-finding trips. We stop and refuel different places. I don't know why generals can't. They can still be in contact. That does not stop your contact with the White House, simply because you land and refuel—not at all.

What about the existing support fleet?

''No,'' Hamre said, ''we don't have aircraft that can fly from here to the Persian Gulf. I suppose you could go on a C–12. You could island-hop like you did in World War II, but I mean that doesn't make any sense. This big inventory of 500 [operational support aircraft]—most of them are tiny airplanes, four-passenger, six-passenger kind of airplanes.''

That is just not so. These are not four-passenger airplanes.

Mrs. BOXER. Isn't it eight?

Mr. HARKIN. These are eight right here. How much staff does a general have to take with him when he goes to a meeting? I would like to find that out.

He said, ''The CINCs aren't [even] happy they have to live with a 12 passenger aircraft.''

Again I ask, how much staff do they need to take to these meetings they go to?

So, again, the Senator from California and I have this amendment that says basically: We ought to put this lease aside. Let's take a look at this. Let's get a good report in. Do these really meet the warmaking needs of the Pentagon?

Plus, I do not know where the facts lie on this one, but I will just say that, according to the New York Times, the lease will cost the taxpayers more than $475 million over 10 years. Purchasing the planes may prove cheaper. Some say purchasing is going to cost more; some say it will cost less. But we do know that for these aircraft, for the cost of the aircraft, plus the operation of them over the next 10 years, it is going to come in at somewhere——

Mrs. BOXER. Over $400 million.

Mr. HARKIN. I think the lease is going to cost over $475 million. And then there are operational costs. Now you are up to $600 or $700 million over the next 10 years just for these aircraft. That may be small change to the Pentagon, which is used to operating with $270 billion budgets, but that is a lot of money for our taxpayers. I just do not know where the facts lie in whether or not leasing is better than purchasing.

We have seen very little information as to the cost tradeoffs of leasing versus purchasing. We have not seen a full report from the Pentagon covering all possible options to cover these CINCs' needs, nor do we have much information as to the needs of the military for all of these such aircraft. That is why our amendment requires a report detailing the requirements and options for such aircraft as an important first step. We do not have that.

Quite frankly, regardless of how our amendment fares, I say to the chairman, and others, I plan to come back to this issue, along with my colleague from California, year after year, until we get a clearer picture. How many flights do senior officers take with senior executive aircraft? We do not even know that. What are the costs? What are the per-hour costs? What are the costs for that trip? Could that trip have been utilized with an alternative such as commercial aircraft? At what cost savings? Could some of these aircraft be sold off as excess aircraft if we better managed the total number of executive aircraft that we have?

For example, we know that senior officials and officers fly from base to base and facility to facility. They fly from Andrews Air Force Base to NAS Jacksonville or to MacDill or to other air bases around the country. Could you utilize commercial aircraft for that? Sometimes yes; sometimes no. But we need to ensure that the DOD is looking for cheaper alternatives, including commercial airline alternatives. It may be slightly less convenient, but it sure would be a lot less costly, and it would free up existing DOD aircraft we have now for the unique missions for which they say they are needed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised by the length and specificity of the argument against this amendment. This amendment, on page 104 of the bill, would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to obtain transportation for the commanders in chief, the regional commanders, to lease aircraft. It does not mandate any leasing. It authorizes leasing.

Currently these commanders in chief, regional commanders, are already flying 707 aircraft built 30, 35 years ago. Commercially, those airlines had 250 seats. They have 45 seats on those aircraft now. They are big. They are old. They are costly to maintain. It is possible to have modern replacements now.

The Senators would have us replace one a year. We will keep operating these old dumbos at enormous cost for repair and replacement of engines, instead of moving out and accepting the fact that there are planes there now, American-built planes, and the Department estimates it will cost $750 million to operate and maintain the current support fleet over the next 10 years. We would reduce that cost and put our people immediately in more cost-effective, quiet, efficient planes.

Yes, they are small compared to what they have now. Today a commander in chief takes along with him up to 45 people. This will reduce that size; there is no question about that. Further, we reduce the number of aircraft from nine to seven. They didn't mention that. This has nothing to say about all those other aircraft.

I would like to have a study of the flights of these airplanes that are owned by the Federal Government, particularly those owned and flown by the White House. We tried to get that and couldn't get it. We would like to find out who flies in the State Department airplane. We couldn't get that.

Now, be my guest and go get those, but these are commanders of our military who are serving as regional commanders of forces. I wonder if the Senate knows there are forces of the American people in 91 different countries today. We are operating at about one-third the staff we had just 5 years ago. We are trying to carry out missions that are almost impossible. Our reenlistment rate of pilots is down to less than one-third of what it was just a year ago. The deployment of our forces is overwhelming. The degree of fatigue on our managers is overwhelming.

I really never expected this kind of argument about replacing the 707s. I do not think anyone wants to continue to fly on the 707s. If nothing else, they are just old.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. STEVENS. No. I am going to table this, follow this bill through, and get it done. I can't understand that an amendment like this would delay this bill, because it is only an authorization to lease. All we have heard today, talking about the number of aircraft, is immaterial. Those aircraft are out there. They are not going to be affected by this amendment at all.

What we are trying to do is say that these commanders who stand in for the President as regional commanders in chief should have the state of the art of American industry in terms of their transportation. That is what this is. What we are doing is trying to get them to lease them, because if we started replacing them, I have to tell you, there is not money in this bill to allow us to buy seven new aircraft for these commanders. We can give them

the authority to lease them and replace them, and those leases can be options to buy later. We can fill that if we want to buy the planes later. We can't do it now, but these planes they are flying now are expensive, and they are too large. They are not what these commanders need.

A DOD report promised us a savings of $250 million over this 10-year period if they had this authority. It doesn't mandate them leasing it. It authorizes them to lease some, buy some, lease with an option to buy, whatever it might be, to get the best deal possible to replace these aircraft.

Now, in terms of maintenance alone, this option would save us a lot of money. I think the problem of having dedicated aircraft is something we ought to look at.

The Senator says he hasn't seen many four-star admirals or four-star generals on airplanes. I see them. They do not wear their uniforms on airplanes. Why should they? They would automatically be a target. It is not what we want anyway. These people are known throughout the world. I think if anyone in the world needs protection, it is the commanders in chief of the regions. We do not provide that, but we can provide them the capability for security and safety as they move around the areas over which they have command.

Talk to the people in industry. Why do you think the big industries are leasing fleets of cars now? Because after the end of a year or so, they turn them back, get a new model—no maintenance, no replacement of parts. The vehicles are out on the civilian market with a good value, because they have only been used for a short while.

We could do the same thing with these aircraft if people would wake up and use the leasing operation. We are not talking about leasing combat aircraft; we are talking about leasing transportation that is vital to the regional commanders.

Again, our section only deals with transportation for the regional commanders, not for all the 684 people. If you want to know who they are, they are people in the State Department. We will be glad to give you a list. State Department, commanders of bases overseas, they are eligible for flight on these aircraft.

But above all, I am sort of taken aback by the fact that we are giving the Department of Defense the right to think about taxpayers' money as they provide this vital transportation link for these regional commanders.

This saves money. The study shows they save money. Before they can complete the lease, they have to come back and get the money to lease. There is no money in this bill to lease. As a practical matter, I really don't understand. Here we are trying to save money. We are trying to replace these antiquated airplanes. These places these people go, most of them have no commercial connections. They just do not.

I took a trip this last week to California and down to the desert in Arizona and back here on business, down at the border to look at some problems there. I will tell the Senate about that later. There were no connections to Douglas, AZ, commercially. I thought I would get down there and see that problem to determine whether we ought to spend taxpayers' money. They have the same problem. How can they tell us what they need in these remote places of the world under their command?

And how can they come to meetings and listen to the Commander in Chief or to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs? These planes are needed by these people. I think one of the great things brought about by the Goldwater-Nichols Act was, in fact, regional commanders. It gave us the kind of command and control we needed to maintain a very efficient military, with fewer people, and utilizing the talent of some very distinguished people. I have to tell you, the longer I am here, the greater respect I have for people who get four stars on their shoulders. That is what we are talking about—the people who have come through the services and have reached the point of ultimate command—and I mean ultimate. They can make decisions in lieu of the Commander in Chief in a time of crisis; I am talking about in lieu of the President. They have the power under that act to act in a crisis.

Now, what do you want to do—let them ride commercial planes? I challenge anybody who has been out in the Pacific and has gone from place to place, from island to island, where we have our military, to figure out how to do it commercially. Even in my State, if you want to go out to Adak, you can go out and come back 2 days later.

As a practical matter, this is transportation for the 21st century. If nothing else, this Senator doesn't want to see representatives of the Nation that leads the world in building aircraft to be traveling in 1960 airplanes in the years 2001, 2002, and 2003. That is what we are talking about. There is a lot here in terms of advertising America to the world. I want these people to be flying in the best we have, because they are demonstrating this country's ability to maintain its position in the world.

I cannot believe there would be this kind of dialog about giving the authority to use a system that American business has now used very efficiently for 40 years—the leasing of equipment as opposed to buying it. I hope to God they use this authority and save us some money and put our people in safe, modern, efficient transportation.

Does the Senator want to speak before I make a motion to table?

Mr. INOUYE. For just 2 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii for 2 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, most respectfully, I have been trying to——

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object—and I will not—I wonder if the Senator from Iowa and I may have a chance to ask a question of the Senator from Alaska so that we can make our point again, because I think he misconstrued what we were saying. I think it is important to set the record straight. May we have 4 minutes between us to simply ask a question?

Mr. STEVENS. I will be pleased to enter into that kind of agreement, following the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have been trying to follow this debate as closely as possible. The explanation the Senator from California has given is that this amendment would strike provisions in the bill which allow the Secretary of the Air Force to lease six Gulfstream V jets to transport the highest ranking military officials.

There is nothing in Section 8106 that speaks of six Gulfstream V jets, nor does it speak of the highest ranking military officials. I have no idea where that came from.

What this section says is:

> The Secretary of the Air Force may obtain transportation for operational support purposes, including transportation for combatant Commanders in Chief, by lease of aircraft, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, consistent with this section, through an operating lease consistent with OMB Circular A–11.

There is nothing about Gulfstreams. There is nothing about the highest ranking military officials. But even if we did say six Gulfstream V jets for the highest military officials, I join my chairman in objecting to this amendment. We should keep in mind that fewer than 1 percent of the population of these United States have stood up and said to the rest of the world they are willing to stand in harm's way in our defense and, if necessary, give their lives. Fewer than 1 percent of us have taken that oath. The least we can do is to give them the cutting edge, and this is the cutting edge that is necessary to differentiate between defeat and victory.

So, Mr. President, I will support a motion to table this amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, let me again say what we are trying to do. We believe under this amendment, by giving the authority to lease aircraft, we will be able to get at least six aircraft in less than 2 years to replace these aircraft that are now well over 30, 40 years old. We believe the savings in retiring these aging, expensive-to-maintain 707 aircraft will be cost effective. But what is more, this move will be very good for the Department, because by pooling these aircraft they will be able to use them efficiently. Nobody will have a dedicated aircraft that is underutilized. They will be able to be used by others when not being utilized under this plan.

We adopted a similar plan last year at my suggestion, and that is when we were going to have aircraft for FEMA,

CIA, and the FBI. We formed a special unit, and they have pooled the aircraft and they are available to them. They will have them available for one or all of them, depending on the needs of the people involved. This is a cost-effective utilization of air transportation to meet the needs of our National Government. I hope we can defeat this amendment.

I am going to make a motion to table. I will be happy to consider time for the Senators to speak. They have spoken almost an hour and a half. I will honor their suggestion if they want some time before I make that motion.

Mr. HARKIN. I would be glad to do 10 minutes and wrap it up.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to complete it with 3 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa have not more than 10 minutes and the Senator from California not more than 5 minutes and I be recognized again to make a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has made a good point that the military should consider leasing and not consider purchasing. That is what our amendment does. Read our amendment. It says:

> Not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the inventory and status of operational support aircraft, Commander-in-Chief support aircraft, and command support aircraft of the Department of Defense. The report shall include a detailed discussion of the requirements for such aircraft, the foreseeable future requirements for such aircraft, the cost of leasing such aircraft, commercial alternatives to use of such aircraft, the cost of maintaining the aircraft, the capability and appropriateness of the aircraft to fulfill mission requirements, and the relevancy of the missions of the aircraft to warfighting requirements.

That is exactly what our amendment does. But we want to know, should we even lease them?

Mr. STEVENS. I have one question. The first sentence says to strike the provision on page 104.

Mr. HARKIN. Strike the provision——

Mr. STEVENS. To lease for another year.

Mr. HARKIN. It strikes the provision which allows the Department of Department to go ahead and lease. It says: Let's do a study before next March 1. What are our requirements? What are our alternatives? And let's examine the leasing versus the purchasing. We don't even have that documentation yet.

So I don't think there is such a need that we have to rush ahead and allow them to go ahead and enter these long-term leasing agreements before March 1 of next year. There is not that requirement there. They tried to put this into the supplemental appropriations bill, and that was knocked out because it wasn't an emergency. Now they have come back on the regular appropriations bill.

So all our amendment is saying, fine, leasing may be the best way to proceed, but we haven't gotten to that point yet. Do we even need these aircraft? We haven't gotten to that point yet. I make the point that I am not certain we need this. Let's take it one step at a time and see if these are really operational requirements.

The Senator also said that it would be costly; we have these old aircraft in inventory we have to repair and keep them up and put new engines in them and all that stuff. It is sort of like my old car. I have an old car, and it needs a new engine. I can put a new engine in that car, and it is going to cost me about $1,300. The car runs fine. In fact, it is a pretty darned nice car. It is just a little old and has a lot of miles on it. If I go out and buy a new car, it will cost me about $20,000. I ask you, which is the better alternative, if I am looking at it costwise? It is a lot cheaper for me to put a new engine in that old car.

These are 30-year-old, well-maintained aircraft. They are the best maintained aircraft in the world. They go through their periodic inspections, their 100-hour inspections, their annual inspections, and they have all kinds of new engines on them and everything. It is much cheaper to keep those flying, to repair them, and to keep them up than it is to go out and pay $40 million for one of these, I can assure you.

Second, my last point: The chairman says that this will not affect the number of aircraft that we have out there now. I beg to differ. It will affect the number of aircraft we have out there now, because if in fact the amendment of the Senator from California and myself is adopted, it is going to require them to take a really hard look at what they have in their inventory, at what their needs are, and at how they can better utilize them. That may affect the other aircraft out there. We may be able to meet the mission requirements of the CINCs with all of the Gulfstreams, the Learjets, the Citation jets, the 707s, the 757s, the 727s, and the DC–9s that we have out there if they are better utilized. That is the missing ingredient. We don't have that kind of an accounting. That is what our amendment calls for.

If it turns out that they really need these aircraft to meet the warmaking capabilities, and it proves that it is cheaper to do it this way than to repair and fix up the older aircraft—if that can be shown—I will be first in line to vote to make sure they get the aircraft.

But I am telling you, this Senator does not have adequate information right now to vote to spend probably upwards of $600 million to $700 million over the next 10 years to lease these Gulfstream Vs and operate them for that period of time.

That is why we need to just step back, take a deep breath, and have them to report back. One year is not going to be a big loss to them, if they have to wait one year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for the time that he has spent on working on this amendment with me and for his experience. His being in the military, I think, brings tremendous credibility to this discussion.

I thank the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii for their patience. I know that this is an amendment that they do not agree with. I know they are not thrilled that we have offered it, but they have shown great respect and have given us the time that we need to explain it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the more than 300 planes in the inventory. These are aircraft available for military administrative travel. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARY PLANES—CIVILIAN EQUIVALENT NAMES AND SPECS

C–9—military equivalent of McDonnell Douglas DC–9—twin-engine, T-tailed, medium-range, swept-wing jet aircraft. Used primarily for aeromedical evacuation missions.

Capacity: 40 litter patients, 40 ambulatory and four litter patients, or various combinations.

Number in the military: Total=34—Navy, 27; Marines, 2; Air Force, 5.

C–12 Huron—Beech Aircraft King Air, a twin turboprop passenger and cargo aircraft.

Built: Wichita, KS—Beech Aircraft Corp. (Raytheon).

Capacity: up to 8 passengers.

Number in the military Total=178—Army, 104; Navy, 51; Marines, 18; Air Force, 5.

C–20 series—Gulfstream Aerospace Gulfstream Series, these are jets.

Built: Savannah, GA—Gulfstream Aerospace Corp.

Capacity: maximum of 19.

Number in the military: Total=16—Navy, 6; Marines, 1; Air Force, 9.

C–20A—Gulfstream III.

C–20B—Gulfstream III.

C–20H—Gulfstream IV.

C–21—Learjet Series, cargo and passenger plane with turbofan jet engines.

Built: Wichita, KS—Learjet Corporation.

Capacity: 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=70—Air Force, 70.

C–22B—Boeing 727–100, primary medium-range aircraft used by the Air National Guard and National Guard Bureau to airlift personnel.

Number in the military: Total=3—Air National Guard, 3.

C–23—an all-freight version of the Shorts 330 regional airliner.

Built: Northern Ireland, UK—Short Brothers plc.

Number in the military: Total=32—Army, 32.

C–26—Fairchild Merlin/Metro, operated exclusively by the Air and Army National

Guard, it is a propeller plane with quick change passenger, medivac, and cargo interiors.

Built: San Antonio, TX—Fairchild Aircraft Corp.

Number in the military: Total=10—Army, 10.

C–32A—Boeing 757–200, equipped with two wing-mounted Pratt & Whitney 2040 engines.

Capacity: 45 passengers and 16 crew.

Number in the military: Total=4; Air Force, 4.

C–37A—Gulfstream V.

Capacity: up to 12 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

C–38A—IAI Astra SPX, primarily for operational support and distinguished visitor transport and can be configured for medical evacuation and general cargo duties.

Capacity: 11 passengers and crew.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

C–137C—Boeing 707–300, provides transportation for the vice president, cabinet and congressional members, and other high-ranking U.S. and foreign officials. It also serves as a backup for Air Force One.

Capacity: 40–50 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=2—Air Force, 2.

UC–35—Cessna Citation 560 Ultra V twin, medium range executive and priority cargo jet aircraft.

Capacity: up to 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=14—Army, 14.

CT–39G—Rockwell International, twin-jet engine, pressurized, fixed wing, monoplane.

Capacity: 8 passengers.

Number in the military: Total=3—Marines, 3.

VC–25—Boeing 757–200.

Capacity: 102.

Number in the Military: Total=2.

C–135—Boeing 707, jet airliner that has performed numerous transport and special-duty functions.

Number in the military: Total=5—Air Force, 5.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if we go through this list, you will see all of them: The C–20 series, the C–12 series, the C–21 series, the C–22B series, and it goes on and on with over 300 planes.

I thank Senator HARKIN's staff for their work in putting that together.

I want to make a point. We have an argument on the floor of the Senate. It is a very fair argument. One side says it is cheaper to lease these Gulfstreams, and others say that it may well be cheaper to buy them—forgetting about the fact that some of us think we don't need them at all. This is almost $½ billion over 10 years at a time when we are cutting virtually everything else but the military right now.

Let's face it. The FAA is almost being crippled with $300 million in rescinded funds to make our civilian skies safer. This is serious. This isn't a small piece of change.

If, as my friend says, the study comes back and shows we save money by buying these things, we will take a look at that.

I agree with the Senator from Alaska. I think there are times when of course—I know the Senator from Iowa agrees—we want to have certain planes set aside for the convenience and use of our top brass. That is not the question here. There are 300 planes in the military that they can use now. In this very bill, we are purchasing more of the Cessna Citation Ultras, which are beautiful planes that the Senator from Iowa has spoken about, to carry them around in luxury. Yes. They may have to stop to refuel, but they can keep in contact with the President of the United States. I have traveled with very impressive delegations where we have had to stop in the middle of very tenuous circumstances.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield, as an old military pilot myself, I must say that if the generals want to get someplace in a real hurry—it may be necessary—and if it is part of our warmaking capabilities, they can get in the back seat of an F–16, get inflight fueling, and they can be there a lot faster than any commercial aircraft or a Gulfstream or anything else. That is the fastest way to get there.

Mrs. BOXER. I reclaim my time. I have a brief amount of time left.

This isn't about hurting anyone in the military. My goodness. No one could respect the military more than the Senator from Iowa. I have to say that is not what this amendment is about. This amendment is about a very hard-nosed money question. Can we move these generals around in style but not in the Gulfstream version? Can we look to see what the best way to go is—leasing or purchasing? Then maybe we can save some money that we need desperately.

Our veterans need veterans cemeteries. They are being told that they have to have a 15-percent cut in the VA allocation. This includes VA hospitals. We could go on. We have military people. You want to talk about the military who have to go on food stamps or the WIC Program. The Senator from Iowa has led that charge. Maybe that is why we feel so strongly about this, that it is a matter of priorities. Respect for the generals? Absolutely. Respect for the enlisted people? Absolutely. Let's do the right thing.

All we are saying is a year's pause, have a good study done, come back together, see what the study shows, and then make the decision that is based more on fact than fiction.

Yes. The New York Times did a study. They said it is costing about $140 million more to go the leasing route. Let's see if they are right.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to stand in strong support for this amendment. This straightforward amendment to strike tens of million of dollars for luxury aircraft for military commanders, brought to the floor by Senators BOXER and HARKIN is about our men and women in uniform.

It is about the men and women that we have heard so much about over the past years, the central players in the services' readiness crisis. It is about the men and women whose lives are on the line in operations around the world. There is no question, Mr. President, that we must provide them with the necessary resources to defend themselves and the United States.

Just last year, there was a virtual consensus that the armed services were facing a readiness crisis. Last September, the Joint Chiefs testified that there was a dangerous readiness shortfall. General Henry Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, claimed that ''without relief, we will see a continuation of the downward trends in readiness . . . and shortfalls in critical skills.'' Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer stated that the military faces a ''hollow force'' without increased readiness spending. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson asserted that the Navy has a $6 billion readiness deficit. So it went for all the services.

To address the readiness shortfall, the Congress passed on emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The bill was well-intentioned in its support for the efforts of our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, something happened on the way to the front lines. The bill spent close to $9 billion, but just $1 billion of it went to address the readiness shortfall.

We added $1 billion for ballistic missile defense. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization still has not spent all that money, yet we have added another $3.5 billion for the BMDO in this bill. Last year's supplemental also added billions to what has become an expected emergency, that being our operations in Bosnia. That other unexpected emergency, the year 2000, received a billion dollars. And so it went. What happened to readiness?

It is with wonderment that the appropriations bill before us today would spend upwards of $40 million in the next fiscal year, and perhaps as much as half a billion dollars over the next ten years on luxury jets for four-star generals. Am I missing something or is this absurd? We actually have troops that qualify for food stamps and DOD can justify spending tens of millions of dollars next year for luxury jets.

This bill will allow the Air Force to lease executive business Gulfstream V jets for the military's unified and regional commanders in chief. This bill also spends $27 million for five UC–35 corporate aircraft that the Pentagon did not even ask for this year. How can this be?

According to John Hamre, the assistant secretary of defense, DOD has an inventory of almost 500 operational support airlift, or OSA, aircraft, including 70 Learjets. The Army owns 160 OSA aircraft, the Air Force 111 OSA aircraft, the Navy 89 OSA aircraft; and the Marines 24. The General Accounting Office found that DOD's operational support fleet ''far exceeded any possible wartime requirement.'' Yet, the Air Force and certain members of

Congress believe this to be a high military priority.

Mr. President, I would like my colleagues to close their eyes for a few minutes while I describe the jet that has become such a military priority. I take this directly from Gulfstream's website:

From the 100 percent fresh air control system, to the comfortably maintained 6,000 foot cabin altitude at 51,000 feet, to cabin size—a generous 1,669-cubic-feet and the longest in the industry—the Gulfstream V provides an interior environment unmatched in transoceanic business travel. The jet also offers a substantial outfitting allowance of 6,700 pounds—more than 12 percent greater than any other business aircraft current or planned—which affords owners and operators the freedom to select furnishings and equipment with minimum tradeoffs. Space-age titanium mufflers and vibration isolators eliminate hydraulic system noise. Plentiful insulation in the side panels reduces sound further, and we've even reengineered Gulfstream's trademark expansive, oval windows to lessen noise levels. The total effect is library-like science conducive to a productive trip.

Now I ask my colleagues to open their eyes and face reality. Supporting the Defense Department's misguided spending priorities is not synonymous with supporting the military. I urge my colleagues to look themselves in the mirror and credibly ask themselves if they can support corporate jets for generals while front-line troops muddle by on food stamps. Which is the higher priority?

I cannot vote to increase the defense budget by tens of billions of dollars, including tens of millions for corporate jets, which the budgets for veterans' health care, education, agriculture and other programs are facing deep cuts.

Throwing good money after bad is not tolerated at other Departments and agencies. Why is it tolerated with DOD? Defense Week reported just yesterday that the Navy has lost track of almost 1 billion dollars' worth of ammunition, arms and explosives. Additionally, DOD has yet to pass an audit. A 1998 GAO audit couldn't match more than $22 billion in DOD expenditures with obligations; it could not find over $9 billion in inventory; and it documented millions in overpayments to contractors. GAO concluded that ''no major part of DOD has been able to pass the test of an independent audit.''

Mr. President, we need some accountability in the Defense Department. Voting for the Boxer-Harkin amendment shows that the Senate supports our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I think it would be interesting for the Senator to know that the plane of our commander in Europe, General Clark, who we all see on the news—and we have met with him respectively, and our committee has twice—the C–9A, cannot land at half of the airfields in Europe because of environmental restrictions.

I don't understand why we can't move to make available the process that has been pioneered and developed by American industry and even States and cities. They lease their aircraft. They lease their fleets of cars. It is cost effective. We are giving them the authority to do this. We are not mandating them to do it by the provision of the bill.

But if people want this substitute amendment—the Senator from California would require a study for more than a year—we would be back here again.

But we faced this. People forget. In the current year appropriations bill, we required an assessment of consolidated CINC support aircraft. It was required to be submitted, and it was submitted by March 1. Here it is. It led to this provision. We have had a year. We had the study. They have told us what they need.

I hope the Senate will support the need as outlined, but the needs can be met by exercising the authority. We are not mandating anything in this bill.

I move to table the amendment, and 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 541. On this question, 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 Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent due to a death in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Akaka	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Gregg	Murkowski
Breaux	Hagel	Murray
Brownback	Hatch	Nickles
Bryan	Helms	Reed
Bunning	Hollings	Reid
Burns	Hutchinson	Roberts
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
Dodd	Landrieu	Thomas
Domenici	Leahy	Thompson
Dorgan	Lieberman	Thurmond
Enzi	Lott	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Lugar	Warner

NAYS—31

Abraham	Byrd	Feinstein
Allard	Conrad	Graham
Baucus	Daschle	Grams
Bayh	Durbin	Grassley
Bingaman	Edwards	Harkin
Boxer	Feingold	Johnson
Kohl	Robb	Torricelli
Lautenberg	Rockefeller	Wellstone
Levin	Santorum	Wyden
Lincoln	Sarbanes	
Mikulski	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	McCain

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senate what we are going to do here. We have resolved, I tell the Senate, all outstanding issues now. I will offer here a package for myself and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and a series of colloquies, and then we will have final passage on the bill.

All of the remaining amendments—some that we thought would be controversial—have now been resolved. I do thank the Senators for their cooperation. I am waiting for just one item.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 578, the Roberts amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 602 TO AMENDMENT NO. 578

(Purpose: To provide for the suspension of certain sanctions against India and Pakistan)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator BROWNBACK and ask unanimous consent it be considered an amendment to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for Mr. BROWNBACK, proposes an amendment numbered 602 to amendment No. 578.

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

TITLE—SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST INDIA AND PAKISTAN

SEC. _1. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective for the period of five years commencing on the date of enactment of this Act, the sanctions contained in the following provisions of law shall not apply to India and Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under those provisions arising prior to that date:

(1) Section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa).

(2) Section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1) other than subsection (b)(2)(B), (C), or (G).

(3) Section 2(b)(4) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(4)).

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMMERCIAL EXPORTS OF DUAL-USE ARTICLES AND TECHNOLOGY.—The sanction contained in section 102(b)(2)(G) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)(2)(G)) shall not apply to India or Pakistan with respect to any grounds for the imposition of that sanction arising prior to the date of enactment of this Act if imposition of the sanction (but for this paragraph) would deny any license for the export of any dual-use article, or related dual-use technology (including software), listed on the Commerce Control List of the

Export Administration Regulations that would not contribute directly to missile development or to a nuclear weapons program. For purposes of this subsection, an article or technology that is not primarily used for missile development or nuclear weapons programs.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS WAIVER OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The restriction on assistance in section 102(b)(2)(B), (C), or (G) of the Arms Export Control Act shall not apply if the President determines, and so certifies to Congress, that the application of the restriction would not be in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) no waiver under paragraph (1) should be invoked for section 102(b)(2)(B) or (C) of the Arms Export Control Act with respect to any party that initiates or supports activities that jeopardize peace and security in Jammu and Kashmir;

(B) the broad application of export controls to nearly 300 Indian and Pakistani entities is inconsistent with the specific national security interest of the United States and that this control list requires refinement.

(C) export controls should be applied only to those Indian and Pakistani entities that make direct and material contributions to weapons of mass destruction and missile programs and only to those items that can contribute such programs.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees listing those Indian and Pakistani entities whose activities contribute directly and materially to missile programs or weapons of mass destruction programs.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—A license for the export of a defense article, defense service, or technology is subject to the same requirements as are applicable to the export of items described in section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)), including the transmittal of information and the application of congressional review procedures described in that section.

(f) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION.—Upon the expiration of the initial five-year period of suspension of the sanctions contained in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the President may renew the suspension with respect to India, Pakistan, or both for additional periods of five years each if, not less than 30 days prior to each renewal of suspension, the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.

(g) RESTRICTION.—The authority of subsection (a) may not be used to provide assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to economic support fund assistance) except for—

(1) assistance that supports the activities of nongovernmental organizations;

(2) assistance that supports democracy or the establishment of democratic institutions; or

(3) humanitarian assistance.

(h) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act prohibits the imposition of sanctions by the President under any provision of law specified in subsection (a) or (b) by reason of any grounds for the imposition of sanctions under that provision of law arising on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. __2. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 620E(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2375(e)).

(2) The India-Pakistan Relief Act (title IX of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, as contained in section 101(a) of Public Law 105–277).

SEC. __3. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. These amendments pertain to the Pakistan issue that has been discussed. They have been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 602) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the underlying amendment itself, as amended, be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 578), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 547.

AMENDMENT NO. 603 TO AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. STEVENS. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator BIDEN to that amendment and ask unanimous consent it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 603 to amendment No. 547.

The amendment is as follows:

In amendment No. 547, on page 1, line 5, strike ''shall'' and insert ''nay.''

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 603) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the underlying amendment itself, as amended, be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 547), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator NICKLES' amendment No. 551. The amendment is acceptable to both sides. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 551) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 575, 580, 586, AND 590, AS MODIFIED

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk modifications to four amendments. These are modifications to amendments currently pending on the list. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be modified and that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are modified and agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 575, 580, 586, and 590) were modified and agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 575, AS MODIFIED

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $4,000,000 may be made available for the Advanced Helmet System Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 580, AS MODIFIED

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress recognizes and supports, as being fundamental to the national defense, the ability of the Armed Forces to test weapons and weapon systems thoroughly, and to train members of the Armed Forces in the use of weapons and weapon systems before the forces enter hostile military engagements.

(2) It is the policy of the United States that the Armed Forces at all times exercise the utmost degree of caution in the training with weapons and weapon systems in order to avoid endangering civilian populations and the environment.

(3) In the adherence to these policies, it is essential to the public safety that the Armed Forces not test weapons or weapon systems, or engage in training exercises with live ammunition, in close proximity to civilian populations unless there is no reasonable alternative available.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there should be a thorough investigation of the circumstances that led to the accidental death of a civilian employee of the Navy installation in Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the wounding of four other civilians during a live-ammunition weapons test at Vieques, including a reexamination of the adequacy of the measures that are in place to protect the civilian population during such training;

(2) the Secretary of Defense should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition training on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Congressional Defense Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is not available an alternative training site with no civilian population located in close proximity;

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the training be carried out;

(C) measures to provide the utmost level of safety to the civilian population are to be in place and maintained throughout the training; and

(D) training with ammunition containing radioactive materials that could cause environmental degradation should not be authorized.

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the Secretary of Defense decides to resume live-ammunition weapons training on the Island of Vieques, consult with the Governor on a regular basis regarding the measures being taken from time to time to protect civilians from harm from the training.

AMENDMENT NO. 586, AS MODIFIED

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Army, up to $10,000,000 may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 590, AS MODIFIED

At the end of the general provisions, add the following:

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE'' (other than the funds appropriated for space launch facilities), up to $7,300,000 may be available, in addition to other funds appropriated under that heading for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for space launch facilities for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules.

(b) The funds set aside under subsection (a) may not be obligated for any purpose other than the purpose specified in subsection (a).

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 604

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 604.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 106, line 4, strike ''The Communications Act'' and insert ''(a) The Communications Act of 1934''.

On page 107, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

(b)(1) Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report which shall—

(A) set forth the anticipated schedule (including specific dates) for—

(i) preparing and conducting the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a); and

(ii) depositing the receipts of the competitive bidding process;

(B) set forth each significant milestone in the rulemaking process with respect to the competitive bidding process;

(C) include an explanation of the effect of each requirement in subsection (a) on the schedule for the competitive bidding process and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) when compared with the schedule for the competitive bidding and any post-bidding activities (including the deposit of receipts) that would otherwise have occurred under section 337(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 337(b)(2)) if not for the enactment of subsection (a);

(D) set forth for each spectrum auction held by the Federal Communications Commission since 1993 information on—

(i) the time required for each stage of preparation for the auction;

(ii) the date of the commencement and of the completion of the auction;

(iii) the time which elapsed between the date of the completion of the auction and the date of the first deposit of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(iv) the dates of all subsequent deposits of receipts from the auction in the Treasury; and

(E) include an assessment of how the stages of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a), including preparation, commencement and completion, and deposit of receipts, will differ from similar stages in the auctions referred to in subparagraph (D).

(2) Not later than October 5, 2000, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Federal Communications Commission shall each submit to the appropriate congressional committees the report which shall—

(A) describe the course of the competitive bidding process required by subsection (a) through September 30, 2000, including the amount of any receipts from the competitive bidding process deposited in the Treasury as of September 30, 2000; and

(B) if the course of the competitive bidding process has included any deviations from the schedule set forth under paragraph (1)(A), an explanation for such deviations from the schedule.

(3) The Federal Communications Commission may not consult with the Director in the preparation and submittal of the reports required of the Commission by this subsection.

(4) In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the following:

(A) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the Senate.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 604) was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 576 AND 585

Mr. STEVENS. I call up amendments Nos. 576 and 585 and ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent amendments Nos. 576 and 585 be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 576 and 585) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there is just one remaining item.

AMENDMENT NO. 574

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator HUTCHISON's amendment No. 574, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 574) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 582

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up Senator KENNEDY's amendment No. 582.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator LOTT's name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 582) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SMITH of New Hampshire be added as a cosponsor of the Kennedy amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. That is amendment No. 582, which we just adopted.

AMENDMENT NO. 548

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, have I called up amendment No. 548?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has not called up that amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I urge the adoption of that amendment. It has been cleared.

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

The amendment (No. 548) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 579 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment No. 579 by Mr. DURBIN, has that been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that that be withdrawn.

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

The amendment (No. 579) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 583 WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Amendment No. 583 by Mr. LEVIN, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be withdrawn.

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

The amendment (No. 583) was withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator EDWARDS be added as a cosponsor of Biden amendment No. 547.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 587 AND 605 THROUGH 607, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment we had listed as No. 587, which is the remainder of the managers' package.

There is the amendment of Senator COVERDELL, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution; an amendment by myself for Senator BOND concerning procurement; an amendment pertaining to the McGregor Range Withdrawal Act in New Mexico for Senator DOMENICI; an amendment regarding military land withdrawals for myself. I ask that they be considered en bloc as the remainder of the managers' package. They should be separately numbered at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and on behalf of other Senators, proposes amendments en bloc numbered 587 and 605 through 607.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 587

(Purpose: To provide funds for the purchase of four (4) F–15E aircraft)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . In addition to funds appropriated elsewhere in this Act, the amount appropriated in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' is hereby increased by $220,000,000 only to procure four (4) F–15E aircraft; *Provided*, that the amount provided in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for National Missile Defense; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''National Guard and Reserve Equipment'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 on a pro-rata basis; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft procurement, Air Force'' is hereby reduced by $70,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts; *Provided further*, that the amount provided in Title III of this Act under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'' is hereby reduced by $50,000,000 to reduce the total amount available for Spares and Repair Parts.

AMENDMENT NO. 605

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the investigation into the June 25, 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers)

At the appropriate place, insert:

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On June 25, 1996, a bomb detonated not more than 80 feet from the Air Force housing complex known as Khobar Towers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 members of the Air Force, and injuring hundreds more;

(2) An FBI investigation of the bombing, soon to enter its fourth year, has not yet determined who was responsible for the attack; and

(3) The Senate in S. Res. 273 in the 104th Congress condemned this terrorist attack in the strongest terms and urged the United States Government to use all reasonable means available to the Government of the United States to punish the parties responsible for the bombings.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) The United States Government must continue its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing until every terrorist involved is identified, held accountable, and punished;

(2) The FBI, together with the Department of State, should report to Congress no later than December 31, 1999, on the status of its investigation into the Khobar Towers bombing; and

(3) Once responsibility for the attack has been established the United States Government must take steps to punish the parties involved.

(The text of the amendments (Nos. 606 and 607) is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 587 and 605 through 607) were agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, are there any further amendments that need to be disposed of that would qualify?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

STRATEGIC AIRLIFT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to address the question of strategic airlift. In this bill, the Managers have attempted to accelerate and increase funding for new modern programs, specifically the C–17, in lieu of investing scarce resources in older aircraft.

Mr. President, currently C–17s are only assigned to a few bases. We recognize some members are concerned that by focusing on the C–17, those strategic airlift bases without C–17s will suffer. I recognize this legitimate concern and want to ask the Chairman his views on the basing of C–17 aircraft. Would the Senator agree with me that C–17s should be assigned to additional bases to replace aging C–141 and C–5 aircraft?

Mr. STEVENS. I fully agree with the Senator's statement. I believe that C–17s should be used to replace many other strategic aircraft and that the basing strategy of the Air Force needs to take this into account.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Chairman agree that one of the bases that should have top priority for C–17s is Dover Air Force Base in Delaware?

Mr. STEVENS. I strongly agree. Dover is one of the key supply bases for all of our operations in Europe and the Middle East. I think it requires the C–17 as soon as possible. The bill before the Senate adds multi-year authority to purchase more C–17s and I think both our Pacific based forces and forces designated to supply Europe need C–17s to stay modern and ready.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator for his comments. He and I have both expressed support in the past for getting C–17s assigned to the Pacific. I am glad to hear him say that Dover Air Force Base is also a very high priority for C–17s.

I stand ready to work with the Senator on ensuring that our Pacific bases and Dover Air Force Base receive the C–17s as expeditiously as possible.

MARSHALL FOUNDATION AND JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I commend the Chairman for recognizing the importance of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, JROTC, for our nation's high schools through his support of the program in this bill.

I ask if the Chairman is familiar with the George C. Marshall Foundation, which assists in the training of ROTC cadets nationwide.

This foundation has worked for over 20 years to develop the Marshall ROTC award and seminar. The Marshall Foundation now wishes to adapt this leadership program for the JROTC.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my good friend from Hawaii asks an important question. I am familiar with the Marshall Foundation and am interested in the prospect of adapting this program to the Junior ROTC.

The committee would be interested in any support the Department of Defense could provide to this important mission. The Marshall Foundation has helped to promote ethical leadership for ROTC cadets and midshipmen, and we all know that any effort to improve citizenship in the nation's youth should be supported. The Department of Defense should support the Marshall Foundation.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chairman.

JOINT COMPUTER-AIDED ACQUISITION AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Will my friend, the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who also ably serves as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, the Senator from Alaska, yield for a colloquy?

Mr. STEVENS. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe the Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support, JCALS, program is one of the most successful joint defense programs in the information technology area. It was begun in 1991 to automate the acquisition and logistics processes that support the Defense Department's weapon systems—

to provide a paperless acquisition and procurement process across all major defense agencies and commands. For example, at the Defense Logistics Agency, the Electronic Folderization Contract used to require 126 tons of paper and 100 days for an acquisition cycle. As a direct result of JCALS, the process is now paperless and the acquisition cycle takes just 15 days. The DOD estimates that JCALS will save $2.3 billion through 2014 just by digitizing documents that now are prepared in paper form.

Is my understanding correct that the FY 2000 Defense Appropriations bill now before the Senate contains the President's budget request of $154.1 million for JCALS, with $121.8 million in the Army Operations and Maintenance account and $32.3 million in the Army Other Procurement account?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman for his assurances. If I may inquire further, is it also my understanding that it is the committee's intent that all of these JCALS funds, including those in the Operations and Maintenance account allocated for defense information infrastructure (DII) purposes, are to be spent exclusively on activities directly related to JCALS?

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct that it is our strong intention that all JCALS funds, including those allocated for so-called defense information infrastructure, be used exclusively for direct JCALS work, as provided in the budget request.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman. If he would yield for a final question, am I correct in my understanding that it is the Committee's further intent that all JCALS defense information infrastructure funds provided in the Army Operations & Maintenance account, approximately $20 million, are to be allocated to the JCALS southeast regional technical center currently located in Fairmont, West Virginia? I am advised that to the maximum extent practicable, the contractor plans to use these funds in Hinton, West Virginia, to further develop JCALS capabilities to support weapons systems.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for his clarification and assistance with this most important issue.

IMPROVED MATERIALS POWERTRAIN ARCHITECTURES FOR 21ST CENTURY TRUCKS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my request for $8 million for ''Improved HMMWV Research'' under Army RDT&E, ''Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology'' was incorporated in this year's defense appropriations bill. These funds are intended to initiate a third phase of the design, demonstration and validation of ultralight, steel-based structures and advanced powertrain architectures on high volume truck platforms.

This research effort, competitively selected by the Army in fiscal year 1999 subsequent to the submittal of the President's Budget is titled ''Improved Materials Powertrain Architectures for 21st Century Trucks,'' IMPACT. The full program will cover light/medium military payloads up to five tons, including applications with an open or closed bed configuration currently serviced by several of the Army's HMMWV variants.

Kentucky is a large commercial producer and Army base user of such vehicles, and now, through the University of Louisville's involvement in this effort, it will also play an important research role in their design and testing. The military should realize significant procurement and O&M cost savings as a result.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for correctly clarifying the intent of these funds.

SOUTH CAROLINA-NEW YORK CANCER PREVENTION AND TELEHEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President I would like the attention of my colleagues to point out a fine program worthy of funding in the Defense Appropriations bill. the South Carolina-New York Cancer Prevention and Telehealth Program design will build on the successful prostate cancer prevention, research, and telemedicine protocol which has already been established at the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC) through the support of the Department of Defense. The current protocol will be expanded to employ real-time, state-of-the-art telemedicine training and technology to prevent, detect, and diagnose prostate cancer in our men in uniform. The program will utilize expertise of leading medical institutions such as MUSC and Sloan Kettering Memorial Cancer Center to provide our military servicemen with treatment at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Keller Army Community Hospital at the US Military Academy at West Point, and the Beaufort Naval Hospital.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I appreciate the distinguished Senator bringing this program to the Senate's attention. Last Year, I supported including the MUSC telehealth program in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that the continued expansion of this program should be included in this FY 2000 bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. STEVENS. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. I, too, supported this program, and as you know I am committed to promoting the best health care possible for the men and women who serve our country. Briefly Senator, would you explain who the primary beneficiaries of this program would be?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I appreciate the Chairman's support and would point out that past and present cancer research demonstrate that these telemedicine techniques would be beneficial to military populations. this telehealth program will replicate the success of the South Carolina model in New York. Once validation of this has been accomplished, a much broader application can be made to other types of cancers at military sites throughout the nation.

Mr. STEVENS. I assure my colleague that we will continue to work together as this bill moves forward.

SENSOR NETWORK DEMONSTRATION

Mr. COVERDELL . Mr. President, as the Chairman knows, the threat of chemical and biological warfare agent incidents due to accidents or acts of terrorism is real. I applaud the attention and support provided by the Committee in S. 1122 to research activities on detection and response technologies to these threats. It has come to my attention that interferometric sensors are one of the most promising technologies for creating relatively inexpensive, small, adaptable, highly sensitive chemical detectors. Such sensors are ideally suited for deployment in domestic emergency warning networks when integrated with technologies such as geographic information systems. Is it the committee's intention that all promising detection technologies, including interferometric sensors, be part of the Department's chemical and biological defense research program?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, the committee directs the Department of Defense to explore all promising detector technologies including interferometric sensors.

Mr. COVERDELL. As the committee noted in its report on S. 1122, the Marine Corps' Chemical Biological Incident Response Force, also known as CBIRF, has an important responsibility in responding to chemical/biological threats and that their activities should be fully integrated with the Department's chemical-biological defense program. It is my understanding that the Marine Corps is prepared to conduct a coordinated civilian and military chemical incident demonstration that would integrate sophisticated sensor technology like that interferometric sensors I just mentioned, into a detection network. My area of the country would make an ideal place for such a demonstration because of the presence of chemical agents and demilitarization facilities in the region and because the region has been the target of terrorist activities in the past. Does the committee agree that such a joint civilian and military exercise is an appropriate part of developing chemical and biological detection technologies and can be funded out of the additional funds made available by the committee under Marine Corps Program Wide Support?

Mr. STEVENS. The committee agrees that such a demonstration by the Marine Corps CBIRF unit is an appropriate activity and should be considered through funding currently available in the bill.

FUEL CELL POWER SYSTEMS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, fuel and power logistics support are mission critical elements for the success of the Air Force ''Air Expeditionary Force Deployment'' concept. The Defense Department has long recognized that fuel cell power systems can reduce the logistics requirements for batteries and liquid fuels, and improve operational effectiveness of various military systems. The Air Force Research Laboratory is the original developer of a polymer membrane material that can improve performance and significantly lower the cost of fuel cells. Unfortunately, reductions in the FY 2000 Air Force Science and Technology budget threaten to terminate Air Force investments in fuel cell development.

I commend my good friend Chairman STEVENS and my good friend and colleague in the Senate, Senator INOUYE, the Ranking Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for the Committee's efforts to adequately fund the Air Force's Science and Technology programs.

I believe that the Air Force should continue to pursue improvements to polymer processing technique and to transition the membrane material for fuel cell production. There are several specific missions and applications that will benefit from fuel cell technology including Air Expeditionary Force Deployment (AEFD), Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE), Rapid Global Mobility (RGM) and battlefield computers that need to operate 16 to 32 times longer than heavy battery powered systems. In addition, future Air Force mission plans are based on space missions at or above the edge of the earth's stratosphere. In these missions fuel cells can play a major role in meeting the energy requirements and improving mission efficiency and effectiveness.

The commercial and military fuel cell market projections are significant—greater than $100 billion per year by the year 2006. Seldom is the opportunity for across the board dual use benefit for the government and commercial sector as vivid as it is for fuel cells. Chairman STEVENS, I'm sure that you will agree that the Air Force should pursue the prototype scale-up, optimization and full-scale demonstration of an advanced solid polymer electrolyte fuel cell that uses PBO based membranes.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank my good friend and colleague, Senator KENNEDY, for his kind remarks regarding this Committee's work on the FY 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill. I recognize the importance of investing in logistics technologies that can extend our military capabilities and can lower the logistics burden for the Air Expeditionary Force Deployment concept.

I agree with my colleague that development of the PBO fuel cell membrane material is important. The membrane is a critical component of the fuel cell, in terms of its performance and cost. Improvements to the fuel cell membrane will result in direct benefits to our military readiness.

Mr. STEVENS. I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his kind remarks about this important Defense spending bill. I share the Senator's concern about levels of investment by the Air Force in Science and Technology. In the past, wise investments in Science and Technology resulted in many of the military systems on which our men and women in the military depend today.

The Air Force Air Expeditionary Force Deployment concept is of great interest to the Committee. Fuel Cells can reduce the logistics burden for many military systems used in peace keeping and humanitarian relief operations, as well as for combat operations. I agree that the Air Force should consider the development of fuel cell membrane materials.

HIGH SECURITY LOCK PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is both important and timely—the security of our nation's secrets and classified material.

Two days ago a bipartisan committee released a report detailing a level of espionage that few Americans expected. American's most vital nuclear information was stolen from the very places that were supposed to be the most secure. I am not here to cast blame but, rather, wish to discuss a program designed to help reduce the risk of this type of travesty.

The Department of Defense has in place a Federal Specification, FF–L–2740, which sets the minimum requirements for locks to be used on any container storing classified materials. The Department, to its credit, is near completion of a program to retro-fit all containers which do not currently meet that specification.

However, there remains an area where our classified materials are vulnerable. As Senator STEVENS knows, contractors also store classified documents throughout the country. Unfortunately, they often do so in containers bearing locks which do not meet Federal Specification FF–L–2740. So, I would ask my colleague, Senator STEVENS, does he believe that our nation's classified documents should be properly stored, whether housed at a governmental agency or contractor's office?

Mr. STEVENS. I respond to the Senator from Kentucky that I absolutely support the safe storage of all classified documents. For this reason, I was happy to accommodate your request to include an additional $10 million dollars for the specific purpose of retrofitting security containers managed by contractors with locks which meet or exceed federal specification FF–L–2740.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator and applaud his leadership on this national security issue.

I also want to make the entire Senate aware of a letter written by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Senators SHELBY and KERREY wrote to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence and pointed out that ''It appears the outdated, non-compliant locks still employed by Defense contractors cannot adequately prevent surreptitious entry.'' They go on to state that ''FF–L–2740 compliant locks are more cost-effective than the devices currently in use.'' Finally, they close by stating that they ''believe DOD should consider directing the retrofit of Defense contractors' equipment.''

I thank the Senator from Alaska for his support of the $10 million appropriation for this retrofit program. His leadership will help prevent the type of espionage that has dominated the news in recent days.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments.

TROOPS TO TEACHERS PROGRAM

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I have been concerned that the extension and improvement of the Troops-to-Teachers program recently authorized in the FY 2000 National Defense Authorization bill, S. 1059, Section 579, might not be funded this year. As my colleagues are well aware, this program will provide excellent assistance to retired military personnel in obtaining teaching credentials to enable them to make the transition from the military to the classroom in an expedited way. Retired military personnel are highly trained professionals, particularly in scientific and technical fields—an area in which the nation's school systems are in dire need of trained professionals. Troops-to-teachers offer stipends to personnel retiring from the military to obtain teaching credentials or vocational instruction certificates needed for primary through secondary schools. It's program by which everyone wins.

I am advised that the President's budget requests $18 million in funding for FY 2000 under the jurisdiction of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Since the Defense Authorization bill would extend Department of Defense management over the program until it transfers responsibility to the Department of Education at a date not later than October 1, 2001, it is essential that the funding be maintained during this period of transition.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his support for this initiative which I sponsored in this year's Defense Authorization bill. I agree that it is a critical program benefiting our nation's children and

schools. While I recognize the Senator from New Mexico's concerns, I believe it is important to remember that the intent of this initiative is to transfer the Troops to Teachers program to the Department of Education. Funding to increase and strengthen this important program is meant to come from the Department of Education, not the Department of Defense. Furthermore, we agreed to delay transfer of this program from DOD to DOE until 2001 in order to ensure a smooth transition which affords minimal disruption to the current program and infrastructure. Our legislation clearly stipulates that expansion of this program through an infusion of funds is meant to be done at the Department of Education with Department of Education funds and not while the program is being transferred from the DOD. I am committed to working with my colleagues, including the Senator from New Mexico who is an original cosponsor of this measure, to ensure that the appropriate funds are allocated for the Department of Education allowing this agency to reform and strengthen the program as authorized by the Senate.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I fully support that view and appreciate his leadership on this important initiative. The Nation's schools and the Nation's students will be the better for it. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DDG–51 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT FUNDING

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to a funding provision of the FY 2000 Defense Authorization Bill that passed after the Appropriations Committee had completed its military budget mark-up last month. Title X of the Authorization Bill allows the Secretary of the Navy to expend no more than $190 million for the advance procurement of components to support the planned construction of DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers in Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003. The Navy, as the Chairman knows, has already written to Congress that it will need $371 million for this purpose by FY 2001, but the obligation of some of this amount next fiscal year may reduce programmatic risks.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair of the Senate Armed Services Seapower Subcommittee for highlighting the DDG–51 advance procurement provision of the FY 2000 Defense Authorization Bill. I am aware of this initiative and strongly support it as a means of providing the Secretary of the Navy with the flexibility to release up to 50% of the DDG–51 advance procurement budget in FY 2000 should he determine that vendor and supplier base stability warrants such expenditures.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his understanding and support of this critical shipbuilding amendment.

PROCUREMENT OF A 20TH LARGE, MEDIUM SPEED ROLL ON/ROLL OFF VESSEL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The Marine Corps has an unfunded requirement for one additional sealift ship to complete their Maritime Prepositioning Force Enhancement [MPF (E)] program. In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Lieutenant General Martin Steele concluded that ''obtaining a 20th Large, Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off vessel (LMSR) and converting an LMSR to meet all MPF (E) requirements is the best solution to our third ship requirement.'' General Steele also notes that the situation in Kosovo has highlighted the need for the additional ship. In light of these comments, I believe that it is essential that Congress fund the procurement of the 20th LMSR.

Mr. INOUYE. The Army has agreed to release an LMSR to the Marine Corps as long as Congress provides funding in the Fiscal Year 2000 defense budget for the construction of a new ship to replace the one given to the Marines. This presents us with an excellent opportunity to fulfill both requirements.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I agree. Funding the vessel will be a win, win, win proposition for the military. The Marine Corps will get their third MPF (E) in a timely manner and at minimal cost, the Army could reach an end state with all eight ships for prepositioning being identical, and the new ship would fill a current sealift shortage of 70,000 square feet of RO/RO in surge sealift. The previous LMSRs have been delivered ahead of schedule and under budget. Funding the 20th ship at this time will save taxpayer dollars in the long run, by keeping the production lien open.

Mr. STEVENS. There is a clear military requirement for the procurement of this ship. Unfortunately, we are working under tight budget restrictions. Should funds become available, I believe that Congress should give careful consideration to procuring a 20th LMSR to meet the Marine Corps' prepositioning needs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their willingness to work with me on this issue.

INNOVATIVE READINESS TRAINING

Mr. DORGAN. I understand that the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill contains $20 million for innovative readiness training. Under this program, the Department of Defense trains Active Duty, Guard and Reserve personnel by providing ''real world'' experience here in the US which is similar to what might be encountered in Overseas Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Programs. Under the Innovative Readiness Program, the Walking Shield American Indian Society has provided such training opportunities on American Indian reservations especially those located in the states of North and South Dakota and Montana. Without the support and cooperation of the Walking Shield American Indian Society, many of the engineering and medical projects conducted by the Department of Defense would not have been possible. This type of civilian-military program has a very positive impact on recruiting and retention and should be continued in FY 2000.

I understand that the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 2000 Appropriations bill for the Department of Defense notes that the Committee believes that the Department should expand the scope of readiness initiatives to include Native American groups, when appropriate and compatible with mission requirements. Is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, it is.

Mr. DORGAN. Are you familiar with the work of Project Walking Shield and the Walking Shield American Indian Society which conduct health, housing, road construction and other projects suitable for military training on Indian Reservations?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I am familiar with the work of this excellent group and the benefits it provides not only to the military but to the tribes served by its activities.

Mr. DORGAN. Would you agree that this group provides the kinds of training opportunities envisioned for the Innovative Readiness Program and it should continue its partnership with the Department and its support and cooperation in Fiscal Year 2000?

Mr. STEVENS. This type of partnership is one we are trying to encourage.

Mr. INOUYE. I share my colleague's enthusiasm for this excellent program.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I agree that the Society's work is what we want to encourage in this account.

JROTC

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to engage the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, in a brief colloquy regarding the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program (JROTC).

As Chairman STEVENS may know, the Chicago Public Schools have developed and implemented a very successful JROTC program. Since the program began, it has served over 7,500 cadets from all four branches of the armed services and helped these students achieve better grades, attendance, conduct, and higher graduation rates. The Chicago Public Schools are now in need of expanding the successful JROTC program to an additional 10 high schools, including the Chicago Military Academy at Bronzeville. And, they are attempting to enter partnerships with all of the branches of the armed services in order to better serve interested students.

The Senate bill includes an increase for JROTC of $3.5 million. Is it the understanding of Chairman STEVENS that successful programs like the one in Chicago should be able to work with the Department of Defense and the various branches to receive funding?

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the fine work being done by the Chicago Public Schools in the area of JROTC. It is an example of a program that works. It is

my understanding that a number of Chicago high schools would like to include JROTC as part of their curriculum. I believe that the level of funding for JROTC in the Senate bill would give programs like the one in the Chicago Public Schools an opportunity to work with the branches of the armed services in order to expand.

BANKING SERVICES ON DOMESTIC BASES

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the Department of Defense is currently drafting proposed regulations to establish a procedure on how military bases are to solicit and select bids from financial institutions to provide banking services on domestic military bases. The regulations are likely to be issued in June of this year. I understand that the regulations may establish a presumption in favor of bids received from local banks over the bids received from any other bank.

It is important that these new regulations not prevent base commanders from approving a bid from a financial institution that specializes in providing banking services to military personnel, if its bid would provide lower cost and more convenient banking services than a bid submitted by a local bank. There are several financial institutions in this country that have made it their business to provide banking services to our armed forces. Their ability to provide affordable and convenient banking services to our military personnel is evident from the bids they have won to establish branches at bases across the country. The Department of Defense should hold an open and competitive bidding process for the establishment of bank branches on military installations and should not shut out these specialized banks from the process.

I do not suggest that the location of a bank not be a consideration in the selection process. However, it should not be the primary criterion. The cost and convenience of banking services for our military personnel should be the overriding factor in determining the bid that is selected, regardless of whether it is a bid from a local bank or a specialized military bank. I intend to follow this regulation closely as it is developed. If it is not written in a manager that best serves the interests of our military personnel, I may seek a legislative change of this policy.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank my colleague from Missouri for bringing this issue to the attention of this body. I agree that it is an issue of concern, and I intend to work with my colleague should a legislative solution be necessary.

BIOENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS RESEARCH

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the Defense Department needs the capability to assess and prevent both the adverse impacts of its operations and training activities on the environment, as well as the adverse health effects of contaminated environments on its troops and employees. One particular area of interest is in bioenvironmental hazards research, which focuses on the development of biosensors and biomarkers of exposure for human and ecological system.

The Office of Naval Research (ONR) and the Naval Oceanographic Office (NAVOCEANO) are currently expanding existing research capabilities in basic and applied environmental sciences of aquatic systems. The purpose of this research is both to understand the processes of riverine and gulf systems and to understand the impacts of human development on estuaries and harbor systems throughout the world. This work complements other ''brown water'' research initiatives in ONR, particularly the STRATAFORM program which is looking at issues of sea level change, climate variability, and riverine runoff.

The joint technology development of the biosensors can be used in autonomous underwater vehicles, which have direct application in support of NAVOCEANO military surveys in the Littoral Zones and the pre-invasion mission to detect mines and obstacles for clearance/avoidance in the Very Shallow Water (VSW) and Surf Zone (SZ) approaches to the amphibious landing areas.

Specifically, the biosensor's role during military surveys conducted by NAVOCEANO will be to collect the natural ''background'' environmental harmful agents to personnel that work in the waters of the littoral zones. Development of this definitive database will support the intelligence requirements of the SEAL, EOD, and amphibious assault teams. Moreover, biosensors will improve the probability of mission success, endurance and survivability of SEAL swimmers through detection of harmful agents during the initial environmental surveys. This health-risk assessment will involve the prediction and monitoring of waters polluted (either naturally or by intention or both by the opposing forces) with heavy metals, microbial hazards, chemical hazards, environmental chemicals, toxic organisms, and areas of outflow from waste treatment plants prior to the hunt for mines and obstacles.

Congress should encourage the Defense Department and the Navy to pursue research and development of technologies and methods for better measuring and understanding the full range of impacts of biological hazards, including biological warfare, to humans (both military and civilian) and other living organisms. This will improve our ability to develop suitable preparations or responses to such hazards.

I would like to ask my colleague from Alaska, would he be willing to look at this need and, if appropriate, provide additional support for this research effort before we are asked to give final approval to the Defense Appropriations bill later this year?

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the senator from Louisiana for raising this issue. I understand why the Navy has a need to better understand the aquatic environment into which it will send its personnel and equipment. I am willing to look at the need to support additional research in this area and to recommend an appropriate response if one is indicated.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank my colleague and I look forward to working with him to provide for a strong integrated bioenvironmental hazards research capability for the Navy.

DISTANCE LEARNING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to engage the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, in a brief colloquy regarding distance learning.

As Chairman STEVENS may know, the City Colleges of Chicago Europe has been providing college degree and certificate programs to the U.S. military service members and their families in Europe since 1969. In fact, the City Colleges of Chicago was one of the early pioneers in distance learning. Today, the program offers over 70 courses on the Internet and provides interactive television courses via satellite to U.S. peacekeeping forces stationed in the Sinai Desert, Bosnia, and Hungary.

The Senate bill includes an increase for distance learning of $45 million. Is it the understanding of Chairman STEVENS that successful programs like the City Colleges of Chicago Europe should be able to work with the Department of Defense to receive funding?

Mr. STEVENS. I am aware of the Center for Opening Learning at the City Colleges of Chicago—Harold Washington College. I believe that the level of funding for distance learning in the Senate bill would give programs like the Center for Opening Learning an opportunity to work with the Department of Defense in order to develop additional courses and enhance new learning technologies that will ultimately help military students stationed overseas.

ELECTRIC DRIVE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to inform the Senate of recent engineering breakthroughs in the area of naval propulsion. In the past few years, industry has been working hard to develop electric drive technology that could be used in a naval vessel. Electric drive would replace the traditional mechanical drive system, that turns the ship's propellers through a system of reduction gears, with a system that uses electricity directly to turn the engines and power the rest of the ship's systems.

Electric drive offers major benefits over mechanical drive. It is more efficient in terms of reduced fuel consumption and requires fewer crew to maintain. It can also generate more power than mechanical systems. Electric drive is also quieter, making it an attractive option for submarines, or any vessel concerned with stealth. Industry analysts believe electric drive could save the Navy $4.3 billion over the life of the new destroyer program, the DD–21, alone.

Last year the appropriations committee included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill asking the Navy to produce a report on the potential for electric drive. The Secretary of the Navy released the study in March, a study that was a powerful endorsement of the electric drive technology. This report points to electric drive as a technology that will no doubt have major implications for the future of naval ship design and engineering. I hope the Navy will continue its research efforts, and make every effort to include this technology in the next generation of destroyers, the DD–21. I also hope the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee will maintain its interest in the program and continue its support.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank Senator KOHL. I agree that the Navy should continue its research efforts into electric drive, and it should strongly consider the benefits it could bring to the DD–21 Class of destroyers. In addition, I am aware that this technology will also provide important benefits to other future Navy ships such as improved stealth for future submarines. By developing a modular, common integrated system, where major system elements can be used on all new Navy ship designs without any design changes, the Navy can also realize the multiple benefits of reduced training and logistics costs, as well as significant production cost savings.

Mr. INOUYE. I concur with the opinions of the chairman and of Senator KOHL. I consider it essential that our Navy be equipped with the most advanced technology in their future ships. Since electric drive not only offers significant operational benefits, but also significant savings, I most strongly urge the Navy to continue its research work and make every effort to ensure that this technology is deployed on DD–21.

Mr. KOHL. As I am sure the chairman and ranking member are aware, much of the research into this technology has been privately funded. General Dynamics and Eaton Corporation, among others, have been leaders in the field of electric drive and their efforts have been crucial to moving the development along. Their investment has presented the Navy and Congress with an excellent opportunity to take advantage of developments financed in the private sector. As the Navy continues to evaluate electric drive and the DD–21 program I hope the committee will be ready to capitalize on that investment.

Mr. INOUYE. I agree that this presents us with an excellent opportunity. The committee will certainly give the Navy consideration should it make an additional request for funding for electric drive research.

Mr. STEVENS. The potential of electric drive is certainly worth exploring, and the committee would be willing to consider a request from the Navy if they believe it is critical to the DD–21 design effort.

Mr. KOHL. I thank both Senators for their support of continuing research and evaluation of electric drive. Senators STEVENS and INOUYE have long been known for their clear vision when it comes to supporting cutting edge military technology, and that reputation is well deserved.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the bill before us today. I would like to sincerely thank Senators STEVENS and INOUYE for their strong leadership on the Defense Subcommittee. I also would like to recognize the hard work and diligence of the staff on this Committee.

Every year this Committee goes through the exercise of trying to allocate sufficient funds for the foremost priorities of providing for our nation's defense. Every year under the current funding constraints the difficulty of this task increases. This year is no exception.

I would like to briefly mention some of the most important aspects of our defense addressed in this spending package.

The bill provides $264.7 billion in new spending authority for the Department of Defense for FY 2000. This is $1.4 billion above the President's request. This recommendation meets the budget authority and outlay limits established in the 302(b) allocation.

In parallel with the Defense Authorization bill, the bill funds almost 1.4 million active duty military personnel. This bill fully funds a 4.8-percent pay raise for FY2000 and includes more than $1.838 billion in supplemental spending for military pay.

This legislation provides approximately $2.1 billion for overseas contingency operations in Southwest Asia and Bosnia. I and many others suspect we'll be forced to pass an additional emergency supplemental for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. As Chairman STEVENS has already indicated, it would be premature to speculate about those possible appropriations at this time.

The bill includes appropriations totaling $92 billion for operation and maintenance (O&M). This is $626.1 million above the Administration's request.

The bill supports the establishment of 17 Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams. And it provides $1.3 billion for combating terrorism. Within the funds for combating terrorism, the bill makes $79.6 million available to provide Army and Air National Guard full-time personnel to facilitate successful achievement of this mission.

I fully support the decision to appropriate $475.5 million for Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction programs. These are important programs that address one of the most significant proliferation threats we face today. I also would like to voice my strong support for the decision that $25 million be used only to support Russian nuclear submarine dismantlement and disposal activities.

I also sincerely appreciate the Committee's effort to restore some of the funding required for research, development, test, and evaluation. The increase of $2.1 billion to the budget request will help prevent the loss of scientific and technical expertise within our defense infrastructure. Moreover, this will help ensure that the U.S. maintains its technological lead in its defense capabilities.

The Committee also funded several items that will ensure that New Mexico based defense installations and programs remain robust. I would like to briefly highlight some of the items that received funding in the appropriations bill.

Directed energy weapons provide the potential of low cost per kill ratios sought for our missile defense capabilities. In the area of directed energy, $14 million will go for the High Energy Laser Test Facility at White Sands, the Army's premier facility for directed energy programs. There is an additional $15 million for the Tactical High Energy Laser program. This joint program with Israel is very important to proving the concept of using lasers to achieve defenses against short and medium range missiles. After significant cuts and changes to its development plan last year, the Airborne Laser program is fully funded at $309 million.

The Committee added $40 million to the Warfighter Information Network program. Based at Laguna Industries, this program manufactures mobile command and control headquarters for a digital Army.

An additional $7.5 million was appropriated for modernization of testing equipment at White Sands Missile Range. Also, $6 million will be made available for much needed perimeter fencing to prevent further accidents from unexploded ordnances at the range.

$10 million is included for the Scorpius Low Cost Launch program. A significant portion of the research and development for this program is based at Phillips, and testing of the engines and the rocket itself is conducted at New Mexico Tech and White Sands. This is an important program both because of the implications to our national security that arise from exorbitant launch costs and due to potential cost savings to taxpayers by lower costs for getting payloads into orbit for U.S. defense programs.

Several other Phillips based programs also received additional support, including: $5 million for further research and development on radio frequency weapons, $25 million for military spaceplane efforts, $5 million for advanced countermeasures using solid state laser technologies.

At my and other member's request, an additional $10 million of funding will be made available for research and development of new technologies to counter chemical and biological

threats. $4 million in support was included for the blast mitigation research of both military and nonmilitary explosives at New Mexico Tech.

Lastly, $10 million in additional funding was added for the Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility (TACCSF) at Kirtland Air Force Base. This will help a great deal in making this facility the world class training facility necessary to maintain combat readiness of our Air Force in the coming years.

I believe this bill demonstrates the balance required to best fund our armed forces under current fiscal constraints. Again, I am pleased by the hard work of my colleagues on this Committee and express, once again, my admiration for the hard work of Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUYE in achieving an appropriate spending package for our military men and women.

ASSEMBLED CHEMICAL WEAPONS ASSESSMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to address the issue of Chemical Weapons Demilitarization. I do so in order to point out that the Department of Defense has consistently ignored Congressional directive and intent.

In 1996, I offered and the Senate accepted an amendment which directed the Army to identify and demonstrate technologies other than baseline incineration which could be utilized in the destruction of America's chemical weapons stockpile. This program, which came to be known as the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment, or ACWA, enjoyed tremendous inititial success. Through the involvement of the DoD, the Army, technology providers and citizens advocacy groups—disparate interests, indeed—agreement was reached on how the process should proceed as well as the criteria for success. It is also critical to point out that one area of consensus was that the timely destruction of the stockpiles remained a top priority. Nobody involved in this process advocates unnecessary delay in efforts to comply with the Chemical Weapons Convention 2007 deadline. Certainly, I never viewed my efforts as anything other than a safeguard to ensure that once the destruction of the stockpile located in Kentucky began, only the safest method available was utilized.

Unfortunately, this is where the good news ends.

After rigorous evaluation and discussions, the decision was announced that six separate methods met the technological criteria necessary in order to be tested as alternatives to baseline incineration. These six were the only proposals of the almost 20 originally submitted for consideration which were deemed capable of producing safer methods. Unfortunately the Army and the Department of Defense made the decision to move forward and evaluate only three of the qualified technologies, leaving three untested. Further, this decision was made not on the basis of what was technologically feasible, but solely on the basis on what was cost-efficient. Not in the interests of finding the safest manner available to destroy the weapons, but on satisfying the minimum requirements so that the incineration could continue regardless of the results of the testing.

To help ease this budget difficulty, I offered and the Senate accepted, an amendment to the FY99 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill which gave the Secretary of Defense the Authority to reprogram up to $25 million in order to fully test each of the technologies which met the criteria for selection as potential alternatives to incineration. This provision was included in the final version of the Defense bill, and was eventually signed into law.

Mr. President, despite this clear expression of Congressional intent, the Army, the Department and the Administration have consistently refused to allocate sufficient funds to complete the testing. As a result, the ACWA program is in danger of losing its credibility—the very quality that led to its initial successes. If the testing of the three technologies does not produce a viable alternative to incineration, then the legitimate question will be posed, ''What about the additional proposals which were viewed to have merit as alternatives to incineration?''

Not wishing to answer that question, I worked to encourage the administration to agree that further testing was cost effective and in the best interests of the country. Their responses, which I will submit for the RECORD, professed their strong support for the goals of the ACWA program, but claimed that the budget was simply too tight for the Department to reprogram funds for additional testing.

With all due respect, that contention is simply false. The truth is that the Department of Defense and the Army made a decision years ago that they would eliminate chemical weapons using incineration and have resisted considering other options since that time.

This year's report, Senate Report 105–53, states that ''the Committee is concerned with the lack of oversight afforded the Chemical Demilitarization Program within the executive branch.''

Further the Report states:

In a review of the program's funding, the Committee discovered that funds had systematically been obligated without being expended and in some instances funds were unobligated. Rather than facing a shortfall in funding, the program had over $200,000,000 of Operation and Maintenance funds unexpended at the end of fiscal year 1998. In light of the unobligated and unexpended balances available to the Department, the program growth in the budget request is not justified.

Mr. President, this language is a stinging indictment of the Department's mismanagement of the Chemical Demilitarization program. Further it demonstrates clearly that there is no truth to the assertion that there were not sufficient funds available to allow for the demonstration of all viable alternatives to baseline incineration.

I intend to continue to press the Army to test all six technologies so that the citizens who live near our stockpiles may be assured that only the safest methods available are employed to destroy chemical weapons.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, December 22, 1998.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: This responds to your interest in the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) Program. I regret any misunderstanding we may have had about responding to your concerns on this matter.

As you know, Congress has directed the Department to demonstrate and evaluate at least two alternatives to baseline incineration for the disposal of assembled chemical munitions. The ACWA Program actually identified six technologies, exceeding the original requirement, but was able to fund only three—the three that were ranked as the best value to the U.S. Government. We would like to go further, but the entire amount appropriated for support of ACWA in the Fiscal year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act will be required to complete demonstration testing and conduct a non-government independent evaluation of cost and schedule with regard to implementing an alternative technology.

The Act also provided authority to use up to an additional $25 million of the funds appropriated for the Chemical Demilitarization program in order to complete ACWA demonstrations. This language, however, addressed authority only; no additional funds were appropriated. While we will vigorously press for savings in the Chemical Demilitarization program, at this point, we are unable to exercise reprogramming authority without jeopardizing our ability to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention mandate of April 2007 for destruction of our chemical weapons stockpile. If, however, additional funding becomes available in the coming fiscal year to support the ACWA Program, we plan to expand the scope of demonstration testing beyond the three technologies already programmed.

Successful disposal of the chemical munitions stockpile and compliance with the Chemical Weapons Convention are among our highest national security priorities. The ACWA Program is a critical component of this effort. I want to thank you for your support of this important program. Again, I regret any misunderstanding concerning my response to your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN HAMRE.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 18, 1998.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: This is in reply to your letter to Secretary Cohen regarding the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program. In that letter you asked about the Department's plans for testing of alternative technologies.

As you may be aware, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997 mandated that we identify and demonstrate not less than two alternatives to the baseline incineration process for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions. In selecting three technologies to proceed to final demonstration testing we have exceeded that requirement. We recognize the intent of the Senate as evidenced in Sec. 8143 of the Senate passed FY 1999 DoD Appropriation Bill. If additional funding becomes available in the coming fiscal year to support the ACWA program, we plan to reexamine the scope of demonstration testing.

A similar letter has been sent to your colleagues who joined you in writing to Secretary Cohen regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. LYNN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Washington DC, March 22, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Thank you for your letter about the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program. The President requested that I respond directly to your letter. The Administration shares your goals of safely disposing of our chemical weapons stockpile and has been supportive of your efforts to find environmentally sound alternatives to the baseline incineration system for destroying these chemical weapons.

As you know, the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1997 created the ACWA program and provided $40 million ''to identify and demonstrate not less than two alternatives to the baseline incineration process for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions.'' In time, the ACWA program identified six alternatives. Due to limitations of funds, only three alternative technologies were selected for further development and testing, one more than required by the 1977 Act. To fund the third alternative, funds had to be reprogrammed from the baseline Chemical Demilitarization program, which supports a safe and effective disposal process in order to fund research into an additional system that may or may not be selected at a future date for implementation.

As you pointed out in your letter, the FY 1999 Defense Appropriations Act provides authority to reprogram up to $25 million from the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense account to fund the demonstration of alternatives to baseline incineration. Unfortunately, the Act also reduced the President's request for the account by $78 million. This reduction will severely challenge the Army's ability to successfully destroy this Nation's chemical stockpile by April 29, 2007, as required by the Chemical Weapons Convention. As a result of the $78 million reduction, to date we have been unable to identify available funds in the Chemical Demilitarization program to reprogram to ACWA for additional demonstration projects.

The Administration's policy is to proceed as quickly as possible with the safe destruction of the Nation's chemical stockpile, while at the same time seeking even safer and more effective methods. The National Academy of Sciences concluded in its 1994 study that the baseline incineration system is a safe and effective disposal process for the stockpile. The Administration will continue to seek even safer methods. We look forward to working with you to that end.

Sincerely,

JACOB J. LEW,
Director.

THE GALLO RESEARCH CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to see language in the Department of Defense Appropriations report which recommends $300 million for medical research and development efforts to be used for life-saving medical projects, including breast cancer and prostate cancer research.

Of the $300 million, the Committee recommends that $50 million is to be made available for peer reviewed medical research grants and activities. Further, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the service of the Surgeons General, establish a process to select medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health. One of the projects listed as having scientific merit and direct relevance to military health is that of alcohol abuse and prevention research.

I believe that alcohol abuse and prevention efforts must be supported by Congress. We have all been witness to broken families, broken lives and lost opportunities attributed to alcoholism. To that end, I would like to share with my colleagues the promising research being conducted to combat alcoholism at the Gallo Center in San Francisco, California.

The mission of the Gallo Center is to identify genes that control brain responses to alcohol and other addicting agents and then develop new drugs to treat addiction. It is the only alcoholism research program in the country that is based with a department of neurology. The Gallo Center is fully equipped for research in cellular, molecular, and behavioral neuroscience and also invertebrate and human genetics.

I join my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, in her request for $11 million from the Medical Research activities budget in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to support alcoholism research at the Gallo Center located at the University of California, San Francisco Medical School. I believe that the important work conducted at the Gallo Center qualifies under the medical research project directive as recommended by the Committee, and that it should be funded from the $50 million already made available for peer reviewed medical research grants and activities.

The Department of Defense Health Program has appropriately identified alcoholism research as a priority area. I believe that providing $11 million from the Medical Research activities budget in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for the Gallo Research Center at the University of California, San Francisco would prove to be a worthwhile investment in our efforts to learn more about alcoholism, it causes, and what we can do to fight it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, page 95 of the report accompanying S. 1122 contains language that encourages the Army to include Rock Island Arsenal in all aspects of the development, design and production of the Lightweight 155mm Towed Howitzer Program. This directive is problematic for many reasons. If followed, it would undermine industrial competition and conflict with the fair and competitive process that has occurred to date. It would preclude further competition for the 155mm Towed Howitzer and all future towed artillery programs. And the report language would potentially contradict several statutes, including the Army Industrial Facilities Act, the Working Capital Funds Act, and the Arsenal Act.

The contract for this program has already been awarded on a competitive basis. Vickers Shipbuilding and Engineering LTD developed the original design and owns background intellectual property in the current Lightweight 155mm system. Attempting now to direct the work to Rock Island would potentially detract from work done at Picatinny Arsenal in my home state of New Jersey, as well as potentially create all sorts of legal fights. While Rock Island should be encouraged to compete for a subcontract, all future awards should be made on a ''best-value'' basis. Any legislative micromanagement that compromises the competitive bidding process is inconsistent with legal and economic prudence. I urge such ill-advised acquisition guidance to be dropped when the Senate convenes with the House to conference this bill.

MCGREGOR RANGE WITHDRAWAL

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill would renew the withdrawal of the McGregor Range for use by the U.S. Army.

McGregor Range is one of six military parcels withdrawn from public domain in 1986. These parcels comprise nearly 30 percent of the Department of Defense's 25 million acres. The lands will revert to the public domain in 2001 unless Congress passes new legislation.

This amendment is specific to the 608,000 acres utilized by Fort Bliss and does not address any of the other renewals for other military installations.

McGregor Range comprises nearly 700,000 of Fort Bliss's 1.12 million acres. The Fort Bliss garrison is adjacent to El Paso, Texas, but the McGregor Range is located entirely in New Mexico.

Sections of McGregor are used for cattle grazing and other nonmilitary purposes such as hunting and recreation. The Bureau of Land Management manages the cattle-grazing program through close coordination with the Army. These cooperative efforts provide for efficient use of the lands as well as effective stewardship of the natural resources located there.

Recent studies of this issue provides a succinct summary of the most relevant policy issues surrounding the renewal of withdrawal for military purposes. Mr. President, allow me to briefly list the major findings of this study:

Fort Bliss has a critical role as a national center for air defense and

McGregor Range is essential for fulfilling that role;

McGregor Range is the only range in the United States capable of training America's air and missile defense forces. Because all CONUS Patriot forces are stationed at Ft. Bliss they depend on McGregor for the training needed to ensure their full readiness prior to deployment.

Successive BRAC rounds have reduced the capability of the DOD to support both current and future training and testing requirements with the available infrastructure. Range complexes such as McGregor and White Sands Missile Range are critical now and will become more critical in the future as weapons systems and doctrine evolve which allow greater standoff distances and mobility in the future. These capabilities are wasted if we fail to train our forces to the maximum extent of their capabilities.

McGregor Range supports the U.S. Air Force in the training activities at Holloman Air Force Base.

The combined space of McGregor Range and White Sands can be leveraged to accommodate the needs of a more modern Army. Currently, the range supports specialized test operations by White Sands Missile Range which require additional safety buffer zones to ensure public safety.

Military training and testing requirements for McGregor Range are foreseen for at least the next 50 years based on weapons systems that are either currently fielded, such as Patriot, or are planned for fielding in the near future. Additionally, emerging doctrine and weapon systems part of the Army-After-Next will require large areas to fully train soldiers in the employment of these weapons systems. If the requirement is known for the next fifty years, then it is unclear why a shorter withdrawal period is reasonable.

The BLM's 1986 Wilderness Study made a ''No Wilderness'' recommendation regarding the Culp Canyon WSA. This recommendation was ''based on the low-quality wilderness value of the WSA and the potential conflicts with associated military use of the area.'' Without this portion of the range, the Army's ability to conduct Patriot and related air and missile defense training will be reduced by approximately one-third.

There is strong regional support for this renewal. 176 public comments expressed support for the Army's preferred alternative. An additional 26 expressed support for one of the other alternatives.

The Army's proposal will continue historic non-military uses of the range which include livestock grazing and hunting for 50 years.

The Army has already met its obligations with respect to performing an Environmental Impact Statement, holding public hearings, and submission of request for renewal to the Administration.

In sum, all of the legal requirements set forth by Congress have been met. Congressional action is now required to ensure that the Army retains its ability to test, simulate, and train for missions at Fort Bliss. Allowing the Army's continued access to these lands is critical to adequate training and readiness now and in the future.

One of the fundamental duties of Congress is the maintenance of the national defense. Nothing is more fundamental than the provision of training ranges, such as McGregor, in maintaining a trained and prepared military.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I do not object to my colleague's amendment to renew the public land withdrawal for the McGregor Range in New Mexico, however, I believe the preferable course of action is to follow the process the Senate agreed to just last month, and allow the Defense and Interior Departments the opportunity to jointly develop a legislative proposal.

The McGregor Range in southern New Mexico was one of several military ranges that was last withdrawn for military purposes in 1986 under Public Law 99–606. The withdrawal period for McGregor and the other ranges is for 15 years, and does not expire until November, 2001.

Last month, language was included in the Committee-reported version of S. 1059, the DOD Authorization bill, that would have extended public land withdrawals at four of the six military installations covered by Public Law 99–606: the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range in Arizona, the McGregor Range in New Mexico, and Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely in Alaska. During the consideration of the bill on the Senate floor, I offered an amendment which replaced the withdrawal language with a ''sense of the Senate'' statement urging the Administration to submit legislative proposals for these four military withdrawals by July 1. I understand that both the Defense and Interior Departments are currently working on such a legislative proposal and that we still anticipate being able to incorporate legislative language in the conference report for the DOD Authorization bill.

With respect to the proposed amendment for the McGregor Range, I want to be clear that I recognize the critical role the range serves for our national defense training needs and I support their continued use for these purposes. In my opinion, however, I think it makes much more sense, and will result in less controversy in the long run, if we allow the normal process for the renewal of the public land withdrawals to be completed. In short, this means allowing the Interior Department the opportunity to review the Army's environmental impact statement, which I understand has only just been completed, and that following that review, the Administration has the opportunity to submit its legislative proposal for our consideration.

The McGregor withdrawal encompasses approximately 608,000 acres of land in New Mexico. The renewal of the withdrawal and future uses of the range are of interest not only to the Army, but also to area residents and other public land users. Although the amendment is not clear, I am concerned that it materially changes some of the withdrawal terms from the 1986 Act.

For example, the 1986 Act authorized a withdrawal period of 15 years. This amendment provides for a 50-year withdrawal. I understand that the military desires a longer withdrawal period than the current 15 years, and I am not opposed to considering a longer term. But meaningful periodic reviews and environmental analyses serve an important purpose. They provide local communities with an opportunity to raise issues about the way these lands are managed, and they allow us to consider new land management issues which may not have been present when the original withdrawals were made. I think it is a mistake to significantly change this policy without at least the opportunity for public hearings.

Another aspect of the amendment that seems to be a significant departure from past management practices is a requirement that the Secretary of the Army manage the withdrawn lands. Under current law, the lands are managed by the Bureau of Land Management for a variety of multiple use purposes, subject to the limitations of the military uses. For example, the 1986 Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to manage the lands in a manner permitting the continuation of grazing, the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, the control of predators, recreation, and the suppression of brush fires.

This amendment now provides for management by the Army, under the terms of a new agreement to be developed between the Army and the Interior Department, which is to provide for the proper management and protection of natural and cultural resources. It may very well be that such an agreement will adequately provide for other non-military uses and protect sensitive natural and cultural resources. However, there is no requirement that the lands be managed under existing law, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The amendment also appears to leave very important land management questions unanswered. For example, the BLM currently manages the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area within the McGregor Range, as well as an ''Area of Critical Environmental Concern.'' Under this amendment, is the Army required to manage those areas to the same degree of protection as required of the Secretary of the Interior? Again, at the very least, I think it is important that all interested parties should be heard on these issues before we decide how to proceed.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude by again urging the Administration to expeditiously complete its legislative proposal by the end of this month. Although I would prefer to hear

the Administration's proposal, I am committed to seeing that the McGregor range renewal is enacted this year. If, however, a timely proposal is submitted by the Administration, I hope that we will be able to include appropriate legislative language to renew the withdrawal for McGregor and the other affected ranges as part of the conference report for the DOD Authorization bill.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the FY 2000 appropriations bill. This legislation demonstrates a strong commitment to America's defense and to our ability to meet future military challenges. I especially thank and acknowledge the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Defense Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, Senator INOUYE, for their work and support of this legislation.

I am particularly pleased that the committee included $1 million for exciting new technology designed to make landmine detection safer and more effective. This technology, known as nonlinear technique for landmine detection, has been developed by engineers at the Davidson Laboratory of the Stevens Institute in my home State of New Jersey. This new method for detection of mines and other buried man-made objects has been devised in such a way as to differentiate between rocks, other solids and actual landmines through acoustics. This technology will increase our ability to meet our international obligations and dramatically improve the safety and security of our armed forces.

I also express my support for the committee's inclusion of an additional $121 million for the production of 11 new Black Hawk helicopters. A coalition of eight companies in my state manufacture critical components for the Black Hawk, which is the Army's premier tactical transport helicopter. First produced in 1977, it is used for combat assault, combat re-supply, battlefield command and control, electronic warfare and medical evacuation. Currently, the Black Hawk is providing critical support functions for our armed services in Kosovo. This funding will ensure that our military has the ability to continue its current operations and sustain readiness for future dangers.

I am also extremely pleased that this legislation represents a significant increase in our commitment to the Defense Health Program. The inclusion of $175 million for the breast cancer program, and the $75 million for the prostate cancer research programs, has special significance for the constituents I represent. New Jersey's breast cancer incidence rate is among the highest in the Nation; and, more than 1,400 of the 6,900 New Jersey men diagnosed with prostate cancer die each year. I am confident that these funding initiatives will bring us much closer to finding answers for the men and women of New Jersey and nationwide, who suffer from these devastating diseases.

Additionally, the pay raise of almost 5 percent for all members of the military included in this bill deals with serious concerns I have had regarding quality of life and morale of our soldiers. By addressing the inequities between military pay and civilian wages, this pay raise will go a long way toward reaching our goals of retaining highly trained personnel and assist in our ability to achieve recruiting goals.

Finally, while I am supportive of these important components of this legislation, I am extremely concerned with the committee's recommendation that the Army and the Marine Corps develop a plan to include the Rock Island Arsenal in all aspects of howitzer development, design, and production for the Lightweight 155mm.

Currently, critical research and development functions for the howitzer take place under the U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. The howitzer, as well as other important military systems, require sophisticated software which may only be fielded by Picatinny Arsenal. If the committee's proposal is implemented, I fear that Rock Island Arsenal will ultimately assume important research and development responsibilities for the howitzer for which they have never before played a role and may be unqualified to preform. I encourage the committee to strongly consider these concerns which have similarly been expressed by the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. President, I again thank Chairman STEVENS, Ranking Member BYRD, and Ranking Member INOUYE for their commitment and attention to these important issues.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Mr. President, it is almost painful to witness the way in which this Senate is abdicating its responsibility to scrutinize the Department of Defense. During debate on the fiscal year 2000 DoD authorization bill, we had exactly two amendments that called a multi-billion dollars weapons system into question. On this appropriations bill, we had exactly two amendments worthy of extensive debate. Two amendments, Mr. President. Here we have a defense policy that perpetuates a Cold War mentality into the 21st century, and the Senate has no questions.

Mr. President, on the heels of an authorization bill that exemplifies the Pentagon's utter failure to adapt its priorities to the post-Cold War era, the American taxpayer is left holding the bag paying for the mess. There are a number of theories that attempt to explain the difficulties faced by the armed services. There is a dearth of thoughtful solutions. The general consensus is that if we pour enough money into the Defense Department, the problems will go away. Unfortunately, effective problem-solving doesn't work that way.

The DoD has a weapons modernization strategy that makes it impossible to buy enough new weapons to replace all the old weapons on a timely basis, even though forces are much smaller than they were during the Cold War and modernization budgets are projected to return to Cold War levels. Consequently, the ratio of old weapons to new weapons in our active inventories will grow to unprecedented levels over the next decade.

Subsequently, that modernization strategy is driving up the operating budgets needed to maintain adequate readiness, even though the size of our forces is now smaller than it was during the Cold War. Each new generation of high complexity weapons costs much more to operate than its predecessor, and the low rate of replacement forces the longer retention and use of older weapons. Thus, as weapons get older, they become more expensive to operate, maintain, and supply.

Couple this with an accounting system that has failed each and every GAO audit since enactment of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, and you have a poorly managed, misguided strategy inviting disaster.

Instead of thoughtfully addressing these shortcomings, Mr. President, we proceed to spend the American taxpayers' money as we have in the past. No change. We continue to promote bigger and more expensive weapons systems at the expense of our men and women in uniform. No matter how much money we throw at this problem, we won't find a solution if we stay on this track.

For the past year, Mr. President, we've heard the call to address our military's readiness crisis from virtually all quarters. We were told that foremost among the readiness shortfalls were operations and maintenance as well as pay and allowances accounts.

Just last year, there was a virtual consensus that the armed services were facing a readiness crisis. Last September, the Joint Chiefs testified that there was a dangerous readiness shortfall. General Henry Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, claimed that ''without relief, we will see a continuation of the downward trends in readiness . . . and shortfalls in critical skills.'' Army Chief of Staff General Dennis Reimer stated that the military faces a ''hollow force'' without increased readiness spending. Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson asserted that the Navy has a $6 billion readiness deficit. So it went for all the services.

To address the readiness shortfall, Mr. President, the Congress passed an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The bill was well-intentioned in its support for the efforts of our men

and women in uniform. Unfortunately, something happened on the way to the front lines. The bill spent close to $9 billion, but just $1 billion of it went to address the readiness shortfall.

We added $1 billion for ballistic missile defense. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization still hasn't spent all that money, yet we've added another $3.5 billion for the BMDO in this bill. Last year's supplemental also added billions to what has become an expected emergency, that being our operations in Bosnia. That other unexpected emergency, the year 2000, received a billion dollars. And so it went. What happened to readiness?

One provision in this bill casts a pall over the readiness needs of our service members and highlights, in microcosm, the Defense Department's misguided priorities. This appropriations bill will spend upwards of $40 million in the next fiscal year, and perhaps as much as half a billion dollars over the next ten years on luxury jets for four-star generals. Am I missing something or is this absurd? We actually have more than 11,000 troops that qualify for food stamps and DoD can justify spending tens of millions of dollars next year for luxury jets. How can this be?

Mr. President, one concern goes to the heart of the entire debate on our national defense. The underlying question is this: Why should the Pentagon receive billions dollars more in funding when it has failed utterly to manage its budget? Throwing good money after bad isn't tolerated at other departments and agencies. Why is it tolerated with DoD?

Defense Week reported just yesterday that the Navy has lost track of almost $1 billion worth of ammunition, arms and explosives. Additionally, DoD has yet to pass an audit. A 1998 GAO audit couldn't match more than $22 billion in DoD expenditures with obligations; it could not find over $9 billion in inventory; and it documented millions in overpayments to contractors. GAO concluded that ''no major part of DoD has been able to pass the test of an independent audit.''

Mr. President, this bill also has some painful implications for other federal programs. Essentially, we are spending tax dollars on a wasteful and misguided defense strategy while domestic programs face steep spending cuts in the upcoming fiscal year.

The bill exceeds the Pentagon's request by $1.4 billion. It spends $1.4 billion more than the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe is sufficient to meet our national defense needs. And that additional money is coming out of vital domestic programs that were already facing spending cuts.

Mr. President, I cannot vote to increase the defense budget by tens of billions of dollars, including tens of millions for corporate jets, while the budgets for veterans health care, education, agriculture and other programs are facing deep cuts. Supporting the Defense Department's misguided spending priorities is not synonymous with supporting the military.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I strongly support S. 1122, the Defense appropriations bill for FY 2000. As scored with adjustments, the pending bill provides $264.9 billion in total budget authority and $176.9 billion in new outlays for the Department of Defense and related activities. When adjusted for outlays from prior years and other actions, the bill totals $263.9 billion in BA and $254.6 billion in outlays.

There are some major elements to this bill that are important for the Senate for review.

The bill is consistent with the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement and the discretionary spending cap. In fact, in both budget authority and outlays the bill is below the amount that the Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2000 would contemplate for the Defense Subcommittee's allocation. This is in recognition of the fact that readiness items originally planned for fiscal year 2000 were accelerated into fiscal year 1999 in the 1999 Emergency Kosovo Supplemental, which the President has signed into law.

As a result, for budget authority, this bill is $3.1 billion below the allocation originally contemplated for it; for outlays it is $2.2 billion below. Because of this situation, the allocation approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for defense has been reduced and held for subsequent reallocation.

In addition, this year the defense budget is once again confronted with a serious mismatch between the DOD/OMB and the CBO estimates of the outlays needed to execute the programs in the budget request. CBO's estimate of outlays was $10.5 billion higher than OMB and DOD's estimate.

Because the President's proposed budget was over the discretionary cap by such a larch amount, compensating for the OMB and DOD undercount of outlays would require very large reductions in manpower, procurement, or readiness, or all three. Cuts like that are simply not acceptable, especially in view of the conflict in the Balkans. To enable this bill to be considered on a basis commensurate with the President's request, an outlay adjustment of that size is included in the scoring of this bill.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has assured me that this action reduces the 2000 outlays shortage to manageable dimensions and avoids the negative effect on readiness or modernization that would otherwise be necessary.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge its adoption. I want to compliment the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on his very skillful handling of this important legislation and for his statesmanlike approach to some serious and troubling issues in this year's defense budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Senate Budget Committee table displaying the budget impact of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1122, DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000 SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618
1999 level:				
Budget authority	250,330	.....	197	250,527
Outlays	248,310	.....	197	248,507
President's request:				
Budget authority	264,896	.....	209	265,105
Outlays	258,610	.....	209	258,819
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays	.....	.....	.....	.....
1999 level:				
Budget authority	13,392	.....	12	13,404
Outlays	6,099	.....	12	6,111
President's request:				
Budget authority	(1,174)	.....	.....	(1,174)
Outlays	(4,201)	.....	.....	(4,201)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	263,722	.....	209	263,931
Outlays	254,409	.....	209	254,618

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I commend the able managers of this bill, Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUYE, for producing a balanced and comprehensive bill that addresses some of the most pressing needs of the U.S. military.

Together with the emergency supplemental spending bill that Congress sent to the President last month, and the Defense authorization bill that the Senate passed prior to Memorial Day, this Defense appropriations bill marks a major commitment to our men and women in uniform by funding a wide array of vital defense programs. In acting quickly and decisively on these three bills, the Senate has sent a strong message of support to the military, particularly to those forces currently engaged in the air war over Yugoslavia. That support is richly deserved. Once again, America's military forces have demonstrated their superior skills and leadership in the Balkan conflict. We are indebted to them for their service and dedication to their country.

This appropriations bill represents a strong effort on the part of the managers to balance the very real needs of the Defense Department against the pressing needs of other domestic programs in the budget. This is a tough year for the appropriators. We are working under very tight budget caps to meet a whole host of escalating infrastructure needs—both physical and human—in this nation. Senator STEVENS was able to trim slightly more than $3 billion from defense spending to allocate to other programs without damaging the integrity of this bill. Even so, it will be difficult to pass all 13 appropriations bills for Fiscal Year

2000 within the constraints of the current budget caps. I do not know what the resolution to this problem will be, but I commend Senator STEVENS for the steps he has taken so far, and I look forward to working with him on the remaining appropriations bills.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, inadvertently, at my request, the Senate adopted the Domenici amendment twice. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to vitiate the adoption of amendment No. 604. It is a duplicate of amendment No. 577.

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

Mr. STEVENS. The bill is ready to be advanced to third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the third time.

The bill (S. 1122) was read the third time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I once again thank all Members of the Senate for their cooperation with us in handling this very controversial bill. I thank my constant companion and good friend, the cochairman of our Defense Subcommittee. I yield to him for any comment he might might make before I ask for the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I think you have once again established a new record.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is absent due to a death in the family.

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Dodd	Johnson
Akaka	Domenici	Kennedy
Allard	Dorgan	Kerrey
Ashcroft	Durbin	Kerry
Baucus	Edwards	Kyl
Bayh	Enzi	Landrieu
Bennett	Feinstein	Lautenberg
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Leahy
Bond	Frist	Levin
Breaux	Gorton	Lieberman
Brownback	Graham	Lincoln
Bryan	Gramm	Lott
Bunning	Grams	Lugar
Burns	Grassley	Mack
Byrd	Gregg	McConnell
Campbell	Hagel	Mikulski
Chafee	Harkin	Moynihan
Cleland	Hatch	Murkowski
Cochran	Helms	Murray
Collins	Hollings	Nickles
Conrad	Hutchinson	Reed
Coverdell	Hutchison	Reid
Craig	Inhofe	Robb
Daschle	Inouye	Roberts
DeWine	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Roth	Smith (NH)	Thompson
Santorum	Smith (OR)	Thurmond
Sarbanes	Snowe	Torricelli
Schumer	Specter	Voinovich
Sessions	Stevens	Warner
Shelby	Thomas	Wyden

NAYS—4

Boxer	Kohl
Feingold	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Crapo	McCain

The bill (S. 1122), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the bill managers. The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii always do a magnificent job. This is not a world record for them, but it certainly is a very fine accomplishment. I am very pleased that we have passed this Department of Defense appropriations bill in such good order. I congratulate the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. STEVENS. Once again, I thank all Members of the Senate and staff for handling this defense appropriations bill. There is a war going on. We thought it essential we act as expeditiously as possible. We thought it was necessary for us to defend the Senate's position to the fullest extent possible. That unanimous consent request is already in place.

Parliamentary inquiry: Is there anything else I need to do in order to handle it according to the prior agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 96

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled to occur with respect to S. 96, the Y2K liability bill, on Wednesday, be vitiated, and following the conclusion of the defense appropriations bill the Senate resume S. 96. I further ask that following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, all pending floor amendments and motions be withdrawn, and Senator MCCAIN be immediately recognized to modify the pending committee substitute with the text of S. 1138 and all remaining amendments in order to S. 96 be relevant to the Y2K issue.

Finally, I ask consent that there be 12 first-degree amendments in order for each side of the aisle, with relevant second-degree amendments, and one additional first-degree amendment in order for each leader under the same terms as outlined above.

This has been discussed with the Democratic leader and cleared on both sides of the aisle. I thank the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, for his help on this very important issue.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following list be printed in the RECORD with respect to the Y2K agreement and first-degree amendments on the Democratic side:

Mr. Hollings, 3 amendments;
Mr. Kerry (MA), 1 amendment;
Mrs. Boxer, 1 amendment;
Mrs. Feinstein, 1 amendment;
Mr. Feingold, 1 amendment;
Mr. Graham, 1 amendment;
Mr. Leahy, 1 amendment;
Mr. Dodd, 1 amendment;
Mr. Edwards, 2 amendments;
Mr. Daschle, 1 amendment.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators being permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL JEFF SEVERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the professional dedication, vision, and public service of Lieutenant Colonel Jeff Severs who is leaving the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office for assignment as the program manager for the Wind Corrected Munitions Dispenser Program at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. It is a privilege for me to recognize the many outstanding achievements he has provided for the Senate, the Air Force, and our great Nation.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs has served our country with distinction for nearly 14 years. After graduating from the University of Georgia in 1985, he embarked on his Air Force Career with a training assignment at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. He subsequently completed tours of duty at McClellan Air Force Base, California; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; Los Angeles Air Force Base, California; and back again to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In each of his Air Force assignments, Lieutenant Colonel Severs' performance has been outstanding.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs began his tour on Capitol Hill as a legislative fellow assigned to the office of my esteemed colleague from Oklahoma, Senator JIM INHOFE. During this assignment, he worked on the fiscal year 1998 Defense authorization bill. After his assignment with Senator INHOFE, Lieutenant Colonel Severs was reassigned to the Air Force Office of Legislative Liaison in the Pentagon.

Initially, he was responsible for acquisition and logistics issues and was responsible for preparing the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force for posture testimony. He was then selected to be the Executive Officer to the Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison followed shortly thereafter by his reassignment as Deputy Chief of the Air Force Senate Liaison Office.