United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1999 No. 80

# Senate

*(Legislative day of Monday, June 7, 1999)*

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

## PRAYER

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

*For the Lord God is a sun and shield;*
*The Lord will be of grace and glory;*
*No good thing will He withhold*
*From those who walk upright.*

Holy Father, Source of strength, Author of the absolutes of morality, and the One to whom we are accountable, we renew our commitment to walk uprightly. We want to stand tall with steady eyes focused on Your irrevocable mandates for character and behavior. Our deepest desire is to walk with You, dear God, at Your pace, in Your timing, and toward Your goals. Help us not to run ahead of You or to lag behind. Only then can we hear what You have to say for each situation and relationship. May this be a sublime day of serenity because we have placed our hands in Your strong and guiding hand.

We join our hearts in sympathy for Mrs. Joe Biden as she grieves the death of her father, Donald Jacobs. Comfort her with Your presence and hope. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

## RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

## SCHEDULE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the defense appropriations bill with a vote ordered on the pending Grassley amendment to occur at 9:45 a.m. As a reminder, first-degree amendments to the bill must be offered by 2:30 p.m. today. Therefore, additional amendments and votes are expected throughout today's session, with the expectation of finishing the bill this evening. Cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to the Y2K legislation yesterday. Thus, a cloture vote will take place on Wednesday.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1122, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:.

A bill (S. 1122) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Stevens (for Grassley) amendment No. 540 to reduce to $500,000 the threshold amount for the applicability of the requirement for advance matching of Department of Defense disbursements to particular obligations.

### AMENDMENT NO. 540

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 15 minutes of debate relative to the Grassley amendment No. 540 with a vote to follow thereon.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, do I control that 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls the time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will not use all of that time for my amendment.

First of all, as to the amendment that is pending, authored by the Senator from Iowa, I thank the Senator from Alaska for offering my amendment yesterday, and I thank the Senator from Alaska for asking for a rollcall vote on my amendment, although this amendment has been offered 5 previous years and adopted 5 previous years without a rollcall. So, personally, I do not think it is necessary to have a rollcall vote. But if the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee want such a rollcall vote, that is OK with me. So I will take then just a few minutes to speak about my amendment on matching disbursements with obligations.

The American taxpayers would take for granted, they would expect, the nurturing of their tax dollars to be so well done at the Federal level that Congress would not have to pass a special amendment which would say that the Department of Defense cannot pay out $1 of taxpayers' money without being able to match it with an invoice and contract that specified what goods or services they were buying. I hope in most of Government that is the case, but it has not been so with the Defense Department. In fact, I have been speaking for years on the subject of the tens of billions of dollars that have actually been spent, and at the time of payment, the department failed to match the particular service or goods that are being paid for with their corresponding contract.

I have had the support of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in setting in place policies that would gradually reduce the amount of money that could be paid out without an invoice and contract to match. This policy has been incorporated in the last

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



Printed on recycled paper.

five appropriations bills—fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999. We are now working on the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill. It is my understanding that the committee supports the amendment again this year.

Under current law, the matching threshold is set at $1 million effective this month. This means that the Department of Defense disbursing officials must match each payment of $1 million or more with a corresponding obligation or contract before the payment is made. My pending amendment would continue the process of ratcheting down the threshold began 5 years ago. It would lower the threshold then from the $1 million in present law to $500,000. Reports of the General Accounting Office and inspectors general consistently show that this policy is helping to reduce DOD's unmatched disbursement problems. As I understand it, the DOD has lowered the threshold to zero in most disbursing centers.

I thank the Department of Defense for having adopted a policy that every taxpayer would assume is a principle of good Government management, and that is that they would not pay out one penny without being able to show what they ordered and received for that penny. That has become a policy at some of the disbursing centers but not at all the centers. So we want to see the threshold lowered to zero at all locations because we think it is just sound business management that not one penny of the taxpayers' dollars should be paid out if there is not an invoice and contract for what has been bought and received, either goods or services, for that amount of money.

So we are not quite at zero all over the country with all of the centers. Some Department of Defense disbursing centers still have problems. This amendment will help keep the pressure on and hopefully in time will help the Department of Defense eliminate in the future all unmatched disbursements, so that the Senator from Iowa will never have to come to the Senate floor again and say we have these billions of dollars that the Pentagon paid out and they have never been able to show exactly what they ordered and received.

If the threshold specified in this amendment is unworkable, then I have asked the chairman to adjust the dollar level in conference, but I hope it is so obvious that we will be able to tell the taxpayers of this country that we know what they are buying; that at least for the next year we should keep the pressure on for the still fantastically high level of $500,000 that could be paid out under certain circumstances without the invoice and contract immediately available.

I do not want to stand before the Senate and be embarrassed by saying that we can somehow justify even a $500,000 check being written without knowing what goods and services were, in fact, ordered and received and being paid for.

I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, and I thank the ranking minority member, Senator INOUYE, for their continuing support of this amendment. Every year for the last 5 years I have offered this amendment, and every year for the last 5 years they have put the amendment in the bill, kept it there and protected it in conference. This effort, particularly with their respected leadership in the area of defense, is very positive toward the Department of Defense changing their attitude about unmatched disbursements and leading us to a point where we are reducing the amount of unmatched disbursements.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their unwavering support, and I hope all my colleagues will support this simple but important amendment. I yield the floor.

I have time left over, and if the Senator from Alaska wants some of my time, he can have it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will take a couple of minutes.

I was pleased to offer this amendment for my good friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY. Senator GRASSLEY's determined effort to improve the Department of Defense financial accounting standards, by demanding that funds disbursed are matched by funds obligated—simply meaning that they balance their checkbook and they let us know so the taxpayers will know what the checks have been written for—his efforts has already yielded results in lowering the Department's unmatched disbursements.

To those who may be unfamiliar with this problem, as of the fiscal year 1998, according to the Department's own inspector general, the Department reported a substantial problem with disbursements. That means that funds were reported having been disbursed to the Treasury but not processed, or, in other cases, the Department's employees could not match a disbursement to an obligated item.

There is a conflict here. We are trying to make certain those who provide services to the Department of Defense are promptly paid. On the other hand, there is a requirement for the taxpayers that we know what they have paid and what we have bought with the funds, as the Senator said.

The Appropriations Committee is pleased to work with Senator GRASSLEY and the Department of Defense to ensure the Department makes steady progress in reducing these problem disbursements. I do support the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, and I believe all Senators seek to improve the Department's control over the appropriation of taxpayers' funds to the Department of Defense.

What time will the vote take place, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. I remind Senators that first-degree amendments to this bill must be offered by 2:30 p.m. Additional amendments and votes are expected through today's session. My colleague and I are working on a package of amendments which we will submit as soon as this time has expired and this amendment has been voted upon. At least we will discuss this package. It is my hope we will be able to finish this bill today. I am going to work to achieve that goal.

Does the Senator from Hawaii wish to make any comments on this amendment?

Mr. INOUYE. No.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

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

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, what time is the vote scheduled to take place?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 9:45.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 540. 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 Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

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

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote ''aye.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—93

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abraham | Cochran | Grassley |
| Akaka | Collins | Gregg |
| Allard | Conrad | Hagel |
| Ashcroft | Coverdell | Harkin |
| Baucus | Craig | Hatch |
| Bayh | Daschle | Helms |
| Bennett | DeWine | Hollings |
| Bingaman | Domenici | Hutchinson |
| Bond | Dorgan | Hutchison |
| Boxer | Durbin | Inhofe |
| Breaux | Edwards | Inouye |
| Brownback | Enzi | Jeffords |
| Bryan | Feingold | Johnson |
| Bunning | Feinstein | Kennedy |
| Burns | Fitzgerald | Kerrey |
| Byrd | Frist | Kerry |
| Campbell | Gorton | Kohl |
| Chafee | Graham | Kyl |
| Cleland | Gramm | Landrieu |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Lautenberg | Nickles | Smith (NH) |
| Leahy | Reed | Smith (OR) |
| Levin | Reid | Snowe |
| Lieberman | Robb | Specter |
| Lincoln | Roberts | Stevens |
| Lott | Rockefeller | Thomas |
| Lugar | Roth | Thompson |
| Mack | Santorum | Thurmond |
| McConnell | Sarbanes | Voinovich |
| Mikulski | Schumer | Warner |
| Murkowski | Sessions | Wellstone |
| Murray | Shelby | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Biden | Grams | Torricelli |
| Crapo | McCain | |
| Dodd | Moynihan | |

The amendment (No. 540) was agreed to.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 541

(Purpose: To substitute for section 8106 (relating to operational support aircraft) a requirement for a report)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 541.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8106, and insert the following:

SEC. 8106. 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.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be laid aside for further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be laid aside.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. 542, 543, 544, AND 545, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to send to the desk a series of amendments which provide adjustments in the bill brought about by a review made by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget. These amendments allocate funds in a different manner under the bill.

The first change is an increase in funds for the Army Test Range Facilities Program.

The second readjusts one account in the Navy, and moves $51.84 million into the Joint War Fighting Experimental Program, and leaves it under the control of Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs reporting to the defense committees of the House and the Senate.

The third will appropriate funds to meet the authorization bill's provision of funds to assist the Red Cross in providing Armed Forces emergency services.

The fourth is to deal with the addition of $10 million from cockpit modifications to the U2.

I send them to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) proposes amendments numbered 542, 543, 544, and 545, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 542, 543, 544, and 545), en bloc, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 542

(Purpose: To provide funds for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army)

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

''SEC. . In addition to any funds appropriated elsewhere in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $9,000,000 is hereby appropriated only for the Army Test Ranges and Facilities program element.''

AMENDMENT NO. 543

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

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy'', is hereby reduced by $26,840,000 and the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', is hereby increased by $51,840,000 to reflect the transfer of the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program may be obligated until the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reports to the Congressional defense committees on the role and participation of all unified and specified commands in the JWEP.''

AMENDMENT NO. 544

(Purpose: To provide funding for the American Red Cross Armed Forces Emergency Services program)

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

''SEC. . In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense, $23,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, that the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $23,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services.''

AMENDMENT NO. 545

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

''SEC. . In addition to the funds available in Title III, $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for U–2 cockpit modifications.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to study these four amendments. They are authorized by the authorizing committee. I am in full support of them.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendments en bloc.

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

The amendments (Nos. 542, 543, 544, and 545), en bloc, 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. Mr. President, we are working on a managers' package. We have several amendments that we believe the Senate should include in such a package. I urge Members who have identified amendments they intend to offer to consult with my friend from Hawaii, myself, and our staffs to see if we can't enlarge this package and take care of a series of items that are really not controversial during the time that we have a vehicle.

As I have stated before, all amendments to this bill in the first degree must be introduced by 2:30 this afternoon.

We stand ready to work with any Member on an amendment. This would be a good time for anyone who has an amendment that is controversial to come and offer it. So far, no one has volunteered to undertake that task. But pending a Member wishing to offer an amendment, 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives the companion bill to S. 1122, the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration thereof; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1122, as passed, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for the third time and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and

that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that S. 1122 not be engrossed and that it remain at the desk pending receipt of the House companion bill, and that upon passage of the House bill, as amended, the passage of S. 1122 be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

## RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are working on the managers' package, and to do this, we have to be off the floor. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11:30 a.m. We hope Members will come and talk to us about this managers' package in the event they want amendments in it.

There being no objection, at 10:42 a.m., the Senate recessed until 11:32 a.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ENZI).

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that Danelle Scotka, a fellow in the office of Senator HUTCHISON, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1122.

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

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. INOUYE. 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. 547

(Purpose: To set aside $63,041,000 of Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation funds for C–5 aircraft modernization)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, I offer an amendment and ask that it be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 547.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', $63,041,000 shall be available for C–5 aircraft modernization.

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

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ms. Sandi Dittig, on the staff of Senator GRAHAM of Florida, be granted full privileges of the floor during this debate.

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

Mr. INOUYE. 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. GREGG. 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. 548

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of refugee relief funds for long-term, regional development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] proposes an amendment numbered 548.

Mr. GREGG. 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 the following new section:

**SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.**

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) for emergency support of refugees and displaced persons and the local communities directly affected by the influx of refugees may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, which I will agree to have set aside whenever the chairman decides to do so, is to address the issue of the reconstruction of Kosovo and funds that might be spent in Kosovo for reconstruction. The concept of reconstruction, of course, is something that is going to have to be dealt with by the Congress and the President over the next few months, no matter what happens relative to the air war.

One of the concerns I have, and I think many Americans have, is that America will end up paying a disproportionate cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo and potentially Yugoslavia. It is my opinion that no American funds should be spent for the reconstruction of Yugoslavia until Milosevic is removed as its leader.

It is further my view that America's participation in the cost of long-term reconstruction of Kosovo should be extremely limited, that our cost should be minor, a fraction of the amount of the cost of reconstruction, and that the vast majority of the burden of reconstruction should be borne by the European nations.

As a nation, the United States has borne a disproportionate amount of the cost of the war that has gone on in Yugoslavia. It is, after all, a European issue more than an American issue. The United States had no national strategic interest in this part of the world. Not until the hundreds of thousands of refugees were created did we really have any significant interest at all in this part of the world; the refugees, of course, being a function of part of the diplomacy of this administration, which, in my opinion, has been a gross blunder in this region of the world.

In any event, this is a European issue which should be addressed by the European nations. Certainly, the reconstruction issue is a European issue which should be addressed by the European nations, and American taxpayers should not be asked to bear the cost of it.

What my amendment does is simply state that the emergency appropriations, which we eventually pass for purposes of fighting the war in Kosovo, will be limited in their application so they cannot be used for long-term structural reform of the economy or the capital needs of Kosovo, without the President coming to Congress and requesting those funds be used in that way and without him putting forward a strategic plan which reflects how much it is going to cost us as a nation to reconstruct the Kosovo infrastructure. Until we receive that plan and it is approved by the Congress, these funds would not be made available for that sort of effort.

It does not limit these funds being used for humanitarian purposes. It does not limit these funds being used for the immediate needs of our own military, should our own military be interjected into Kosovo for some reason. It does not limit the funds being used for things such as replacing wells and getting people back in their homes with electricity temporarily.

What it does limit is any long-term attempt to rebuild Kosovo's infrastructure, which would be part of an overall plan for reconstruction, without us first getting such a plan and knowing

how much it is going to cost the American taxpayers. I do think the administration has an obligation to be honest with the taxpayers and tell us exactly what they are really thinking we are going to have to pay in terms of costs.

I have read news reports coming out of the European Union that suggested the European Union position is that the U.S. taxpayer should pay for half of the cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo. To me, that would be unacceptable. I have read other news reports from folks who work for our agencies saying the United States may be willing to pay up to 25 percent of the long-term cost of the reconstruction of Kosovo. We are talking about, potentially, 5, 10, 15 years, with significant capital expenditures in that region of the world, and 25 percent would be a huge number.

If that is the administration's position, we need to know what that number is before we start down that road. This amendment is a minor attempt to keep us from starting down that road and to get the administration to be forthright as to what are these costs.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will discuss this matter later, but I will say that the Senator's amendment is consistent with my understanding of the purposes for which we passed the 1999 supplemental. The moneys in that supplemental were for assistance to the refugees and for conducting the air war. It is my understanding that there was no money for the ground war, no money for the subsequent force—whatever it may be—that follows after the cessation of hostilities in that area. As the Senator stated, it would be for the long-term reconstruction and not for the temporary things that might be done to assist the Kosovo refugees to go back to their former homes. I think that will be probably something that will have to have money immediately, once we have a cessation of hostilities, which I pray will be very soon.

I think this ought to be a marker that we put down that we want to see how these costs are going to be met in this area after the hostilities cease. The economy of the European Union now is greater than ours. Their employment picture is even better than ours. I don't see any reason why there should be an assumption that we will carry on at the past level of expenditures. There is no question that the expenditures made in the war so far are overwhelmingly U.S. expenditures. I do not deny the participation of the NATO allies in the activities, but their costs are infinitesimal compared to ours when you view the long line that our supplies have to follow to get there and the cost of maintaining our forces there as compared to those who go home every night, in terms of the participants from the European Union.

I hope the Senate will take a very careful look at the Senator's suggestion. I want to make sure that it does not impede the activities of our forces to really provide for their own protection, as well as the facilities that will be needed by our people if they move into the area immediately after the cessation of hostilities. But I do think when we get to a long-range concept, a new Marshall Plan for this area, it is something that the Congress must be involved in, and the taxpayers must know what our share is going to be before we commence such activities.

I urge the Senator to lay his amendment aside.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe my amendment is in sync with the opinions expressed by the chairman. I ask that my amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 549 AND 550, EN BLOC

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes amendments numbered 549 and 550, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 549

(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, $10,000,000 shall be 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. 550

(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 $10,000,000 shall be 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.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Department of Defense operates over two million separate computers and 25,000 distinct computer systems to conduct its mission. These computer systems are integral parts of a wide variety of Department of Defense (DOD) programs. Many of these programs are critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; but other vital activities also affected include command and control, satellites, inventory and transportation management, medical equipment, payment of checks, and personnel records.

The Department is now becoming aware that attacks on these systems may be capable of significantly affecting our military power, just as surely as a direct physical assault. Experience with ''hackers'' and DOD exercises indicate that defense systems, often globally-linked and readily-accessed, are vulnerable to unauthorized penetration of their information networks. Newspapers have been filled with reports in recent days about ''hackers'' attacking the web sites of the FBI, the White House, the Department of Interior, and even the Senate.

For example, I am told that by using unsophisticated ''hacker tools,'' intruders are able to crack systems passwords, establish super-user status (network control), search for and turn on microphones or cameras on personal computers connected to the installation campus area network. Hackers may then capture intra-office conversations and live video and download it to their computers. A simple test of the microphone sensitivity revealed low-level conversations were easily heard from roughly thirty feet away. This is particulary critical in areas where classified and sensitive information is stored and discussed.

The compelling need for controlling access to our Nation's vital information networks through computers becomes immediately evident when one considers just one battlefield scenario—the possibility that one of our important command and control outposts on the ground is overrun by hostile forces. Just imagine what leverage that would provide to a computer-sophisticated enemy. And, I am told that the Department has learned from its experience in Kosovo that this kind of a threat is not limited to major world powers.

At the present time, the basic process the Department relies upon to protect its computer systems are some kind of card and/or passwords including random characters. Users often are required to have several such cards or passwords in connection with their work. This approach to information security has some serious drawbacks for the long run. Passwords can be forgotten, shared, or observed, and cards can

be lost, stolen, or duplicated. Moreover, as the need for even more security grows with advancing technology, the situation will become more cumbersome and less effective. On the other hand, more sophisticated means are expected to become available to make unwanted intrusions, necessitating even more complex password and card systems.

There is an emerging technology available to the Department that promises to provide a more effective information security system, and that is biometrics. Almost everyone is familiar with fingerprints. Fingerprints are a biometric signature. Others are voice, face recognition, the iris of the eye, and keystroke dynamics or typing patterns; and I understand there are others as well. With this approach, access to a particular computer or network of computers is controlled by comparing one or several biometric signatures of the person asking to use the machine, with a template on file in a central location that contains the biometric identification of the authorized user of that computer. There is no card. There is no password. The test is whether the potential user is who he or she claims to be. The system authenticates a claimed identity from previously enrolled patterns or distinguishable traits. I understand that in the commercial world there are some examples of biometric identification already in use. Some ATM machines, for instance, now rely on iris signatures to permit access rather than the familiar card we all carry.

The Army has a particular interest in developing an effective control over the access to its information systems through computers, because of the far flung nature of its forces, and because its battle systems are becoming increasingly dependent on information networks.

This bill already includes $5.0 million in the Other Procurement, Army, appropriation for an initial biometrics computer information assurance system prototype project. I understand that the Army has exhibited strong leadership in the exploration and development of technologies in the biometrics arena, and is a natural leading candidate to be considered as the executive agent in this work for the Department of Defense and perhaps the federal government. The amendment I am offering is intended to respond to the immediacy of the critical information assurance requirement of the Army, and to build on the Army's leadership role in biometrics technology. The amendment also builds on the biometrics prototype project to explore a more focused and synergistic effort to develop information assurance technology. Finally, it also builds on and anticipates a working relationship with the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the FBI, which houses and operates the world's finest single biometric data base—fingerprints. Specifically, my amendment provides an additional $10.0 million 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be laid aside.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment to this bill. In fact, I am a member of the subcommittee and I commend the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE, for their leadership and work on this legislation. I am pleased to work with them on a range of issues that deal with the defense of this country and with the strengthening of the Armed Forces. I think they do an excellent job.

There is one area—and not just on this legislation—of the policy debate in Congress I wanted to mention during the discussion on funding, and that is the area of national missile defense. I do have some concerns about the policy and direction of national missile defense. I wanted to express them now because I think this is the appropriate place.

I don't quarrel with the question of research for national missile defense. We have been involved in a robust research program on missile defense. Hopefully, that research, at some point, will bear fruit sufficient that if a threat exists that would persuade us to deploy, we would deploy a national missile defense system that is a workable system and one that provides real and significant protection to our country.

Last week—I think perhaps it was a week ago tomorrow—I was driving on a road up in far northeastern North Dakota. I looked to my left and I saw this huge concrete structure. It is, of course, the only antiballistic missile system that was ever built in the free world. It was built in the late 1960s, early 1970s. It was built in Nekoma, ND, up in the northeastern corner of our State. The very month it was declared operational it was also mothballed. Apparently, in today's dollars, somewhere around $20 billion was spent. We still have the massive quantities of concrete poured into a building that looks very much like a modern-day pyramid up in the vast reaches of northeastern North Dakota. That is a legacy, I suppose, to the taxpayers who say sometimes you can have a very expensive program that doesn't turn out quite the way you expected. Some will say, well, that program was just fine; it was a bargaining chip in arms control, and it was mothballed the very month it was declared operational because that was part of the strategic calculation of our country. Of course, that is not the case.

I want to talk for a moment about the range of threats against our country. One of those threats is the threat of a terrorist nation, or an adversary, acquiring an intercontinental ballistic missile and affixing to the top of this missile a nuclear warhead and then firing that missile at the United States of America. If that should happen, do we want to have in place a national missile defense system to intercept it? Of course. The answer is yes, of course.

What are the likely threats? I mentioned an intercontinental ballistic missile being acquired by a terrorist nation. But, it is far more likely that it would not be an intercontinental ballistic missile but a cruise missile; they are much more widely dispersed, and it would be much more easily acquired. That cruise missile would travel 500 feet above the ground, at 500 or 600 miles an hour, and would be launched from a barge, or a submarine, or a plane just off our shores. That is not going to be intercepted by a national missile defense system.

Some say we are working on theater defense that will intercept cruise missiles. Yes, but that theater defense isn't part of what is going to protect the perimeter of our country. It is far more likely that a terrorist nation would acquire a cruise missile. Is there a defense system against a cruise missile?

It is far more likely a terrorist nation would, in fact, terrorize our country with a deadly vial of biological or chemical weapons that could cause the kind of chaos that nearly occurred in Japan a couple of years ago, where the right kind of deadly biological agents can kill thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million people. It is far more likely that a major U.S. city would be threatened by a suitcase bomb placed in the trunk of a rusty Yugo car on a New York City dock by a terrorist nation. That is far more likely than them acquiring a sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missile.

The potential, for example, of an adversary such as Russia, which has substantial nuclear might, accidentally launching tubes full of missiles from a Russian submarine would not be defeated by the national missile defense system we are talking about because the system being discussed could only potentially defeat a handful of missiles, not an accidental launch of all the tubes of a Russian submarine. Only a handful of missiles could be intercepted by the missile defense system that is currently under discussion. That doesn't suggest that we ought not consider it. But the question I ask is this: Consideration at what price and with what other consequences?

First, as we begin to make decisions about a national missile defense system, I don't think we ought to just throw money at the system. I think some who have an appetite for it say

we should just keep pouring money in there and somehow a system will emerge that will protect our country. I think that would lead to a great deal of waste.

Second, the debate we have about deploying a national missile defense system, as soon as technologically possible or feasible, is a debate that worries me, because it seems to suggest all of the consequences are less important and all of the consequences should be set aside.

What are those other consequences? One is a program we now have under way with Russia in which we actually saw the wings off Russian bombers. We actually remove Russian missiles from their silos and remove the warheads from the missile. We are reducing in a dramatic way the number of missiles and bombers and the capabilities of delivering warheads aimed at this country.

I have in this desk drawer a little vial which, with the consent of the Presiding Officer, I will show. This little vial of material is wiring that was ground up. It is from a Russian submarine that carried missiles aimed at the United States. That submarine is reduced to small pieces of metal. It is cut up. It doesn't exist anymore. I have some of the wiring right here.

How do we acquire the wiring of a Russian ballistic missile submarine? You could shoot it and destroy it. That is one way. Or, the other way is with an agreement between ourselves and the Russians to reduce weapons of mass destruction and the delivery capabilities of each side. We have seen submarines and bombers and nuclear warheads being systematically reduced in a very aggressive way.

That is exactly what is happening here. That happens through the Nunn-Lugar funds that are offered in this kind of legislation. It is a very important program. It has been remarkably successful. I do not want to, by what we are doing in other areas, jeopardize that kind of arms reduction and arms control.

One other point, Mr. President: It is true that this is an increasingly difficult and dangerous world. North Korea is testing medium-range missiles. Iran is testing medium-range missiles. Pakistan and India do not like each other, and they exploded nuclear weapons right under each other's nose. It is a difficult and dangerous world.

I support research on missile defense. But I do not support efforts that would say let us demand deployment of any system as soon as technologically feasible, even if it is at the expense of injuring other efforts to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons, or to eliminate delivery systems of nuclear weapons under current arms control regimes.

Some say the ABM Treaty is for a country that no longer exists, the old Soviet Union; don't worry about it; ignore it.

The fact is that we have made significant progress under our arms control agreements. I think we need to be very careful as we proceed down this road not to do one thing at the expense of others that we know will work.

I only wanted to say again that the national missile defense program is one that I have provided support for by substantial amounts of research. I do worry sometimes that the amount of money offered is exceeding the amount of money the system is capable of using effectively. It is a difficult technology to hit a bullet with a bullet at intercontinental missile speeds. Some of my colleagues make the point that it is not one program, it is many programs in a seamless transition of dealing with suppression of missile threats in the theater, and also dealing with intercontinental ballistic missile threats.

It is true that these programs represent a number of different kinds of programs. But the largest of them is the national missile defense program, commonly referred to as that, which would be deployed to defend against an intercontinental ballistic missile. Representing a State that has housed the only ABM or national missile defense program that was ever built in the Free World, I have some acquaintance with it.

It is my hope that when and if this country deploys a system in the future, it not be done at the expense of arms control reductions that exist in other arms control agreements. That we not decide to focus so much on this issue that we do so at the expense of the nonproliferation efforts this country ought to have as job one. We ought to worry very much every day and in every way about efforts to prevent the proliferation and spread of weapons of mass destruction.

I think there is a lot of evidence out there about which we need to be very concerned. Frankly, I think it has taken a back seat in recent years. I think it has taken a back seat in Congress and a back seat in the administration. I don't think we have had nearly as much effort as I would feel comfortable with to try to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There are not too many countries that have nuclear weapons at this point, but many countries want to acquire them. There is a black market in the weapons material and production of nuclear weapons. As all of those countries are seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, I hope, as we discuss all of these issues, our country will understand that to prevent proliferation of these weapons, we should not just discuss national missile defense in a way that says it is more important than any other area. If we are to build a safer future for ourselves and our children, it must be a priority for us to say that the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world is a very serious problem that this country ought to pay serious attention to, and it ought to command a substantial amount of our time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

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. 551

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), for Mr. NICKLES, proposes an amendment numbered 551.

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

''None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other act may be made available for reconstruction activities in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of Kosovo) as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).''

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be set aside.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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. 552 THROUGH 573, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a portion of the managers' package that we have been working on. I will delineate each amendment, send them to the desk, and ask they be considered en bloc.

The first is an amendment of Senator INHOFE pertaining to the Starstreak missile. The next is an amendment of Senator MACK, $6 million for advanced-track acquisition; another amendment of Senator MACK, $3 million electronic propulsion systems; Senator MACK, $5 million for the tropical remote sensing radar; an amendment of Senator BURNS, $6 million for pollution/waste systems, research and development; Senator MCCONNELL, $13 million for the MK–45, and $19 million for the Close In Weapon System.

I have an amendment for $1.5 million for the Pallet-Loading System; Senator BENNETT, $1 million for the alternative missile engine; Senator HOLLINGS, $3 million for the Environmental Pollution Preventive Initiative; Senator

REID, $4.5 million for hot gas decontamination projects; Senator LIEBERMAN, $2 million for the Medical Informatics; Senator REID, $2.8 million for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System; Senator KERREY, $2 million for recombinant vaccine research; Senator LAUTENBERG, an Army firefighting equipment amendment; Senator BIDEN, $3 million for advanced composite materials processing; Senator DOMENICI, $5 million for Army warfare analysis; Senator DOMENICI, $7.5 million for shield imaging; Senators WYDEN and SMITH, $4 million for laser fusion; an amendment of mine for $20 million for supersonic noise reduction; Senator LEAHY, JCETS reporting requirement; Senator SHELBY, $5 million for the DAU pilot program; Senator INOUYE, an amendment for training by the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management.

As I indicated, these amendments are part of the managers' group and I ask they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendments by number.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for himself and Mr. INOUYE, and on behalf of other Senators, proposes en bloc amendments numbered 552 through 573.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I have studied the measures. I have no objection.

Mr. STEVENS. These amendments have been cleared on both sides. I ask they be considered en bloc, passed and adopted en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 552 through 573) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 552

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

SEC. . The Department of the Army is directed to conduct a live fire, side-by-side operational test of the air-to-air Starstreak and air-to-air Stinger missiles from the AH–64D Longbow helicopter. The operational test is to be completed utilizing funds provided for in this bill in addition to funding provided for this purpose in the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–262): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department is to ensure that the development, procurement or integration of any missile for use on the AH–64 or RAH–66 helicopters, as an air-to-air missile, is subject to a full and open competition which includes the conduct of a live-fire, side-by-side test as an element of the source selection criteria: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition & Technology) will conduct an independent review of the need, and the merits of acquiring an air-to-air missile to provide self-protection for the AH–64 and RAH–66 from the threat of a hostile forces. The Secretary is to provide his findings in a report to the Defense Oversight Committees, no later than March 31, 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 553

(Purpose: To authorize use of $6,000,000 of Air Force RDT&E funds (in PE 604604F) for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system)

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, AIR FORCE'', up to $6,000,000 may be made available for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system.

AMENDMENT NO. 554

(Purpose: To authorize use of $3,000,000 of Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy funds for electronic propulsion systems)

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, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for electronic propulsion systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 555

(Purpose: To authorize use of $5,000,000 of Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense funds for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar)

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE,'' up to $5,000,000 may be made available for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems)

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill the following:

''SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $6,000,000 may be provided to the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory to continue research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems.''

AMENDMENT NO. 557

(Purpose: To correct the allocation of Navy operation and maintenance funds between two naval gun depot overhaul programs)

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY,'' up to $13,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the MK–45 weapon system, and up to $19,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the Close In Weapon System.

AMENDMENT NO. 558

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System)

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY,'' up to $1,500,000 may be available for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System.

AMENDMENT NO. 559

(Purpose: To designate funds for the development of alternate missile engines)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new general provision:

SEC. . Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $1,000,000 may be made available only for alternative missile engine source development.

AMENDMENT NO. 560

(Purpose: To set aside $3,000,000 of Army research, development, test, and evaluation funds for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative)

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriate in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative.

AMENDMENT NO. 561

(Purpose: To provide funds for a hot gas decontamination facility)

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $4,500,000 may be made available for a hot gas decontamination facility.

AMENDMENT NO. 562

(Purpose: To support a DoD Center for Medical Informatics)

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to support the establishment of a DoD Center for Medical Informatics.

AMENDMENT NO. 563

(Purpose: To increase funds for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System)

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS'', up to $2,800,000 may be made available for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System.

AMENDMENT NO. 564

(Purpose: To support recombinant vaccine recombinant vaccine research)

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to continue and expand on-going work in recombinant vaccine research against biological warfare agents.

AMENDMENT NO. 565

(Purpose: To require conveyance of certain Army firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey)

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

SEC. 8109. (a) The purpose of this section is to provide means for the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, to furnish fire protection through the City's municipal fire department for the tenants, including the Coast

Guard, and property at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, thereby enhancing the City's capability for furnishing safety services that is a fundamental capability necessary for encouraging the economic development of Military Ocean Terminal.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, convey without consideration to the Bayonne Local Redevelopment Authority, Bayonne, New Jersey, and to the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, jointly, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the firefighting equipment described in subsection (c).

(c) The equipment to be conveyed under subsection (b) is firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, as follows:

(1) Pierce Dash 2000 Gpm Pumper, manufactured September 1995.

(2) Pierce Arrow 100-foot Tower Ladder, manufactured February 1994.

(3) Pierce HAZMAT truck, manufactured 1993.

(4) Ford E–350, manufactured 1992.

(5) Ford E–302, manufactured 1990.

(6) Bauer Compressor, Bauer–UN 12–E#5000psi, manufactured November 1989.

(d) The conveyance and delivery of the property shall be at no cost to the United States.

(e) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 566

(Purpose: To provide $3,000,000 (in PE 62234N) for the Navy for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding))

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding).

AMENDMENT NO. 567

(Purpose: To set aside $5,000,000 of Army RDT&E funds (in PE 605604A) for Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

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 Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis.

AMENDMENT NO. 568

(Purpose: To set aside $7,500,000 of Air Force RDT&E funds (in PE 603605F) for the GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $7,500,000 may be made available for the GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 569

(Purpose: To set aside $4,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

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 available solely for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries.

AMENDMENT NO. 570

(Purpose: To provide funds for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research)

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available in title IV of this Act for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $20,000,000 may be made available for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research and development efforts.

AMENDMENT NO. 571

On line 22, page 97, insert the following:

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitate the waiver.

AMENDMENT NO. 572

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

SEC. . From within the funds provided for the Defense Acquisition University, up to $5,000,000 may be spent on a pilot program using state-of-the-art training technology that would train the acquisition workforce in a simulated government procurement environment.

AMENDMENT NO. 573

(Purpose: To stipulate training activities of Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance)

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following:

SEC. . During the current fiscal year, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management and humanitarian assistance: *Provided,* That not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the training of foreign personnel conducted under this authority during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under the section: *Provided further,* That the report shall specify the countries in which the training was conducted, the type of training conducted, and the foreign personnel trained.

Mr. STEVENS. We have several other amendments we are trying to get agreed to. I plead with Members of the Senate to bring forth the amendments so we may study them and know the amendments that we will debate later today. It is my hope we will finish this bill this evening.

Let me state for the information of Members of the Senate, this is not a military construction bill. This is the defense bill. Military construction items will be in a separate bill. That bill will be marked up by the Senate tomorrow. Members who have amendments concerning military construction at home or abroad should present those to the subcommittee for consideration at markup tomorrow. We have had some suggested amendments to this bill; we do not want those to come to this bill. This is not within the jurisdiction of the Defense Subcommittee. We will be forced to oppose any amendment that is offered that deals with military construction.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. 574

(Purpose: To authorize a project at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, to evaluate methods of improving efficiency in the operation of military installations)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HUTCHISON, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mrs. HUTCHISON, proposes an amendment numbered 574.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be set aside.

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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as in morning business for 3 minutes.

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

## PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF JAMES HORMEL

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was very surprised and disappointed to find that during our recess when we were not here, the President made a very controversial appointment of James Hormel to be U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. I believe it is something that should not be done. In fact, when I think of procedures, I look to a man I admire so much, Senator BOB BYRD from West Virginia.

During a recess in 1985, President Reagan made several appointments.

Senator BYRD said: The recess appointment power should not be used simply to avoid controversy or to circumvent the constitutional power and responsibility of the Senate. In several cases, Reagan's recess appointments avoided serious and probing debate by the Senate on controversial issues. There is no evidence that the needs of government required any of these appointments to be made as recess appointments.

Then Senator BYRD went on to give the history, as he always does in his very eloquent style, as to how the Constitution does provide for emergencies, for such things as appointments back in the 1800s when people were traveling and unable to get here or when something strategic is pending. In the case of James Hormel, certainly there is not anything strategic pending.

For that reason, I am serving official notice today that I am going to do the same thing Senator BYRD did back in 1985: I am putting holds on every single Presidential nomination.

In the case of James Hormel, it is a little confusing to a lot of people as to why he became controversial. Yes, he is gay. That is not the reason for people opposing him. It is the fact that he is a gay activist who puts his agenda ahead of the agenda of America.

I can recall when he made the statement when first nominated by the President: I wish the President had nominated me to be Ambassador to Norway, because if they have something on the ballot—same-sex marriages or something like that—I might be able to influence it.

That, to me, demonstrated very clearly that he wanted to use this position to advance his own agenda and not the agenda of America.

I hasten to say, I would have the same feelings about any other appointment on any other issue. If David Duke were appointed and came to the conclusion he was going to use his militia interests as his motivation and his agenda more than America's agenda, I certainly would oppose that nomination in the same way. Notice is hereby served.

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.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the regular order.

## RECESS

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

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS).

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 having arrived, the Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes; and under the previous order, at the hour of 2:20, the Senator from Alaska is to be recognized.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield my time to my friend from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 548, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. I send a modification to the desk to amendment No. 548.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

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

**SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.**

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that Commander Tom Bailey, a fellow serving on the staff of Senator COCHRAN, be allowed privileges of the floor during the debate on this bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 575

(Purpose: To authorize $4,000,000 of Army research, development, test, and evaluation funds (in PE 60481A) to be used for the Advanced Integrated Helmet System Program)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator GORTON and ask 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. GORTON, proposes an amendment numbered 575.

The amendment is as follows:

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 576

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for the distinguished majority leader and ask 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. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 576.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

Office of Net Assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the United States Pacific Command, shall submit a report to Congress no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act which addresses the following issues:

1. A review and evaluation of the operational planning and other preparations of the U.S. Defense Department, including but not limited to the U.S. Pacific Command, to implement the relevant sections of the Taiwan Relations Act since its enactment in 1979.

2. A review and evaluation of all gaps in relevant knowledge about the current and future military balance between Taiwan and mainland China, including but not limited to Chinese open source writings.

3. A set of recommendations, based on these reviews and evaluations, concerning further research and analysis that the Office of Net Assessment and the Pacific Command believe to be necessary and desirable to be performed by the National Defense University and other defense research centers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, and ask that it be qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 577.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

(Purpose: To extend for a period of 3 years the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 and the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. ROBERTS, proposes an amendment numbered 578.

The amendment is as follows:

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

**SEC. 8109. EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998 AND INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.**

(a) EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—Section 2 of the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–194; 112 Stat. 627) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1999'' each place it appears and inserting ''September 30, 2002''.

(b) EXTENSION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 902(a) of the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1 note) is amended by striking ''for a period not to exceed one year upon enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''for a period not to exceed September 30, 2002''.

(2) REPORT.—Section 904 of such Act is amended by striking ''a one-year period described in section 902'' and inserting ''the first year following the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or September 30, 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator from Hawaii have any amendments?

Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 579

(Purpose: Relating to the conveyance of the remaining Army Reserve property at former Fort Sheridan, Illinois)

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator DURBIN on Fort Sheridan and ask that it be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 579.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph(1) is a parcel of real property, including any improvement thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 580

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding the accidental civilian casualties of live ammunition testing at Vieques, Puerto Rico, and actions to prevent a recurrence of such a tragic accident)

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN on Vieques, Puerto Rico, and ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 580.

The amendment is as follows:

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 testing of 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 and independent 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 testing and of the extent to which the civilian population at the site can be adequately protected during such testing;

(2) the President should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition testing on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

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

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the testing be carried out despite the potential risks to the civilian population;

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

(D) in the event that testing resumes, measures are to be taken to protect the Island of Vieques and the surrounding area from environmental degradation, including possible environmental harm, that might result from the testing of ammunition containing radioactive materials; and

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the President should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the President decides to resume live-ammunition weapons testing 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 testing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE. I offer an amendment for Senator INOUYE on native Hawaiians, and I ask to have that numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be numbered and laid aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 582

(Purpose: To authorize the use of up to $35,000,000 for the retrofitting and improvement of the current inventory of Patriot missiles to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for Senator KENNEDY on Patriot missiles, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 582.

The amendment is as follows:

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

Of the funds appropriated in title III, Procurement, under the heading ''MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $35,000,000 may be made available to retrofit and improve the current inventory of Patriot missiles in order to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 583

(Purpose: To reduce funding for the National Missile Defense program by $200,000,000 and to increase funding for Army modernization programs by $200,000,000)

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for Senator LEVIN on the National Missile Defense program, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 583.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in Title IV of this act under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, is hereby reduced by $200,000,000: *Provided,* That not more than $836,555,000 of the funds provided under this Act may be obligated for National Missile Defense programs: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Aircraft Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $56,100,000 for re-engining of the CH–47 helicopter; *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Missile Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $98,400,000 for advance procurement of the Javelin missile; *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army is hereby increased by $20,000,000 for procurement of the Field Artillery Ammunition Supply Vehicle; *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Other Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $25,500,000 for procurement of SINCGARS radios.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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

(Purpose: To reduce amounts appropriated for unrequested, low-priority, unnecessary, and wasteful spending by $3,100,000,000)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have 2 amendments to send to the desk. My understanding is, under the unanimous consent agreement, both of these amendments have to be proposed by the time of 2:30, so I send them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 584.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8108, and insert the following:

SEC. 8108. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act by titles III, IV, and VI is hereby reduced by $3,100,000,000, the reductions to be derived from appropriations as follows:

(1) From Operation and Maintenance, Army, $27,000,000.

(2) From Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $36,000,000.

(3) From Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, $10,200,000.

(4) From Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $61,800,000.

(5) From Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, $78,900,000.

(6) From Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, $53,500,000.

(7) From Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard, $2,900,000.

(8) From Aircraft Procurement, Army, $178,000,000.

(9) From Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, $26,400,000.

(10) From Procurement of Ammunition, Army, $37,500,000.

(11) From Other Procurement, Army, $135,500,000.

(12) From Aircraft Procurement, Navy, $69,000,000.

(13) From Weapons Procurement, Navy, $54,400,000.

(14) From Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, $317,500,000.

(15) From Other Procurement, Navy, $67,800,000.

(16) From Procurement, Marine Corps, $54,900,000.

(17) From Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, $164,500,000.

(18) From Missile Procurement, Air Force, $25,400,000.

(19) From Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, $5,100,000.

(20) From Other Procurement, Air Force, $53,400,000.

(21) From Procurement, Defense-Wide, $73,000,000.

(22) From National Guard and Reserve Equipment, $190,500,000.

(23) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, $249,100,000.

(24) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $288,700,000.

(25) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, $263,300,000.

(26) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, $287,900,000.

(27) From Defense Health Program, $226,200,000.

(28) From Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, $61,600,000.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 585

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive certain domestic source or content requirements in the procurement of items)

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I send a second amendment to the desk, and I ask that it be numbered and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 585.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. (a) Subject to subsection (c) and except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may waive any domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement referred to in subsection (b) and thereby authorize procurements of items that are grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured—

(1) inside a foreign country the government of which is a party to a reciprocal defense memorandum of understanding that is entered into with the Secretary of Defense and is in effect;

(2) inside the United States or its possessions; or

(3) inside the United States or its possessions partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured outside the United States or its possessions.

(b) For purposes of this section:

(1) A domestic source requirement is any requirement under law that the Department of Defense must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item that is grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States, its possessions, or a part of the national technology and industrial base.

(2) A domestic content requirement is any requirement under law that the Department must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item produced or manufactured partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States or its possessions.

(c) The authority to waive a requirement under subsection (a) applies to procurements of items if the Secretary of Defense first determines that—

(1) the application of the requirement to procurements of those items would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding providing for reciprocal procurement of defense items that is entered into between the Department of Defense and a foreign country in accordance with section 2531 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) the foreign country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country; and

(3) one or more of the conditions set forth in section 2534(d) of title 10, United States Code, exists with respect to the procurement.

(d) LAWS NOT WAIVED.—The Secretary of Defense may not exercise the authority under subsection (a) to waive any of the following laws:

(1) The Small Business Act.

(2) The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c).

(3) Sections 7309 and 7310 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to ships in Federal Supply Class 1905.

(4) Section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 (10 U.S.C. 2241 note), with respect to articles or items of textiles, apparel, shoe findings, tents, and flags listed in Federal Supply Classes 8305, 8310, 8315, 8320, 8335, 8340, and 8345 and articles or items of clothing, footware, individual equipment, and insignia listed in Federal Supply Classes 8405, 8410, 8415, 8420, 8425, 8430, 8435, 8440, 8445, 8450, 8455, 8465, 8470, and 8475.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority under subsection (a) to waive a domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement is in addition to any other authority to waive such requirement.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman when he would like me to address the issue of one amendment concerning reallocation of $3.1 billion.

Mr. STEVENS. Could we wait until after 2:30? We are trying to get these in by the deadline, and then I will be happy to listen to the Senator's comments.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the chairman, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 586

(Purpose: To provide funds for continued research and development in Space Control Technology)

Mr. STEVENS. I send an amendment to the desk for Senator SHELBY, 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. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 586.

The amendment is as follows:

In Title IV, under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, add the following:

''Of the funds appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation Army, up to $10 million dollars may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology.''

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

AMENDMENT NO. 587

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it, amendments should be numbered and qualified now, and we still have a portion of the managers' package to complete. Would it be in order for me to reserve a place now for the final portion of the managers' amendment and just have an amendment numbered for that purpose at this time.

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

Mr. STEVENS. May I inquire now from the clerk what number will that be?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. 587.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair, and 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 588

(Purpose: To authorize the use of $220,000 for a study at Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin, relating to environmental restoration and remediation at weapons and ammunition production facilities)

Mr. STEVENS. On behalf of the Senator from Hawaii, I send to the desk an amendment for Senator KOHL, 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. INOUYE, for Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 588.

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $220,000 may be made available to carry out the study described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall carry out a study for purposes of evaluating the cost-effectiveness of various technologies utilized, or having the potential to be utilized, in the demolition and cleanup of facilities contaminated with chemical residue at facilities used in the production of weapons and ammunition.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the study at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin.

(3) The Secretary shall provide for the carrying out of work under the study through the Omaha District Corps of Engineers and in cooperation with the Department of Energy Federal Technology Center, Morgantown, West Virginia.

(4) The Secretary may make available to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government information developed as a result of the study.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Again, Mr. President, for the benefit of all Senators, after 2:30, no further amendments in the first degree will be in order; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 589

(Purpose: To provide $3,800,000 (in PE 0602315N) for polymer cased ammunition and to provide an offset)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senators LOTT and COCHRAN, and I ask that it be qualified and set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. LOTT and Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 589.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . Of the total amount appropriated in this Act for RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY shall be increased by $3,800,000 to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 590

(Purpose: To set aside an additional $7,300,000 for space launch facilities, for a second team of personnel for range reconfiguration to accommodate launch schedules)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator GRAHAM, I send an amendment to the desk and 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. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 590.

The amendment is as follows:

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), $7,300,000 shall 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).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 591

(Purpose: To provide for a study of the long term solutions to the removal of ordnance from the Toussaint River, Ohio)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senator

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.

Lieutenant Colonel Severs has earned the respect and trust of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His professional abilities and expertise enabled him to foster excellent working relationships that have served the Air Force and the Senate exceptionally well. As a liaison officer in the Senate, Lieutenant Colonel Severs has provided members and staff with informative and timely support regarding Air Force plans, programs, and constituent casework. His efforts have contributed greatly to maintaining the best trained, best equipped, and best prepared Air Force in the world.

Mr. President, Jeff Severs, his wife, Gay, and children, Hugh and Brooke, have made many sacrifices during his 14-year Air Force career. He continues to serve with a dedication and enthusiasm seen only in our Nation's best and brightest. He is a great credit to the Air Force and the country, and his efforts on behalf of members and staff of the Senate will be greatly missed. As he now departs for new challenges at Eglin Air Force Base, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize his service to the Senate and wish him well in his new assignment.

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, June 7, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,606,738,885,838.87 (Five trillion, six hundred six billion, seven hundred thirty-eight million, eight hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred thirty-eight dollars and eighty-seven cents).

Five years ago, June 7, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,606,572,000,000 (Four trillion, six hundred six billion, five hundred seventy-two million).

Ten years ago, June 7, 1989, the federal debt stood at $2,795,983,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred ninety-five billion, nine hundred eighty-three million).

Fifteen years ago, June 7, 1984, the federal debt stood at $1,519,266,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred nineteen billion, two hundred sixty-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, June 7, 1974, the federal debt stood at $471,794,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-one billion, seven hundred ninety-four million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,134,944,885,838.87 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, nine hundred forty-four million, eight hundred eighty-five thousand, eight hundred thirty-eight dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

## S. 744

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to speak briefly on a bill reported out of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on May 19, 1999. S. 744 provides for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 744 is to provide Alaska's federal land grant college, the University of Alaska, with a federal land grant of at least 250,000 acres. S. 744 would also transfer to the federal government 29 inholdings currently owned by the University within conservation system units in Alaska.

When this bill was passed out of Committee it was done so with an amendment that clarified the lands the University was to relinquish under Section 3 of the bill. Those lands are listed in a document entitled ''The University of Alaska's Inholding and Reconveyance Document'' and dated May 17, 1999.

I ask unanimous consent a copy of this document be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA'S INHOLDING RECONVEYANCE DOCUMENT, MAY 17, 1999

| Region | Area | UA ID Number | Booked value | Acres | Federal land type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| South Central | Alaska Peninsula | AP.IH.001 | $15,000 | 8 | AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. |
| South Central | Alaska Peninsula | AP.UL.001 | 36,000 | 360 | AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. |
| South Central | Alaska Peninsula | AP.UL.002 | 16,000 | 8 | AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. |
| South Central | Alaska Peninsula | AP.WB.001 | 373,200 | 622 | AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. |
| South Central | Alaska Peninsula | AP.WB.002 | 5,600 | 56 | AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. |
| South Central | Nuka Island | HM.NK.001 | 76,500 | 23 | Kenai Fjords National Park. |
| South Central | Nuka Island | HM.NK.002 | 150,000 | 24 | Kenai Fjords National Park. |
| Southeast | Brady Glacier | JU.BG.0001 | 15,000,000 | 400 | Glacier Bay National Park. |
| South Central | Jack Bay | GU.JB.0001 | 600,000 | 942 | Chugach National Forest. |
| Southeast | Cape Bingham | JU.CB.0001 | 1,650,000 | 835 | Tongass National Forest. |
| South Central | Copper Basin | CB.CC.001 | 36,400 | 108 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Blackburn Subd | WR.BB.001 | 25,000 | 5 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Blackburn Subd | WR.BB.002 | 85,000 | 17 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Blackburn Subd | WR.BB.003 | 10,000 | 2 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Blackburn Subd | WR.BB.004 | 170,000 | 34 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy Creek Subdivison | WR.MC.001–094 | 2,015,775 | 867 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.003 | 614,466 | 1,058 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.004 | 192,000 | 320 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.005 | 1,344,000 | 2,240 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.006 | 384,000 | 640 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.007 | 240,000 | 400 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.008 | 223,200 | 372 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | McCarthy | WR.MY.009 | 240,000 | 400 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Strelna | WR.SN.001 | 240,000 | 400 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Strelna | WR.SN.002 | 871,200 | 1,452 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Strelna | WR.SN.004 | 254,400 | 424 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Wrangell Glaciers | WR.WG.001 | 800 | 20 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Wrangell Glaciers | WR.WG.002 | 5,439 | 136 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Wrangell Glaciers | WR.WG.003 | 100 | 103 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Wrangell Glaciers | WR.WG.004 | 100 | 82 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| South Central | Orange Hill | WR.OII.001 | 225,000 | 1,600 | Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve. |
| | | Totals | 25,189,130 | 13,552 | |

SUMMARY

| Federal conservation system unit | Values | Acres |
|---|---|---|
| AK Peninsula & Maritime National Wildlife Refuge | $445,800 | 1,054 |
| Chugach National Forest | 600,000 | 942 |
| Glacier Bay National Park | 15,000,000 | 400 |
| Kenai Fjords National Park | 226,500 | 47 |
| Tongass National Forest | 1,690,000 | 835 |
| Wrangell St. Elias National Park & Perserve | 7,226,880 | 10,680 |
| Total | 25,189,189 | 13,958 |

## WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity today to call my colleagues' attention to the importance of women's health care issues. I came to know the importance of women's health early in life. Some of you may know that my mother suffered from tuberculosis. Back in those days, patients with TB had to be isolated, so my mother was living in a sanatorium. I could not see her in person, only through the windows.

In the past, women's health did not receive the attention it deserves. I believe it is time to change that. If we are to eliminate the diseases that especially afflict women today, we will need real dedication to the task of developing new treatments and prevention techniques.

And because women make many of the health care decisions for families, their decisions touch the health of many people—children, spouses, elderly parents and relatives. In this great country of ours, where we emphasize personal responsibility, good health care decisions are fundamental to quality health.

As medical science advances into new territory, expanded choices will give women unprecedented opportunities to live better and longer lives, and to affect the quality of health care in our country. Women will be called upon to take charge of their own health as well

as to demand medical excellence for their families. Only with the help of such informed decision makers will we be able to develop policies which assure all Americans access to affordable, quality health care.

In an effort to highlight women's health care and to make women aware of the health care choices that are available to them, I recently co-hosted a forum, Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know, with our former colleague in the Senate, Hank Brown, now President of the University of Northern Colorado. The conference featured a number of panelists who discussed the latest research and treatment of various kinds of cancer as well as depression and eating disorders. Legislative initiatives and solutions were also part of the forum agenda.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the forum agenda and an article from the Greeley Tribune newspaper highlighting remarks of the keynote speaker Assistant Surgeon General Susan Blumenthal be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

HEALTH CARE: WHAT EVERY WOMAN SHOULD KNOW

Sponsored by Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and the University of Northern Colorado)

U.S. SENATE,
*Washington, DC, June 3, 1999.*

DEAR FRIENDS: Thank you for attending today's forum, Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know. I am honored to co-host this event with the University of Northern Colorado, and I hope today's forum provides you with knowledge to ensure a healthier life for you and your families.

I have always worked to ensure access to affordable, high quality health care. Women's health has historically received little attention and it is time that we correct that. Because women are the primary care givers and make most of the health care decisions for families, it is important to make women aware of the advances that are taking place in the areas of research, detection, treatment and prevention.

Personal health choices are fundamental to quality health care. Today's forum will highlight approaches that can lead to early intervention, less invasive and less expensive treatment and cost-saving strategies.

I sincerely hope you will use what you learn today to make positive health care choices.

Sincerely,

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL,
*U.S. Senator.*

AGENDA

8:30 a.m.—Registration Confirmation: Coffee, fruit, bagels.

9:00 a.m.—Welcome: UNC President Hank Brown and Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

9:15 a.m.—Panel I: Confronting the ''C'' Word—Moderator: Kim Christiansen, Channel 9 News Anchor.

Saving Your Skin: Skin Cancer—Jim Martin, PhD, GNP;

The Capricious Cancer: Breast Cancer—Alison Merrill, RN, MS;

The Silent Cancer: Ovarian Cancer—Susan Carter, MD;

Survival and Beyond: Cancer Rehabilitation—Susan Carter, MD.

10:20 a.m.—Break.

10:35 a.m.—Panel II: Mind and Body Connections—Moderator: Adele Arakawa, Channel 9 News Anchor—

Your Mind and Moods: Dealing with Depression—Maria deMontigny Korb, RN, PhD;

The Fear of Being Fat: Eating Disorders—Judy Stauter Huse, RD, MS;

How to Change with the Change of Life—Meredith Mayer, RN, MS, FNP.

11:35 a.m.—Getting the Best Care: How You Can Be An Advocate (Legislative Initiatives and Solutions)—Raissa Geary, MA, Professional Staff, U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

Noon—Lunch: Guest Speaker: Susan Blumenthal, MD, MPA, Assistant Surgeon General—''Critical Public Health Issues for Women in the 21st Century''.

1:00 p.m.—Closing Remarks: Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO,
*Greeley, CO, June 1999.*

GREETINGS: It is my pleasure to extend warm greetings and welcome you to this forum on Health Care: What Every Woman Should Know. The University is proud to co-sponsor this event with Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and the College of Health and Human Sciences. The College is dedicated to improving the human condition through its educational programs and fosters a desire of ''giving back'' to the community.

This is a special occasion for the University of Northern Colorado and a sign of our commitment to be an educational partner with other community. I would like to acknowledge the North Colorado Medical Center, Inc. and the Western Plains Health Network who serve as partners in this important forum. We hope to expand our partnerships with other institutions and communities to truly reflect our University mission in teaching, research, and service throughout the State of Colorado.

The forum is designed to help you: recognize the warning signs and be aware of factors that affect your well-being; take responsibility for making wise decisions about your treatment and recovery; and, how to be an active, well-informed partner in health care. Your attitude, knowledge and involvement in the health care partnership can influence the progress of treatment and rehabilitation. This forum can help you make a difference.

We hope you will find this forum a fine resource for the knowledge necessary to dispel old myths, quiet new anxieties, and provide information that all women need about their health care.

Sincerely,

HANK BROWN,
*President.*

MODERATORS

Adele Arakawa is an anchor for Channel 9 News, the Gannett-owned NBC affiliate. She attended Tennessee Tech University and the University of Tennessee and has been in broadcasting since the age of 16. She won best-anchor in 1997 for coverage of the Oklahoma City Bombing Trial and has received a total of 7 Emmy nominations.

Kim Christiansen is an anchor and reporter for Channel 9 News, the Gannett-owned NBC affiliate. She received a degree in Journalism from the University of Colorado in Boulder. Kim is devoted to the fight against breast cancer and serves as the spokesperson for the Buddy Check 9 program at 9 News, which was nominated for a national community service Emmy Award. She received three heartland region Emmy awards for news writing and outstanding general news.

SPEAKERS

Susan J. Blumenthal, MD, MPA is a national expert in women's health and mental illness. Dr. Blumenthal serves as U.S. Assistant Surgeon General, Rear Admiral, and Senior Science Advisor in the Department of Health and Human Services. She is also a Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Georgetown School of Medicine and Tufts University Medical Center. For 12 years prior to her appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, she directed major national research programs at the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Blumenthal writes a monthly health column for Elle magazine.

Raissa Geary is a professional staff member for the U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. She received a BA from the University of Connecticut and holds a Master's Degree in Comparative Politics from American University. Ms. Geary develops and drafts health legislation and agency directives and advises the committee on all health issues. Her work during the 106th Congress includes Managed Care Reform and Medical Records Confidentiality.

PANELISTS

Susan Carter is a gynecologic surgeon, specializing in women's health issues. She received a BA from the University of Texas, Austin and an MD from the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston. Dr. Carter is Director of the Regional Breast Center of North Colorado and Medical Director of the Rocky Mountain Cancer Rehabilitation Institute.

Jan Martin has worked with the University of Northern Colorado School of Nursing for over 14 years. She received a BS in nursing from Northwestern Louisiana University; an MS in nursing and GNP from the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center; and a PhD in Higher Education Administration from the University of Denver.

Alison S. Merrill teaches nursing at the University of Northern Colorado and is a Clinical Nurse Specialist in Oncology. She received a BS in Nursing from the University of Rhode Island and an MS in Nursing from the University of Michigan.

Meredith Mayer is a nurse practitioner and faculty member at the North Colorado Family Medicine Residency Training program in Greeley, CO. She received a BS in psychology at the University of Colorado in Boulder and an MS in Nursing at Pace University in Briarcliff Manor, NY.

Judy Stauter Huse is a Health Education and Nutrition Consultant, specializing in wellness and eating disorders. She received her BS and MS from Iowa State University and has taught nutrition at the North Colorado Medical center and the University of Northern Colorado.

Maria deMontigny Korb is on faculty at the University of Northern Colorado Department of Nursing. She studied for a Master's Degree and PhD in Transcultural Nursing at the University of Utah and has worked and taught in the clinical area of psychiatric nursing.

---

WOMEN'S HEALTH GETS MORE ATTENTION—ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL SPEAKS ON ADVANCES

(By Adam Silverman)

Although mammograms are responsible for saving the lives of thousands of women every year, the technology is 40 years old and still misses crucial early warning signs of breast cancer.

That was the challenge facing Susan Blumenthal, assistant surgeon general of the United States. Rather than waiting for new technology to be developed, she called the CIA. Together with NASA and the CIA, Blumenthal used spy-satellite technology to improve the success of mammograms.

''Some of the same imaging technology used to find tanks camouflaged behind trees can now be used to find cancer cells,'' she

said. Blumenthal was in Greeley on Thursday to deliver the keynote address at a conference about women's health.

The conference, held at the University of Northern Colorado, featured a variety of panelists who discussed everything from anorexia to breast cancer to political action.

Blumenthal delivered a ''report card'' on women's health in the country today: The biggest problem facing women isn't any one disease, but instead is a lack of focus on women's health.

''We must address these issues if we want to safeguard women's health,'' she said.

The problem stems from the fact that women's health issues also are political issues, said Raissa Geary, a member of the U.S. Senate's Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

''This is more politically charged than almost anything we do,'' she said. ''We're treated as a political issue when it comes to health care. We have wonderful, pure approaches to women's health care policy, but it's not in a vacuum.''

Although women's health is not being discussed as often as most women would like, awareness of health problems facing women has increased in the past century, Blumenthal said.

For many years, serious health problems such as heart disease and lung cancer were thought only to occur in men. But through increasing research in women's health issues, Blumenthal said, concerns such as these are being discussed.

Also, it's important to include women and minorities in all research projects relating to health issues that affect women as well as men, Blumenthal said. Programs that don't include women will lose their federal funding.

Marianne Dinges attended the conference Thursday and said the experience was valuable. She said she was impressed with the quality of the speakers and the topics they were scheduled to discuss.

''It appeared we were going to see a full gamut of issues and their political relevance,'' she said. ''A lot of us are involved in women's issues and hear a lot about this, but we all got new information.''

The conference was sponsored by UNC and U.S. Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, R-Colo. Campbell said his staff pitched the idea to UNC after receiving many calls from women about health issues.

''It came from the community activists who wanted me to do it,'' he said.

The issues addressed at the conference need to be at the forefront of public debate, Campbell said.

He said he will take the information back to Washington, D.C., and enter it into the Congressional Record. He also wants to start a series of forums like the one Thursday to further address the issues.

''We just touched the surface of women's health,'' he said. ''The time to endure is passed. It's time to fight back.''

HEALTHY LIVING

Susan Blumenthal, assistant U.S. surgeon general, gave these tips for healthy lives:

Find a doctor who respects you.

Know your family health history; many diseases are genetic and run in families.

If you smoke, stop. If you don't, never do. It's the No. 1 preventable cause of health problems among women.

Exercise or do some other sort of physical activity at least 30 minutes every day. This could be as simple as riding a bike or walking up stairs rather than using the elevator.

Eat smart.

Get annual physical exams, and make sure to include routine women's health tests such as pap smears.

Know your health care plan and make sure to read the fine print.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, information we received at the forum will be helpful in my work on the Appropriations Committee as we consider funding priorities in the women's health area.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1259. An act to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

H.R. 1915. An act to provide grants to the States to improve the reporting of unidentified and missing persons.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 435) to make miscellaneous and technical changes to various trade laws, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 334(b)(1) of Public Law 105–220 and the order of the House of Thursday, May 27, 1999, and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, the Speaker appoints the following member on the part of the House to the Twenty-First Century Workforce Commission: Mr. David L. Stewart of St. Louis, Missouri.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, Chairman, appointed on February 11, 1999: Mr. GILMAN of New York, Vice Chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota, Mr. SHAW of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. UPTON of Michigan, Mr. STEARNS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. DANNER of Missouri, Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

## MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1915. An act to provide grants to the States to improve the reporting of unidentified and missing persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–3384. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3385. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Thomson, GA: Docket No. 99–ASO–45–17 (5–17)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0176), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3386. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22), Amdt. No. 1931/5–21 (5–24)'' (RIN2120–AA65) (1999–0026), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3387. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (65), Amdt. No. 1930/5–21 (5–24)'' (RIN2120–AA65) (1999–0025), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3388. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Streamlining of Radio Technical Rules in Parts 73 and 74 of the Commission's Rules-First Report and Order'' [MM Docket No. 98–93), (RIN3060–AG81), (FCC 99–55), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3389. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. [Meyersdale, Pennsylvania; Richwood, West Virginia; Newell, Iowa; Superior, Wyoming; LaCenter, Kentucky; Lovell, Wyoming; Royal City, Washington)'' [MM Docket Nos. 98–28; 98–33, 98–71; 98–109; 98–114; 98–116; 98–150), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3390. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Memorandum Opinion and Order—Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act'' [MM Docket No.

97–234, CG Docket No. 92–52 and Gen Docket No. 90–264), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3391. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 72.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (East Brewton, Alabama and Navarre, Florida)'' [MM Docket No. 97–233, received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3392. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 72.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ely and Carlin, NV)'' [MM Docket No. 98–185), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EC–3393. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice, Procedure, and Evidence for Administrative Proceedings of the Coast Guard (USCG–1998–3472)'' (RIN2115–AF59), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3394. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, TX (CGD–08–99–034)'' (RIN2115–AE479)(1999–0011), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3395. A communication from the Senior Regulations Analyst, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR: Cape Fear River, Wilmington, North Carolina (CGD–05–98–106)'' (RIN2115–AE46)(1999–0010), received April 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3396. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Means of Compliance for the Pilot-In-Command; Night Takeoff and Landing; Recent Flight Experience Requirements; Final Rule'' (RIN2120–AG77), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3397. A communication from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Revision to Regulations Governing Transportation and Unloading of Liquified Compressed Gas Service'' (RIN2137–AD07), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3398. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Governing the Taking of Marine Mammals by Alaskan Natives; Marking and Reporting of Beluga Whales Harvested in Cook Inlet'' (RIN0648–AM57), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3399. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''American Meteorological Society's Industry/Government Scholarship and Fellowship Program'' (RIN0648–ZA61), received May 14, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3400. A communication from the Deputy Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Availability of Funds for Cooperative Agreements to Provide Fellowships for Undergraduate, Graduate, and Post-Graduate Students'' (RIN0693–ZA29), received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3401. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Gulf of Alaska to Directed Fishing for Groundfish by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear'', received May 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3402. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States—Announcement That the 1999 Summer Flounder Commercial Quota Has Been Harvested for Maine'', received April 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3403. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Licensing, Financial Responsibility Requirements, and General Duties for Ocean Transportation Intermediaries'' (Docket No. 98–28), received April 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3404. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Carrier Automated Tariff Systems'' (FMC Docket No. 98–29), received April 30, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3405. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Order on Reconsideration: In the Matter of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Commercial Availability of Navigational Devices'' (CS Docket No. 97–80; FCC 99–95), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3406. A communication from the Program Support Analyst, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; S.N. CENTAIR 101 Series Gliders; Docket No. 98–CE–50–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3407. A communication from the Program Support Analyst, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Request for Comments: Eurocopter France Model SA341G and SA342J Helicopters; Docket No. 99 SW 03–AD'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3408. A communication from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31. 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3409. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3410. A communication from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3411. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the HHS section of the Office of Inspector General's semiannual report for the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3412. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Office of Government Ethics Freedom of Information Act Regulations'' (RIN3209–AA22), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3413. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the actuarial reports on the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System, and the Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement System for the plan year ending September 30, 1996; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3414. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5A for the Period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998''; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3415. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a certification of a proposed Manufacturing and Technical Assistance Agreement for the Netherlands and Germany; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3416. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the employment of Americans by the United Nations during calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3417. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a certification of a proposed manufacturing license for the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3418. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3419. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Reserve Forces Policy Board annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3420. A communication from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–307)'' (RIN0790–AG68), received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3421. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of

Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Work Stoppage Report'' (DFARS Case 99–D003), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3422. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Contracts Crossing Fiscal Years'' (DFARS Case 99–D008), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3423. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Entity List: Addition of Entities Located in the People's Republic of China; and Correction to Spelling of One Indian Entity Name'' (RIN0694–AB60), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3424. A communication from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organization and Functions, Availability and Release of Information, Contracting Outreach Program'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3425. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exemption of the Securities of the Kingdom of Sweden under the Securities Act of 1934 for Purposes of Trading Futures Contracts on Those Securities'' (RIN3235–AH68), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3426. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26692, 05/17/99'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3427. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26694, 05/17/99'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3428. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations, 64 FR 26690, 05/17/99 (FEMA Doc. #7284)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3429. A communication from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Consumer Report for calendar year 1998; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3430. A communication from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Programs Guaranteed Loans'' (RIN0575–AC17), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3431. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas'' (APHIS Docket No. 99–033–1), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3432. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rev. Rul. 99–26, BLS–LIFO Department Store Indexes-April 1999'' (Rev. Rul. 99–26), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3433. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled the ''Self-Employment Assistance Program''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3434. A communication from the Register of Copyrights, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Copyright and Digital Distance Education''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3435. A communication from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Willow Creek Dam, Sun River Project, Montana; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3436. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs'' for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3437. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Fuel Transportation Program'' (RIN1904–AA99) (10CFR Part 490), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3438. A communication from the Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 800)'' (RIN3010–AA04), received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3439. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'' (98F–0730), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3440. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'' (98F–0368), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3441. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Polymers'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3442. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3443. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Admimistration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conforming Regulations Regarding Removal of Section 507 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act; Confirmation of Effective Date'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3444. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations for in Vivo Radiopharmaceuticals Used for Diagnosis and Monitoring'' (RIN0910–AB52), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3445. A communication from the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled ''Implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994'' and ''1998 State Profiles''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3446. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitative Research'' (84.133), received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3447. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Final Annual Performance Plan for Fiscal Year 2000''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3448. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Crocket, TX; Docket No. 99–ASW–03 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0184), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3449. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model AS 3321.2 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Project No. 98–SW–61 [5/26 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0232), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3450. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model SA–365N, N1, N2, N3, ans SA–366G1 Helicopters; Request for Comments; Project No. 98–SW–47 [5/26 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0231), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3451. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Mooney Aircraft Corporation Model M20R Airplanes; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99–CE–14 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0230), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3452. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98–NM–383 [5/24 (5–27)]'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0229), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3453. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–68–AD; Amendment 39–11165; AD 99–10–12'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3454. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–337–AD; Amendment 39–11132; AD 99–08–23'' (RIN2120–AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3455. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped With General Electric Model CF6-45 or -50 Series Engines; or Pratt and Whitney Model JT9D-3, -7, or -70 Series Engines; and 747-E4B (Military) Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-49-AD; Amendment 39-11144; AD 99-09-11'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3456. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-59-AD; Amendment 39-11136; AD 99-09-04'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3457. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-44-AD; Amendment 39-11135; AD 99-09-03'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3458. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-43-AD; Amendment 39-11134; AD 99-09-02'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3459. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Request for Comments; Eurocopter France Model AS-350B, B1, B2, B3 BA, and D Helicopters and Model AS 355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters; Docket No. 98-SW-44-AD;'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3460. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems Model 369E, 369FF, 500N, and 600H Helicopters; Docket No. 99-SW-11-AD'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3461. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Lockheed Model L-1011-385 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-199-AD; Amendment 39-11147; AD 99-09-14'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 3, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3462. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Empressa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-145 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-11172; AD 99-11-01'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3463. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3R and CL-604) Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-99-AD; Amendment 39-11170; AD 99-09-52'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3464. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Mitsubishi Model YS-11 Series Airplanes; DOT Docket No. 97-NM-92-AD; Amendment 39-11169; AD 99-10-16'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3465. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P-180 Airplanes; Docket No. 98-CE-96-AD'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3466. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Beech Models 65-90, 65-A90, 65-A90-1, -2, -3, -4, B90, C90, C90A, E90, H90 and F90 Airplanes; Final Rule; Request for Comments; Docket No. 99-CE-18-AD'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3467. A communication from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Docket No. 97-ANE-58-AD, Amendment 39-11173; AD 99-11-02; Pratt and Whitney R-1340 Series Reciprocating Engines'' (RIN2120-AA64), received May 17, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3468. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of five rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and Rhode Island; Nitrogen Oxides Budget and Allowance Trading Program (FRL #6080-4)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Amendments to Air Pollution Control Regulation Number 9 (FRL #6346-6)'', ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Generic Maximum Achievable Control Technology (Generic MACT) (FRL #6346-9)'', ''OMB Approvals under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Technical Amendments (FRL #6056-6)'' and ''Underground Storage Tank Program: Approved State Petroleum Program for Tennessee (FRL #6334-7), received May 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3469. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio (FRL #6337-5)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3470. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) Addressing Sulfur Dioxide in Harris County (FRL #6349-9)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3471. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Group-Term Insurance; Uniform Premiums'' (RIN1545-AN54) (TD 8821), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3472. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Secured Employee Benefits Settlement Initiative'' (Revenue Procedure 99-26), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3473. A communication from the Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3474. A communication from the Chair, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Selected Medicare Issues'', dated June 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3475. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–3476. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers; Correction'' (92F–0285), received May

27, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3477. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Direct Food Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe: Cellulase Enzyme Preparation Derived from Trichoderma Longibrachiatum for Use in Processing Food'' (79G–0372), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3478. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Infertility and Sexually Transmitted Diseases'', dated March 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3479. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pennsylvania Regulatory Program—Final Rule; Correction'' (SPATS #PA–125–FOR), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3480. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Energy Efficient and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Biodiesel Fuel Use Credit'' (RIN1904–AB00) (10 CFR part 490), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3481. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Macau to the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AB89), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3482. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Flood Insurance Program; Determining the Write-Your-Own Expense Allowance 64 FR 27705, 05/21/99'' (RIN6067–AC92), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3483. A communication from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, a report relative to export controls imposed on the Portuguese Colony of Macau; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3484. A communication from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3485. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the authorization request for fiscal years 2000 and 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3486. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of User Fees for 1999 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers—Final Rule'' (Docket No. CN–99–001), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3487. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Difenoconazole Pesticide Tolerance (FRL #6081–5), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3488. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3489. A communication from the Director, Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reemployment Rights of Employees Performing Military Duty'' (RIN3206–AG02), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3490. A communication from the Director, Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Statuatory Bar to Appointment of Persons Who Fail to Register Under Selective Service Law'' (RIN3206–AI72), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3491. A communication from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Status; Continued Validity of Nonimmigrant Status, Unexpired Employment Authorization, and Travel Authorization for Certain Applicants Maintaining Nonimmigrant H or L Status'' (RIN1115–AE96) (INS No. 1881–97), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3492. A communication from the Chairwoman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999 and the Commission's Management Report for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3493. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3494. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3495. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3496. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3497. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Additions to the Procurement List'', received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3498. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3499. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Palestine Liberation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3500. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the employment of Americans by the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the payment of danger pay to civilian employees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3502. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada State Implementation Plan Revision, Clark County (FRL #6350–5)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3503. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; South Dakota Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills (FRL #6351–8)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3504. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Incorporation of Montreal Protocol Adjustments for a 1999 Interim Reduction in Class I, Group VI Controlled Substances (FRL #6351–6)'', received May 26, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3505. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of New Source Review Provisions Implementation Plan for Nevada State Clark County Air Pollution Control Division (FRL #6336–5)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3506. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clean Air Act Approval in Part and Disapproval in Part, Section 1112(l), State of Alaska: Amendment and Clarification (FRL #6317–7)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3507. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group I Polymers and Resins and Group IV Polymers and Resins and Standards of Performance for Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions from the Polymer Manufacturing Industry (FRL #6338–3)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3508. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and

Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Availability of Funds for Source Water Protection (FRL #6336–7)'', received May 4, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3509. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Minnesota (FRL #6339–5)'', received May 12, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3510. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two rules entitled ''Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit (FRL #6343–2)'' and ''Withdrawal of Direct Final Amendment to Regulations Governing Equivalent Emission Limitations by Permit (FRL #6343–1)'', received May 11, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3511. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries; 1999 ABC, OY, and Tribal and Nontribal Allocations for Pacific Whiting'' (RIN0648–AM12), received May 18, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3512. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reduction of Cod Landing Limit (under the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan)'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3513. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Unity Electric Company Fireworks Display, Shinnecock Bay, Hampton Bays, NY (CGD01-99–038)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0022), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3514. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Fire Island Tourist Bureau Fireworks Display, Great South Bay, Cherry Grove, NY (CGD01–99–047)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0023), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3515. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA (CGD01–99–053)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0024), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3516. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: San Pedro Bay, CA (COTP LA/LB 99–003)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0025), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3517. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Ground; Safety Zone; Speed Limit; Tongass Narrows and Ketchikan, AK (CGD17–99–002)'' (RIN2115–AF81), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3518. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mandatory Ship Reporting System Off the Northeast and Southeast Coasts of the United States (USCG–1999–5525)'' (RIN2115–AF82), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3519. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Harvard-Yale Regatta, Thames River, New London, CT (CGD01–99–054)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0015), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3520. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Lake Ponchatrain, LA (CGD08–99–032)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0012), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3521. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Massalina Bayou, FL (CGD08–99–033)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0012), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3522. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Muskingum River, OH (CGD08–99–020)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0017), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3523. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Harvey Canal, LA (CGD08–99–029)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0016), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3524. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Falgout Canal, LA (CGD08–99–035)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0015), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3525. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Lake Champlain, NY and VT (CGD01–98–032)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0014), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3526. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Groton Long Point Yacht Club Fireworks Display, Main Beach, Groton Point, CT (CGD01–99–039)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0021), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3527. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled the ''Sixteenth Annual Report of Accomplishments under the Airport Improvement Program'' for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3528. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Hudson Valley Triathalon, Hudson River, Kingston, NY (CGD01–98–155)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0016), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3529. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; SLR; Fleet's Albany Riverfest, Hudson River, NY (CGD01–98–163)'' (RIN2115–AE46) (1999–0017), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3530. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; River Rouge (Short-Cut Canal), MI (CGD09–98–055)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0013), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3531. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; 4th of July Celebration Fireworks Display; Great South Bay, Sayville, NY (CGD01–99–040)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0020), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3532. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 1999''; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

EC–3533. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to support to civil authorities for combating terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3534. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Economic Development Conveyances of Base Closure Property''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3535. A communication from the Deputy Assistant for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to National Discovery Trails; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3536. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fuel Economy Calculations'' (RIN2127–AG95), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3537. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''High-Theft Lines for Model Year 2000'' (RIN2127–AH36), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3538. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pelvic Restraints'' (RIN2127–AG48), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3539. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Information on Tire Grading'' (RIN2127–AG67), received May 24, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3540. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Rochester, MN; Docket No. 99–AGL–13 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0178), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3541. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Minot, ND; Docket No. 99–AGL–12 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0177), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3542. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace; Wilmington, OH; Docket No. 99–AGL–14 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0179), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3543. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Jackson, MI; Docket No. 99–AGL–15 (5–27/5–25)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0180), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3544. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Muskegon, MI; Docket No. 99–AGL–16 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0181), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3545. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Chico, CA; Docket No. 99–AWP–98 (5–25/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0182), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3546. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Pampa, TX, Direct Final Rule, Confirmation of Effective Date; Docket No. 98–ASW–57 (5–24/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0185), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3547. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class D Airspace and Modification of Class E Airspace, Bozeman, MT; Correction; Docket No. 98–ANM–19 (5–24/5–27)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0183), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3548. A communication from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (La Fayette, Georgia),'' received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3549. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disaster Assistance; Cost-Share Adjustment, 64 FR 19496, 04/21/99'' (RIN3067–AC72), received April 30, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3550. A communication from the Chief, Operations Division, Directorate of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule Establishing an Administrative Appeal Process for the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers'' (RIN0710–AA41), received May 11, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3551. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Radiological Protection for DOE Activities'' (DOE N 441.4), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3552. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities'' (DOE O 425.1A), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3553. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safeguards and Security Independent Oversight Program'' (DOE O 470.2), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3554. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit Assistance for Surface Transportation Projects'' (RIN2125–AE49), received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3555. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3556. A communication from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3557. A communication from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation relative to a working capital fund for the Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3558. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Office of Law Enforcement, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting: Regulations Regulating Baiting And Baited Areas'' (RIN1018–AD74), received May 28, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3559. A communication from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to abnormal occurrences for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3560. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Quality Assurance Project Plan for the PM2.5 Performance Evaluation Program''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3561. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled ''Revised Policy for Amending Form R and Form A Submissions; Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Reporting: Community Right-to-Know''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3562. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision: Kern County Air Pollution Control District, Mudoc County Air Pollution Control District, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District (FRL #6331–8)''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3563. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Regulated Substances and Thresholds for Accidental Release Prevention; Stay of Effectiveness for Flammable Hydrocarbon Fuels (FRL #6351–1)'', received May 25, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3564. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of three rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama (FRL #6352–5)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Florida (FRL #6352–7)'' and ''Grant Application Guidance to Improve Small Business Assistance (FRL #)'', received May 27, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3565. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report

of three rules entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan for South Coast Air Quality Management District (FRL #6335–3)'', ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: North Dakota; Control of Emissions from Existing Hazardous/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators (FRL #6340–6)'' and ''Revisions to the Permits and Sulfur Dioxis=de Allowance System Regulations under Title IV of the Clean Air Act: Compliance Determination (FRL #6341–2)'', received May 7, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3566. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Ellis Island Medals of Honor Fireworks, New York Harbor, Upper Bay (CGD01–99–034)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0018), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3567. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations: Hutchinson River, NY (CGD01–99–031)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0008), received May 10, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3568. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3569. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to Vietnam; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3570. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of the waiver, under the Trade Act of 1974, to the Republic of Belarus; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3571. A communication from the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuing humanitarian crisis in the Kosovo region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3572. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regional Haze Regulations'' (FRL #6353–4), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3573. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants; Measurement of Mercury in Water (EPA Method 1631, Revision B); Final Rule'' (FRL #6354–3), received June 1, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3574. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Progress on Superfund Implementation in Fiscal Year 1998''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM—138. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to the temporary visa waiver program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, the United States Congress passed the Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1986 that established a temporary visa waiver program to pave the way toward better international relations and increased visitor travel between the United States and certain participating foreign countries; and

Whereas, the temporary visa waiver program expired in September, 1996, and has since been extended on a year-to-year basis, with the current extension expiring in September, 1999; and

Whereas, the visa waiver program allows persons with waivers to enter the United States for a period of up to ninety days without a visa; and

Whereas, twenty-one countries were participating in the visa waiver program with the United States as of 1996, with more being added since then; and

Whereas, the visa waiver program is critical to boosting the number of international arrivals in Hawaii, with an estimated eighty percent of all international visitors arriving at Honolulu International Airport being under the visa waiver program; and

Whereas, the addition of Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the visa waiver program by the United States would further boost Hawaii's economy because of the huge numbers of travelers to Hawaii from these countries; and

Whereas, despite the success of the visa waiver program, the United States Congress has not made the program permanent, instead preferring to extend it on a year-to-year basis; now, therefore,

*BE IT RESOLVED* by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999, the Senate concurring, that the United States Congress is urged to:

(1) Make the visa waiver program permanent; and

(2) Add Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the visa waiver program;

and

*Be it Further Resolved* that members of Hawaii's congressional delegation are urged to exert efforts to make the visa waiver program permanent and add Taiwan, South Korea, and China to the program; and

*Be it Further Resolved* that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation.

---

POM–139. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the threat of terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 28

*Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:*

Whereas, the threat of terrorism in the United States is a real and complex phenomenon that can strike any community, state or geographic region of our nation; and

Whereas, threats incorporating the use of nuclear, radiological, biological, chemical and cyber weapons or combination thereof, may be used against critical infrastructures and the nation's food supply, of which the state of Idaho is a major producer; and

Whereas, because terrorist incidents would occur in local communities within the states, it is imperative that planning, training, exercises, equipping and funding strategies for state and local response forces be included in any national strategy; and

Whereas, the Legislature joins with the National Governors' Association and the National Emergency Management Association to affirm its commitment to ensuring a coordinated response and recovery to major emergencies and disasters, including incidents of terrorism and the use of weapons of mass destruction; now, therefore,

*BE IT RESOLVED*, by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we recommend the following actions be taken to improve the nation's preparedness, and to more effectively prepare for, respond to, and recover from consequences of terrorism at the state and local level that:

(1) The White House and the Congress should consult and coordinate with the nation's governors and their states to develop and implement a national strategy that initiates and sustains activities for domestic preparedness at the state and local level. One hundred percent federally funded state and local assistance, previously granted to the states for civil defense, should be provided to the states for preparedness activities for crisis and consequence management as the result of the increasing potential for acts of terrorism and use of weapons of mass destruction.

(2) The federal government recognizes that the short and long-term consequences of domestic terrorism is among the responsibilities of state and local government supplemented by the resources of the federal government. Federal agencies that are tasked with providing assistance to state and local government must be required to recognize and use the state's emergency management systems that have effectively responded to state and local emergencies and disasters for over fifty years.

(3) The National Guard of each state and territory is a critical state resource during emergencies and disasters. As such, the role of the National Guard and the Department of Defense must be better defined in preparing for acts of terrorism. Furthermore, the National Guard must be funded, trained, equipped and well exercised if it is to have a viable role in the response and recovery to the use of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

(4) The nation's public health and medical system capabilities must be significantly improved and fully integrated into the evolving domestic preparedness program. As a health matter, specific attention must be placed on the nation's food supply, both that which has been harvested, and that which is yet to be developed.

(5) The government at all levels must ensure that the protection of civil liberties and states' rights will remain the highest priority within the context of national security as the United States prepares for and addresses the consequences of terrorism. The White House and the Congress should specifically develop methods to eliminate unauthorized activity in the name of expedience and national security.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the state of Idaho recognizes and supports the efforts of the U.S. Department of Justice to accomplish the much needed program coordination through the creation of the National Domestic Preparedness Office.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to the U.S. Department of Justice, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the members of the Senate

and the House of Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

---

POM–140. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa relative to Health Care Financing Administration rules; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 24

Whereas, rules recently promulgated by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services requiring Outcome and Assessment Information Set (OASIS) assessment and follow-up reports for all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies and health departments, whether or not the patient is a recipient of Medicare; and

Whereas, the OASIS system requires an 18-page initial assessment which must be completed by a registered nurse, and a 13-page follow-up assessment which is required to be completed every sixty days; and

Whereas, the requirement for computer software necessary for preparation and transmission of the OASIS system assessments and reports is essentially an unfunded federal mandate; and

Whereas, the HCFA requirement necessitates costly reporting for patients who receive services not paid through Medicare and the reporting is duplicative of existing assessment and reporting requirements; and

Whereas, in the small-scale home health care organization environment in Iowa, it is not feasible to provide services through separate organizations based upon whether the patient is a recipient of Medicare; and

Whereas, the HCFA rules would result in Medicare-certified organizations only providing services to recipients of Medicare, thereby reducing the availability of preventive home services to older Iowans who are not recipients of Medicare, increasing in-hospital admissions and Medicare costs, and increasing nursing home admissions and Medicaid costs; and

Whereas, OASIS appears to be solely a research project of HCFA, totally unfunded by federal sources, and accomplished with loss of funds by reporting agencies and loss of services to older Iowans; now; therefore,

*Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring,* that the Congress of the United States is encouraged to amend the OASIS system requirements to apply them only to patients who are recipients of Medicare and not to all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies; and

*Be It Further Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House is directed to provide a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the Minority Leaders of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to each member of Iowa's congressional delegation.

---

POM–141. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to Health Care Financing Administration rules; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5041

Whereas, New rules made by HCFA require OASIS assessment and follow-up reports for all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies and health departments whether or not the personal or attendant care for such patients is paid from Medicare, and

Whereas, The new HCFA report requires an 18-page initial assessment, which must be completed by a registered nurse, with a 13 page follow-up assessment being required every 60 days; and

Whereas, The requirement for computer software for the preparation and transmission of such assessments and follow-up reports is another unfunded mandate of the federal government; and

Whereas, The HCFA requirement requires costly unfunded reporting of those who receive services which are not paid by Medicare—which reporting duplicates existing assessment and reporting requirements of the Kansas Department on Aging; and

Whereas, In the environment of the small, home health care services existing in Kansas, it is not feasible to create separate organizations to provide services for non-Medicare customers. The end result of the HCFA rules is that Medicare-certified agencies will no longer be able to provide in-home services to non-Medicare customers. Consequently, with lower levels of preventive home services being available to older Kansans there will be an increase in hospital admissions, thus increasing Medicare costs, and an increase in nursing home admissions, thus increasing Medicaid costs; and

Whereas, OASIS appears to be solely a research project of HCFA, totally unfunded by federal sources, and accomplished with loss of funds by reporting agencies and loss of services for Kansas seniors: now; therefore,

*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein:* That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to require the Health Care Financing Administration OASIS reporting and data reporting requirements to apply only to Medicare patients and not to all patients of Medicare-certified home health agencies; and

*Be it further resolved:* That the Secretary of State be directed to provide an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Secretary of Health and Human Services, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, minority leaders of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Kansas Congressional delegation.

---

POM–142. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

We, your Memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho assembled in the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas, the estate and gift tax is the federal government's least significant revenue source contributing approximately 1.1% of total federal revenue and in 1998 just 1.66% of adult deaths in the United States are expected to result in taxable estates; and

Whereas, a rationale for the estate and gift tax is that only the very wealthy pay it, but in 1995, 54% of all estate tax revenue came from estates under five million dollars and estate taxes that year fell for those with estates over twenty million dollars; and

Whereas, the reason for the preceding is that careful estate planning can virtually eliminate the tax, however many estate planning techniques are costly and require long lead-times to implement, making the burden of the estate tax often falling on those with recently acquired modest wealth such as farmers and small businesses; and

Whereas, the tax can be devastating on small businesses and agricultural operations and protecting these ventures from estate taxes can be costly and drain resources that could be better used by the owners to upgrade and expand their operations; and

Whereas, the estate and gift tax may be having unintended environmental consequences as America's nonindustrial private forest owners (who own 58% of America's forest land) face the untimely timber harvest and disruption of established forest management programs because of the federal estate tax and this is counterproductive to society's goals of sustainable forestry and environmental quality and the tax may also have the unintended consequence of forcing a decedent's estate to subdivide or sell all or portions of the family land, that otherwise might be managed in a sustainable manner, in order to meet the estate tax obligation; and

Whereas, Canada, Australia and Israel have repealed their estate taxes with three policy reasons given that more people were becoming subject to the tax, the relative tiny portion of revenue raised and arguments by economists that the tax is counterproductive; and

Whereas, the inheritance tax is applied to property and goods that have already been taxed and some economists have indicated that the gross domestic product over the next seven years would be $80 billion higher if the estate and gift tax were repealed; now; therefore,

*Be it resolved* by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we respectfully request that members of Congress take a serious look at repealing the estate and gift tax or, at the very least, to increasing the exemption substantially.

*Be it further resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congress delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

---

POM–143. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to tobacco settlement funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, on November 23, 1998, representatives from forty-six states signed a settlement agreement with the five largest tobacco manufacturers, which settled lawsuits seeking to recoup the states' costs of treating smokers; and

Whereas, the Attorneys General Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement culminated legal action that began in 1994 when states began filing lawsuits against the tobacco industry; and

Whereas, currently, the respective states are in the process of finalizing the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement and are making initial fiscal determinations relative to the most responsible ways and means to utilize the settlement funds; and

Whereas, under the terms of the agreement, tobacco manufacturers will pay $206,000,000,000 over the next twenty-five years to the respective states in up-front and annual payments; and

Whereas, under the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement, Hawaii is projected to receive $1,179,165,923.07 through the year 2025; and

Whereas, because many state lawsuits sought to recover Medicaid funds spent to treat illnesses caused by tobacco use, the U.S. Health Care Financing Administration contends that it is authorized and obligated under the Social Security Act, to collect its share of any tobacco settlement funds that are attributable to Medicaid; and

Whereas, the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement does not address the Medicaid

recoupment issue, and thus, the Social Security Act must be amended to resolve the recoupment issue so that the moneys from the settlement remain with the respective states; and

Whereas, in addition to the recoupment issue, there is also considerable interest in earmarking state tobacco settlement fund expenditures at both the state and national levels; and

Whereas, as the final approval of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement nears, it is imperative that the states retain their rightful full share of the tobacco settlement funds; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999,* That the U.S. Congress is urged to enact legislation that amends the Social Security Act to prohibit the federal government from receiving any share of the funds awarded in the tobacco settlement that was reached in 1998 between the states and the tobacco industry; and be it further *Resolved* that the respective state legislatures retain complete autonomy over the appropriation and expenditure of their respective tobacco settlement funds; and be it further *Resolved* that the U.S. Congress oppose any efforts by the federal government to earmark or impose any other restrictions on the respective states' use of the state tobacco settlement funds; and be it further *Resolved* that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the members of Hawaii's Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–144. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Rockwood, Michigan relative to imported trash; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–145. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Vermont relative to the United Nations Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Whereas, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 15, 1979, and

Whereas, it became an international treaty on September 3, 1981, and by October 1986, 154 countries had consented to be bound by the Convention's provisions, and

Whereas, the Convention provides a comprehensive framework for challenging various forces that have created and sustained gender-based discrimination against one-half of the world's population, and

Whereas, the Convention banning discrimination against women guarantees women's rights across many fields, including employment, education, voting, nationality, marriage and divorce, health care and equality before the law, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont shares the goals of the Convention, namely affirming faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of all human beings and in the equal rights of women, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont has a history of supporting efforts to end gender-based employment discrimination and, in 1972, ratified the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution, and

Whereas, although women have made major gains throughout the 20th century in the struggle for equality in social, business, political, legal, health, educational and other fields, there remains much yet to be accomplished, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont recognizes the fact that other countries still engage in practices of gender apartheid—many African countries practice female genital mutilation; Afghanistan's Taliban militia does not permit women to work, go to school or even leave the confines of their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative, and are prohibited from going to most hospitals or seeking care from male doctors, which leads to women and girls dying from easily treatable diseases; and sex tourism (the trafficking of women and girls) is practiced in Asia and is supported by organizations in the United States, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont recognizes the greatly increased interdependence of the people of the world in this age of the global village and global telecommunications, and

Whereas, the state of Vermont enacted a joint resolution urging the United States Congress to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which has not been ratified to date by the United States Congress, and

Whereas, the United States is one of only 22 countries that have not ratified the Convention, now therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives,* That the Vermont House of Representatives urges the United States Congress to consider ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Clerk of the House be directed to send a copy of this resolution to President Bill Clinton, Vice President Al Gore, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, U.S. Senator Jesse Helms, Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–146. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to a national veterans cemetery in Idaho; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Whereas, Idaho is the only state in the nation without either a national veterans cemetery or a state veterans cemetery; and

Whereas, the majority of the states without a national cemetery are located in the Northwest; and

Whereas, only one of the six states bordering Idaho has a national cemetery; and

Whereas, Idaho is centrally located for a regional cemetery in the Northwest; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper that a grateful nation should provide a burial site within a reasonable distance from the homes of those Idahoans and others residing in the northwestern states who honorably served their country in a time of emergency.

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein,* That we respectfully and urgently request members of Idaho's congressional delegation to support funding for a national veterans cemetery in Idaho to serve veterans in the northwestern states, and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

---

POM–147. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota relative to the Superior National Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, pursuant to the Organic, Enabling, and other acts relating to the establishment of the state of Minnesota, land commonly referred to as school trust land has been granted to the state of Minnesota for public school and other purposes and has been constitutionally accepted and dedicated by the citizens of the state for such purposes by applying these lands to the production of income for the state's permanent school fund, all as described in detail in Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, subdivision 2; and

Whereas, pursuant to the federal Enabling Act authorizing the establishment of the state of Minnesota, on an equal footing with the original 13 states, and the Constitution of Minnesota, by which the citizens of Minnesota accepted the terms and conditions of the Enabling Act, the ownership of navigable waters and their beds was transferred to the state of Minnesota, all as described in detail in Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, subdivision 1; and

Whereas, approximately 100,000 acres of state-owned land (mostly school grant land) and approximately 172,000 acres of state-owned waters, or a total of over 272,000 state-owned acres, make up one-quarter of the 1,078,000 acres that are included within that portion of the Superior National Forest that has been designated by Congress as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness; and

Whereas, the extraordinary nature of the land and waters located in this wilderness area has been described by the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals as follows in its decision in *State of Minnesota by Alexander* v. *Block*, 449 F. Supp. 1223 (D. Minn. 1980), 660 F.2d 1240 (8th Cir. 1981), Cert. denied 431 U.S. 939 (1982):

''The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is the largest wilderness area east of the Rocky Mountains and the second largest in our wilderness system. It is our Nation's only lakeland canoe wilderness—a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages which served as the highway of fur traders who followed water routes pioneered by Sioux and Chippewa Indians. Despite extensive logging, the BWCA still contains 540,000 acres of virgin forests, by far the largest such area in the eastern United States.

''This last remnant of the old 'northwoods' is remarkable not only for its lakes and virgin forests, but also for its wildlife. * * * [M]any western wilderness areas lack such complete food chains. This natural ecosystem is a valuable educational and scientific resource; it has been the focal point of important research in wildlife behavior, forest ecology, nutrient cycles, lake systems, and vegetation history.''; and

Whereas, within this wilderness that contains a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages and a land surface that is crowned with a forest which includes 540,000 acres of virgin or ''old growth'' timber that hosts unique plant and animal ecosystems such as that of the timber wolf, the state of Minnesota's school grant and other lands are scattered in a checkerboard fashion across the entire area, a consequence of the fact that the lands were granted almost entirely in Sections 16 and 36 in most townships in what now is designated as a federal wilderness; and

Whereas, as a consequence of decisions by the federal courts in the above cited case of State of Minnesota by Alexander v. Block, where the state unsuccessfully challenged the unilateral action by Congress of extending federal jurisdiction from federally owned land to state-owned water, the state's free exercise of authority over its state-owned lands and waters was severely diminished; and

Whereas, in the 18 years since the federal courts upheld this congressional extension of

federal authority over state water, the only revenue earned on school and other state grant lands from wilderness users has been derived from a token campground reservation fee that is reappropriated for necessary campground maintenance and therefore adds nothing to the permanent school fund, the fund constitutionally established to support public schools of the state out of income derived from school and other grant land sale and natural resource management revenues; and

Whereas, continuance of state land ownership within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness not only defeats the purpose for which the state school grant lands were granted and dedicated, it also unnecessarily handicaps federal management duties relating to the wilderness area; and

Whereas, the Minnesota Constitution, article XI, sections 8 and 10, provide that school and other grant lands may be sold only at public auction or exchanged; and

Whereas, consolidation of federal land ownership within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness through an exchange of Superior National Forest land that is located outside the wilderness area for state land that is located within the wilderness area will mutually benefit both the federal and state governments by simplifying federal wilderness area management activities through efficiencies arising from single land ownership and by enabling the state to properly manage its school trust lands for the purposes for which these lands were granted and dedicated, as was first contemplated for these lands by the Minnesota legislature in the enactment of Laws 1917, chapter 448, which created the Minnesota state forests in the counties of Cook, Lake, and St. Louis, the first state forests established in Minnesota; and

Whereas, there appears, preliminarily, to be sufficient acreage of federal land that is located within the exterior boundaries of the Superior National Forest, exclusive of lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, to exchange for the high value state-owned school grant and other land inholdings located within the wilderness area; now, therefore, be it *Resolved,* By the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that Congress is requested to speedily enact laws that would expedite the exchange of federally owned land located within the Superior National Forest that lies outside of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for land owned by the state of Minnesota located within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and Be it Further *Resolved,* That in its deliberations concerning this request, Congress is requested to be especially cognizant that the legal title of the state of Minnesota to its school and other grant lands located within this wilderness area has been preserved, relatively unaltered, since being separated by grant from the federal public domain at statehood, and that the state of Minnesota's checkerboard land ownership pattern gives these lands a unique value because the lands are an integral part of what the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals recognized in State of Minnesota by Alexander v. Block as ''. . . our Nation's only lakeland canoe wilderness—a network of more than 1,000 lakes linked by hundreds of miles of streams and short portages which served as the highway of fur traders . . .'' and which ''. . . still contains 540,000 acres of virgin [old growth] forests, by far the largest such area in the eastern United States.'' And be it further *Resolved,* That Congress also be cognizant that the Minnesota Constitution, article XI, section 10, relating to the exchange of school grant and other state lands, requires the state to reserve mineral and water power rights in lands transferred by the state and, in addition, that Minnesota has never leased any state-owned minerals located on lands within the area that is federally designated as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and further, that since 1976, under Minnesota Statutes, section 84.523, state law prohibits, except when needed in a national emergency declared by Congress, the exploration and mining of state-owned minerals and the harvesting of state-owned peat, and Be it further

*Resolved,* That while the state of Minnesota is cognizant of the fact that Congress may authorize the federal government to acquire state-owned school grant and other lands by eminent domain proceedings brought in federal courts, a procedure which entails congressional appropriation of the substantial amount of money necessary to pay Minnesota the market value of these lands as approved by the federal courts, the state hereby affirms that the mutual best interests of both the federal and state governments are best served by land exchange as a solution to the long-standing problem of intermingled land ownership within the Superior National Forest, and Be it further

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota is directed to prepare copies of this memorial and transmit them to the President of the United States, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the chair of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the chair of the House Committee on Resources, and to each of Minnesota's Senators and Representatives in Congress for the purpose of assisting those members in the discharge of duties imposed by Minnesota Statutes, section 1.0451, especially those duties set forth in subdivision 3 relating to land exchange.

---

POM–148. A petition from a citizen of the U.S. Virgin Islands relative to a shoppers visa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–149. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana relative to full funding of payments in lieu of taxes on federal land in Montana; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the stability of Montana's economy has historically been dependent on use of our abundant natural resources; and

Whereas, the natural resource harvest has contributed billions of dollars to Montana's economy by providing employment opportunities to members of our communities and by supporting our business communities; and

Whereas, revenue from industries related to natural resource harvest has produced taxes for the support of local and state governments; and

Whereas, the federal government has long recognized the importance of supporting local governments in counties where the United States controls management of public lands by reimbursing state and local governments by payments in lieu of taxes (PILT); and

Whereas, a variety of federal legislation, such as the Forest Reserve Act of 1890 sought to make equitable distribution to counties and to the education system of 25% of net proceeds derived by the sale of resources harvested on federal land; and

Whereas, the federal government is now reducing the volume of timber cut in relation to the allowable sale quotas (ASQ), redistributing funds historically contained in the 25% fund (outfitter fees), reducing its commitment to full funding of PILT, which was reduced from 100% in 1994 to 53% in 1998, and redefining its commitment to states and counties (a decoupling effort to overturn the 1890 Forest Reserve Act); and

Whereas, this effort has and will cause irreparable financial harm to state and local governments, our natural resource industries, and employment opportunities for Montanans.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana:* That the legislature of the State of Montana petition the U.S. Congress to ensure a full commitment by the federal government to full funding of PILT, a commitment toward the proper harvest of the natural resource base by way of already adopted ASQ, and a renewal of its compact with states and local governments to contribute the federal government's fair share in taxes on land present in Montana but retained by the federal government, and

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Western Governors' Association, and the Montana Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–150. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Midland, Texas relative to incentives for the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–151. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Midland, Texas relative to incentives for the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–152. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana relative to water resource policies and issues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the western states of the United States are critically dependent upon present and future water resources for their quality of life and economic base; and

Whereas, the western states are geographically, hydrologically, and economically diverse and distinct from each other and from the eastern states; and

Whereas, the western states have developed a customized system of water allocation under the prior appropriation doctrine in response to the arid conditions of the region; and

Whereas, water resources in many of the major interstate river basins in the West are apportioned and administered through interstate and other compacts or court decrees between two or more states; and

Whereas, there has been a long-standing policy of federal deference to the states in the areas of water resources administration, management, allocation, and protection; and

Whereas, the western states have extensive experience in managing water resources, both surface and ground water supplies, and recognize the importance of protecting their water resources for present and future beneficial uses; and

Whereas, all western states have a system of law for allocation of water rights, and there is broad consensus within the federal system that states should continue to have the exclusive responsibility to create and administer water rights; and

Whereas, state water law provides for public participation and is based upon the allocation, transfer, and protection of water resources in the public interest; and

Whereas, the number of federal agencies involved in some aspect of water policy or management continues to increase, adding duplication, confusion, and conflicting missions to the historic state systems; and

Whereas, the U.S. Congress often considers legislation related to water resources management, some of which contains elements that could increase the federal role in water administration and conflict with the state's responsibility for water programs; now

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That Montana's Congressional Delegation be respectfully requested to advocate to the appropriate federal agencies that any new or revised federal legislation or policy should:

(1) Recognize that water resources administration, management, allocation, and protection are primarily the responsibility of the states and that federal policy should be supportive of this role of the western states;

(2) provides flexibility for states to continue to develop and refine water resource programs appropriate for their own circumstances, taking into consideration items such as hydrology, existing water rights, potential development of the area, interstate and other compact obligations, and the public interest;

(3) require all federal agencies to conduct their activities in accordance with, and in support of, state water resource programs and state water law; and

(4) recognize and cooperate with the states' prerogative and ability to manage, administer, and develop their water resources; be it

*Further Resolved,* That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and the Montana Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–153. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Whereas, the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund was created in 1965 to provide matching funds to encourage and assist local and state government in urban and rural areas to develop parks and to ensure accessibility to local outdoor recreation resources; and

Whereas, the state of Idaho has invested more than $32 million in Federal Land and Water Conservation funds, which were matched by local and state funds, donated labor and materials, and community force accounts, to produce eighty percent of Idaho's local recreation facilities and nearly all of our state parks; and

Whereas, the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund was the primary source of funding for Idaho's greenbelts, exercise trails, neighborhood parks, swimming facilities, state parks, multipurpose sports fields, boating facilities, golf courses, camping areas, equestrian arenas, fishing accesses, zoo facilities, amphitheaters and scenic areas; and

Whereas, since 1980, Idaho's allocation of Federal Land and Water Conservation Funds for grants has diminished from $1.9 million to its total elimination in 1995; and

Whereas, the elimination of Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund allocations has adversely affected Idaho's outdoor recreation infrastructure, greatly reduced the ability of Idaho's cities and counties to meet the needs of our rapidly increasing populations, and created a backlog of upgrades, renovations and repairs to outdoor recreation facilities exceed $270 million; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation provides important economic, social, personal and resources benefits to the citizens of Idaho; and

Whereas, it has been determined that four out of every five Americans utilize local and state government recreation and park services; and

Whereas, outdoor recreation reduces crime by providing positive alternatives and experiences for Idaho's citizens; and

Whereas, the United States Congress is currently considering various bills and amendments concerning stateside funding for the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund generated from Outer Continental Shelf oil royalties; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the First Regular Sessions of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein,* That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass legislation reallocating funding to the states from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, be it

*Further Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Dirk Kempthorne, Governor of the State of Idaho.

---

POM–154. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 4

Whereas, under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Managemenbt Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the United States Forest Service pays to counties through the state treasurer twenty-five percent of gross revenues from timber sales, grazing permits and leases, recreation fees, power line rights-of-way, special use permits and other programs; and

Whereas, the payments are made to states from each national forest, then are apportioned to counties according to the proportion of acreage of each national forest in each county; and

Whereas, counties have few sources of revenue and rely on these payments to maintain their public roads and their public schools; and

Whereas, the Forest Service payments have become unpredictable due to market fluctuations and the volatility of the public debate on timber harvests on national forests, and generally have declined because of reduced timber harvest on national forests; and

Whereas, demands on counties to provide good public roads and public schools have increased due to increases in resident population and tourism; and

Whereas, stabilizing payments required by the 1908 Forest Service law is essential for responsible fiscal planning by the counties; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein,* That we strongly support stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service to county governments through the state treasurer and urge our congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support legislation that will stabilize payments made by the United States Forest Service to the counties of the state of Idaho; be it

*Further resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

---

POM–155. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 5

Whereas, under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Management Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act, the United States Forest Service pays to counties through the State Treasurer twenty-five percent of gross revenues from timber sales, grazing permits and leases, recreation fees, power line rights-of-way, special use permits and other programs; and

Whereas, the payments are made to states from each national forest, then are apportioned to counties according to the proportion of acreage of each national forest in each county; and

Whereas, the law mandates that these funds be used for public roads and public schools; and

Whereas, counties with large amounts of federal lands have few sources of revenue and rely on these payments to maintain their public roads and their public schools; and

Whereas, the Forest Service payments have become unpredictable due to forest planning processes over the past ten years that have reduced timber harvests on national forests; and

Whereas, demands on counties to provide necessary services such as good public roads, public schools, sanitation services, and search and rescue have increased; and

Whereas, stabilizing payments required by the 1908 Forest Service law is essential for responsible fiscal planning by the counties; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-fifth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein,* That we strongly support stabilization of payments of the United States Forest Service to county governments through the State Treasurer and urge our congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support legislation that will stabilize payments made by the United States Forest Service to the counties of the state of Idaho by increasing the annual timber harvest from federal lands within the state of Idaho to the allowable sales quantity levels outlined in the current forest plans and by increasing to fifty percent the amount of federal funds returned to the counties from the sale of federal timber under the provisions of the Forest Service law of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat. 259, 260, 267 and as subsequently amended by the National Forest Management Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act; be it

*Further resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the state of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

---

POM–156. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to the Appalachian Development Highway System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 523

Whereas, the construction of the Coalfields Expressway is anticipated to begin in 1999; and

Whereas, the estimated cost of completing the Coalfields Expressway is $1.5 billion; and

Whereas, through federal taxes on motor fuels and special fuels, motorists in the Commonwealth of Virginia contribute significantly to the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, the Appalachian Development Highway System was created by the United States Congress for the purpose of stimulating the economic development of the entire Appalachian Region and is now funded directly through the federal Highway Trust Fund; and

Whereas, a recently completed study of the Appalachian Development Highway System concluded that, upon its completion, this system will provide the region through which it passes with 42,000 new jobs, 84,000 new residents, $2.9 billion in new wages, and $6.9 billion in value added business; and

Whereas, the Coalfields Expressway, when completed, will traverse a portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia characterized by chronic unemployment and pockets of intractable poverty; and

Whereas, the Coalfields Expressway is not presently a portion of the Appalachian Development Highway System, but receives its federal funding through special congressional appropriations made in unpredictable amounts at irregular intervals; and

Whereas, federal funding of the Coalfields Expressway to date consists of only two appropriations: one of $50 million in 1991 and another of $22.7 million in 1998; and

Whereas, inclusion of the Coalfields Expressway into the Appalachian Development Highway System would allow it to be funded more fully and more reliably; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring,* That the Congress of the United States be urged to include the Coalfields Expressway in the Appalachian Development Highway System; and, be it

*Resolved Further,* That the Clerk of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the Virginia General Assembly in this matter.

---

POM–157. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Inkster, Michigan relative to state and local land use zoning authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–158. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas, The economy of the State of Nevada is dependent upon tourism; and

Whereas, Canada and Mexico rank No. 1 and No. 7, respectively, among Nevada's sources of international tourism, sending more than 1.5 million Canadian visitors and more than 104,000 Mexican visitors to this state per year; and

Whereas, Visitors from Canada and Mexico comprise a major economic contribution to the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, the United States has entered into international trade agreements with its neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to foster, encourage and stimulate the exchange of goods and products for mutual economic gain; and

Whereas, The United States does not currently require departing tourists returning to Canada and Mexico to be stopped and identified at border crossings; and

Whereas, Section 100 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 requires that a new entry-exit control system be implemented to track all foreign visitors entering and leaving the United States but does not provide any law enforcement benefits; and

Whereas, The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 would impose new border inspection requirements for the gathering of data at entry and departure points for vehicular traffic from Canada and Mexico where none currently exist; and

Whereas, The new border entry-exit system does not provide for any enhancement of provisions for apprehending or removing illegal immigrants, drug traffickers, terrorists or other criminals and would not curtail illegal immigration at the borders; and

Whereas, No inspection stations or other facilities for departing foreign travelers have been constructed; and

Whereas, This system would be implemented at enormous expense to the taxpayers of the United States with no tangible benefits; and

Whereas, Congress has held hearings at various sites along the Canadian border to consider exempting that country from the provisions of the Act, but no such hearings have been held or are scheduled in the Mexican border states; and

Whereas, Mexican and Canadian tourists who enter the United States for business and recreational travel are not immigrants; and

Whereas, These nonimmigrant Mexican and Canadian business and leisure travelers who will already be required to present travel documents to enter the United States, would be subjected to inspections and queries upon departure that would cause travel delays and inconveniences to those tourists; and

Whereas, Such delays and inconveniences would discourage tourism in the United States by Mexican and Canadian citizens, delay commerce and create an economic downturn; and

Whereas, The borders with Canada and Mexico should be kept reasonably free of governmental over-involvement in order to encourage tourism, trade and legitimate economic activity that benefit all three countries; and

Whereas, The National Governors' Association at its meeting in Washington in February 1998 determined that the entry-exit control system may have ''unintended negative consequences on international trade, tourism and the economy''; and

Whereas, The National Governors' Association urged suspension of implementing the entry-exit control system until Congress and the President can ensure that any such system will not disrupt tourism, trade or other legitimate traffic entering the United States; and

Whereas, Congress passed legislation in October 1998 delaying imposition of the implementation of the provisions of Section 110 until March 31, 2001, but allowing the exit system to take effect at the airports of international entry in the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That Congress is hereby urged permanently to mitigate the consequences of the provisions of Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; and be it further

*Resolved,* That Congress is encouraged to keep the borders between the United States and Canada and Mexico reasonably free of governmental over-involvement and to impose no new restrictions until infrastructure is available that can collect data and detect illegal and unwanted immigration without disrupting legitimate tourist travel; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and approval.

---

POM–159. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan relative to prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 55

Whereas, The 48th Annual National Day of Prayer was observed on May 6, 1999, and the United States of America was founded by men and women with varied religious beliefs and ideals; and

Whereas, The First Amendment to the United States Constitution states that ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .,'' which means that the government is prohibited from establishing a state religion. However, no barriers shall be erected against the practice of any religion; and

Whereas, The establishment clause of the First Amendment was not drafted to protect Americans from religion, rather, its purpose was clearly to protect Americans from governmental mandates with respect to religion; and

Whereas, The Michigan Legislature strongly believes that reaffirming a right to voluntary, individual, unorganized, and nonmandated prayer in public schools is an important element of religious choice guaranteed by the Constitution, and will reaffirm those religious rights and beliefs upon which the nation was founded; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate,* That the members of this legislative body memorialize the Congress of the United States to strongly support voluntary, individual, unorganized, and non-mandatory prayer in the public schools of this nation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

---

POM–160. A resolution adopted by the St. Francis Assisi Parish of Houston, Texas relative to capital punishment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–161. A resolution adopted by the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, D.C. relative to hate crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–162. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington relative to the Land and Water Conservation Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4012

To the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, Washington state contains a rich diversity of forests, rivers, seacoasts, grasslands, deserts, and other habitats, and an

equally diverse population of fish and wildlife, all of which require by law some level of protection and responsible management by federal, state, and local agencies; and

Whereas, Washington state also contains a large number and variety of outstanding recreational facilities and opportunities, including three national parks, a national volcanic monument, one hundred twenty-five state parks, and many local parks, trails, water access areas, swimming pools, and sports fields; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation and wildlife enjoyment are important elements of the Northwest way of life. A large majority of Washington's residents and visitors actively pursue and enjoy a range of outdoor recreation activities, from active sports such as soccer, softball, swimming, and bicycling, to outdoor and wildlife-related pursuits such as hiking, camping, canoeing, and wildlife observation; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation and wildlife enjoyment are also important elements of Washington's economy. For example, a 1996 survey conducted by the United States fish and wildlife service showed that annual wildlife-related recreation expenditures exceeded one hundred billion dollars, almost three billion dollars spent in Washington state. Wildlife viewing alone accounts for more than twenty-one thousand jobs in Washington state; and

Whereas, Washington's population is one of the fastest-growing in the United States, with an even faster-growing public demand for wildlife conservation, wildlife-related recreation, and outdoor recreation facilities; and

Whereas, the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was created in 1965 to preserve, develop, and assure that all Americans have access to quality outdoor recreation. In the thirty years since its creation, LWCF has funded the acquisition of almost seven million acres of parkland, water resources, wildlife habitat open space, and the development of more than thirty-seven thousand state, municipal, and local parks and recreation projects. In recent years, LWCF funding for federal projects has been reduced by more than half and funding for state projects has been entirely eliminated; and

Whereas, Washington and other states lack adequate, dedicated funding for fish and wildlife protection and management, especially for those species which are not hunted and fished and which are not listed as threatened or endangered. In 1980, Congress passed the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (P.L. 96–366) which was intended to address the protection and management of nonhunted wildlife species, but the act was never funded, leaving the entire responsibility to the states;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that Congress pass legislation to restore and revitalize federal funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Lands shall be open for public use and enjoyment. We pray that Congress create a new dedicated fund for state-level fish and wildlife management, which would be administered by the United States fish and wildlife service; be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington.

---

POM–163. A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, Ohio relative to the Ryan White Care Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

POM–164. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 219

Whereas, the State of Alaska received an increase in its Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) from 50 percent to 59.8 percent in consideration of the high cost of living in Alaska by an amendment to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, United States Senator Daniel K. Akaka, United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye, United States Representative Neil Abercrombie, and United States Representative Patsy T. Mink have recently introduced federal legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase Hawaii's FMAP in consideration of Hawaii's high cost of living; and

Whereas, federal financial participation for the medicaid program is based on the FMAP which is calculated according to a formula based on per capita income in the individual state in relation to the per capita income of the United States; and

Whereas, the FMAP is calculated as the quotient of the per capita income of the United States, times a multiplier, the state income is determined as a designated portion of the national income as determined at the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) and the per capita income of Hawaii is an amount that is derived at the BEA as a portion of national income statistics; and

Whereas, because of its island location and other factors, the cost of living in Hawaii greatly exceeds the cost of living in the mainland states, so that per capita income is a poor measure of its relative ability to bear the cost of medical services; and

Whereas, a study conducted by the Taubman Center for State and Local Government at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government and the Office of United States Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, established that if per capita income is measured in real terms, considering cost of living factors, Hawaii ranked 47th at $19,755 compared to the national average $24,231 and Alaska is ranked 34th with a real per capita income level of $21,592; and

Whereas, the Harvard/Moynihan study cites Hawaii with one of the highest poverty rates in the nation—Hawaii ranks eighth in the country with a poverty rate of 16.9 percent as compared to the national average of 14.7 percent—and on a per capita basis state revenues and expenditures are far higher in Hawaii, as well as Alaska, than in the other 48 mainland states, but Alaska's 10.6 percent poverty rate is lower than the national average, placing it 39th in the country; and

Whereas, Hawaii has not participated in the economic rebound that has benefited most of the rest of the nation in the past several years, in part because of its heavy dependence on international tourism and trade, and Hawaii continues to suffer from the drop in value in the Japanese yen, its unemployment rate is above the national average, and its tax revenues have fallen short of estimates; and

Whereas, based on Hawaii's current medicaid spending level of approximately $700 million, each percentage point increase in its FMAP rate would provide approximately $7 million annually in additional federal funds; and

Whereas, the State of Hawaii is seeking to have its medicaid program funded in dollars equal to its tax contributions based on its higher per capita income and one that recognizes its true costs, as was done for Alaska; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1999 (the Senate concurring)*, That this body hereby urges the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services to support United States Senator Daniel K. Akaka, United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye, United States Representative Neil Abercrombie, and United States Representative Patsy T. Mink's federal legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase Hawaii's FMAP in consideration of our high cost of living; and be it further

*Resolved* That certified copies of the Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the members of the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

---

POM–165. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Vermont relative to Social Security; to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas, the purpose of Social Security is to provide a strong, simple and efficient form of basic insurance against the adversities of old age, disability and dependency, and

Whereas, for 60 years Social Security has provided a stable platform of retirement, disability and survivor annuity benefits to protect working Americans and their dependents, and

Whereas, the costs to administer Social Security are less than one percent of the benefits delivered, and

Whereas, the American and world economies continue to encounter periods of high uncertainty and volatility that make it as important as ever to preserve a basic and continuing safety net of protections guaranteed by our society's largest guarantor of risk, the federal government, and

Whereas, Social Security affords protections to rich and poor alike and no citizen, no matter how well-off today, can foretell tomorrow's adversities, and

Whereas, average life expectancies are increasing and people are commonly living into their 80's and 90's, making it more important than ever that each of us be fully protected by defined retirement benefits, and

Whereas, medical scientists are continually developing new ways to maintain and enhance the lives of people with severe disabilities, thus making it more important that each of us to be protected against the risk of dependency, institutionalization and impoverishment, and

Whereas, the lives of wage earners and their spouses are seldom coterminous; one often outlives the other by decades, making it crucial to preserve a secure base of protection for children and other family members dependent on a wage earner who may die or become disabled, and

Whereas, Social Security, in current form, reinforces family cohesiveness and enhances the value of work in our society, and

Whereas, Congress currently has proposals to shift a portion of Social Security contributions from insurance to personal investment accounts for each wage earner, and

Whereas, Social Security, our largest and most fundamental insurance system, cannot fulfill its protective function if it is splintered into individualized stock accounts and must create and manage millions of small risk-bearing investments out of a stream of contributions intended as insurance, and

Whereas, private accounts cannot be substituted for Social Security without eroding basic protections for working families, since such protections, to be strong, must be insulated from economic uncertainty and be

backed by the entity best capable of spreading risk, the federal government, and

Whereas, the diversion of contributions to private investment accounts would dramatically increase financial shortfalls to the Social Security trust fund and require major reductions in the defined benefits upon which millions of Americans depend, and

Whereas, to administer 150 million separate investment accounts would require a larger bureaucracy, and the resulting expense and the cost of converting each account to an annuity upon retirement would consume much of the profit or exacerbate the loss realized by each participant, and

Whereas, the question of whether part of the Social Security Trust Fund should be diversified into investments other than government bonds so that, while still invested collectively at low expense, returns may be increased, thus enhancing the capacity of the fund to meet its obligations to pay benefits while spreading the risk across the entire spectrum of Social Security participants, is entirely different from that of splintering its millions of accounts, and

Whereas, creating an array of winners and losers would be contrary to the basic principles of insurance and risk distribution, thus defeating the purpose of this part of our retirement system, and

Whereas, Congress amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide a full menu of provisions that enables working Americans and their employers to voluntarily contribute to tax-sheltered accounts that are open to the opportunities and exposed to the risks of investment markets, diverting Social Security contributions to private accounts duplicates existing programs, and

Whereas, such recently created systems now cover half of American families, now therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives,* That the General Assembly respectfully and strongly urges Congress not to enact laws that might tend to diminish or undermine a unified and stable Social Security system, and be it further

*Resolved,* That laws to encourage workers and their employers to save or invest for retirement should supplement and not substitute for the basic benefits of Social Security insurance that are vital to American working families, and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

---

POM–166. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee relative to the reindustrialization of the East Tennessee Technology Park; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–167. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland Heights, Ohio relative to the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–168. A joint resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of Nevada relative to surface mining regulations; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19—

Whereas, Mining is of critical importance to Nevada and its rural communities as a significant contributor to this state's economy; and

Whereas, The ''Nevada model'' of regulating the mineral industry is known and respected industrywide because it balances the global needs for natural resources with related environmental concerns and the economic needs of private business, thereby resulting in an environmentally healthy state with a viable and responsible mineral industry that uses state-of-the-art technology; and

Whereas, Surface mining regulations governing hardrock mining operations and mineral exploration activities on public lands are codified in Part 3809 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations and are commonly referred to as ''3809 Regulations''; and

Whereas, The Bureau of Land Management initiated the revision of these regulations in January 1997; and

Whereas, In response to concerns raised by the Western Governor's Association and a group of 15 United States Senators, including Nevada Senators Harry Reid and Richard H. Bryan, Congress included language in the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998 to require a detailed, comprehensive study by the National Academy of Science of the environmental and reclamation requirements for mining on federal lands and the adequacy of those requirements to prevent undue degradation, and prohibited final revision to the 3809 Regulations before September 30, 1999; and

Whereas, Contrary to the requirements of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, the Secretary of the Interior is moving forward with revisions to the 3809 Regulations and to the Environmental Impact Statement; and

Whereas, Under the Bureau of Land Management's most recent revisions, every western state, including Nevada, may be faced with the choice of either expending substantial resources to revise its regulations to conform with the new requirements of the Bureau of Land Management or having the successful programs of the State of Nevada, which have been carefully tested and enforced over the years, simply cease to be operative on public lands, thereby imposing significantly detrimental impacts on the mineral industry and the State of Nevada; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, Jointly,* That the members of the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature do hereby urge the Secretary of the Interior to comply with the intent of Congress as stated in the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998 which requires a study of the issue by the National Academy of Sciences and prohibits final revision of 43 C.F.R. Part 3809, the 3809 Regulations, before September 30, 1999; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Nevada Legislature strongly supports Alternative 1, the ''No Action'' alternative, as described in the draft Environmental Impact Statement on Surface Management Regulations and Locatable Mineral Operations, to maintain the existing 3809 Regulations without revision or modification; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and approval.

---

POM–169. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska relative to the use of phosphide gas in grain storage; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 43

Whereas, Nebraska's agricultural heritage and economy is dependent upon the harvest, storage, and transportation of grain; and

Whereas, there are 357 grain elevators with 663 million bushels of storage and 55,000 farms with 1.02 billion bushels of storage in Nebraska; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators are valued neighbors to and located in close proximity to homes, schools, farms, and businesses in most of all Nebraska's communities; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators, feed mills, processors, and growers are committed to protecting the health and safety of applicators and workers and to the well-being of the public; and

Whereas, grain elevators are located in Nebraska communities near railroads and highways to facilitate the transportation of grain; and

Whereas, Nebraska is a leader in the nation and in the world in grain production; and

Whereas, Nebraska grain elevators, feed mills, processors, and growers are committed to producing an adequate, safe, and high quality food supply for domestic and world consumers; and

Whereas, treaties and established trade relations may require pest-controlled grain before grain can be exported; and

Whereas, insect pests in grain without fumigation treatment could create health risks and reduce the quality of the grain marketed from Nebraska; and

Whereas, aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas are cost-effective fumigants used both by commercial elevators and farmers in the storage of grains in Nebraska; and

Whereas, the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) acknowledges few, if any, viable alternatives to the use of aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas exist for fumigation to control pests in stored grain; and

Whereas, the current label restrictions for aluminum and magnesium phosphide gas provide for the safe and effective use of the product; and

Whereas, the State of Nebraska practices rigorous enforcement of the label restrictions on fumigants, ensures adequate training of certified applicators, and conducts a fumigation and grain storage project to inspect the use of fumigants; and

Whereas, restrictions in the use of fumigants in grain storage and transport should be based only on sound scientific reasoning, available technology, and analysis of risk level and avoid raising undue public alarm over unsubstantiated or inconsequential risk: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the ninety-sixty legislature of Nebraska, first session,* That the Congress of the United States direct the federal Environmental Protection Agency to curtail implementation of new restrictions from its Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) on phosphide gas that would require a 500-foot buffer zone and other restrictions that effectively preclude the use of aluminum or magnesium phosphide in most of Nebraska's grain storage facilities and grain transportation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States direct the federal Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that risk mitigation allowances for aluminum or magnesium phosphide are clearly demonstrated as necessary to protect human health, are based upon sound science and reliable information, are economically and operationally reasonable, and will permit the use of these products in accordance with the label.

---

POM–170. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado relative to a pay increase for Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 99–005

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment to the constitution of the United States, also

known as ''The Madison Amendment'', provides that ''No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.''; and

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment requires that an intervening election be held between the enactment of any congressional pay increase and its subsequent application to any member of Congress; and

Whereas, The twenty-seventh amendment's requirement for an intervening election is intended to allow voters in each state and congressional district to obtain direct information regarding salary increases prior to the reelection of incumbents or the election of others in their stead; and

Whereas, Salary increases for members of Congress currently are regulated by ''The Government Ethics Reform Act of 1989,'' (''The Act'') pursuant to 2 U.S.C. sec. 31; and

Whereas, The Act gives members of Congress an immediate one-time salary increase and, in subsequent years, an annual cost of living adjustment increase to salaries or pensions; and

Whereas, Such annual cost of living adjustment is established in accordance with federal law and incorporated in an executive order of the President in December of each year to establish salary increases that are put into effect on January 1 of the next year; and

Whereas, Through the automatic operation of the cost of living adjustment provisions, congressional salaries have been increased on the first day of January for several years; and

Whereas, Without the action of legislation, each Congress effectively and automatically enacts for itself a cost of living adjustment salary increase in violation of the twenty-seventh amendment; and

Whereas, When each year's cost of living adjustment increase is paid on the following January 1 to members of Congress, former members, or spouses of deceased members without the process of an intervening election, the twenty-seventh amendment is violated; now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, (the House of Representatives concurring herein),* That the General Assembly hereby expresses its opposition to automatic annual cost of living adjustment salary increases for members of Congress of the United States as violative of the twenty-seventh amendment to the United States Constitution and hereby memorializes the Congress to refrain from enacting any pay increase for members of Congress without an affirmative vote or that takes effect before the following Congress has been elected and fully sworn into office; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this Memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Congressional delegation representing the state of Colorado.

---

POM–171. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington relative to immigration laws, policies and practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4015

To the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) represent the most dramatic changes in immigration law in more than 30 years; and

Whereas, These acts mandate that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) arrest, detain, and deport large segments of the United States immigrant population and the implementation of these laws has had far-reaching effects, including unnecessary financial burdens on the state's legal, social, and welfare systems; and

Whereas, The United States has long been known as a nation of immigrants, as a champion of human rights for all peoples, and as a country that holds justice and equality under the law among its highest ideals, especially equal justice under law; and

Whereas, Immigrant detainees may have been legal permanent residents who have lived almost their entire lives in the United States, served in the United States military, have a United States citizen spouse, or have United States citizen children; and

Whereas, Detainees, including women and children, are frequently in INS custody for periods longer than seventy-two hours and are especially vulnerable within the INS system; and

Whereas, Families consisting of both legal and illegal family members are often divided causing not only emotional and psychological hardship when mothers are separated from their children, but also financial difficulties resulting in increased welfare rolls when primary wage earners are removed from their jobs;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the President, the Congress, and the appropriate agencies continue to look closely at current immigration law and INS policies and practices, and that necessary changes be made so that problems surrounding immigration may be resolved as soon as possible; and be it

*Resolved,* That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable William J. Clinton, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of Congress from the State of Washington, Doris Meissner, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Gary Locke, the Governor of the State of Washington.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 323. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park and establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–69).

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1009. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1188. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the provision of classroom-related technology training for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1188. A bill to provide grants to State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the provision of classroom-related technology training for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

TEACHER TECHNOLOGY TRAINING ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help teachers use technology in their teaching, the Teacher Technology Training Act of 1999.

This bill has three major provisions:

It authorizes $500 million for state education departments to award grants to local public school districts on the basis of need to train teachers in how to use technology in the classroom.

It specifies that grants may be used to strengthen instruction and learning, provide professional development, and pay the costs of teacher training in using technology in the classroom.

It requires the Secretary of Education to evaluate the technology training programs for teachers developed by school districts within three years.

I am introducing this bill because teachers say they need to learn how to use computers and other technology in their teaching. In a 1998 survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, only 20 percent of teachers said they felt ''well prepared'' to integrate educational technology into instruction.

Furthermore, the training that does exist for these teachers is inadequate. In the same Department of Education survey, among full-time, public school teachers, 78 percent said they had participated in professional development programs on using educational technology in their instruction, but only 23 percent of those teachers said they felt ''well prepared'' in this area. Of the teachers who report having received some training, 40 percent felt that it had improved their classroom teaching only ''somewhat'' or ''not at all.'' This is unacceptable. What we see now is that in many schools the students know more about how to use computers than the teachers do. In one Kentucky school profiled by Inside Technology Training magazine, the students run the school's computer systems. The article quoted the school district's technology coordinator as saying that the students had ''long surpassed'' what the teachers could do and

reported that one student had recently trained twenty teachers on software for Web page construction (''Fast Times at Kentucky High,'' Inside Technology Training, June 1998).

I see this problem in my own state. A report by the Los Angeles County Office of Education in 1996 found that in Los Angeles County, nearly half of the teachers had no experience with computers or had only limited familiarity with word processing software. According to a 1998 report by the California Teachers Association, teachers in California rank training in the use of new technology fourth among eighteen changes they believe could most improve public education. Forty-five percent of the teachers surveyed said more technology training would greatly improve conditions for teaching and learning (CTA for the Next Century, 1998).

It is crucial that we given students the opportunity to become familiar with technology in their classrooms because post-high school education and most good jobs require experience using computers. U.S. Commerce Secretary William M. Daley has said, ''Opportunities are now dependent upon a person's ability to use computers and engage in using the Internet'' (CQ Weekly, ''Digital Haves and Have Nots,'' April 17, 1999). In my state, a 1997 Rand report found that there is currently a shift in the state's economy away from manufacturing and toward higher-skill service and technology industries, and employers are placing a higher premium on the computer skills necessary for these positions (Immigration in a Changing Economy, Rand, 1997). Students are better educated when their teachers are well trained. We cannot prepare students for the increasingly technological workplace without trained teachers.

We have made great efforts to make technology available to students in their classrooms, and now we have a national student to computer ratio of 10 to 1. Seventy-eight percent of our nation's schools have Internet access. These are good first steps.

But also essential is having teachers and students use all this technology in their day-to-day classroom activities when it can enhance learning. This will not happen until teachers are trained in how to include technology in their instruciton.

One teacher expressed her frustration in an article in the National School Boards Association's Electronic School magazine:

> Most teachers have no model to show them the advantages of hooking up to the projects available on the Internet. And shrinking school budgets don't provide nearly enough money to train teachers in new or visionary techniques. Meanwhile, we can't escape the magazine and newspaper articles touting the Information Superhighway and heralding new ways of responding to, using, and learning information in our society. Well, who most needs to learn to traverse this road successfully? Society future leaders—and their teachers (Electronic School, ''Going Global,'' February 1995).

I agree.

Our teachers are not prepared to use technology in their classrooms. Students need to learn to use modern technology and it can help them learn. If we are expecting teachers to use up-to-date methods and tools, we must train them to do so. This bill will provide some of the funds needed to do that.

By introducing this bill I am not suggesting that technology is a cure-all for the problems in our schools. Technology is one of many teaching and learning tools. It can bring some efficiencies to learning, for example, providing a new way to do math and spelling drills or keeping students engaged in learning while a teacher works with other students who need extra help. It can also be an important research tool by providing easy access to information that, without a computer, is not easily available.

We expect a great deal from our teachers and students. We must give them the resources they need. This bill is one step.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 216

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 216, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the use of foreign tax credits under the alternative minimum tax.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes.

S. 337

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to preserve the balance of rights between employers, employees, and labor organizations which is fundamental to our system of collective bargaining while preserving the rights of workers to organize, or otherwise engage in concerted activities protected under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 348

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance training, research and development, energy conservation and efficiency, and consumer education in the oilheat industry for the benefit of oilheat consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459 a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to research on autism.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make certain changes related to payments for graduate medical education under the medicare program.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage depletion allowance for certain hardrock mines, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims.

S. 625

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 642, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals are being significantly reduced, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the hydroelectric licensing process by granting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission statutory authority to better coordinate participation by other agencies and entities, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to combat nursing home fraud and abuse, increase protections for victims of telemarketing fraud, enhance safeguards for pension plans and health care benefit programs, and enhance penalties for crimes against seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 777, a bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information.

S. 784

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 784, a bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program.

S. 880

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to remove flammable fuels from the list of substances with respect to which reporting and other activities are required under the risk management plan program.

S. 897

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S.897, a bill to provide matching grants for the construction, renovation and repair of school facilities in areas affected by Federal Activities, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a permanent tax incentive for research and development, and for other purposes.

S. 1003

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1003, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased tax incentives for the purchase of alternative fuel and electric vehicle, and for other purposes.

S. 1010

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1010, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a medical innovation tax credit for clinical testing research expenses attributable to academic medical centers and other qualified hospital research organizations.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1023, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1053, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999.

S. 1066

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1066, a bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1067

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to promote the adoption of children with special needs.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1074, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for medicare coverage of individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), and to provide medicare coverage of drugs and biologicals used for the treatment of ALS or for the alleviation of symptoms relating to ALS.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for qualified individual for bone mass measurement (bone density testing) to prevent fractures associated with osteoporosis.

S. 1110

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Engineering.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. LOTT, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1128, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers, to provide for a carryover basis at death, and to establish a partial capital gains exclusion for inherited assets.

S 1148

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1148, a bill to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project, and for other purpose.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1150, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment.

S. 1177

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1177, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to permit the harvesting of crops on land subject to conservation reserve contracts for recovery of biomass used in energy production.

S. 1187

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 34, a resolution designating the week beginning April 30, 1999, as ''National Youth Fitness Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 59

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 59, a resolution designating both July 2, 1999, and July 2, 2000, as ''National Literacy Day.''

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

### BOXER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 541

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1122) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 8106, and insert the following:

SEC. 8106. 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.

### STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 542

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

''SEC. . In addition to any funds appropriated elsewhere in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $9,000,000 is hereby appropriated only for the Army Test Ranges and Facilities program element.''

### STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 543

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Navy'', is hereby reduced by $26,840,000 and the total amount appropriated in this Act for Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', is hereby increased by $51,840,000 to reflect the transfer of the Joint Warfighting Experimentation program: provided, That none of the funds provided for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation Program may be obligated until the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reports to the Congressional defense committees on the role and participation of all unified and specified commands in the JWEP.

### STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 544

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense, $23,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, that the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $23,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services.

### STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 545

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . In addition to the funds available in Title III, $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for U–2 cockpit modifications.

## Y2K ACT

### DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 546

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 96) to regulate commerce between and among the several States by providing for the orderly resolution of disputes arising out of computer-based problems related to processing data that includes a 2-digit expression of that year's date; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. ___. WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY FOR A Y2K ACTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consent is given to join the United States as a necessary party defendant in a Y2K action.

(b) JURISDICTION AND REVIEW.—The United States, when a party to any Y2K action—

(1) shall be deemed to have waived any right to plead that it is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty;

(2) shall be subject to judgments, orders, and decrees of the court having jurisdiction; and

(3) may obtain review thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

### BIDEN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 547

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. EDWARDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', $63,041,000 shall be available for C–5 aircraft modernization.

### GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 548

Mr. GREGG proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

**SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE.**

None of the funds made available in the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) for emergency support of refugees and displaced persons and the local communities directly affected by the influx of refugees may be made available to implement a long-term, regional program of development or reconstruction in Southeastern Europe except pursuant to specific statutory authorization enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

### BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 549–450

Mr. BYRD proposed two amendments to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 549

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, $10,000,000 shall be 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. 550

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 $10,000,000 shall be 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.

## NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other act may be made available for reconstruction activities in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of Kosovo) as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

## INHOFE AMENDMENT NO. 552

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

SEC. . The Department of the Army is directed to conduct a live fire, side-by-side operational test of the air-to-air Starstreak and air-to-air Stinger missiles from the AH–64D Longbow helicopter. The operational test is to be completed utilizing funds provided for in this bill in addition to funding provided for this purpose in the Fiscal Year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act (P.L. 105–262): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department is to ensure that the development, procurement or integration of any missile for use on the AH–64 or RAH–66 helicopters, as an air-to-air missile, is subject to a full and open competition which includes the conduct of a live-fire, side-by-side test as an element of the source selection criteria: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition & Technology) will conduct an independent review of the need, and the merits of acquiring an air-to-air missile to provide self-protection for the AH–64 and RAH–66 from the threat of hostile forces. The Secretary is to provide his findings in a report to the Defense Oversight Committees, no later than March 31, 2000.

## MACK AMENDMENTS NOS. 553–555

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MACK) proposed three amendments to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 553

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, AIR FORCE'', up to $6,000,000 may be made available for the 3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system.

AMENDMENT NO. 554

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, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for electronic propulsion systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 555

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', up to $5,000,000 may be made available for a ground processing station to support a tropical remote sensing radar.

## BURNS AMENDMENT NO. 556

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill the following:

''SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army''; up to $6,000,000 may be provided to the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory to continue research and development to reduce pollution associated with industrial manufacturing waste systems.''

## MCCONNELL AMENDMENT NO. 557

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY'', up to $13,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the MK-45 weapon system, and up to $19,000,000 may be available for depot overhaul of the Close In Weapon System.

## STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 558

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title IV under the heading ''Research, Development, Test, And Evaluation, Army'', up to $1,500,000 may be available for prototyping and testing of a water distributor for the Pallet-Loading System Engineer Mission Module System.

## BENNETT AMENDMENT NO. 559

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BENNETT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new general provisions:

SEC. . Of the funds provided under Title IV of this Act under Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force', up to $1,000,000 may be made available only for alternative missile engine source development.

## HOLLINGS AMENDMENT NO. 560

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HOLLINGS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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 $3,000,000 may be made available for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence Pollution Prevention Initiative.

## REID AMENDMENT NO. 561

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follow:

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

''SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', up to $4,500,000 may be made available for a hot gas decontamination facility.

## LIEBERMAN AMENDMENT NO. 562

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Defense Health Program'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to support the establishment of a DOD Center for Medical Informatics.

## REID AMENDMENT NO. 563

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title III under the heading ''PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS'', up to $2,800,000 may be made available for the K-Band Test Obscuration Pairing System.

## KERREY AMENDMENT NO. 564

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KERREY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', up to $2,000,000 may be made available to continue and expand on-going work in recombinant vaccine research against biological warfare agents.

## LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 565

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LAUTENBERG) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. (a) The purpose of this section is to provide means for the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, to furnish fire protection through the City's municipal fire department for the tenants, including the Coast Guard, and property at Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, thereby enhancing the City's capability for furnishing safety services that is a fundamental capability necessary for encouraging the economic development of Military Ocean Terminal.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, convey without consideration to the Bayonne

Local Redevelopment Authority, Bayonne, New Jersey, and to the City of Bayonne, New Jersey, jointly, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the firefighting equipment described in subsection (c).

(c) The equipment to be conveyed under subsection (b) is firefighting equipment at Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, as follows:

(1) Pierce Dash 2000 Gpm Pumper, manufactured September 1995.

(2) Pierce Arrow 100-foot Tower Ladder, manufactured February 1994.

(3) Pierce HAZMAT truck, manufactured 1993.

(4) Ford E–350, manufactured 1992.

(5) Ford E–302, manufactured 1990.

(6) Bauer Compressor, Bauer–UN 12–E#5000psi, manufactured November 1989.

(d) The conveyance and delivery of the property shall be at no cost to the United States.

(e) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

---

## BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 566

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be made available for basic research on advanced composite materials processing (specifically, resin transfer molding, vacuum-assisted resin transfer molding, and co-infusion resin transfer molding).

---

## DOMENICI AMENDMENTS NOS. 567–568

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 567

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

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 Information Warfare Vulnerability Analysis.

---

AMENDMENT NO. 568

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

SEC. 8109. Of the funds appropriated in title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE'', up to $7,500,000 may be made available for GEO High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program.

---

## WYDEN (AND SMITH) AMENDMENT NO. 569

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert:

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 available solely for research, development, test, and evaluation of elastin-based artificial tissues and dye targeted laser fusion techniques for healing internal injuries.

## STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 570

Mr. STEVENS proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . Of the funds made available in Title IV of this Act for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', up to $20,000,000 may be made available for supersonic aircraft noise mitigation research and development efforts.

---

## LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 571

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On line 22, page 97, insert the following:

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

---

## SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 572

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. . From within the funds provided for the Defense Acquisition University, up to $5,000,000 may be spent on a pilot program using state-of-the-art training technology that would train the acquisition workforce in a simulated government procurement environment.

---

## INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 573

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill add the following:

SEC. . During the current fiscal year, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management and humanitarian assistance: *Provided,* That not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the training of foreign personnel conducted under this authority during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under the section: *Provided further,* That the report shall specify the countries in which the training was conducted, the type of training conducted, and the foreign personnel trained.

---

## HUTCHISON (AND GRAMM) AMENDMENT NO. 574

Mr. STEVENS (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. GRAMM)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. (a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to evaluate and demonstrate methods for more efficient operation of military installations through improved capital asset management and greater reliance on the public or private sector for less-costly base support services, where available.

(b) AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may carry out at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, a demonstration project to be known as the ''Base Efficiency Project'' to improve mission effectiveness and reduce the cost of providing quality installation support at Brooks Air Force Base.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the Project in consultation with the Community to the extent the Secretary determines such consultation is necessary and appropriate.

(3) The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other authority vested in or delegated to the Secretary, and the Secretary may exercise any authority or combination of authorities provided under this section or elsewhere to carry out the purposes of the Project.

(c) EFFICIENT PRACTICES.—(1) The Secretary may convert services at or for the benefit of the Base from accomplishment by military personnel or by Department civilian employees (appropriated fund or non-appropriated fund), to services performed by contract or provided as consideration for the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of property.

(2) Notwithstanding section 2462 of title 10, United States Code, a contract for services may be awarded based on ''best value'' if the Secretary determines that the award will advance the purposes of a joint activity conducted under the Project and is in the best interest of the Department.

(3) Notwithstanding that such services are generally funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large, the Secretary may contract for public services at or for the benefit of the Base in exchange for such consideration, if any, the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(4)(A) The Secretary may conduct joint activities with the Community, the State, and any private parties or entities on or for the benefit of the Base.

(B) Payments or reimbursements received from participants for their share of direct and indirect costs of joint activities, including the costs of providing, operating, and maintaining facilities, shall be in an amount and type determined to be adequate and appropriate by the Secretary.

(C) Such payments or reimbursements received by the Department shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(d) LEASE AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary may lease real or personal property located on the Base to any lessee upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and in the interest of the United States, if the Secretary determines that the lease would facilitate the purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a lease under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) A lease under this subsection—

(A) may be for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary to accomplish the goals of the Project; and

(B) may give the lessee the first right to purchase the property if the lease is terminated to allow the United States to sell the property under any other provision of law.

(4)(A) The interest of a lessee of property leased under this subsection may be taxed by the State or the Community.

(B) A lease under this subsection shall provide that, if and to the extent that the leased property is later made taxable by State governments or local governments under Federal law, the lease shall be renegotiated.

(5) The Department may furnish a lessee with utilities, custodial services, and other base operation, maintenance, or support services, in exchange for such consideration, payment, or reimbursement as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(6) All amounts received from leases under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(7) A lease under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, other than subsection (b)(1) of that section.

(B) Section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b).

(C) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.).

(e) PROPERTY DISPOSAL.—(1) The Secretary may sell or otherwise convey or transfer real and personal property located at the Base to the Community or to another public or private party during the Project, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of the Project.

(2) Consideration for a sale or other conveyance or transfer or property under this subsection shall be determined in accordance with subsection (g).

(3) The sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall not be subject to the following provisions of law:

(A) Section 2693 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)

(4) Cash payments received as consideration for the sale or other conveyance or transfer of property under this subsection shall be deposited into the Project Fund.

(f) LEASEBACK OF PROPERTY LEASED OR DISPOSED.—(1) The Secretary may lease, sell, or otherwise convey or transfer real property at the Base under subsections (b) and (e), as applicable, which will be retained for use by the Department or by another military department or other Federal agency, if the lessee, purchaser, or other grantee or transferee of the property agrees to enter into a leaseback to the Department in connection with the lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of one or more portions or all of the property leased, sold, or otherwise conveyed or transferred, as applicable.

(2) A leaseback of real property under this subsection shall be an operating lease for no more than 20 years unless the Secretary of Defense determines that a longer term is appropriate.

(3)(A) Consideration, if any, for real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection shall be in such form and amount as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) The Secretary may use funds in the Project Fund or other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department for use at the Base for payment of any such cash rent.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department or other military department or other Federal agency using the real property leased under a leaseback entered into under this subsection may construct and erect facilities on or otherwise improve the leased property using funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department or other military department or other Federal agency for such purpose. Funds available to the Department for such purpose include funds in the Project Fund.

(g) CONSIDERATION.—(1) The Secretary shall determine the nature, value, and adequacy of consideration required or offered in exchange for a lease, sale, or other conveyance or transfer of real or personal property or for other actions taken under the Project.

(2) Consideration may be in cash or in-kind or any combination thereof. In-kind consideration may include the following:

(A) Real property.

(B) Personal property.

(C) Goods or services, including operation, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of any property or facilities (including non-appropriated fund facilities).

(D) Base operating support services.

(E) Construction or improvement of Department facilities.

(F) Provision of facilities, including office, storage, or other usable space, for use by the Department on or off the Base.

(G) Public services.

(3) Consideration may not be for less than the fair market value.

(h) PROJECT FUND.—(1) There is established on the books of the Treasury a fund to be known as the ''Base Efficiency Project Fund'' into which all cash rents, proceeds, payments, reimbursements, and other amounts from leases, sales, or other conveyances or transfers, joint activities, and all other actions taken under the Project shall be deposited. All amounts deposited into the Project Fund are without fiscal year limitation.

(2) Amounts in the Project Fund may be used only for operation, base operating support services, maintenance, repair, construction, or improvement of Department facilities, payment of consideration for acquisitions of interests in real property (including payment of rentals for leasebacks), and environmental protection or restoration, in addition to or in combination with other amounts appropriated for these purposes.

(3) Subject to generally prescribed financial management regulations, the Secretary shall establish the structure of the Project Fund and such administrative policies and procedures as the Secretary considers necessary to account for and control deposits into and disbursements from the Project Fund effectively.

(4) All amounts in the Project Fund shall be available for use for the purposes authorized in paragraph (2) at the Base, except that the Secretary may redirect up to 50 per cent of amounts in the Project Fund for such uses at other installations under the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary as the Secretary determines necessary and in the best interest of the Department.

(i) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—(1)(A) Any Federal agency, its contractors, or its grantees shall pay rent, in cash or services, for the use of facilities or property at the Base, in an amount and type determined to be adequate by the Secretary.

(B) Such rent shall generally be the fair market rental of the property provided, but in any case shall be sufficient to compensate the Base for the direct and overhead costs incurred by the Base due to the presence of the tenant agency on the Base.

(2) Transfers of real or personal property at the Base to other Federal agencies shall be at fair market value consideration. Such consideration may be paid in cash, by appropriation transfer, or in property, goods, or services.

(3) Amounts received from other Federal agencies, their contractors, or grantees, including any amounts paid by appropriation transfer, shall be deposited in the Project Fund.

(j) ACQUISITION OF INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY.—(1) The Secretary may acquire any interest in real property in and around the Community that the Secretary determines will advance the purposes of the Project.

(2) The Secretary shall determine the value of the interest in the real property to be acquired and the consideration (if any) to be offered in exchange for the interest.

(3) The authority to acquire an interest in real property under this subsection includes authority to make surveys and acquire such interest by purchase, exchange, lease, or gift.

(4) Payments for such acquisitions may be made from amounts in the Project Fund or from such other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department for such purposes.

(k) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to transactions at the Base during the Project.

(2)(A) Not later than March 1 each year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on any transactions at the Base during the preceding fiscal year that would be subject to such section 2662, but for paragraph (1).

(B) The report shall include a detailed cost analysis of the financial savings and gains realized through joint activities and other actions under the Project authorized by this section and a description of the status of the Project.

(l) LIMITATION.—None of the authorities in this section shall create any legal rights in any person or entity except rights embodied in leases, deeds, or contracts.

(m) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to enter into a lease, deed, permit, license, contract, or other agreement under this section shall expire on September 30, 2004.

(n) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Project'' means the Base Efficiency Project authorized by this section.

(2) The term ''Base'' means Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

(3) The term ''Community'' means the City of San Antonio, Texas.

(4) The term ''Department'' means the Department of the Air Force.

(5) The term ''facility'' means a building, structure, or other improvement to real property (except a military family housing unit as that term is used in subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code).

(6) The term ''joint activity'' means an activity conducted on or for the benefit of the Base by the Department, jointly with the Community, the State, or any private entity, or any combination thereof.

(7) The term ''Project Fund'' means the Base Efficiency Project Fund established by subsection (h).

(8) The term ''public services'' means public services (except public schools, fire protection, and police protection) that are funded by local and State taxes and provided without specific charge to the public at large.

(9) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a civilian official of the Department appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(10) The term ''State'' means the State of Texas.

---

## GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 575

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

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

## LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 576

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

Office of Net Assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the United States Pacific Command, shall submit a report to Congress no later than 180 days after the enactment of this act which addresses the following issues:

1. A review and evaluation of the operational planning and other preparations of the U.S. Defense Department, including but not limited to the U.S. Pacific Command, to implement the relevant sections of the Taiwan Relations Act since its enactment in 1979.

2. A review and evaluation of all gaps in relevant knowledge about the current and future military balance between Taiwan and mainland China, including but not limited to Chinese open source writings.

3. A set of recommendations, based on these reviews and evaluations, concerning further research and analysis that the Office of Net Assessment and the Pacific Command believe to be necessary and desirable to be performed by the National Defense University and other defense research centers.

## DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; 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.

## ROBERTS AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

**SEC. 8109. EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998 AND INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.**

(a) EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURE EXPORT RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—Section 2 of the Agriculture Export Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–194; 112 Stat. 627) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1999'' each place it appears and inserting ''September 30, 2002''.

(b) EXTENSION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN RELIEF ACT OF 1998.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 902(a) of the India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1 note) is amended by striking ''for a period not to exceed one year upon enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''for a period not to exceed September 30, 2002''.

(2) REPORT.—Section 904 of such Act is amended by striking ''a one-year period described in section 902'' and inserting ''the first year following the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or September 30, 1999.

## DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out any conveyance of land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, Unless such conveyance is consistent with a regional agreement among the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan and in accordance with section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 573).

(2) The land referred to in paragraph (1) is a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, located at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of approximately 14 acres, and known as the northern Army Reserve enclave area, that is covered by the authority in section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and has not been conveyed pursuant to that authority as of the date of enactment of this Act.

## BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 580

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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 testing of 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 and independent 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 testing and of the extent to which the civilian population at the site can be adequately protected during such testing;

(2) the President should not authorize the Navy to resume live ammunition testing on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, unless and until he has advised the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that—

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

(B) the national security of the United States requires that the testing be carried out despite the potential risks to the civilian population;

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

(D) in the event that testing resumes, measures are to be taken to protect the Island of Vieques and the surrounding area from environmental degradation, including possible environmental harm, that might result from the testing of ammunition containing radioactive materials; and

(3) in addition to advising committees of Congress of the findings as described in paragraph (2), the President should advise the Governor of Puerto Rico of those findings and, if the President decides to resume live-ammunition weapons testing 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 testing.

## INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 581

Mr. INOUYE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SECTION 1. FEDERAL HEALTH CARE PARTNERSHIP.**

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 governmental services 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''.

## KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 582

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

Of the funds appropriated in title III, Procurement, under the heading ''MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $35,000,000 may be made available to retrofit and improve the current inventory of Patriot missiles in order to meet current and projected threats from cruise missiles.

## LEVIN AMENDMENT NO. 583

Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in Title IV of this act under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, is hereby reduced by $200,000,000: *Provided,* That not more than $836,555,000 of the funds provided under this Act may be obligated for National Missile Defense programs: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Aircraft Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $56,100,000 for re-engining of the CH–47 helicopter, *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Missile Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $98,400,000 for advance procurement of the Javelin missile; *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army is hereby increased by $20,000,000 for procurement of the Field Artillery Ammunition Supply Vehicle, *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for Other Procurement, Army is hereby increased by $25,500,000 for procurement of SINCGARS radios.

## MCCAIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 584–585

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. MCCAIN) proposed two amendments to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 584

Strike section 8108, and insert the following:

SEC. 8108. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act by titles III, IV, and VI is hereby reduced by $3,100,000,000, the reductions to be derived from appropriations as follows:

(1) From Operation and Maintenance, Army, $27,000,000.

(2) From Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $36,000,000.

(3) From Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, $10,200,000.

(4) From Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $61,800,000.

(5) From Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, $78,900,000.

(6) From Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, $53,500,000.

(7) From Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard, $2,900,000.

(8) From Aircraft Procurement, Army, $178,000,000.

(9) From Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, $26,400,000.

(10) From Procurement of Ammunition, Army, $37,500,000.

(11) From Other Procurement, Army, $135,500,000.

(12) From Aircraft Procurement, Navy, $69,000,000.

(13) From Weapons Procurement, Navy, $54,400,000.

(14) From Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, $317,500,000.

(15) From Other Procurement, Navy, $67,800,000.

(16) From Procurement, Marine Corps, $54,900,000.

(17) From Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, $164,500,000.

(18) From Missile Procurement, Air Force, $25,400,000.

(19) From Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, $5,100,000.

(20) From Other Procurement, Air Force, $53,400,000.

(21) From Procurement, Defense-Wide, $73,000,000.

(22) From National Guard and Reserve Equipment, $190,500,000.

(23) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, $249,100,000.

(24) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $288,700,000.

(25) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, $263,300,000.

(26) From Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, $287,900,000.

(27) From Defense Health Program, $226,200,000.

(28) From Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense, $61,600,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 585

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

SEC. 8109. (a) Subject to subsection (c) and except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may waive any domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement referred to in subsection (b) and thereby authorize procurements of items that are grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured—

(1) inside a foreign country the government of which is a party to a reciprocal defense memorandum of understanding that is entered into with the Secretary of Defense and is in effect;

(2) inside the United States or its possessions; or

(3) inside the United States or its possessions partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured outside the United States or its possessions.

(b) For purposes of this section:

(1) A domestic source requirement is any requirement under law that the Department of Defense must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item that is grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States, its possessions, or a part of the national technology and industrial base.

(2) A domestic content requirement is any requirement under law that the Department must satisfy its needs for an item by procuring an item produced or manufactured partly or wholly from components grown, reprocessed, reused, produced, or manufactured in the United States or its possessions.

(c) The authority to waive a requirement under subsection (a) applies to procurements of items if the Secretary of Defense first determines that—

(1) the application of the requirement to procurements of those items would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding providing for reciprocal procurement of defense items that is entered into between the Department of Defense and a foreign country in accordance with section 2531 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) the foreign country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country; and

(3) one or more of the conditions set forth in section 2534(d) of title 10, United States Code, exists with respect to the procurement.

(d) LAWS NOT WAIVED.—The Secretary of Defense may not exercise the authority under subsection (a) to waive any of the following laws:

(1) The Small Business Act.

(2) The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c).

(3) Sections 7309 and 7310 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to ships in Federal Supply Class 1905.

(4) Section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 (10 U.S.C. 2241 note), with respect to articles or items of textiles, apparel, shoe findings, tents, and flags listed in Federal Supply Classes 8305, 8310, 8315, 8320, 8335, 8340, and 8345 and articles or items of clothing, footware, individual equipment, and insignia listed in Federal Supply Classes 8405, 8410, 8415, 8420, 8425, 8430, 8435, 8440, 8445, 8450, 8455, 8465, 8470, and 8475.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority under subsection (a) to waive a domestic source requirement or domestic content requirement is in addition to any other authority to waive such requirement.

## SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 586

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

In Title IV, under Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, add the following:

''Of the funds appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation Army, up to $10 million may be utilized for Army Space Control Technology.''

---

## BOND (AND ASHCROFT) AMENDMENT NO. 587

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

---

## KOHL AMENDMENT NO. 588

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. KOHL) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

SEC. 8109. (a) Of the amounts appropriated by title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $220,000 may be made available to carry out the study described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall carry out a study for purposes of evaluating the cost-effectiveness of various technologies utilized, or having the potential to be utilized, in the demolition and cleanup of facilities contaminated with chemical residue at facilities used in the production of weapons and ammunition.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the study at the Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin.

(3) The Secretary shall provide for the carrying out of work under the study through the Omaha District Corps of Engineers and in cooperation with the Department of Energy Federal Technology Center, Morgantown, West Virginia.

(4) The Secretary may make available to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government information developed as a result of the study.

---

## LOTT (AND COCHRAN) AMENDMENT NO. 589

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S.1122, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . Of the total amount appropriated in this Act for RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY shall be increased by $3,800,000 to continue research and development on polymer cased ammunition.

---

## GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 590

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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), $7,300,000 shall be available, in additional 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).

---

## VOINOVICH AMENDMENT NO. 591

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. VOINOVICH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; 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.

---

## SANTORUM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 592

STEVENS (for Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Mr. SPECTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

---

## HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 593

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

---

## BYRD AMENDMENTS NOS. 594–595

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BYRD) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 594

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

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).

---

## ASHCROFT (AND BOND) AMENDMENT NO. 596

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. ASHCROFT (for himself and Mr. BOND)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

## SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 597

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

## HARKIN AMENDMENT NO. 598

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122 supra; as follows:

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.

## GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 599

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

## COLLINS AMENDMENT NO. 600

Mr. STEVENS (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

## INOUYE AMENDMENT NO. 601

Mr. SPECTER (for Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

---

## BROWNBACK AMENDMENT NO. 602

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BROWNBACK) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 578 proposed by Mr. ROBERTS to the bill, S. 1122, supra; 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.

## BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 603

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

---

## DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 604

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; 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.

---

## COVERDELL (AND KERREY) AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. COVERDELL, for himself and Mr. KERREY), proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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.

---

## DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 606

Mr. STEVENS (for Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

On page 102, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

### TITLE IX—McGREGOR RANGE LAND WITHDRAWAL

**SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''McGregor Range Withdrawal Act''.

**SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) The term ''Materials Act'' means the Act of July 31, 1947 (commonly known as the Materials Act of 1947; 30 U.S.C. 601–604).

(2) The term ''management plan'' means the natural resources management plan prepared by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to section 9005(e).

(3) The term ''withdrawn lands'' means the lands described in subsection (d) of section 9003 that are withdrawn and reserved under section 9003.

(4) The term ''withdrawal period'' means the period specified in section 9007(a).

**SEC. 9003. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS AT MCGREGOR RANGE, NEW MEXICO.**

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, and except as otherwise provided in this title, the Federal lands at McGregor Range in the State of New Mexico that are described in subsection (d) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the Materials Act.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the withdrawal is to support military training and testing, all other uses of the withdrawn lands shall be secondary in nature.

(c) RESERVATION.—The withdrawn lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for military training and testing.

(d) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The lands withdrawn and reserved by this section (a) comprise approximately 608,000 acres of Federal land in Otero County, New Mexico, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''McGregor Range Land Withdrawal-Proposed,'' dated January ____, 1999, and filed in accordance with section 9004.

**SEC. 9004. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**

(a) PREPARATION OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of the withdrawn lands; and

(2) file one or more maps of the withdrawn lands and the legal description of the withdrawn lands with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and with the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) LEGAL EFFECT.—The maps and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this title, except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the maps and legal description.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—Copies of the maps and the legal description shall be available for public inspection in the offices of the New Mexico State Director and Las Cruces Field Office Manager of the Bureau of Land Management and in the office of the Commander Officer of Fort Bliss, Texas.

**SEC. 9005. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.**

(a) GENERAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—During the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall manage the withdrawn lands, in accordance with the provisions of this title and the management plan prepared under subsection (e), for the military purposes specified in section 9003(c).

(b) ACCESS RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CLOSE.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Secretary of the Army determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to public use of any portion of the withdrawn lands (including any road or trail therein) commonly in public use, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to take such action.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Any closure under paragraph (1) shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods required for the purposes specified in such paragraph. During a closure, the Secretary of the Army shall keep appropriate warning notices posted and take appropriate steps to notify the public about the closure.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN AND ACQUIRED MINERAL RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior shall manage all withdrawn and acquired mineral resources within the boundaries of McGregor Range in accordance with Public Law 85–337 (commonly known as the Engle Act; 43 U.S.C. 155–158).

(2) MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL MATERIALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or the Materials Act, the Secretary of the Army may use, from the withdrawn lands, sand, gravel, or similar mineral material resources of the type subject to disposition under the Materials Act, when the use of such resources is required for construction needs of Fort Bliss.

(d) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the withdrawn lands shall be conducted in accordance with section 2671 of title 10, United States Code, and the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.).

(e) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly develop a natural resources management plan for the lands withdrawn under this title for the withdrawal period. The management plan shall be developed not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be reviewed at least once every five years after its adoption to determine if it should be amended.

(2) CONTENT.—The management plan shall—

(A) include provisions for proper management and protection of the natural, cultural, and other resources and values of the withdrawn lands and for use of such resources to the extent consistent with the purpose of the withdrawal specified in section 9003(b);

(B) identify the withdrawn lands (if any) that are suitable for opening to the operation of the mineral leasing or geothermal leasing laws;

(C) provide for the continuation of livestock grazing at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army under such authorities as are available to the Secretary; and

(D) provide that the Secretary of the Army shall take necessary precautions to prevent, suppress, or manage brush and range fires occurring within the boundaries of McGregor Range, as well as brush and range fires occurring outside the boundaries of McGregor Range resulting from military activities at the range.

(3) FIRE SUPPRESSION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of the Army may seek assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in suppressing any brush or range fire occurring within the boundaries of McGregor Range or any brush or range fire occurring outside the boundaries of McGregor Range resulting from military activities at the range. The memorandum of understanding under section 9006 shall provide for assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in the suppression of such fires and require the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the Bureau of Land Management for such assistance.

**SEC. 9006. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to implement this title and the management plan.

(b) DURATION.—The duration of the memorandum of understanding shall be the same as the withdrawal period.

(c) AMENDMENT.—The memorandum of understanding may be amended by agreement of both Secretaries.

**SEC. 9007. TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION; EXTENSION.**

(a) TERMINATION DATE.—The withdrawal and reservation made by this title shall terminate 50 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTENSION.—

(1) NOTICE OF CONTINUED MILITARY NEED.—Not later than five years before the end of the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall advise the Secretary of the Interior as to whether or not the Army will have a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn lands after the end of the withdrawal period.

(2) APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION.—If the Secretary of the Army determines that there

will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn lands after the end of the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army shall file an application for extension of the withdrawal and reservation of the lands in accordance with the then existing regulations and procedures of the Department of the Interior applicable to extension of withdrawal of lands for military purposes and that are consistent with this title. The application shall be filed with the Department of the Interior not later than four years before the end of the withdrawal period.

(c) LIMITATION ON EXTENSION.—The withdrawal and reservation made by this title may not be extended or renewed except by Act or joint resolution.

**SEC. 9008. RELINQUISHMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.**

(a) FILING OF RELINQUISHMENT NOTICE.—If, during the withdrawal period, the Secretary of the Army decides to relinquish all or any portion of the withdrawn lands, the Secretary of the Army shall file a notice of intention to relinquish with the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) DETERMINATION OF PRESENCE OF CONTAMINATION.—Before transmitting a relinquishment notice under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall prepare a written determination concerning whether and to what extent the lands to be relinquished are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous wastes and substances. A copy of such determination shall be transmitted with the relinquishment notice.

(c) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION.—In the case of contaminated lands which are the subject of a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Army shall decontaminate or remediate the land to the extent that funds are appropriated for such purpose if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of the lands is practicable and economically feasible, taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land; and

(2) upon decontamination or remediation, the land could be opened to the operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(d) DECONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO OTHER LAWS.—The activities of the Secretary of the Army under subsection (c) are subject to applicable laws and regulations, including the Defense Environmental Restoration Program established under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(e) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO REFUSE CONTAMINATED LANDS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept lands specified in a relinquishment notice if the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army, concludes that—

(1) decontamination or remediation of any land subject to the relinquishment notice is not practicable or economically feasible;

(2) the land cannot be decontaminated or remediated sufficiently to be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

(3) a sufficient amount of funds are not appropriated for the decontamination of the land.

(f) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LANDS.—If, because of the condition of the lands, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction of lands proposed for relinquishment or, if at the expiration of the withdrawal made under this title, the Secretary of the Interior determines that some of the withdrawn lands are contaminated to an extent which prevents opening such contaminated lands to operation of the public land laws—

(1) the Secretary of the Army shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands;

(2) after the expiration of the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Army shall retain jurisdiction over the withdrawn lands, but shall undertake no activities on such lands except in connection with the decontamination or remediation of such lands; and

(3) the Secretary of the Army shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(g) SUBSEQUENT DECONTAMINATION OR REMEDIATION.—If lands covered by subsection (f) are subsequently decontaminated or remediated and the Secretary of the Army certifies that the lands are safe for nonmilitary uses, the Secretary of the Interior shall reconsider accepting jurisdiction over the lands.

(h) REVOCATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over lands specified in a relinquishment notice, the Secretary of the Interior may revoke the withdrawal and reservation made under this title as it applies to such lands. If the decision be made to accept the relinquishment and to revoke the withdrawal and reservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(1) terminate the withdrawal and reservation;

(2) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(3) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws, if appropriate.

**SEC. 9009. DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY.**

(a) SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—The functions of the Secretary of the Army under this title may be delegated.

(b) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this title may be delegated, except that an order under section 9008(h) to accept relinquishment of withdrawn lands may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

---

## STEVENS (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 607

Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1122, supra; as follows:

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

**TITLE —RENEWAL OF MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS**

**SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the Military Lands Withdrawal Renewal Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 02. WITHDRAWALS.**

(a) MCGREGOR RANGE.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the public lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army—

(A) for training and weapons testing; and

(B) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), for other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are the lands comprising approximately 608,384.87 acres in Otero County, New Mexico, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''McGregor Range Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(d) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

(4) Any of the public lands withdrawn under paragraph (1) which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, are managed pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) shall continue to be managed under that section until otherwise expressly provided by law.

(b) FORT GREELY MANEUVER AREA AND FORT GREELY AIR DROP ZONE.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws), under the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union'', approved July 7, 1958 (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21), and under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for—

(A) military maneuvering, training, and equipment development and testing; and

(B) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3)(A) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(i) the lands comprising approximately 571,995 acres in the Big Delta Area, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Greely Maneuver Area Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(e) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986; and

(ii) the lands comprising approximately 51,590 acres in the Granite Creek Area, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Greely, Air Drop Zone Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of such section.

(B) Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

(c) FORT WAINWRIGHT MANEUVER AREA.—(1) Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this title, the public lands described in paragraph (3) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and the geothermal leasing laws), under the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union'', approved July 7, 1958 (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21), and under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) Such lands are reserved for use by the Secretary of the Army for—

(A) military maneuvering;

(B) training for artillery firing, aerial gunnery, and infantry tactics; and

(C) subject to the requirements of section 2904(f), other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes specified in this paragraph.

(3) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) are the lands comprising approximately 247,951.67 acres of land in the Fourth Judicial District, Alaska, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fort Wainwright Maneuver Area Withdrawal—Proposed'', dated January 1985, and withdrawn by the provisions of section 1(f) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. Such lands do not include any portion of the lands so withdrawn that were relinquished to the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that Act.

**SEC. 03. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**

(a) PUBLICATION AND FILING REQUIREMENT.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of the lands withdrawn by this title; and

(2) file maps and the legal description of the lands withdrawn by this title with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Such maps and legal descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if they were included in this title except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in such maps and legal descriptions.

(c) AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—Copies of such maps and legal descriptions shall be available for public inspection in the following offices:

(1) The Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) The offices of the Director and appropriate State Directors of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) The offices of the Director and appropriate Regional Directors of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(4) The office of the commander, McGregor Range.

(5) The office of the installation commander, Fort Richardson, Alaska.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for any costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out this section.

**SEC. 04. MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN LANDS.**

(a) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—(1)(A) The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the lands withdrawn by this title pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other applicable law, including the Recreation Use of Wildlife Areas Act of 1962 (16 U.S.C. 460k et seq.) and this title. The Secretary shall manage such lands through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) To the extent consistent with applicable law and Executive orders, the lands withdrawn by this title may be managed in a manner permitting—

(A) the continuation of grazing pursuant to applicable law and Executive orders where permitted on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat;

(C) control of predatory and other animals;

(D) recreation; and

(E) the prevention and appropriate suppression of brush and range fires resulting from nonmilitary activities.

(3)(A) All nonmilitary use of the lands withdrawn by this title, other than the uses described in paragraph (2), shall be subject to such conditions and restrictions as may be necessary to permit the military use of such lands for the purposes specified in or authorized pursuant to this title.

(B) The Secretary of the Interior may issue any lease, easement, right-of-way, or other authorization with respect to the nonmilitary use of such lands only with the concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(b) CLOSURE TO PUBLIC.—(1) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the closure to public use of any road, trail, or other portion of the lands withdrawn by this title, that Secretary may take such action as that Secretary determines necessary to effect and maintain such closure.

(2) Any such closure shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods which the Secretary of the military department concerned determines are required to carry out this subsection.

(3) During any closure under this subsection, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall—

(A) keep appropriate warning notices posted; and

(B) take appropriate steps to notify the public concerning such closures.

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—(1)(A) The Secretary of the Interior (after consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned) shall develop a plan for the management of each area withdrawn by this title.

(2) Each plan shall—

(A) be consistent with applicable law;

(B) be subject to conditions and restrictions specified in subsection (a)(3); and

(C) include such provisions as may be necessary for proper management and protection of the resources and values of such areas.

(3) The Secretary of the Interior shall develop each plan required by this subsection not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act. In developing a plan for an area, the Secretary may utilize or modify appropriate provisions of the management plan developed for the area under section 3(c) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986.

(d) BRUSH AND RANGE FIRES.—(1) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall take necessary precautions to prevent and suppress brush and range fires occurring within and outside the lands withdrawn by this title as a result of military activities and may seek assistance from the Bureau of Land Management in the suppression of such fires.

(2) Each memorandum of understanding required by subsection (e) shall provide for Bureau of Land Management assistance in the suppression of fires referred to in paragraph (1) in the area covered by the memorandum of understanding, and for a transfer of funds from the military department concerned to the Bureau of Land Management as compensation for such assistance.

(e) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the military department concerned shall (with respect to each area withdrawn by section 2902) enter into a memorandum of understanding to implement the management plan developed under subsection (c).

(2) Each memorandum of understanding shall provide that the Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall provide assistance in the suppression of fires resulting from the military use of lands withdrawn by this title if requested by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(f) ADDITIONAL MILITARY USES.—(1) The lands withdrawn by this title may be used for defense-related uses other than those specified in the applicable provision of section 2902. The use of such lands for such purposes shall be governed by all laws applicable to such lands, including this title.

(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Interior in the event that the lands withdrawn by this title will be used for defense-related purposes other than those specified in section 2902.

(B) Such notification shall indicate the additional use or uses involved, the proposed duration of such uses, and the extent to which such additional military uses of the lands will require that additional or more stringent conditions or restrictions be imposed on otherwise-permitted nonmilitary uses of the land or portions thereof.

(3) Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize sand, gravel, or similar mineral or material resources on the lands withdrawn by this title when the use of such resources is required to meet the construction needs of the military department concerned on the lands withdrawn by this title.

**SEC. 06. LAND MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS.**

(a) PERIODIC ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—Not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, any every 10 years thereafter, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, conduct an analysis of the degree to which the management of the lands withdrawn by this title conforms to the requirements of laws applicable to the management of such lands, including this title.

(b) DEADLINE.—Each analysis under this section shall be completed not later than 270 days after the commencement of such analysis.

(c) LIMITATION ON COST.—The cost of each analysis under this section may not exceed $900,000 in constant 1999 dollars.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the completion of an analysis under this section, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to Congress a report on the analysis. The report shall set forth the results of the analysis and include any other matters relating to the management of the lands withdrawn by this title that such Secretary considers appropriate.

**SEC. 07. ONGOING ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION.**

(a) REQUIREMENT.—To the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall carry out a program to provide for the environmental restoration of the lands withdrawn by this title in order to ensure a level of environmental decontamination of such lands equivalent to the level of environmental decontamination that exists on such lands as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORTS.—(1) At the same time the President submits to Congress the budget for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2000, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the committees referred to in paragraph (2) a report on environmental restoration activities relating to the lands withdrawn by this title. The report shall satisfy the requirements of section 2706(a) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to the activities on such lands.

(2) The committees referred to in paragraph (1) are the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Resources of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 08. RELINQUISHMENT.**

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may relinquish

all or any of the lands withdrawn by this title to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) NOTICE.—If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines to relinquish any lands withdrawn by this title under subsection (a), that Secretary shall transmit to the Secretary of the Interior a notice of intent to relinquish such lands.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTAMINATION.—(1) Before transmitting a notice of intent to relinquish any lands under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense, acting through the military department concerned, shall determine whether and to what extent such lands are contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous materials.

(2) A copy of a determination with respect to any lands under paragraph (1) shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior together with the notice of intent to relinquish such lands under subsection (b).

(3) Copies of both the notice of intent to relinquish lands under subsection (b) and the determination regarding the contamination of such lands under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) DECONTAMINATION.—(1) If any land subject to a notice of intent to relinquish under subsection (a) is contaminated, and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned, makes the determination described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, undertake the environmental decontamination of the land.

(2) A determination referred to in this paragraph is a determination that—

(A) decontamination of the land concerned is practicable and economically feasible (taking into consideration the potential future use and value of the land); and

(B) upon decontamination, the land could be opened to operation of some or all of the public land laws, including the mining laws.

(e) ALTERNATIVES.—(1) If a circumstance described in paragraph (2) arises with respect to any land which is covered by a notice of intent to relinquish under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to accept the land under this section.

(2) A circumstance referred to in this paragraph is—

(A) a determination by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the military department concerned that—

(i) decontamination of the land is not practicable or economically feasible; or

(ii) the land cannot be decontaminated to a sufficient extent to permit its opening to the operation of some or all of the public land laws; or

(B) the appropriation by Congress of amounts that are insufficient to provide for the decontamination of the land.

(f) STATUS OF CONTAMINATED LANDS.—If, because of their contaminated state, the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction over lands withdrawn by this title which have been proposed for relinquishment under subsection (a)—

(1) the Secretary of the military department concerned shall take appropriate steps to warn the public of the contaminated state of such lands and any risks associated with entry onto such lands; and

(2) the Secretary of the military department concerned shall report to the Secretary of the Interior and to Congress concerning the status of such lands and all actions taken in furtherance of this subsection.

(g) REVOCATION OF AUTHORITY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may, upon deciding that it is in the public interest to accept jurisdiction over lands proposed for relinquishment pursuant to subsection (a), revoke the withdrawal established by this title as it applies to such lands.

(2) Should the decision be made to revoke the withdrawal, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register an appropriate order which shall—

(A) terminate the withdrawal;

(B) constitute official acceptance of full jurisdiction over the lands by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(C) state the date upon which the lands will be opened to the operation of some or all of the public lands laws, including the mining laws.

(h) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN RELINQUISHED LANDS.—Any lands withdrawn by section 2902(c) or 2902(d) that are relinquished under this section shall be public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and shall be consider vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated for purposes of the public land laws.

**SEC. 09. DELEGABILITY.**

(a) DEFENSE.—The functions of the Secretary of Defense or of the Secretary of a military department under this title may be delegated.

(b) INTERIOR.—The functions of the Secretary of the Interior under this title may be delegated, except that an order described in section 2908(g) may be approved and signed only by the Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, or an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

**SEC. 10. WATER RIGHTS.**

Nothing in this title shall be construed to establish a reservation to the United States with respect to any water or water right on the lands described in section 2902. No provision of this title shall be construed as authorizing the appropriation of water on lands described in section 2902 by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act except in accordance with the law of the relevant State in which lands described in section 2902 are located. This section shall not be construed to affect water rights acquired by the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 11. HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.**

All hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands withdrawn by this title shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 2671 of title 10, United States Code.

**SEC. 12. MINING AND MINERAL LEASING.**

(a) DETERMINATION OF LANDS SUITABLE FOR OPENING.—(1) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act and at least every five years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned, which public and acquired lands (except as provided in this subsection) described in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2902 the Secretary of the Interior considers suitable for opening to the operation of the Mining Law of 1872, the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of 1947, the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, or any one or more of such Acts.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall publish a notice in the Federal Register listing the lands determined suitable for opening pursuant to this section and specifying the opening date.

(b) OPENING LANDS.—On the day specified by the Secretary of the Interior in a notice published in the Federal Register pursuant to subsection (a), the land identified under subsection (a) as suitable for opening to the operation of one or more of the laws specified in subsection (a) shall automatically be open to the operation of such laws without the necessity for further action by the Secretary or Congress.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMMON VARIETIES.—No deposit of minerals or materials of the types identified by section 3 of the Act of July 23, 1955 (69 Stat. 367), whether or not included in the term ''common varieties'' in that Act, shall be subject to location under the Mining Law of 1872 on lands described in section 2902.

(d) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior, with the advice and concurrence of the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall prescribe such regulations to implement this section as may be necessary to assure safe, uninterrupted, and unimpeded use of the lands described in section 2902 for military purposes.

(2) Such regulations shall contain guidelines to assist mining claimants in determining how much, if any, of the surface of any lands opened pursuant to this section may be used for purposes incident to mining.

(e) CLOSURE OF MINING LANDS.—In the event of a national emergency or for purposes of national defense or security, the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of the Secretary of the military department concerned, shall close any lands that have been opened to mining or to mineral or geothermal leasing pursuant to this section.

(f) LAWS GOVERNING MINING ON WITHDRAWN LANDS.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this title, mining claims located pursuant to this title shall be subject to the provisions of the mining laws. In the event of a conflict between those laws and this title, this title shall prevail.

(2) All mining claims located under the terms of this title shall be subject to the provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(g) PATENTS.—(1) Patents issued pursuant to this title for locatable minerals shall convey title to locatable minerals only, together with the right to use so much of the surface as may be necessary for purposes incident to mining under the guidelines for such use established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation.

(2) All such patents shall contain a reservation to the United States of the surface of all lands patented and of all nonlocatable minerals on those lands.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, all minerals subject to location under the Mining Law of 1872 shall be treated as locatable minerals.

**SEC. 13. IMMUNITY OF UNITED STATES.**

The United States and all departments or agencies thereof shall be held harmless and shall not be liable for any injuries or damages to persons or property suffered in the course of any mining or mineral or geothermal leasing activity conducted on lands described in section 2902.

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing entitled ''Home Health Care: Will the New Payment System & Regulatory Overkill Hurt Our Seniors?'' This Subcommittee hearing will focus on how the new Medicare Interim Payment System and new regulatory requirements from the Health Care Financing Administration may limit the access of beneficiaries most in need of home health services.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 10, 1999, at 2:00 p.m., in Room

342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Lee Blalack of the Subcommittee staff at 224–3721.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce that a full committee oversight hearing has been schedule before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Thursday, June 24, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine the implications of the proposed acquisition of the Atlantic Richfield Company by BP Amoco, PLC. Specifically the Committee will examine the following issues related to the acquisition:

U.S. national and energy security;

Impact on crude oil prices and supply on the U.S. West Coast;

Marine transportation;

Pipeline transportation; and

Exploration and production in Alaska and the lower 48.

Those who wish to testify or to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. Presentation of oral testimony is by Committee invitation only. For further information, please contact Jo Meuse or Brian Malnak at (202) 224–6730.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been schedule before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 29, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on fire preparedness on Federal lands. Specifically, what actions the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service are taking to prepare for the fire season; whether the agencies are informing the public about these plans; and ongoing research related to wildfire and fire suppression activities.

Those who wish to submit written testimony should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please contact Mike Menge (202) 224–6170.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a full committee hearing on S. 1049, the ''Federal Oil and Gas Lease Management Improvement Act of 1999,'' scheduled for June 17, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building has been postponed and will be rescheduled for a later date to be announced by the committee.

For further information, please contact Dan Kish, of the committee professional staff, at (202) 224–8276.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. in open session, to consider the nominations of General Eric K. Shinseki, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army; and Lieutenant General James L. Jones, Jr., USMC, to be general and for appointment as Commandant of the Marine Corps.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet in closed session for a hearing re Department of Justice Oversight, during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 10:00 a.m., in S407 of the Capitol.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing on the nominations of Kenneth W. Kizer, M.D., M.P.H., to be Under Secretary for Health, Department of Veterans Affairs, and John T. Hanson to be Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 2:15 p.m., in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on African Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 8, 1999, at 2:15 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### RETIREMENT OF COL. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, USAF

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as the Senate proceeds with its debate on the Defense Appropriations Bill, it is appropriate that we pause and recognize the contribution of a Defense Procurement Official on the occasion of his retirement. Colonel William Alexander—Alex to his friends—is retiring this month after an Air Force career spanning almost 30 years. Alex has spent much of his career leading and mentoring Defense Acquisition Professionals, leaving as his legacy a new generation of experienced procurement managers.

Born in the baby boom era between WWII and the Korean War, Alex grew up in Indiana, where he attended DePauw and Indiana Universities. After completing his Masters Degree in 1970, he entered the Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio. Some of his early projects started the development for today's generation of precision guided weapons. It was a whole lot trickier then, without the advantage of the Global Positioning System, but his team worked to develop a way to triangulate a target designation to improve bomb targeting reliability.

The Air Force recognized the contributions of this young officer and moved him into a career in procurement and satellite operations. Alex spent the next 20 years of his career moving between different aspects of the complex world of keeping satellites operating successfully on orbit. He was a procurement official in a number of software source selections, using his abilities to aid the Air Force in getting revolutionary operating software for its expanding fleet of satellites. After his work in operations, the Air Force wisely transferred him into the National Reconnaissance Office as the Director of the Acquisition and Engineering Group within the Communications System Acquisition and Operations Directorate. When the Deputy Director of the Communications Directorate was reassigned, Alex was selected for this position in light of his vast experience in successful acquisitions.

However, I don't want to spend too much time discussing the technical details of Colonel Alexander's career. There are many successful procurement officials within the Air Force and the Department of Defense, but few are as widely recognized for their crafting of personnel in addition to their acquisition expertise. Although the project was always treated with importance, Alex always made sure that his people came first. He was always looking to find ways to challenge his staff to grow both in technical ability and in interpersonal relationships. His success gives credence to the philosophy of empowering and caring for your people, which ultimately leads to the program success. One night during his time in satellite operations, a satellite was having difficulties getting initialized. Scores of people were working around the clock trying to work through the complex issues involved. Recognizing that people do not perform at their best when they are exhausted, Colonel Alexander banished a number of people from the operations floor until they had a rest period. The engineers returned to the floor with clearer heads and ultimately were able to get the satellite up and running successfully on orbit.

When there was a tragic death of an employee on official travel, Alex temporarily set aside his own grief to assist others in the office in addition to the employee's family. In the confusion that surrounded the funeral, Alex took time to meet with all of the family members to try to help them understand the events that had taken place. It was a difficult time for all involved, but Alex clearly demonstrated his caring for his co-workers and should be commended for his actions.

One area where Colonel Alexander should be especially proud is in his initiatives for acquisition reform. Alex was always driving to improve all aspects of buying satellites and software, looking for new and innovative ways to execute the program. At his encouragement, one division has studied purchasing satellites on-orbit, which would be a first for the NRO. He has been an advocate for openness and revolutionary thinking, balancing trusted methods with new ideas. Under his leadership, a security rebaselining was started which resulted in his program appearing on CBS' Eye on America. His drive in this area has literally saved the federal government millions of dollars.

Finally, I want to thank Colonel Alexander for one final initiative. After being nominated for a Congressional Fellowship by Colonel Alexander, a member of his staff has joined my staff for the legislative year. This staff member has been of great assistance already in the Defense bills that have gone to the floor, and I look forward to his continuing contribution through the rest of the Senate's session.

I'm sure that there are still many details for Colonel Alexander to work out as he transitions to a ''former'' military life. I wish him the best in his endeavors and pass along a sincere thank you on behalf of Congress for passing along his life's philosophy to the generation that will follow in his procurement footsteps. The legacy left behind is greater than mere relics of satellites and software, which will age and be disregarded. Colonel Alexander's heritage is in a corps of people who now have a greater understanding of the balances and pressures in life and a toolkit with how to deal with them. This is a true success, and one that I hope will be a sustained source of pride throughout his retirement.●

## THE FENWAY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today the Fenway Community Development Corporation in Boston is celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, and I congratulate the corporation on its impressive accomplishments.

The Nation's economy is currently enjoying the longest period of peacetime expansion in the nation's history. Today, more Americans than ever have access to quality education and productive jobs and careers. But that success is no cause for complacency. Too many of our fellow citizens and too many of our communities are not full participants in the nation's overall prosperity. For them, economic growth often means higher housing costs and pressures to move out of neighborhoods which have been their homes all their lives.

Twenty-five years ago, the Fenway Community Development Corporation was formed to do more to see that neighborhood development benefits the residents of the neighborhood. The Corporation stands proudly for the fundamental principle that local residents should enjoy the benefits of economic growth too, regardless of their incomes, and that neighborhood planning should always put people first.

Since 1973, the Fenway CDC has worked skillfully to improve the quality of life in the community, actively encouraging residents to participate in decisions that affect it. Under its leadership, residents from different cultures, age groups, and income levels have all come together for a better Fenway. I commend them for what they have done to empower people and strengthen the fabric of their neighborhoods.

A large part of this success comes from many activities to improve life in the Fenway. Protecting existing housing, actively seeking opportunities to develop affordable new housing, pursuing commercial development that meets the needs of the neighborhood—all of these are essential parts of the mission.

Other activities include homebuyer counseling—the afterschool programs and playground renovation for neighborhood youth through the Fenway Family Coalition—the computer training and job opportunities with local employers through the Walk to Work Program—and the Senior Task Force, which maintains affordable housing for low income elderly residents, as well as blood pressure screenings and recreation facilities available at the Peterborough Senior Center. All of these programs have contributed immensely to the quality of life in the Fenway neighborhood, and the Corporation deserve great credit for these achievements.

Fenway CDC is a respected leader of CDCs nationwide. I congratulate them for 25 years of skillful work and real results, and I know that the next 25 years will be just as successful.●

## TRIBUTE TO THE LOON MOUNTAIN RECREATION CORPORATION

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation of Lincoln, New Hampshire for their outstanding achievements in the environmental arena. This month. Loon Mountain will receive the Times Mirror Company's Silver Eagle Award for Environmental Excellence in Visual Impact.

Loon Mountain will be receiving this award due to the recent installation of a new snowmaking pump station. The resort's two objectives in the design of this station were to reduce the visual impact of the pump station to the surrounding community and minimize the impact of the new water withdrawal system on the adjacent river.

Through careful site planning and creative architectural design, the pump station blends in naturally with its surroundings. The techniques employed during construction were environmentally sound and the withdrawal system does not disturb the river environment.

As a senior member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I realize the impact that industrial design can have on the environment, and I am excited to see businesses such as Loon Mountain working hard to minimize these impacts. I commend the Loon Mountain Recreation Corporation for their environmental awareness, and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

## ANDRE AGASSI

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the historic event that took place this past weekend in Paris when Las Vegas's own Andre Agassi captured the 1999 French Open Championship. Andre's completion of the career Grand Slam secures him a place in tennis history that only five other men can claim, and as a testament to his versality, he is the only person to accomplish this feat on three different surfaces—hardcourt, grass, and clay. He is the first American in 61 years to win all four majors—Wimbledom in 1992, the U.S. Open in 1994, the Australian Open in 1995, and now the French—and his victory will soon catapult him to No. 4 in the world rankings.

As great as Andre's accomplishments have been on the court throughout his career, they are, in my opinion, overshadowed by the generosity and compassion he has shown off the court. Andre's commitment to at-risk and underprivileged youth has been a passion of his throughout his tennis career. His establishment of the Andre Agassi Foundation in 1994 to support and fund programs that serve underprivileged kids has provided much needed assistance to a variety of service organizations that work with children in the Las Vegas area, including the Boys & Girls Clubs in Las Vegas, the Assistance League of Las Vegas, and Child Haven. Since its inception, the Agassi Foundation has donated over $5 million to local youth charities.

In today's world of professional sports, it is always refreshing to see an athlete who recognizes the blessings and opportunities he has received, and has chosen to give something back to his community. In spite of a tennis career that has had its ups and downs, Andre has always had a steady hand

when it comes to helping underprivileged children. Andre Agassi is the epitome of what a professional athlete should be, and I ask my colleagues to join me in commending him for making tennis history and for all of his charitable endeavors that mean so much to the Las Vegas community.●

## TRIBUTE TO MEYER ''MIKE'' BERMAN

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Meyer ''Mike'' Berman, a World War II veteran who demonstrated unusual heroism during his two years of service in the United States Army.

Mike Berman, Private First Class, served as part of the 12th Infantry Regiment during World War II. An outstanding soldier, he was decorated with the Good Conduct Medal, the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the World War II Victory Medal and Ribbon, the European African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, and a Ribbon with one Silver Service Star.

However, the accomplishment Mike Berman is proudest of is the time he saved the life of his friend, Private John Buyers. While artillery shells were coming from all directions, Mike Berman rushed to the aid of Private Buyers, who had been grievously injured. Mike Berman singlehandedly carried Private Buyers by foot to the service jeep that transported him to medical aid. I ask that Private Buyers' letter expressing the gratitude he felt towards Private Berman for saving his life be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

*England: Oct: 29th 1944*

DEAR MIKE: Just a few lines to say hello and let you know I'm coming along pretty good. I just wanted to thank you for what you done for me the day I got hit. I'll never forget it. If it hadn't been for you, I wouldn't be living today. Thanks a million, ''Mike.'' I've had three operations so far and I'm pretty weak, but I'll live through it. I won't be with you boys' any more but tell them all hello for me. Please write to me if you get a chance.

Well, Mike, be good and take care of yourself. I sure didn't last long, did I? Oh well! It was all in the cards I guess. Please excuse my writing. I can do better but I'm pretty nervous these days. Once again thanks for what you done for me and maybe some day, I'll be able to sort of square things up.

So long.

Cordially,

BUYERS.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It is particularly appropriate with the recent celebration of Memorial Day that we pay homage to truly courageous individuals like Mike Berman, whose faith in democracy and freedom for mankind have helped make our nation as great as it is today.

The worst of times often best reveals the character of an individual. In the worst of times, Mike Berman proved his charity and love for his fellow man. He went beyond the call of duty when no one else dared to.

Having come from an immigrant family, Mr. Berman's achievements illustrate the enormous passion and desire America's immigrants have to create a better future in their newly adopted country. Our recognition of Mr. Berman reminds us of the tremendous contribution that immigrants have made in the shaping of our Nation. This diverse group of extraordinary, enterprising, and self-sufficient individuals have continuously served to strengthen the United States.●

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 1554

Mr. STEVENS. I move that with respect to H.R. 1554, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and further, the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed from the Judiciary Committee: Mr. HATCH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KOHL; from the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee: Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. HOLLINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1999

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 9. I further ask that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

I further ask consent there then be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator COLLINS, 20 minutes; Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, 10 minutes; Senator DURBIN or his designee, 30 minutes.

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

Mr. STEVENS. As I understand it, the consent that was just entered into means Senator MCCAIN will be recognized at the close of that period of morning business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I further ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. the Senate begin consideration of S. 96, the Y2K legislation, in accordance with that agreement.

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

## PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. tomorrow. By previous consent, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 96 has been vitiated, and at 11 a.m. the Senate will begin debate on the important Y2K legislation. Hopefully, the Senate will make substantial progress throughout the day, and therefore votes on amendments can be expected.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. STEVENS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:52 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 9, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8, 1999:

### FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

FRANZ S. LEICHTER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2006, VICE DANIEL F. EVANS, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

DOUGLAS L. MILLER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 27, 2002, VICE LAWRENCE U. COSTIGLIO, TERM EXPIRED.