



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1999

No. 85

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, help us to see our work here in Government as our divine calling and mission. Whatever we are called to do today, we want to do our very best for Your glory. Our desire is not just to do different things but to do some of the same old things differently: with freedom, joy, and excellence. Give us new delight for matters of drudgery, new patience for people who are difficult, new zest for unfinished details. Be our lifeline in the pressures of deadlines, our rejuvenation in routines, and our endurance whenever we feel enervated. May we spend more time talking to You about issues than we do talking to others about issues. So may our communion with You give us such deep convictions that we will have the high courage to defend them. Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on us so that we may serve You with renewed dedication today. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senate will begin now 10 minutes of debate on S. 1205, the military appropriations construction bill, followed by 20 minutes of debate on S. 331, the work incentives legislation. Votes on passage of those two bills will begin at approximately 10:45. Following those votes, the Senate will begin debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the House-

passed Social Security lockbox legislation for 1 hour, with that vote to begin after all time has expired or been yielded back.

It is expected that the Senate will complete the energy and water appropriations bill during today's session of the Senate as well as resume consideration of H.R. 1664 regarding the steel, oil, and gas revolving loan.

I presume the vote on the Social Security lockbox legislation will occur around 12:30 or so. So we have two votes then, at approximately 10:45 and another one at 12:30, and then we probably will have at least one more, maybe two, with regard to the energy and water appropriations bill, and then we will go back to the oil and gas revolving fund.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1205 which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1205) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form with an additional 5 minutes for the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

The distinguished Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I will have to ask some of the staff but I

think Mr. MCCAIN will not be present to make his statement this morning. I will make mine, and then we will work that out later.

I am pleased to bring before the Senate the military construction appropriations bill and report for fiscal year 2000. The bill reflects a bipartisan approach that the ranking member, Senator MURRAY of the State of Washington, and I have tried to maintain regarding military construction and this subcommittee.

This isn't the first year we have put this bill together. We are getting to be old hands at it. But I want to say personally it is a pleasure to work with the Senator and her staff. It seems as if we have a lot of luck in working out some of the problems some people would run into before we ever get the bill to the floor. So those problems are taken care of. I appreciate the attitude and manner in which we have worked together on this bill.

This bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee on June 10 by a unanimous vote of 28 to nothing. The bill recommended by the full Committee on Appropriations is \$8,273,820,000.

The administration submitted the fiscal year 2000 military construction budget with all of the military construction and family housing projects incrementally funded over a 2-year period. We are finding that some of that is working and some of it is not, and we will probably be looking at this in a different light in another year.

To have proceeded in this manner would have demonstrated a poor financial stewardship on the part of the Senate and placed the Department's 2000 military construction program in great jeopardy. That is the reason we are taking a look at it. The subcommittee rejected that recommendation and provided full funding for all of the construction projects.

Accordingly, the bill is \$2.8 billion over the budget request, but the bill is

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7039

still \$176 million less than what was appropriated just a year ago. However, more important, the legislation reflects a reduction of \$1.7 billion from just 3 years ago.

We have sought to recommend a balanced bill to the Senate. We believe it addresses key military construction requirements for readiness, family housing, barracks, quality of life, and of course we do not want to forget our Guard and our Reserve components.

This bill honors the commitment we have to our Armed Forces. It helps ensure that the housing and infrastructure needs of the military are given proper recognition.

Also, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the bill is within the committee's 302(b) budget allocations for both budget authority and outlays.

This bill has some points I want to mention. We have added \$485 million above the budget request to provide better and more modern family housing for our service personnel and their families.

Just less than a month ago, we opened a new housing unit at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana. I said at that time, and I still mean it, there is no better way to send a strong message to our fighting men and women than to provide them with good housing in a good atmosphere and the greatest way we can say we care.

On another quality of life measure, we added substantially to the budget request for barracks construction projects, some \$587 million for 47 projects throughout the United States and overseas.

I say right now to the American people, we have American troops deployed in over 70 countries around the world.

This funding will provide single service members a more favorable living environment wherever they are stationed.

The committee also fully funds the budget request of \$245 million for funding 25 environmental compliance projects.

We also addressed the shortfalls that continue to plague our reserve components.

I continue to be greatly alarmed that the Department of Defense takes no responsibility for ensuring that our reserve components have adequate facilities.

Their lack of disregard for the total force concept very much concerns me and a number of our colleagues.

This comes at a time when our country is so heavily dependent on the Guard and Reserve to maintain our presence around the world.

For example, the President's budget requested funding of only \$77 million for all of the Reserve components and the National Guard.

Recognizing this chronic shortfall, we have again lent support by adding \$560 million to these accounts.

In each case, the funds will help satisfy essential mission, quality of life or readiness requirements.

We fully funded the budget request for the base realignment and closure account by providing \$706 million to continue the ongoing brac process.

All of the projects that we have recommended were thoroughly screened to ensure that they meet a series of defensible criteria and that they were authorized in the defense authorization bill.

We will work very closely with the Senate Armed Services Committee, as we put together a conference package for military construction.

There are many other issues that I could speak about at this time. I urge the Members of the Senate to support this bill and move it forward expeditiously.

I yield the floor for the ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my colleague, Chairman BURNS, in recommending the fiscal year 2000 military construction bill to the Senate for approval.

I begin by thanking him and his staff for being so great to work with. He is right, we are old hands but not that old; and it is great to work with him.

This bill, which was reported with the unanimous approval of the Senate Appropriations Committee last week, bears little resemblance to the spending structure proposed by the administration last winter. The administration, in what I consider to be a misguided effort to free up more money for defense spending, proposed a buy-now, pay-later military construction bill. The subcommittee carefully analyzed the administration's plan. We had numerous briefings as well as two subcommittee hearings. Our conclusion was that split funding not only would set a dangerous precedent but also would jeopardize the integrity of the entire military construction program.

At the recommendation of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the Appropriations Committee wisely rejected the administration's proposal for incremental funding. With the help of our chairman and ranking member, Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD, we were able to fully fund our Military Construction Program. Moreover, we were able to surmount the woefully inadequate amounts of funding that the administration sought to spread over the full 2-year construction program. In the end, we increased construction funding for active duty components by \$278 million over the administration's total request, and for reserve components by nearly \$388 million over the request.

We achieved these increases by judicious reductions in other accounts, such as the base realignment and closure account, without jeopardizing the pace of ongoing work. Senator BURNS and his staff deserve a great deal of credit for the thoughtful and careful

approach that they took in the drafting of this bill. As always, they have worked hard to produce a balanced, bipartisan product that takes into account both the concerns of the Senate and the needs of the military.

In particular, they have done a superb job of continuing to shine the spotlight on the quality of life projects that are so important to our men and women in uniform, and to their families. At a time when military enlistment and retention are in free fall, and the services cannot hope to match the financial incentives of the private sector, quality of life issues are magnified in importance. They do not diminish the importance of readiness projects, but they are a factor in recruiting and retaining our military personnel.

Within the budget constraints that we are all forced to operate this year, this bill attempts to meet the most urgent and most timely of the military construction projects available. All of the major construction projects that we have funded have been authorized. In addition, we have ensured adequate funding for family housing and barracks construction, and we have suggested that the Department of Defense revisit the issue of housing privatization to determine if it is a workable solution to our military housing needs.

Even so, this bill is \$176 million below the military construction bill enacted last year. This continues the recent, and troubling, downward spiral in military construction investment. During a year in which the Congress has made great strides toward addressing the need to enhance defense readiness and military personnel spending, it is disappointing—and in my opinion, shortsighted—to see defense infrastructure needs struggling to keep pace.

This is an extremely important bill for our Nation and our military forces. I again commend Senator BURNS and his staff for their excellent work in producing the bill, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, as United States military forces deploy into war-torn Kosovo for another protracted, costly stay of indeterminate duration and of considerable potential risk, I am left wondering why, with all of the readiness and modernization problems that are well-established matters of record, we felt compelled to add over \$6 million in this bill for a new Visiting Officers Quarters at Niagara Falls. Is this really the message we want to send to our military personnel and to the American taxpayer. I think not.

The propensity of members of Congress to devote enormous time and energy to adding items to spending bills for primarily parochial considerations remains one of our most serious weaknesses. The implications for national defense, however, are no laughing matter. Those of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee have heard a great deal of testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as from

regional and functional commanders in chief, of the impact extraordinarily high operational tempos are having on both near- and long-term military readiness. And we hear it directly from troops in the field. They are tired; repeated deployments and declining quality of life has taken a toll. A vicious cycle has emerged wherein the impact of high deployment rates and shrinking force structure are exacerbated by the flight of skilled personnel out of the service as a result of those trends.

So I have to wonder why, given the scale of the problems documented, we are adding \$12 million to the budget for new visitors quarters at Dover Air Force Base, \$12 million for a Regional Training Institute in Hawaii, \$3 million for a Marine Corps Reserve Center in Louisiana, \$8.9 million for a C-130J simulator facility in Mississippi, \$8 million for the Red Butte Dam in Utah, and \$15 million for an Armed Forces Reserve Center in Oregon. None of these projects—none of them—were requested by the Department of Defense, and none of them are on the services' Unfunded Priority Lists. Unrequested projects totaling \$985 million—almost \$1 billion—was added to this bill, on top of the \$5 billion in member-adds included in the defense appropriations bill passed last week.

I have asked rhetorically on the floor of the Senate many times when we are going to stop this destructive and irresponsible practice of adding projects to the defense budget primarily for parochial reasons. I have yet to receive an answer. Certainly, the practice has neither stopped nor slowed. The last minute insertion in the defense appropriations bill of \$220 million for four F-15 fighters not requested by the Air Force solely for the purpose of appeasing hometown constituencies was one of the more disgraceful acts I've witnessed since, well, since we went through the same exercise last year. The total in unrequested items between the defense and military construction appropriations bills is almost \$6 billion. That is serious money.

As American pilots continue to patrol the skies over Iraq, maintain a tenuous peace in Bosnia, and proceed into uncharted terrain in Kosovo, we would do well to consider the ramifications of our actions. I'm under no illusions, however, that such contemplation will occur. It is apparently, and sadly, not in our nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying list be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILCON appropriations adds for FY 00

[In millions of dollars]

ALABAMA

Maxwell AFB: Off. Transient Student Dormitory	10.6
Anniston AD: Ammo Demilitarization Facility	7.0

MILCON appropriations adds for FY 00—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Redstone Arsenal: Unit Training Equip. Site	8.9
Dannelly Field: Med. Training & Dining Facility	6.0
ALASKA	
Fort Wainwright: Ammo Surveillance Facility	2.3
Fort Wainwright: MOUT Collective Trng. Facility	17.0
Elmendorf AFB: Alter Roadway, Davis Highway	9.5
ARKANSAS	
Pine Bluff Arsenal: Chemical Defense Qual. Facility	18.0
Pine Bluff Arsenal: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	61.8
CALIFORNIA	
Fresno ANG: Ops Training and Dining Facility	9.1
COLORADO	
Pueblo AD: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	11.8
CONNECTICUT	
West Hartford: ADAL Reserve Center	17.525
Orange ANG: Air Control Squadron Complex	11.0
DELAWARE	
Dover AFB: Visitor's Quarters	12.0
Smyrna: Readiness Center	4.381
FLORIDA	
Pensacola: Readiness Center	4.628
GEORGIA	
Fort Stewart: Contingency Logistics Facility	19.0
NAS Atlanta: BEQ-A	5.43
HAWAII	
Bellows AFS: Regional Training Institute	12.105
IDAHO	
Gowen Field: Fuel Cell & Corrosion Control Hgr	2.3
INDIANA	
Newport AD: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	61.2
Fort Wayne: Med. Training & Dining Facility	7.2
IOWA	
Sioux City IAP: Vehicle Maintenance Facility	3.6
KANSAS	
Fort Riley: Whole Barracks Renovation	27.0
KENTUCKY	
Fort Campbell: Vehicle Maintenance Facility	17.0
Blue Grass AD: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	11.8
Blue Grass AD: Ammo. Demilitarization Support	11.0
LOUISIANA	
Fort Polk: Organization Maintenance Shop	4.309
Lafayette: Marine Corps Reserve Center	3.33
NAS Belle Chase: Ammunition Storage Igloo	1.35
MARYLAND	
Andrews AFB: Squadron Operations Facility	9.9
Aberdeen P.G.: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	66.6

MILCON appropriations adds for FY 00—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

MASSACHUSETTS	
Hansen AFB: Acquisition Man. Fac. Renovation	16.0
MICHIGAN	
Camp Grayling: Air Ground Range Support Facility	5.8
MINNESOTA	
Camp Ripley: Combined Support Maintenance Shop	10.368
MISSISSIPPI	
Columbus AFB: Add to T-1A Hangar	2.6
Keesler AFB: C-130J Simulator Facility	8.9
Miss. Army Ammo Pl.: Land/Water Ranges	3.3
Camp Shelby: Multi-purpose Range	14.9
Vicksburg: Readiness Center	5.914
Jackson Airport: C-17 Simulator Building	3.6
MISSOURI	
Rosencrans Mem APT: Upgrade Aircraft Parking Apron	9.0
MONTANA	
Malmstrom AFB: Dormitory	11.6
Great Falls IAP: Base Supply Complex	1.4
NEVADA	
Hawthorne Army Dep.: Container Repair Facility	1.7
Nellis AFB: Land Acquisition	11.6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Portsmouth: Waterfront Crane	3.850
Pearl Trade Part ANG: Upgrade KC-135 Parking Apron	9.6
NEW JERSEY	
Fort Monmouth: Barracks Improvement	11.8
NEW MEXICO	
Kirtland AFB: Composite Support Complex	9.7
Cannon AFB: Control Tower	4.0
Cannon AFB: Repair Runway #2204	8.1
NEW YORK	
Niagara Falls: Visiting Officer's Quarters	6.3
NORTH CAROLINA	
Fort Bragg: Upgrade Barracks D-Area	14.4
NORTH DAKOTA	
Grand Forks AFB: Parking Apron Extension	9.5
OHIO	
Wright Patterson: Convert to Physical Fitness Ctr.	4.6
Columbus AFB: Reserve Center Addition	3.541
Springfield: Complex	1.77
OKLAHOMA	
Tinker AFB: Repair and Upgrade Runway	11.0
Vance AFB: Upgrade Center Runway	12.6
Tulsa IAP: Composite Support Complex	10.8
OREGON	
Umatilla DA: Ammo. Demilitarization Facility	35.9
Salem: Armed Forces Reserve Center	15.255
PENNSYLVANIA	
NFPC Philadelphia: Casting Pits Modification	13.320

MILCON appropriations adds for
FY 00—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

NAS Willow Grove: Ground Equipment Shop	0.6
Johnstown ANG: Air Traffic Control Facility	6.2
RHODE ISLAND	
Quonset: Maintenance Hangar and Shops	16.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	
McEntire ANG: Replace Control Tower	8.0
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Ellsworth AFB: Education/library Center	10.2
TENNESSEE	
Henderson: Organization Maintenance Shop	1.976
TEXAS	
Dyess AFB: Child Development Center	5.4
Lackland AFB: F-16 Squadron Ops Flight Complex	9.7
UTAH	
Salt Lake: Red Butte Dam	8.0
Salt Lake City IAP: Upgrade Aircraft Main. Complex	9.7
VERMONT	
Northfield: Multi-purpose Training Facility	8.652
VIRGINIA	
Fort Pickett: Multi-purpose Training Range	13.5
WASHINGTON	
Fairchild AFB: Flight Line Support Facility	9.1
Fairchild AFB: Composite Support Complex	9.8
WEST VIRGINIA	
Eleanor: Maintenance Complex	18.521
Eleanor: Readiness Center	9.583
Total	985

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the pending Military Construction Appropriations bill provides \$8.3 billion in new budget authority and \$2.5 billion in new outlays for Military Construction and Family Housing programs and other purposes for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000.

When outlays from prior-year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the outlays for the 2000 program total \$8.8 billion.

Compared to 1999 appropriations, this bill is \$385 million lower in budget authority, and it is \$622 million lower in outlays.

This legislation provides for construction by the Department of Defense for U.S. military facilities throughout the world, and it provides for family housing for the active forces of each of the U.S. military services. Accordingly, it provides for important readiness and quality of life programs for our service men and women.

The bill is within the revised section 302(b) allocation for the Military Construction Subcommittee. I commend the distinguished subcommittee Chairman, the Senator from Montana, for bringing this bill to the floor within the subcommittee's allocation.

The bill provides an important and necessary increase in budget authority above the President's request for 2000. Most of the \$2.8 billion increase fully funds projects that the President's request only partially funded. Because the bill supports appropriate full funding budgeting practices and because it funds highly important quality of life programs for our armed services, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the relationship of the bill to the subcommittee's section 302(b) allocation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1205, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS,
2000, SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars]

Category	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	8,274	8,274
Outlays	8,789	8,789
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	8,274	8,274
Outlays	8,789	8,789
1999 level:				
Budget authority	8,659	8,659
Outlays	9,411	9,411
President's request:				
Budget authority	5,438	5,438
Outlays	8,921	8,921
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority
Outlays
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority
Outlays
1999 level:				
Budget authority	(385)	(385)
Outlays	(622)	(622)
President's request:				
Budget authority	2,836	2,836
Outlays	(132)	(132)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	8,274	8,274
Outlays	8,789	8,789

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions. Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, 06/14/99.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the speedy passage of S. 1205, the fiscal year 2000 military construction appropriations bill. I compliment both Chairman BURNS and the ranking member, Senator Murray, for their excellent work in producing a bill that won the unanimous endorsement of the subcommittee. I am sure the bill will receive a similar degree of support from the entire Senate. I must also commend Senators BURNS and MURRAY for rejecting the President's premature and irresponsible attempt to incrementally fund these essential projects. The Congress must continue to send this President the clear and consistent message that his fiscal negligence toward our Armed Forces will not be tolerated.

I would like to take a moment to highlight two of the four important military construction projects for Arkansas included in this bill. The first is an \$8.7 million project for Little Rock Air Force Base. This project is comprised of three new facilities, and the renovation of a fourth, that will greatly enhance the mission capabilities of the 189th Airlift Wing, Arkansas Na-

tional Guard. The new Communications, Vehicle Maintenance and Civil Engineering/Medical Services facilities along with the renovated Aircraft Support building will stand as visible reminders of the Federal Government's commitment of Little Rock Air Force Base's bright future as an essential component of our nation's security.

The other military construction project I would like to highlight is one that the Subcommittee wisely added to the President's insufficient proposal. I am speaking about the inclusion of an \$18 million Chemical Defense Quality Evaluation Facility to be constructed at the Pine Bluff Arsenal.

Pine Bluff Arsenal presently serves as the Department of Defense's primary maintenance and certification facility for chemical and biological defense equipment such as gas masks for our soldiers and air filters for M-1 tanks. The Department of Defense describes the present facility as:

operating at maximum capacity, beyond levels consistent with good laboratory practice, with no space for [expansion].

According to the Department of Defense:

if this project is not provided, inadequate . . . stockpile surveillance testing will continue, with an undefined chance that defective, deteriorated or damaged protective equipment or components could be accepted or retained in stock for issue. This risk directly endangers the worker in a toxic chemical environment or the soldier facing toxic chemicals in a combat situation. [DOD] cannot ensure reliability of [chemical and biological] equipment without . . . a suitable test facility.

The construction of this new Chemical Defense Quality Evaluation Facility will reaffirm that defense against Weapons of Mass Destruction remains a national priority, and that the Pine Bluff Arsenal remains at the forefront of America's efforts in that endeavor.

I will finish by again complimenting the subcommittee for its efforts in producing this legislation, and urge my colleagues to vote for its quick adoption.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to state my concern about a provision in the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2000 that the Senate is considering today. I am very concerned about the potential effects of Section 129 of the bill relating to the chemical weapons demilitarization program planned for the Bluegrass Army Depot.

My concern, simply stated, is that Section 129 could delay the chemical demilitarization process beyond the deadline for destroying all our chemical weapons under the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). This provision, which would levy additional requirements before demilitarization work can begin at the depot, could prevent the United States from complying with its obligations under the CWC.

The Administration shares my concern and strongly opposes this provision of S. 1205. In fact, their opposition is stated in the first item listed in the

Statement of Administration Policy regarding this bill. Here's what the Administration has to say about this matter:

The Administration strongly opposes Section 129, which would require the demonstration of six alternative technologies to chemical weapons incineration before construction of the Chemical Demilitarization facility at Bluegrass, Kentucky could begin. Prompt construction of the Bluegrass site is critical to ensuring U.S. compliance with the deadline for chemical weapons destruction agreed to under the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Department of Defense has demonstrated three alternative technologies, one more than required by P.L. 104-208, the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. This provision would delay construction of the Bluegrass site by at least one year, resulting in a breach of the Chemical Weapons Convention deadline.

The President of the United States signed the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Senate provided its advice and consent to ratification of that treaty. The treaty is now in force and the United States is a party to it, so we are bound by its terms and requirements. I am very disturbed and dismayed that the United States is not in compliance with this treaty, a situation that could worsen if legislation such as contained in Section 129 is enacted into law.

I remind my fellow Senators that the United States has still not gathered and declared information regarding U.S. industrial chemical facilities that is required by the treaty. In addition, the U.S. has not complied with treaty provisions governing inspections of military facilities authorizing the use of treaty-approved inspection equipment. Finally, the implementing legislation for the CWC contains provisions that are antithetical to treaty provisions. Should the President exercise the option approved in the implementing legislation to refuse a challenge inspection, such action would directly contravene both the intent and the letter of the treaty that entered into force. I urge my fellow Senators to be aware of these problems and to support efforts to resolve them so that the United States can become compliant with its international treaty obligations and assume the leadership needed in order to make this treaty effective.

One of the central requirements of the Chemical Weapons Convention is that parties must destroy their chemical weapons stockpile within 10 years of the date of entry into force of the treaty. That means that the United States must destroy all its chemical weapons by April 29, 2007. I am concerned that Section 129 of this bill would prevent the United States from meeting its legal obligation to destroy all its chemical weapons before this deadline. I believe it would be both unwise and unnecessary to enact legislation that would have the effect of preventing the United States from meeting one of its treaty obligations.

To be specific, Section 129 would prevent the obligation or expenditure of any funds made available by the Mili-

tary Construction Appropriations Act or any other Act for the purpose relating to construction of a facility at Bluegrass Army Depot in Kentucky for demilitarization of chemical weapons until the Secretary of Defense reports to the Congress on the results of evaluating six alternative technologies to the current baseline incineration process for destroying chemical weapons.

While this may sound quite reasonable, it poses a problem that I want to highlight. It would effectively delay the chemical demilitarization process at Bluegrass to the point that we would likely not be able to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention. This is because it would add a new requirement to demonstrate and evaluate three additional alternative destruction technologies, and for the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congress on those additional technologies before any demilitarization construction funding could be used at the Bluegrass Depot.

There are currently three alternative technologies being considered by the Defense Department under the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment (ACWA) program. This program was established in law several years ago, but the law required the Department to evaluate at least two alternative technologies—not six. Section 129 would add the requirement to evaluate four additional technologies which will take additional time and money. That will result in a one-year delay in starting the chemical demilitarization process at Bluegrass which would prevent the U.S. from destroying all the chemical weapons there before the CWC deadline.

I note that the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, has no provision in the Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2000 that places any restriction on the chemical demilitarization program. In fact, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, on which I serve as the Ranking Member, included report language that emphasizes the importance of meeting our CWC Treaty obligation to destroy all of our chemical weapons by the treaty deadline. Moreover, the Defense Authorization bill which passed the Senate on May 27, 1999, fully funds the Defense Department's request for funds for the chemical demilitarization program.

I do not believe that it is the intent of this provision or of its sponsors to prevent the United States from meeting its treaty obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention, or to force the U.S. to violate the treaty. Therefore, I urge my fellow Senators during the forthcoming conference on the Military Construction Appropriations bill to support modifications to Section 129 so that the bill will not have this unintended effect. I'm certain that my colleagues agree that it is essential for the Senate to take all actions necessary to ensure that we uphold our treaty obligations just as we

would demand of other states. Modification of Section 129 would constitute such an action.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1205, the Military Construction Appropriations bill. I congratulate Chairman BURNS and the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, for crafting a spending bill which addresses the critical priorities of America's soldiers in a prudent and effective manner.

This year's Administration submission made the task of the Committee more difficult than at any time since I have been a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. By suggesting that Congress incrementally fund all military construction programs, the Administration charted a course for failure and left Senators BURNS and MURRAY to clean up the mess. They have done so admirably and I am proud to support their efforts.

While I strongly support the entire bill before the Senate today, I would like to take just a moment of the Senate's time to explain a particular section of the bill. Section 129 of this measure was included at my request and deals with the construction of chemical demilitarization facilities at the Bluegrass Army Depot in Kentucky. Specifically, this provision would prohibit such construction until the Secretary of Defense reports on the completed demonstration of 6 alternatives to baseline incineration as a means of destroying America's chemical weapons stockpile.

I think it is important to state first what this amendment does not do. This language will have no impact on any proposed funding in the FY00 military construction bill. The reason is that the prohibition on spending for construction at Bluegrass Army Depot applies only to facilities which are technology specific. This means that construction for buildings which will be necessary regardless of the method of destruction employed at Bluegrass is permitted. This allows for progress on necessary components for eventual demilitarization activities such as administrative facilities, but prohibits construction of the actual treatment facility to be deployed in Kentucky until the Secretary certifies that demonstration of the six alternatives is complete.

It is also not my intent to delay or avoid destruction of the stockpile in Kentucky. My sole purpose is to ensure that when the weapons stored in Kentucky are destroyed only the safest most effective method is utilized. Once the Secretary certifies that all six alternative technologies have been demonstrated—and this can occur in the very near future—technology specific efforts at Bluegrass may begin. I supported ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention and believe that the United States should do everything it can to meet the April 2007 deadline. The language contained in Section 129 should have no adverse impact on the

U.S. being able to satisfy its Chemical Weapons Convention obligations.

Now that I have offered an explanation as to what this language will not do, let me describe what I hope it will accomplish. Quite simply, this is a continuation of my efforts to push the military to recognize that public safety should be the top priority as America eliminates its chemical weapons in compliance with the CWC. The Army's selection of incineration as their preferred technology dates all the way back to 1982—almost 20 years ago. It is unreasonable, and in fact irresponsible, to assume that there have been no technological advancements since that time which could lead to improved methods of disposal. Only ten years ago few would have predicted the dynamic nature of the Internet would provide Americans instant access to information around the globe. Given that example, why has the department chosen to ignore potential strides in chemical weapons destruction? Why then has the safety of those Americans who live near chemical weapons destruction sites taken a back seat to fiscal and calendar concerns?

In an effort to force the Department to consider the possibility of alternatives to incineration, I offered and the Senate accepted an amendment to the FY97 Defense Appropriations bill which established the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program. As I previously stated, this program identified a total of six technologies as suitable for demonstration. Unfortunately the Department has chosen to fund only three. As a result of the Department's decision to not fully test each technology, much of the good will established by the program has eroded. Continued DOD intransigence will lead to well deserved skepticism regarding the eventual report issued by ACWA. The citizens who are counting on the federal government's honest assessment of how to proceed deserve the security of knowing that all viable options were appropriately considered.

I have outlined the hypocrisy of the Department's argument in a floor statement I made on June 8, 1999, and so I will not repeat myself at this point. Regardless of the Department's contention that funding for further testing is limited, I believe the interests of public safety far outweigh any limited fiscal concerns. This is not a case of one Senator screaming that the "sky is falling." Rather, this is an effort to hold the Department of Defense accountable for what should have always been its first priority—the safety of potentially impacted citizens. I will continue to press for full testing and accountability.

I thank my colleagues and urge their support for the Military Construction bill.

WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 331, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 331) to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.

TITLE I—EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Sec. 101. Expanding State options under the medicaid program for workers with disabilities.

Sec. 102. Continuation of medicare coverage for working individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 103. Grants to develop and establish State infrastructures to support working individuals with disabilities.

Sec. 104. Demonstration of coverage under the medicaid program of workers with potentially severe disabilities.

TITLE II—TICKET TO WORK AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency

Sec. 201. Establishment of the Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program.

Subtitle B—Elimination of Work Disincentives

Sec. 211. Work activity standard as a basis for review of an individual's disabled status.

Sec. 212. Expedited reinstatement of disability benefits.

Subtitle C—Work Incentives Planning, Assistance, and Outreach

Sec. 221. Work incentives outreach program.

Sec. 222. State grants for work incentives assistance to disabled beneficiaries.

TITLE III—DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AND STUDIES

Sec. 301. Permanent extension of disability insurance program demonstration project authority.

Sec. 302. Demonstration projects providing for reductions in disability insurance benefits based on earnings.

Sec. 303. Studies and reports.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Sec. 401. Technical amendments relating to drug addicts and alcoholics.

Sec. 402. Treatment of prisoners.

Sec. 403. Revocation by members of the clergy of exemption from Social Security coverage.

Sec. 404. Additional technical amendment relating to cooperative research or demonstration projects under titles II and XVI.

Sec. 405. Authorization for State to permit annual wage reports.

TITLE V—REVENUE

Sec. 501. Modification to foreign tax credit carryback and carryover periods.

Sec. 502. Limitation on use of non-accrual experience method of accounting.

Sec. 503. Extension of Internal Revenue Service user fees.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

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

(1) Health care is important to all Americans.

(2) Health care is particularly important to individuals with disabilities and special health care needs who often cannot afford the insurance available to them through the private market, are uninsurable by the plans available in the private sector, and are at great risk of incurring very high and economically devastating health care costs.

(3) Americans with significant disabilities often are unable to obtain health care insurance that provides coverage of the services and supports that enable them to live independently and enter or rejoin the workforce. Personal assistance services (such as attendant services, personal assistance with transportation to and from work, reader services, job coaches, and related assistance) remove many of the barriers between significant disability and work. Coverage for such services, as well as for prescription drugs, durable medical equipment, and basic health care are powerful and proven tools for individuals with significant disabilities to obtain and retain employment.

(4) For individuals with disabilities, the fear of losing health care and related services is one of the greatest barriers keeping the individuals from maximizing their employment, earning potential, and independence.

(5) Individuals with disabilities who are beneficiaries under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) risk losing medicare or medicaid coverage that is linked to their cash benefits, a risk that is an equal, or greater, work disincentive than the loss of cash benefits associated with working.

(6) Currently, less than 1/2 of 1 percent of social security disability insurance and supplemental security income beneficiaries cease to receive benefits as a result of employment.

(7) Beneficiaries have cited the lack of adequate employment training and placement services as an additional barrier to employment.

(8) If an additional 1/2 of 1 percent of the current social security disability insurance (DI) and supplemental security income (SSI) recipients were to cease receiving benefits as a result of employment, the savings to the Social Security Trust Funds in cash assistance would total \$3,500,000,000 over the worklife of the individuals.

(b) *PURPOSES.*—The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To provide health care and employment preparation and placement services to individuals with disabilities that will enable those individuals to reduce their dependency on cash benefit programs.

(2) To encourage States to adopt the option of allowing individuals with disabilities to purchase medicaid coverage that is necessary to enable such individuals to maintain employment.

(3) To provide individuals with disabilities the option of maintaining medicare coverage while working.

(4) To establish a return to work ticket program that will allow individuals with disabilities to seek the services necessary to obtain and retain employment and reduce their dependency on cash benefit programs.

TITLE I—EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

SEC. 101. EXPANDING STATE OPTIONS UNDER THE MEDICAID PROGRAM FOR WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—

(1) *STATE OPTION TO ELIMINATE INCOME, ASSETS, AND RESOURCE LIMITATIONS FOR WORKERS*