

this extremely complex and expensive national effort if we do not have an objective, scientifically based yardstick to measure our progress?

Americans know that before you buy a car, you would like to know its fuel economy, power, load capacities, and whether it has a good maintenance record. Buying a major weapon system is not different—no matter how complex. Before the Department of Defense or Congress buys a multibillion-dollar system, we, and the American people, should want to know how well it should and does perform. For a missile defense program, this means how reliably interceptors will launch, how many missiles it should be able to shoot down, how many decoys it can deal with, and so on.

The administration has no such standards for missile defense. At this moment, neither Congress nor the American people know what we are getting for our money in missile defense. Even for the "limited" system the administration plans to field in 2004, there is no description of and commitment to the types of missiles it must or will defend against, or how many decoys it can handle. I hope we can find some way to develop some performance standards for our missile defense program.

In the area of signals intelligence, I fully support the funding increases for signals intelligence aircraft. These assets have played a disproportionately large role in the war on terrorism and continue to be heavily utilized. It is essential that we provide the critical funding to sustain and improve these important aircraft.

Unmanned aerial vehicles have played a remarkable role in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as in the greater war on terrorism. This is one reason that a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle were disappointed with the Navy's decision not to buy the new Fire Scout unmanned helicopters. The Fire Scout has per-

formed well during its development and holds significant promise for the future. I fully support the additional \$40 million provided for Fire Scout that should allow production to start in 2004.

I also note my support on the provision that will focus the attention of the National Nuclear Security Administration's efforts to address the maintenance backlog at its facilities. The Department of Energy, DOE, has been trapped in a death spiral of deferring maintenance for 20 years. We all hope that a provision in this bill brings a new dedication to facilities management that ends the spiral.

Finally, one additional area in the bill that troubles me, and many of our colleagues, is its approach to nuclear weapons.

It appears that the Bush administration is making a significant change in U.S. nuclear weapons policy by blurring the distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear weapons.

This blurring appears to be leading to a new and unsettling notion of usable nuclear weapons, a possible resumption of nuclear weapons testing, and an overall approach that would lend renewed credibility and legitimacy to nuclear weapons at levels well below their traditional strategic deterrence role. This bill supports those goals.

It is important that the United States maintain a strong nuclear deterrent. But it is equally important for the United States to maintain the longstanding policy that nuclear weapons are a weapon of last resort—not just another weapon.

Today the United States sits firmly atop the moral high ground when it comes to the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. Our leadership and commitment to non-proliferation is undisputed.

Just over the last few years, the United States has successfully assisted the third and fourth largest nuclear weapons states, Ukraine and

Kazakhstan, to be signatories of the NPT as nonnuclear weapons states.

The United States is working hard to reduce tensions and nuclear risks between Pakistan and India. At the same time, we are locked in a tough strategic challenge over nuclear weapons in North Korea.

With strong leadership we can continue making progress against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons. But we must continue to lead by example.

But we will fail if our leadership suggests to the world that we have accepted the legitimacy of nuclear weapons as a realistic tactical option.

I acknowledge that we have legitimate scientific interests in the reliability and effectiveness of our nuclear arsenal and new technologies that may improve safety or reduce costs. Members tend to agree on these research interests. But Members, and the American people, tend to divide over committing the Nation to programs that will develop and deploy new weapons for purposes other than nuclear deterrence.

We are entering dangerous territory here and must move forward carefully, mindful of our global leadership, without illusions of those threats that are most likely and most dangerous, and without ideological blinders.

I will join with several of my colleagues later in a series of amendments that will, if adopted, address some of these concerns. The debate that lies ahead will be important to this bill and our national security.

Mr. President, my thanks again to Senator ALLARD for his leadership of our subcommittee this year, and to Senators WARNER and LEVIN for their leadership of the full committee. I look forward to the work we will do together as we move this important bill to final passage.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 22,
2003

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 22. I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1050, the Department of Defense authorization bill, provided further that the Murray amendment No. 691 be temporarily set aside, and, fur-

ther, when the Murray amendment recurs, Senator BROWNBACk be recognized; provided further that when the Senate resumes consideration of the bill on Thursday, Senator DASCHLE or his designee be recognized to call up amendment No. 791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what this unanimous consent agreement says is, in the morning we will come in, do the prayer and the pledge, then we will move to the Daschle amendment. When that is disposed of, Senator BROWNBACk will be recognized to offer a second-degree

amendment to the Murray amendment. This is a right the majority would have.

What we are doing here is making sure that Senator FRIST, who may not be available at that time in the morning, will have his rights protected.

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

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for working with us. We have had a knotty problem here, but I think we are getting on through it, and I appreciate their cooperation in working with us.