What happened? The Yellowstone Pipeline Company went to the Forest Service and said: Give us an estimate for the reroute proposal. We have to do an environmental impact statement. We want to do it right. This was back in 1997. What will it cost they asked. Less than a million dollars was the response from the Forest Service. Good they responded, let's go ahead with the EIS process and find a viable route. Three years later, the Yellowstone Pipeline Company has paid $5 million to resite those 60 miles of pipeline, and just a week and a half ago the Yellowstone Pipeline was forced to pull the plug on the project because the Forest Service refused to acknowledge that their preferred alternative was too expensive to build. A pipeline, the cheapest way to move fuel and distribute energy across this country, now is in jeopardy, if not dead.

The result will be that these 60 miles absent of pipeline will be crossed in another way. We are going to rail it or truck it. We will probably have an accident, even the Forest Service's EIS documents acknowledge this. A spill will probably result—we have already had one at Alberton. We might also truck it. However, with energy costs as high as they are today, that will increase the cost to consumers. It also, in that 60 miles, exposes traffic to large semis on a two-lane road. Lives will be at stack. The Forest Service has also acknowledged that, but continues to forge along proposing an unbuildable route. The hazards to the public, and the costs to the consumer, increase. That is just an example of what this administration has failed to do to ensure that we have energy prices that are affordable and energy is accessible to all Americans.

So we feel for those truckers out there. We know what it is like to go down that road and try to deliver the goods to America in an efficient and safe way, and to get the products to market in a competitive manner so they fall within the consumers' reach of affording them.

Two years ago, we were buying gasoline for around 85, 90 cents a gallon. It didn't take us long to get spoiled, did it? But now we find that through that we usually have to pay the piper one time or another. It is us, the consumers, that will pick up the bill of a failed energy policy. The administration will be gone, but we will be left holding the tab. It is our economy that will slow, and it is our families that will have to do with less. We see it happening today in our oil and gas production. Let's not see it happen in our electricity production. This economy we have been enjoying all these years could go away in a flash—just a flash. It takes a while for an administration's action to lead to a tangible impact, we are beginning the impact of this administration's failed energy policy today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What is the status of the legislation at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are considering H.R. 1883 under a time limit.

Mr. DOMENICI. Under that time limit, can the Senator from New Mexico speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If he yields himself time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 7 minutes.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the legislation before us. This legislation is only one of many important steps required to counter the greatest threat to U.S. security in this era—the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I am not being an alarmist. I am being a realist. The proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological technologies and the means to deliver them present a growing threat to U.S. security. This is a threat which we have only begun to address in the changed security environment of the 21st century.

Mr. President, I would like to mention three important aspects of the problem as stated by George Tenet, the Director of Central Intelligence, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence early in February.

First, Russia and China no longer represent the only missile threat to the United States. The missile threat to U.S. interests and forces from other nations is here and now.

Second, South Asian nations are establishing doctrine and tactics for the use of their missiles and weapons of mass destruction. The nuclear rivalry between India and Pakistan steadily intensifies. The potential for miscalculation, misperception and escalation of the conflict in Kashmir is high.

Third, the countries we previously considered technology importers are now assuming roles as ''secondary suppliers.'' This compounds the proliferation problem and confounds our ability to control or defend against it.

As outlined in the most recent Intelligence Community assessment of Ballistic Missile Threats, by the year 2015 the U.S. will not only face the ongoing challenges of large-scale missile threats from China and Russia. U.S. cities will also confront a real threat from other actors—North Korea, probably Iran, and possibly Iraq.

One must mention that Intelligence Community's estimate excludes the possibility of social or political changes in those countries that would change the calculus. Also, the missile arsenals of these nations would be much smaller, limited to smaller payloads, and less reliable than Chinese or Russian capabilities.

At the same time, these remain a lethal and less predictable threat. Acute accuracy is not required for missiles tipped with nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads. And the U.S. cannot bank on rational actions from dictators like Saddam Hussein or Kim Chong-il.

At the same time that the threat increases, global changes make non-proliferation efforts even more difficult. Three specific aspects in the current international security environment will impede U.S. efforts to control or minimize this threat.

First, Russia—hard currency starved and heavily indebted—is a willing merchant—most notably of conventional defense items, but the U.S. Russian sales are not limited to this. This legislation attempts to address this aspect through creating incentives for the Russian government and others to implement and enforce stricter export controls on private actors or institutes in their dealings with Iran.

Second, North Korea and their No-Dong missile sales are altering strategic balances in the Middle East and Asia. While the administration's new strategy for engagement with North Korea may retard developments that require testing, such as reliability of long-range missiles, many suspect that the North Korean missile program continues and that its role as a supplier of medium-range missile technology has not been addressed.

Third, technology advances and rapid international economic integration alter and confuse the means by which the United States can control military advances of other nations. The list of potentially threatening dual-use technologies continues to grow. This is especially true of information technologies—command, control, communication, and information technologies, C–31, now comprise about 75 percent of a modern military's capability. But potential dual use is also true of nuclear, chemical, biological, and missile technologies.

The proliferation threat will remain our Nation's No. 1 security challenge in the 21st century. At the same time, the United States will be most vulnerable to this threat. As George Tenet, our head of the CIA, also noted, U.S. hegemony has become a lightning rod for the disaffected.

As Americans enjoy unprecedented prosperity, many in the world remain disaffected. These disaffected represent a group who resent our power and our prosperity. Our success fuels the intensity of their claims and their feelings.

The same forces aligned against our nonproliferation objectives apply to terrorist organizations as well, whether state sponsored or not. A disaffected Iran, despite some moderating trends, remains an active state supporter of terrorism.

Terrorist groups will continue to increase their destructive or their potential for disruption through rapidly evolving and spreading technologies. Again, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents offer cheap means to achieve highly lethal terror. Acquisition of information technology may not only greatly improve a terrorist group's means for organization and coordination and attack, these technologies offer increasing potential for massive, possibly crippling, disruption of U.S. information infrastructure.

This legislation is a small step, but a good one, in addressing the problem of supplying WMD technologies to Iran. But we have much more work to do. We must prevent, when prevention is possible, such as providing safeguards for nuclear materials in Russia and controlling access to technology and know-how as best we can and in as many cases as we can.

We must also find the most effective means to defend against such threats, such as training and equipping policemen and firemen to respond to these attacks and pursuing the best technological solutions to defend against them.

I believe the United States is not pursuing with sufficient vigor the means of greatest potential against missile threats. For example, directed energy technologies represent the next revolutionary step in military technologies. Laser technologies in particular dramatically alter U.S. potential to counter a missile attack. Missile defense at the speed of light will improve effectiveness and efficiency, substantially reducing the cost-per-kill ratios.

Despite this understanding, the budget of the President cut the airborne laser program $92 million. In addition, the defense budget reduced science and technology spending, according to our first estimates, by more than $1 billion. It is not easy to understand. The administration proposes sacrificing the potential of real defense against proliferation threats, although it seems very clearly to be a shortsighted approach.

I have been working as hard as I can, and in some instances at the forefront, on some prevention efforts, especially with respect to proliferation threats from Russia. I hope this year for stepped up measures of prevention, especially regarding the threat of nuclear proliferation in the form of the brain drain from Russia. At the same time, where I can, I will put on a full court press to improve the science and technology budget for the Pentagon, especially as it pertains to the most promising means of missile defense and directed energy.

I hope my colleagues will join in ensuring that every means of proliferation prevention is pursued. I also invite my colleagues to join in increasing the means of our military laboratories to provide for our national defense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of H.R. 1883 occur at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 24.

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

Mr. GRAMS. In light of this agreement, there will be no rollcall votes today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes out of order.

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR TED KENNEDY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, The Apocrypha, or the Hidden Books, is a term used to describe the books found in the Alexandrine Greek Scripture (The Septuagint), but absent from the Orthodox Hebrew Scripture. In the second book of Esdras is found the following Admonishment: ''Now therefore keep thy sorrow to thyself, and bear with a good courage that which hath befallen thee.''

There is one Member of this body who seems to have lived his life by that particular piece of ancient wisdom. That Member to whom I refer is the senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

The saga of the Kennedy family is well known by nearly everyone. It is a story replete with triumphs and unfathomable tragedies. Many times, I have marveled, at the resilience displayed by TED KENNEDY and by his family. Somehow they always manage to regroup, to prevail, to go on, even in the face of devastation.

I believe they find their strength in the love of each other, and in their unstinting devotion to public service.

Senator TED KENNEDY is absolutely committed to public service.

He has served and served wisely and well in the United States for 38 years. First elected to the Senate in 1962, TED KENNEDY is now the third most senior Member of this body.

A child of privilege, educated at Harvard and the University of Virginia Law School, TED KENNEDY could have taken the easier path in life. But instead TED KENNEDY came to the Senate to work. And the causes he has championed and put his broad shoulder to the wheel to support, are for the most part, the causes that benefit the little people—the poor, the downtrodden, the children in our society.

Senator KENNEDY has been an unstinting warrior in the effort to ensure quality health care to the citizens of the Nation. Two recent achievements in this area are the Health Insurance and Accountability Act of 1996, which makes it easier for those who change or lose their jobs to keep their health insurance, and the children's Health Insurance Act of 1997, which makes their health insurance far more widely available to children through age 18 in all 50 states.

Senator KENNEDY has for years, also been a dynamic leader on a wide range of other issues of central importance to the people of this Nation, including education, raising the minimum wage, defending the rights of workers and their families, strengthening civil rights laws, assisting individuals with disabilities, fighting for cleaner water and cleaner air, and protecting Social Security and Medicare for senior citizens.

I have not always agreed with his solutions to our Nation's problems, but I have always respected his capacity for hard work, his devotion to the causes he champions, and his energetic ability to get things done.

And although we have disagreed in the past, one time or another over the years, Senator KENNEDY and I have come to be friends for a long time. We share many things in common, although two more different individuals in background could hardly be imagined. We share a love of history, of poetry, of the rough-and-tumble and the humor of politics, and we share a love and understanding of this Senate and the singularly important role it was intended to play in this Republic.

Rarely have I been more touched than when TED personally delivered 80 long-stemmed roses to my office in remembrance of my 80th birthday, 2 years ago. It was a memorable moment for me.

Through all the triumphs and tragedies, through all the hard work, the disappointments, and the hard knocks that always accompany a long political career, Senator KENNEDY has retained a young man's zeal for life, for service, for laughter, and for achievement. I believe that his shadow will loom large when the history of this body is written in future years. Already, the sum total of his legislative achievements is enormous, and he is still as active, as energetic and as committed as ever. Fortunately, for this body and for the Nation, we can expect many, many more years of loyal and distinguished service from the senior Senator from the Bay State.

So today on the birthday of my friend, TED KENNEDY, I rise to salute his courage, his work, his resiliency, and his extraordinary friendship and kindness to me.

And I offer to him this day one of those famous, certainly very lyrical of Irish blessings:

May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind be always at your back,
May the sun shine warm upon your face,
May the rain fall softly upon your fertile fields.
And, until we meet again,