

“(10) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES FOR FIREFIGHTING VEHICLES.—The Director shall ensure that not more than 25 percent of the assistance made available under this subsection for a fiscal year is used for the use described in paragraph (3)(G).

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director—

“(A) \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

“(B) \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

“(C) \$400,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

“(D) \$600,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

“(E) \$800,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

“(F) \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the amounts made available under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Director may use not more than 10 percent for the administrative costs of carrying out this section.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3754

(Purpose: To increase the amount available for close-in weapon system overhauls by \$10,000,000)

On page 58, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 313. CLOSE-IN WEAPON SYSTEM OVERHAULS.

Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(2), \$391,806,000 is available for weapons maintenance.

The total amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for spectrum data base upgrades is reduced by \$10 million.

AMENDMENT NO. 3755

(Purpose: To make available, with an offset, \$150,000,000 for additional cleanup activities at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation, Richland, Washington)

On page 556, line 24, strike “\$5,501,824,000” and insert “\$5,651,824,000”.

On page 559, line 8, strike “\$3,028,457,000” and insert “\$3,178,457,000”.

On page 559, line 11, strike “\$2,533,725,000” and insert “\$2,683,725,000”.

On page 564, line 8, strike “\$540,092,000” and insert “\$390,092,000”.

On page 564, line 13, strike “\$450,000,000” and insert “\$300,000,000”.

On page 603, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 3156. TANK WASTE REMEDIATION SYSTEM, HANFORD RESERVATION, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON.

(a) FUNDS AVAILABLE.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 3102, \$150,000,000 shall be available to carry out an accelerated cleanup and waste management program at the Department of Energy Hanford Site in Richland, Washington.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 15, 2000, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report on the Tank Waste Remediation System Project at the Hanford Site. The report shall include the following:

(1) A proposed plan for processing and stabilizing all nuclear waste located in the Hanford Tank Farm.

(2) A proposed schedule for carrying out the plan.

(3) The total estimated cost of carrying out the plan.

(4) A description of any alternative options to the proposed plan and a description of the costs and benefits of each such option.

AMENDMENT NO. 3756

(Purpose: To increase funds for the national ignition facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California)

On page 547, line 16, strike “\$6,214,835,000” and insert “\$6,289,835,000”.

On page 547, line 19, strike \$4,672,800,000” and insert “\$4,747,800,000”.

On page 547, line 24, strike “\$3,887,383,000” and insert “\$3,822,383,000”.

On page 548, line 3, strike “\$1,496,982,000” and insert “\$1,471,982,000”.

On page 548, line 5, strike “\$1,547,798,000” and insert “\$1,507,798,000”.

On page 549, line 2, strike “\$448,173,000” and insert “\$588,173,000”.

On page 552, line 7, strike “\$74,100,000” and insert “\$214,100,000”.

On page 560, line 23, strike “\$141,317,000” and insert “\$216,317,000”.

On page 603, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 3156. REPORT ON NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY, LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY, LIVERMORE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) NEW BASELINE.—(1) Not more than 50 percent of the funds available for the national ignition facility (Project 96-D-111) may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Energy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth a new baseline plan for the completion of the national ignition facility.

(2) The report shall include a detailed, year-by-year breakdown of the funding required for completion of the facility, as well as projected dates for the completion of program milestones, including the date on which the first laser beams are expected to become operational.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF NIF PROGRAM.—(1) The Comptroller General shall conduct a thorough review of the national ignition facility program.

(2) Not later than March 31, 2001, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the review conducted under paragraph (1). The report shall include—

(A) an analysis of—

(i) the relationship of the national ignition facility program to other key components of the Stockpile Stewardship Program; and

(ii) the potential impact of delays in the national ignition facility program, and of a failure to complete key program objectives of the program, on the other key components of the Stockpile Stewardship Program, such as the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative Program;

(B) a detailed description and analysis of the funds spent as of the date of the report on the national ignition facility program; and

(C) an assessment whether Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory has established a new baseline plan for the national ignition facility program with clear goals and achievable milestones for that program.

AMENDMENT NO. 3755

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . BREAST CANCER STAMP EXTENSION.

Section 414(g) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “2-year” and inserting “4-year”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3657

(Purpose: Relating to the greenbelt at Fallon Naval Air Station, Nevada)

On page 546, after line 13, add the following:

SEC. 2882. ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE GREENBELT AT FALLON NAVAL AIR STATION, NEVADA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy shall, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, carry out appropriate activi-

ties after examination of the potential environmental and flight safety ramifications for irrigation that has been eliminated, or will be eliminated, for the greenbelt at Fallon Naval Air Station, Nevada. Any activities carried out under the preceding sentence shall be consistent with aircrew safety at Fallon Naval Air Station.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Navy such sums as may be necessary to carry out the activities required by subsection (a).

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS POLICY

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senate convened a joint meeting between Democrats and Republicans to receive a classified nuclear briefing from the Department of Defense. The purpose of this bipartisan meeting was for the members of the Senate to get a better understanding of our strategic nuclear weapons policy.

Our briefers, which included Admiral Richard Mies, Commander of STRATCOM, had been invited to the Senate to explain the details of the Single Integrated Operational Plan—or SIOP. The SIOP is the highly-classified nuclear blueprint of targets and targeting assignments for our strategic nuclear weapons arsenal, and is the driving force behind our strategic nuclear force levels. While the SIOP is a military document, it is based on guidance given to the Department of Defense by the President.

As elected representatives of the people, and with a Constitutional role in determining national security policy, Congress should have an understanding of the principles underpinning our nuclear policy. Both the guidance provided by the President and the details of the SIOP are necessary for us to make informed national security decisions.

With this in mind, we gathered in an interior room in the Capitol to get a full briefing on the SIOP. But when we asked the DoD briefers precise questions about the SIOP, we did not get the information we were seeking. The briefers were unable, or unwilling, to give us the kind of specific information about our nuclear forces and plans we need to make the decisions required as elected representatives of the people.

In fact, when asked for detailed targeting information we were given three different answers. First, we were told that they did not bring that kind of information. Then, we were told there were people in the room who were not cleared to receive that kind of information. Finally, we were told that kind of information is only provided to the Senate leadership and members of the Armed Services Committee. Because members of the leadership and the Senate Armed Services Committee indicated they had never received such information, I can only surmise there must be a fourth answer.

We find ourselves in an uncomfortable and counter-productive Catch-22. Until we as civilians provide better guidance to our military leaders, we are unlikely to affect the kind of changes needed to update our nuclear policies to reflect the realities of the post-cold-war world. Yet, providing improved guidance is difficult when we are unable to learn the basic components of the SIOP. Given this, I followed up our meeting with a letter to Senate Minority Leader Tom DASCHLE requesting that he schedule another briefing so that we could get the information our first briefers would not provide.

While I still believe this briefing is needed, we need not wait for a briefing on the details of the SIOP to answer the question of how many nuclear weapons are needed to deter potential aggressors. In truth, it is important for citizens, armed only with common sense and open-source information, to reach sound conclusions about our nuclear posture and force levels.

To illustrate, we should ask experts to describe the deterrent capability of a single Trident submarine—our most survivable and reliable delivery platform. Within an hour of receiving an order to launch, a Trident could deliver and detonate 192 nuclear weapons on their targets. The minimum size of the detonations would be 100 kilotons; the maximum would be 300 kilotons. By comparison, the Hiroshima detonation that caused Japan to sue for unconditional peace in August 1945 was only 15 kilotons. In the open, we should assess what damage 192 of these weapons would cause and determine whether this would deter most, if not all of the threats we face.

Mr. President, I have made no secret of my strongly-held belief that we can and we should make dramatic reductions in our strategic nuclear arsenals. I believe that by keeping such a large arsenal of strategic nuclear weapons we are decreasing rather than enhancing our security. By keeping such a large arsenal we are forcing the Russians to keep more weapons than they can safely control. By keeping such a large arsenal we are increasing the chance of accidental or unauthorized launch. By keeping such a large arsenal we are increasing the likelihood of the proliferation of these weapons. By keeping such a large arsenal we are en-

couraging nations like India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea to pursue a nuclear weapons option. And finally, by keeping such a large arsenal we are diverting budgetary resources away from our conventional forces—the forces that are vital to protecting our interests around the globe.

In the near future, I will return to the Senate floor to discuss this issue further. I will return with non-classified information—information that comes not from briefings in secret rooms, but information all citizens can access through a simple search on Yahoo—in an attempt to better understand our nuclear policy and the changing definition of deterrence in the post-Cold War world.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do have some Executive Calendar matters and other unanimous consent agreements that have already been worked out. I will proceed to those. However, I do note I want to offer a unanimous consent request with regard to the estate tax matter. I want the Democratic leader to be here when I make that request. I am hoping within the next few minutes we will also be able to conclude an agreement with regard to the Department of Defense authorization bill. Discussions are still underway, but I thought I would take advantage of this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Calendar Nos. 567 through 570. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

Paul C. Huck, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, vice Kenneth L. Ryskamp, retired.

John W. Darrach, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern Dis-

trict of Illinois, vice George M. Marovich, retired.

Joan Humphrey Lefkow, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, vice Ann C. Williams, elevated.

George Z. Singal, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, vice Morton A. Brody, deceased.

CONFIRMATION OF GEORGE SINGAL

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has confirmed George Singal, the President's nominee for a seat on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maine, and rise to express my strong unequivocal support for his nomination.

In advance, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, for proceeding so expeditiously on Mr. Singal's nomination—especially when considering his nomination was transmitted to the Senate just six weeks ago. In addition, I would like to thank the Majority Leader for bringing his nomination to the floor so rapidly—just three days after being reported by the Judiciary Committee.

George Singal immigrated along with his family to the United States at a very young age, and has become a living embodiment of the American dream. He possesses a superior legal mind, has distinguished himself within the legal profession, and is deeply committed to upholding the very highest standards of our nation's judicial system.

Moreover, Mr. Singal has a wide range of experience serving as both a prosecutor and as a defense attorney—a deep understanding and appreciation for the constitutionally mandated roles of the three branches of government—and the enormous respect of his colleagues, a number of whom have contacted me in support of his nomination. Finally, and just as telling, he enjoys bipartisan support across the State of Maine.

Consider what George's background says about his character and qualifications. Born in a refugee camp in Italy after his family fled before the German invasion of his native Poland, he arrived in Bangor along with his sister and widowed mother in 1949.

After graduating summa cum laude from my alma mater, the University of Maine in 1967, and becoming only the second recipient of the highly respected Root-Tilden Scholarship in the history of the university, George briefly left our state to receive his law degree from Harvard University three years later.

Indeed, not one to forget his roots, George immediately returned to Maine to begin his legal career in Bangor, serving as the Assistant County Attorney for Penobscot County from 1971 to 1973, even as he worked his way to a partnership in the respected law firm of Gross, Minsky, Mogul, & Singal—the firm in which he has remained to this day.