

Golden Gavel. This award continues to represent our appreciation for the time these dedicated Senators contribute to presiding over the U.S. Senate—a privileged and important duty.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our sincere appreciation to Senator FITZGERALD for presiding during the 106th Congress.

CONFIRMATION OF RUSSELL JOHN QUALLIOTINE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to express great appreciation for the confirmation of Russell John Qualliotine to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York. Hailing from Nesconset, New York, he served more than a quarter century with the New York City Police Department, retiring this past January. As an Officer of the NYPD, he held the position of Detective First Grade in the elite Personal Security Section of the Intelligence Division. The NYPD has given him four outstanding achievement awards, three awards for excellent police work, and one for meritorious service. From 1969 to 1972, he also served in the United States Army and earned an Army Commendation Medal.

In his roles as police detective and soldier, Mr. Qualliotine has displayed exemplary dedication, character, and professionalism. He is superbly qualified, and I am confident he will make an excellent United States Marshal.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to address the Senate once again on the subject of military construction projects added to an appropriations bill that were not requested by the Department of Defense. The bill that passed by voice vote prior to the July 4th recess contains more than \$1.5 billion in unrequested military construction projects. More importantly, I would like to spend a few minutes discussing Congress's role in the budget process and its utter lack of fiscal discipline. There is \$4.5 billion in pork-barrel spending in this bill, \$3.3 billion of that total in the so-called "emergency supplemental."

Webster's, Mr. President, defines "emergency" as "a sudden, generally unexpected occurrence or set of circumstances demanding immediate action." What we have here is the antithesis of that concept. It is highly questionable whether \$20 million for abstinence education should be included in a bill the purpose of which is to provide emergency funding that will not count against budget caps.

For months this body made a deliberate decision not to act quickly and

deliberately with regard to legitimate spending issues involving military readiness and the crisis in Colombia. The decision was made not to treat these essential and time-sensitive activities as expeditiously as possible. Now, after many months and seemingly endless legislative maneuvering, we were presented with an \$11 billion bill replete with earmarks that under no credible criteria should be categorized as "emergency"—and this is in addition to the over \$1.5 billion added to the underlying military construction appropriations bill for strictly parochial reasons.

As everyone here is aware, I regularly review spending bills for items that were not requested by the Administration, constitute earmarks designed to benefit specific projects or localities, and did not go through a competitive, merit-based selection process. I submit lists of such items to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, generally prior to final passage of the spending bill in question. In the case of the Military Construction bill for fiscal year 2001, I submitted such a list, along with a statement critical of the process by which that bill was put together, particularly the over \$700 million worth of military construction projects added to that bill that were not requested by the Department of Defense—an amount, I reiterate, that was doubled in conference with the other Body.

This is an institution that has proven itself incapable of passing legislation on an expedited basis that genuinely warrants the categorization of "emergency." Funding for ongoing military operations that strains readiness accounts is a case in point. The one thing, Mr. President, we can pass without hesitation and consideration is money for pork-barrel projects. Just prior to final passage back in May of the Military Construction appropriations bill, the Appropriations Committee pushed through \$460 million for six new C-130J aircraft for the Coast Guard—the very aircraft that we throw money at with wanton abandon as though our very existence as an institution is dependent upon the continued acquisition of that aircraft.

That funding and those aircraft are in the bill that emerged from conference with the House. A consensus exists, apparently, that we must have six more C-130Js in addition to the ones added to the defense appropriations bill despite a surplus in the Department of Defense of C-130 airframes that should see us through to the next millennium and beyond. And this, Mr. President, despite the General Accounting Office's finding, based upon the Coast Guard's own study, that the service's existing fleet of HC-130s will not need to be replaced until 2012–2027. And this, Mr. President, despite an ongoing Coast Guard-directed study designed to determine precisely what

types and numbers of aircraft and surface vessels it will require in the future. Message to parents saving up for little junior's college education: invest in the stock of the company that makes C-130s; the United States Congress will ensure your offspring never need student loans.

Compared to the \$460 million for the C-130s, it hardly seems worth it to mention the \$45 million added to this emergency spending measure for yet another Gulfstream jet, other than to point out that it is manufactured in the same state as the C-130s. The decision to include funding for this jet, intended for the Coast Guard commandant, an emergency spending bill lends further credence to the notion that our interest in the integrity of the budget process is nonexistent.

It was reassuring that a compromise was reached on the issue of helicopters for Colombia. It is extremely unfortunate, however, that an issue of life and death for Colombian soldiers being sent into combat to fight well-armed drug traffickers and the 15,000-strong guerrilla army that protects them was predicated upon parochial considerations. Valid operational reasons existed for the decision by the Department of Defense and the Colombian Government to request Blackhawk helicopters, and the Senate's decision to substitute those Blackhawks for Huey IIs was among the more morally questionable actions I have witnessed within the narrow realm of budgetary decision-making by Congress.

Specific to the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001, it continues to strain credibility to peruse this legislation and believe that considerations other than pork were at play. How else to explain the millions of dollars added to this bill for National Guard Armories, which, in a typically Orwellian gesture, are now referred to as "Readiness Centers?" Whether the \$6.4 million added for a new dining facility at Sheppard Air Force Base; the \$12 million for a new fitness center at Langley Air Force Base; the \$5.8 million for a joint personnel training center at Fairchild Air Force Base, Alaska; the \$3.5 million added for an indoor rifle range and \$1.8 million for a religious ministry facility at the Naval Reserve Station in Fort Worth, Texas; the \$4 million added for the New Hampshire Air National Guard Peace International Trade Port; the \$4 million for a Kentucky National Guard parking structure; and the \$14 million added for New York National Guard facilities all constitute vital spending initiatives is highly questionable.

There are one-and-a-half billion dollars worth of projects added to this bill at member request. Not all of them, in particular family housing projects, warrant criticism or skepticism. There are important quality of life issues involved here. The public should be under