

S. CON. RES. 6

Whereas on the morning of January 26, 2001, a devastating and deadly earthquake shook the state of Gujarat in western India, killing untold tens of thousands of people, injuring countless others, and crippling most of the region;

Whereas the earthquake of January 26, 2001, has left thousands of buildings in ruin, caused widespread fires, and destroyed infrastructure;

Whereas the people of India and people of Indian origin have displayed strength, courage, and determination in the aftermath of the earthquake;

Whereas the people of the United States and India have developed a strong friendship based on mutual interests and respect;

Whereas India has asked the World Bank for \$1,700,000,000 in economic assistance to start rebuilding from the earthquake;

Whereas the United States has offered technical and monetary assistance through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID); and

Whereas offers of assistance have also come from the Governments of Turkey, Switzerland, Taiwan, Russia, Germany, China, Canada, and others, as well as countless nongovernmental organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to the citizens of the state of Gujarat and to all of India for the tragic losses suffered as a result of the earthquake of January 26, 2001;

(2) expresses its support for—

(A) the people of India as they continue their efforts to rebuild their cities and their lives;

(B) the efforts of the World Bank;

(C) continuing and substantially increasing the amount of disaster assistance being provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and other relief agencies; and

(D) providing future economic assistance in order to help rebuild Gujarat; and

(3) recognizes and encourages the important assistance that also could be provided by other nations to alleviate the suffering of the people of India.

PERMITTING USE OF THE ROTUNDA

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 14 and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 14) permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

(Purpose: To change the date)

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 11.

The first section of the resolution is amended by striking "April 18, 2001" and inserting "April 19, 2001".

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 11) was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, as amended, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 14), as amended, was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: No. 15 and all the nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, 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 were considered and confirmed as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Paul Henry O'Neill, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of five years; United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; United States Governor of the African Development Bank for a term of five years; United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank; United States Governor of the African Development Fund; United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

FOREIGN SERVICE

PN109 Foreign Service nominations (7) beginning James D. Grueff, and ending Ralph Iwamoto, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 1, 2001.

PN110 Foreign Service nominations (23) beginning An Thanh Le, and ending Army Wing Schedlbauer, which nominations were

received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 1, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105-83, his appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the National Council on the Arts: The Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, AND TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2001

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Monday, February 12, for a pro forma session only. No business will be transacted during Monday's session. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate then immediately adjourn over until Tuesday, February 13, at 9:30 a.m. I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m., to be divided in the following fashion: Senator DASCHLE, or his designee, controlling the time between 9:30 a.m. and 11 a.m., and Senator MURKOWSKI, or his designee, controlling the time between 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 p.m. and 2:15 p.m. in order for the weekly party conferences to meet.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m., there be an additional hour for morning business with 2:15 p.m. to 2:45 p.m. under the control of Senator DURBIN, or his designee, and 2:45 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. under the control of Senator THOMAS, or his designee.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will not be in session.

The Senate will next convene on Monday for a pro forma session only. The Senate will reconvene on Tuesday at 9:30 a.m. and conduct morning business until 12:30 p.m. Following the weekly recess, and some additional morning business, at 3:15 p.m. on Tuesday, it is the majority leader's intention to turn to any legislative and executive calendar items that may be cleared for consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator BYRD and Senator HARKIN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES, for his courtesy. Have a good day.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States Armed Forces have great abilities, supreme dedication, and they deserve the highest level of support that this Nation can give them.

But despite outstanding military troops, a number of challenges lie ahead for the Department of Defense, particularly in the area of allocating monetary resources. One of the first budget challenges that President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld will face is how to improve military readiness. By now, we are all familiar with the myriad problems confronting our military forces today—recruitment and retention problems, crushing deployment burdens, aging ships and tanks and aircraft, a scarcity of spare parts—even a scarcity of ammunition according to yesterday morning's Washington Post—substandard housing and outdated facilities—and the list can go on and on.

All of these factors affect readiness. All of these deficiencies will require money to correct. Already, representatives of the Joint Chiefs are lobbying the Senate Armed Services Committee for a supplemental appropriations bill to increase the current defense budget by perhaps as much as \$10 billion. Presumably, the Services will get around to making their wishes known to the Appropriations Committee as well, since it is that committee that actually has the responsibility over the supplemental appropriations. But re-

gardless of the tactics employed, the supplemental is just the first sortie. Beyond the current budget, we are bracing for the likelihood of requests for major leaps in defense funding—perhaps as much as \$50 billion a year—just over the horizon.

With that said, I was heartened to read President Bush's comments in Monday's New York Times, in which he called for a comprehensive review of Pentagon priorities and strategies before seeking funding increases for modernization that make sense to me, it seems. Hopefully, President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld will be able to impose some order and discipline on the Pentagon budget process. That is probably going to be a pretty big order—a pretty big order to impose some order and discipline on the Pentagon budget process.

Clearly, it is necessary to focus on defense, readiness, and national security. The United States cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that a strong defense is the key to national security. We must never risk complacency in a world that encompasses the likes of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden; a world in which the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons represents a threat to our very existence.

But before we consider how much more money we need to spend on defense, I believe we should take a close look at how the Pentagon is managing the money and the assets it already has.

Now, one of our colleagues, Senator GRASSLEY, has been very interested in this same subject. It was his intention to speak this afternoon, but other matters have intervened, and he will speak on this same subject one day next week.

Just recently, the General Accounting Office gave us a good insight into the current situation with the release of a status report on the Defense Department's management of key programs and assets. The conclusions are disturbing. In six key areas—financial management, information technology, acquisitions, contracts, support infrastructure, and logistics—the GAO found Defense Department management practices to be vulnerable to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Together, these deficiencies represent a tremendous drain on the ability of the Defense Department to operate efficiently, effectively, and safely.

The GAO report put it starkly. Here is what it said: If these problems are not addressed, the report stated, "inefficiencies will continue to make the cost of carrying out assigned missions unnecessarily high and, more important, increase the risks associated with those missions. Each dollar that is spent inefficiently," said the report, "is a dollar that is unavailable to meet other internal Department priorities

such as weapon system modernization and readiness."

What is most disturbing to me is that, in program after program, management procedures are so garbled that the General Accounting Office cannot even estimate—cannot even estimate—the level of inefficiency. This is a critical knowledge gap when one considers the fact that the Defense Department accounts for about 15 percent of the entire Federal budget, and roughly half of all discretionary spending—roughly half of all discretionary spending.

The Defense Department has a budget of about \$310 billion a year and assets estimated at \$1 trillion. Clearly, keeping score when dealing with numbers of that magnitude is a huge challenge. But it is a challenge that must be faced. In an agency as vast as the Defense Department, which has approximately 3 million military and civilian employees, sloppy accounting and accountability procedures can have enormous ramifications on personnel, on readiness, and on national security.

Some of the details of the GAO report are shocking. For example, in the area of financial operations—just plain old bookkeeping in lay terms—the General Accounting Office reported that the Defense Department does not know with any certainty how much money it has available, and its books are in such disarray that it cannot pass a standard financial audit. Now, how about that? How about that? Let me repeat that for emphasis: The Defense Department, which is talking about needing an additional \$50 billion dollars a year to meet readiness requirements, does not know with any certainty how much money it currently has available and cannot pass the test of receiving a clean audit opinion on its financial statements.

Now, take that home with you and sleep on it. That is worth repeating. The Defense Department—this is not ROBERT BYRD saying this. I am just repeating what the General Accounting Office, the arm of the Congress, reported: The Defense Department does not know with any certainty how much money it has, and its books are in such disarray that it cannot pass a standard financial audit.

The Defense Department, which is talking about needing an additional \$50 billion—they want \$50 more for every minute since Jesus Christ was born; that is \$50 billion—a year to meet readiness requirements. Yet the Defense Department does not know with any certainty how much money it currently has available. It would seem to me that before Congress appropriates \$50 billion more, we ought to know how much money the Defense Department has available.

It cannot pass the test of receiving a clean audit opinion on its financial statements; that, despite the fact the Chief Financial Officers' Act of 1990 requires the Department of Defense to