

residents located near other airports across the country in a similar situation to what is occurring at the Dekalb-Peachtree Airport. The Commerce Committee has authorized a significant increase in noise mitigation funding for the FAA to address this problem and accelerate the buy-out process.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the chairman for his assistance. My staff and I look forward to working with him and the junior Senator from Georgia on this important matter.

Mr. CLELAND. Will the chairman yield for another question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be happy to yield to the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, the noise mitigation funding which this bill authorizes is very much needed—and appreciated—by communities located near our nation's airports. Over 10 years ago, Georgia's second busiest airport, Dekalb-Peachtree Airport, began a runway expansion program to accommodate its increased traffic. Six years ago, the FAA began providing funding to relocate the residential homes located in the Airport's Runway Protection Zone. Thanks to noise mitigation money, 108 homes have had the opportunity to relocate. Unfortunately, after a decade, 58 homes and 61 businesses are still in limbo, and still impacted by the noise from 225,000 flights a year. This community near Atlanta—and I am sure there are communities in similar straights in Arizona—has suffered for years, because the buy-out has gone on far too long. Don't you agree that in determining the need for noise money, the FAA should take into consideration the harmful, drawn-out impact on communities from long-standing projects which have awaited completion over a number of years?

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senator is correct. As the Senator knows, in the report accompanying the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill, the Commerce Committee, at the instigation of the Junior Senator from Georgia, urges the FAA to take into consideration the negative impact on communities, like DeKalb County, of such unresolved long-standing projects when allocating noise mitigation money.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the chairman for his remarks, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Senator from Arizona and my colleague from Georgia to complete the Dekalb-Peachtree Airport buy-out.

#### LOUISVILLE AIRPORT

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I want to express my hope that Senators MCCAIN and GORTON will work to include language in the conference report accompanying S. 82, which is of great importance to the Regional Airport Authority of Louisville and Jefferson County, KY. I would like to provide a brief explanation of the need for this provision and what it is intended to accomplish.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his support of the

legislation and we are pleased to hear his views on this provision.

Mr. BUNNING. In 1991, the Regional Airport Authority of Louisville and Jefferson County entered into a letter of intent (LOI) with the Federal Aviation Administration for funding from the Airport Improvement Program for an ambitious expansion of the Louisville Airport. The LOI was for \$126 million. When the new east runway was completed in 1995 and ready for operation, Louisville was informed that no funds were available in the FAA Facilities and Equipment Account (F&E) to provide an Instrument Landing System (ILS), thus rendering the new runway inoperative. FAA advised Louisville that if they procured the ILS, the FAA would later reimburse them for the expenditure of \$5.68 million for the system.

Mr. MCCAIN. I can appreciate the demands on the F&E account for these expenditures and can well understand how such a regrettable situation might occur.

Mr. BUNNING. We currently have a confusing situation where the FAA has informed Louisville that \$4.2 million in funds drawn down against the LOI in 1998 were for reimbursement for the ILS.

Mr. MCCAIN. As the Senator knows, the FAA routinely provides safety and navigational equipment to airports.

Mr. BUNNING. Yes, indeed. That is precisely the purpose of the language. The \$4.2 million the FAA designated as reimbursement is money the Louisville Airport would have received under the \$126 million LOI anyway. The provision in the legislation simply directs the FAA to amend the existing LOI with the Regional Airport Authority to increase it by \$5.68 million, thus reimbursing Louisville the total cost of the ILS.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is my understanding that a similar provision was included in the Statement of Managers accompanying the Transportation appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. BUNNING. That is correct.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator for his description of the situation, and I will be happy to continue to work to rectify this matter.

Mr. BUNNING. I thank the Senators for their assistance.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator STEVENS, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Elwell, a congressional fellow in Senator STEVENS' office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the pendency of the Senate consideration of S. 82.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the agreement of yesterday referencing the filing of amendments, Senator FITZGERALD be recognized and that it be in order for him to offer an amendment not previously filed, and that the amendment then be agreed to.

Prior to that, if it is agreeable with Senator FITZGERALD, Senator ASHCROFT wants to have 5 minutes to make a statement. I ask unanimous consent that prior to that, Senator ASHCROFT have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

#### NOMINATION OF RONNIE WHITE

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for affording me this opportunity to make some remarks regarding the vote on the nomination of Ronnie White.

Yesterday, in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement entered into last week, we set aside substantially over an hour to debate not only the White nomination but a number of other nominations which came before the Senate today. I was here for that debate, I engaged in that debate, and I outlined my opposition to Judge White, not my opposition based on anything personal or based on my distaste in any way for the judge, but based on my real reservations about his record as it relates to law enforcement.

After the conclusion of the vote today, there were a number of individuals who secured integrals of time to speak about that nomination and about that vote and raised questions that more properly should have been raised in the debate, and, secondly, deserve a response. So I come to respond in that respect.

I want to explain why I believe Judge White should not have been confirmed, and I believe the Senate acted favorably and appropriately in protecting the strong concerns raised by law enforcement officials.

The National Sheriffs Association expressed their very serious opposition to the nomination of Judge White. The Missouri Federation of Chiefs of Police expressed their opposition. The Missouri Sheriffs Association raised strong concerns and asked for a very serious consideration. In my conferences with law enforcement officials, prosecutors and judges, they raised serious concerns; so that when those who come to the floor today talk about this nomination in a context that is personal rather than professional and is political rather than substantive, I think they miss the point.

There are very serious matters addressed in his record that deserve the attention of the Senate and which, once having been reviewed by Members of the Senate, would lead Senators to the conclusion that, indeed, the Senate did the right thing.

Judge White's sole dissent in the Missouri v. Johnson, a brutal cop killer, an individual who killed three law enforcement officials over several hours, holding a small town in Missouri in a terrified condition, that opinion which sought to create new ground for allowing convicted killers who had the death