

most of the extraneous legislative riders in the bill. Under the conference agreement, the President was given the authority to waive implementation of these riders, most of which are attempts to weaken our environmental laws and regulations. Knowing the strong commitment that the President and Vice President have to protecting our environment, I am quite certain that the President will exercise his authority to ensure that these riders are not implemented. These legislative restrictions have no place on an appropriations bill to begin with. More importantly, they seriously undermine our commitment to ensure a healthy and safe environment for our children. Every poll indicates that the public expects the Government to be the public steward of our precious natural resources—our public lands, our air, and our water. That stewardship must not be abandoned.

This bill also addresses critical local issues. As all of my colleagues know, flooding in the Devils Lake Basin continues to pose serious problems for residents and businesses in North Dakota. Just this week, Devils Lake reached another 120-year high level and the lake is expected to rise by an additional two feet next June or July. When the lake rose to its current level last July, it caused \$50 million in damages to roads and public and private property in the area. Similar damages are expected this year.

Because of this serious situation, during the Senate's original consideration of this measure, Senator CONRAD and I proposed two amendments to mitigate the flooding problems at Devils Lake. Those amendments were adopted by the full Senate. The first amendment added \$10 million to the Economic Development Administration budget for hazard mitigation assistance in the form of road raises and water storage on private lands in the Devils Lake Basin. The second amendment provided an additional \$2.8 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service for water storage and for necessary repairs on their already damaged lands in the Devils Lake area. The House bill had no similar provisions.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly Senators HATFIELD, BYRD, HOLLINGS, GORTON and GREGG, for ensuring that the bulk of the money provided in our floor amendments was retained in conference. While there are no earmarks in the conference agreement, the statement of managers report makes clear that the Fish and Wildlife Service should give every consideration to the needs at Devils Lake in allocating the \$38.9 million in additional disaster relief funding made available to that agency in the conference agreement.

The total pot of disaster funding in the bill for the Economic Development Administration—\$18 million—is made available for disasters in the Pacific Northwest and for other disasters nationwide, so North Dakota will have to

compete with other States for that money. Senator CONRAD and I intend to work closely with the administration to ensure that Devils Lake receives its fair share of that funding. If we successful, we can take preventive measures to mitigate the anticipated flooding in the Devils Lake Basin this summer, and significantly reduce future Federal and State disaster assistance outlays.

While this is not a perfect agreement, it's a good compromise, and I am pleased that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues supported it. •

WELCOME TO DR. ABDALLA A. NSSOUR, DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to extend welcoming remarks to Dr. Abdalla A. Nssour, Deputy Prime Minister of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Dr. Nssour will be the honored guest at a dinner on May 2, 1996 in Livonia, MI. In addition, I would also like to welcome to Michigan His Excellency Fayez Tarawneh, Ambassador to the United States from Jordan, and Head of the Jordanian Delegation to the Middle East Peace Process. The American Arab Chamber of Commerce, Michigan, the Jordanian American Association of Michigan, and Royal Jordanian Airlines will be sponsoring the dinner honoring Dr. Nssour.

In addition to serving as Jordan's Deputy Prime Minister, Dr. Nssour also serves as the Minister of Higher Education and the Chair of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Jordanian Parliament. Prior to his esteemed government service, Dr. Nssour had many great accomplishments in the scientific community. I am certain that the dinner audience will be greatly enriched by Dr. Nssour's remarks.

It is most fitting that the Arab American community has chosen to honor Dr. Nssour for his service to his country and I am pleased to join the community in welcoming Dr. Nssour to Michigan. •

THE US MILITARY AND A NEW CENTURY: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, this week the Senate Armed Services Committee is engaged in marking up the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill. All of us on the committee, as well as many of my colleagues who are not on the defense committee, are concerned about how we fund, structure, equip, maintain and train our military forces to meet the challenges which our country faces today and will face tomorrow as we defend and advance our national interests. I would like to speak for a few moments today about some of the difficult questions I believe we are facing as we confront the challenges which lie ahead for our military forces.

The millennium is coming and beyond it a new century—a century which, if what we see occurring around us today offers any indication, will bring changes few of us can begin to imagine, no more than people at the end of the 19th century could have foretold what the 20th century would bring.

We need only to look at the incredible leaps which have occurred in technology in the past decade and the ever-increasing frequency with which new technological wonders are being introduced to know that the 21st Century will be a time of amazing change full of great opportunity and great risk for all of us.

The past years have shown us not only that new technologies are becoming more readily available—whether it is faster, smaller and cheaper computers and computer chips, inexpensive and reliable global positioning systems, or communications which permit us to bring into our homes hundreds of different television channels from around the world, movies on demand, and global news which is real-time and all too real—but that changes will have to come about in the way we organize our daily lives and the very structure of businesses and institutions in response to that technology. Those enterprises which fail to adapt to new technology quickly find themselves behind their competitors and, in the private sector, are soon out of business.

The same is true of national governments and military organizations—those which are unable to recognize that rapid change is the one constant in our lives and cannot exploit that change, risk falling behind their potential competitors. History teaches that every significant new industrial or technological advance finds its way into warfare. Unlike business, however, the price of failure for our national security is not bankruptcy or disappointed shareholders; it could well be the loss of our freedom, our foreign markets and the safe and prosperous future which all of us seek for our children.

Guaranteeing our security in the new century will require innovation. It will also require courage and wisdom as we incorporate technology and innovation into our defense structure.

To help structure the very important debate which I believe we need to engage in across the country on national security, I would like to offer a few observations and pose a few questions

First, as we look to the future, we ought to be asking a very basic question: What is it we want our military to be able to do? Not just in the sense of military capabilities—this is an important question we will get to shortly—rather, the broader question that underlies the other. What role do we want the United States to play in the next century and what will we need our military to be able to do in order for the US to play that role?

I believe that America's values and interests in the 21st century will demand that we play at least as active a role in the world as we did in this century and especially during the cold war. We can already see signs of this in the optempo rates of all our Armed Forces in the years since the fall of the Berlin Wall. We cannot shrink from playing our part as world leader, nor should we. To make a long story short, let me simply say that American leadership in world affairs increases the personal security and economic opportunities of the American people. This will be true in the next century as it is today.

We have now and will continue to have vital national interests in the security and stability of Europe, Southwest Asia, the Middle East, East Asia and elsewhere, just as we have vital interests in maintaining our freedom of access to sea- and air-lanes of transportation and commerce. We must be able to defend these interests and values and to support those who share them with us. We must continue to pursue them in the century ahead, as we have in the past, in concert with strategic allies and coalition partners. We should, if at all possible, try to go about this work with our allies, particularly our NATO and Pacific partners, but even with partners, it is essential that the military force we begin to structure in the final years of this century will enable us to fulfill our role of internationalist leader in the next century.

Second, we must consider and evaluate the sources of the challenges we are likely to face as we protect and advance our national interests in the international community of tomorrow. What kinds of regional hegemony are likely to develop in the years ahead and are any of them likely to graduate into a superpower status—either because they are smaller nations who obtain weapons of mass destruction or because they are larger nations who will have economic power coupled with weapons of mass destruction?

In the near term, the likelihood of a superpower—or “peer competitor” which could directly threaten the United States—is low. It is precisely this lack of a near-term, superpower, peer competitor which provides us with breathing room, a window of opportunity, if you will, in which we can reassess our military structures and be willing to take some risks in order to ensure our Armed Forces are properly structured, sized and equipped in the longer-term. We can afford to step back and take a look at where we are and where we want to go and to take some risk today to prevent a much greater risk in the future if we fail to make this reassessment.

Third, we must consider the form challenges to our interests are likely to take in the next century. Are conflicts likely to be of the cold war variety—either in the sense of needing to rely on our nuclear deterrent capabil-

ity or requiring massive numbers of ground forces as would have been needed to fight a Soviet invasion of Western Europe—or will they be on the order and scale of Haiti, Somalia, or Bosnia. I believe that, in the near- and mid-term, they are more likely to be of the latter sort. As Gen. Charles Krulak, Commandant of the Marine Corps and someone who is thinking long and hard about “the day after tomorrow,” has said, the future is most likely not “Son of Desert Storm;” rather, it will be “Stepchild of Somalia and Chechnya.”

We cannot rule out the possibility of another Saddam Hussein rising in a region of strategic interest to the United States nor can we discount the potential for a resurgence of Russian nationalism or aggressiveness, or Chinese or Islamic nationalism or aggressiveness particularly if coupled with the ability to deliver weapons of mass destruction. We must do all we can to prepare for such a possibility using every tool available to a country of our stature—economic, diplomatic, and military. To use the terminology of Secretary of Defense Perry, we must maintain a hedging capability to counter such threats if they arise. But we also must be ready for smaller contingencies which I believe will be more likely and, unfortunately, more frequent.

We also cannot ignore the unconventional challenges which we face today and which we will, without a doubt, face on a greater scale in the decades ahead. Here I mean the threat of terrorist actions beyond and within our borders and the ever-increasing dangers posed by the spread of relatively inexpensive weapons of mass destruction—especially chemical and biological weapons. We must have forces and policies which allow us to respond to all of these challenges and to head them off whenever we can.

Our strategic planners must think hard and innovatively about the way others—both states and non-state actors—will try to influence what we do in the future. In this regard, I recommend to you an article which appeared in the January 29th issue of the *Weekly Standard* by Col. Charles Dunlap, an Air Force lawyer and a provocative thinker and writer. In this article, entitled “How We Lost the High-Tech War of 2007,” a fictional Holy Leader of some unstated group recaps the strategy used to defeat the United States by terror and exploiting the power of televised images of death and destruction. In a particularly unsettling passage, he says:

Though we rarely defeated the Americans on the battlefield, we were able to inflict such punishment that they were soon pleading for peace at any price. With their economy in ruins, their borders compromised, their people demoralized, and civil unrest everywhere, they could not continue. We had broken their will! They had no choice but to leave us with the lands we conquered and the valuable resources they contain.

And finally, we are told: “We taught the Americans that no computer wages war with the exquisite finality of a

simple bayonet thrust.” So, while we work to exploit the technology of the future, we cannot afford to become its prisoner.

Fourth, we must confront the question of how to shape, size and equip our military forces in order for them to do what we want of them and to be able to confront—and defeat if need be—the wide range of challenges we will face. While all of the preceding questions are important, this question is the one toward which the other questions lead. It is, in fact, the reason why we must ask and answer the preceding questions.

When the Clinton administration came to office in 1993, Secretary of Defense Aspin undertook the Bottom-Up Review “to define the strategy, force structure, modernization programs, industrial base, and infrastructure needed to meet new dangers and seize new opportunities.” The Bottom-Up Review was a useful transitional document, but I believe it is already inadequate to the present and certainly to the future because it does not appropriately answer the preceding questions. The reality of the strategic environment has already changed and the resources we have committed to our military have been limited. It is time for a new strategic review by the Department of Defense on behalf of the President, and, I believe we would benefit at this time in our history from the work of an independent, bipartisan commission.

I hope that Congress will mandate before long both a new Bottom-Up Review and a National Bipartisan Commission. I am confident that dedicated and innovative thinkers both within the Administration and outside it will be able to put us on the right course for the next century. This must be done soon. I do not believe that we can afford—either fiscally or strategically—to continue to tinker at the margins of our military forces or to procure just the same sorts of Cold War systems in ever diminishing quantities (and at an ever-increasing price).

As we seek to answer the questions of how best to size, shape and equip our military forces, we must take a hard look at technology, defense organization and management, industrial base capabilities, and research and development capabilities where we have a competitive advantage over potential adversaries. Then, keeping in mind the warnings of thoughtful people like Charles Dunlap, we must exploit these advantages to structure and equip our forces appropriately. I would caution against thinking of “defense innovation” strictly in terms of developing new technologies. That is overly simplistic and potentially dangerous. Innovation must incorporate organization, strategy, and doctrine as well. If we are to succeed in the new century, we must be innovative in our thinking about what we procure and how we procure it, the way our forces are organized and sized, and the way they will respond to challenges which may be unlike most of what we have encountered so far in our history.

It is conventional wisdom today to say that a technology-driven revolution in military affairs is here. The technological advances I spoke of earlier beckon us to find ways to integrate what will be commonplace tomorrow into the decisions we are making today on weapons systems, command and control systems, intelligence gathering capabilities, and the means of conducting and defeating information warfare.

As a subset of this question, we must consider "how do we get from here to there?" What is our transition strategy? How do we ensure that we do not reverse course in our procurement strategies so precipitously that important defense industries find themselves gutted of their skilled work forces, critical research and development, or essential near-term production? How do we ensure that we do not make technologically-driven alterations in our force structure that diminish the effectiveness and morale of our troops?

Government and industry need to form a new partnership in which both sides work together to ensure that we develop and buy the right products at the right price and in the right quantities to protect our national security without fiscally overburdening the Nation. We cannot afford the luxury of buying products which do not provide the capabilities we need for tomorrow. Nor can we afford to procure weapons systems which just provide more of the capabilities we already possess.

Throughout all of this runs the very serious question of fiscal resources. The traditional question "how much is enough?" is no longer sufficient—if, in fact, it ever was. We cannot be concerned just with aggregate spending levels though much of the current and future debate will center on the "right number" for the defense budget for this fiscal year or during the Future Years Defense Plan, or FYDP. If we are to succeed in making the best use of limited defense dollars, we must also ask "are we spending defense dollars wisely?"

If we hope to be able to maintain the support of our people for spending to protect our national security, we must be able to demonstrate that we have broken the chains of tradition and parochialism within the Congress, the Executive branch and in the military services and are investing in a military force for the future not the past.

The debate which many of us in the Congress have been and are engaged in must stay focused on the right questions. There is a danger that liberal Democrats, many of whom want to cut defense spending to increase social spending, will join Republican budget hawks, who want to cut defense spending to reduce the deficit, to form an odd-couple defense-cutting coalition.

But neither group, as far as I can see, is asking the right questions before recommending that defense spending should be cut. And neither group acknowledges that we are spending a smaller percentage of our GDP on de-

fense today than at any time since Pearl Harbor. Total defense expenditures may be able to be reduced in future years—although I am skeptical—but we won't know if this is the right decision until we answer the basic questions I have posed: what are the security challenges of the next century and what do we need to meet them?

There are, in fact, a number of thoughtful studies underway today which are examining these questions. Each of them seems to start with the premise that our current force structure may well be most appropriate for the kinds of conflict which will occur least often in the future. We need to pursue this premise not as a means of hacking away at one service or another just for the sake of downsizing or as a means of capturing savings to procure one favored weapons system over another, but because technology may have the same potential to achieve personnel reductions in the military as it has in the private sector. Military success in the future will depend on how visionary and clear-headed we are today and on how courageous we are prepared to be.

Remember the familiar line from Ralph Waldo Emerson's *Self-Reliance*, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines." We have the intellectual strength in this country today both in the Pentagon and outside to ensure we do not maintain a foolish consistency and that we break with the models and standards of the past if that is what is best for our Nation's security.

Andy Marshall and Bill Owens have certainly laid the groundwork for such thinking within the Pentagon. Organizations such as the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments have been active, creative and constructive in contributing to the debate with their analyses. The American Enterprise Institute, under the leadership of Dick Cheney and Richard Perle, and the Democratic Leadership Council, which I have the privilege of chairing, have completed studies or have work underway which have or will offer innovative and thought-provoking analyses and proposals. Taking these efforts in conjunction with my proposals for a new strategic review by the Department of Defense and an independent National Bipartisan Commission, I believe we can and will get it right, though the conclusions we come to may be painful for many to accept.

We must be engaged in this difficult debate today if we are to have the best defense tomorrow and avoid maintaining the world's finest fighting force for wars we have already fought. We must also engage in it in order to rebuild the popular consensus which is essential for our national security in support of sufficient defense spending. If we involve more of our citizens in these discussions, Congress and the American people will be willing to provide the necessary resources, because they will

understand that Sir John Slessor was right when he said:

It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditure on armaments as conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free.

If we are, in fact, going to do our duty to keep the American people "alive and free," we must engage in this debate with all our energy, our intellect and our courage. We owe this to the people who have sent us to the Senate to serve them and we owe it to the future of our great country. I hope my remarks today will be seen as a contribution to this important debate and I look forward to engaging all of my colleagues in these important discussions. ●

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN M. SANDERS,
THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SMALL
BUSINESS ACCOUNTANT ADVOCATE OF THE YEAR

●Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate a hard working New Hampshire accountant, Susan M. Sanders, on being named the 1996 New Hampshire Small Business Accountant Advocate of the Year. The Small Business Administration recently honored Susan with this award based on a number of criteria such as volunteer work to assist small firms, advocacy of a reduction of financial and regulatory requirements for small businesses, and support for initiatives to promote legislation strengthening the financial help of small businesses.

Susan is a certified public accountant and supervisor at Melanson, Greenwood & Co., a CPA firm in Nashua. She specializes in small business accounting and management advisory services with emphasis on startup businesses. She provides assistance to small business people seeking counseling and consulting services on financial and management matters. Susan also prepares a quarterly publication of statistical information entitled *Economic Conditions In NH*, which is distributed free through the Nashua and Manchester Chambers of Commerce to business and government leaders, and is included in relocation packages mailed to prospective employers. Susan's commitment to the success of small businesses is also reflected by her outstanding volunteer work for local organizations such as the Nashua Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Nashua Center for Economic Development, and the Nashua Small Business Development Center.

As a dedicated small business accountant, Susan believes that small business owners are a special breed of people that should be admired for their determination, innovation, and courage. Susan's own work with small businesses demonstrates many of these same qualities.

Small business is not only the backbone of our economy, but an expression