

I close with this last comment. The call for openness at the World Trade Organization is a pro-trade position. It will strengthen this organization. Sunshine will be beneficial to the cause of free and expanded trade, a cause that I have consistently voted for in my years in the U.S. Congress. But if there is a continued lack of accountability, if there is a continued obsession with secrecy, I believe that is going to undermine the cause of expanded trade in the world. I am very hopeful that as we look to bring more openness to the World Trade Organization, we will see the importance of doing the public's business in public all through the world.

Mr. President, many of our colleagues are aware that I am trying to bring more openness to the U.S. Senate, with Senator GRASSLEY, by barring the right of a Senator to put a secret hold or objection on business here in the U.S. Senate. So I am very hopeful that this year will see changes, changes in the rules in the U.S. Senate, that will bring more openness to the way decisions are made here, changes at the World Trade Organization so there is more openness and more accountability in the way decisions are made there.

I hope I will be able to come back to this floor in the months ahead without this poster, and say the World Trade Organization has taken down the "private" signs and shown the public how it is making its decisions and why. Doing the public's business in public is more likely to generate confidence in the important decisions that are made at the World Trade Organization and here in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for about 7 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my friend.

ALASKA LANDS BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of S. 660, known as the University of Alaska lands bill.

Alaska entered the Union in 1959 as the largest State with about 360 million to 365 million acres of land, an area one-fifth the size of the United States. As part of our Statehood Compact, we were to be treated like other States and, from the standpoint of land provided for our land grant education system, namely the University of Alaska, we were to be accorded a reason-

able amount of land for our land grant college.

Today, Alaska ranks 48th out of 50 States in the federal land granted for higher education. We have approximately 112,000 acres. It is important that I put this in perspective, because the State of New Mexico has 1.3 million acres; Oklahoma has 1,050,000 acres; Indiana has 436,000 acres; New York, 990,000 acres. And here sits Alaska, 48th, with 112,000 acres.

Something is lacking with regard to the issue of equity. We are the only federal land grant college in the country without the federal land. We received less than one-half of the Federal land that was promised. There is only one other State that has less land in its land grant system, and that is the State of Delaware with approximately 90,000 acres. Here is Alaska with 360 million acres receiving 112,000; New Mexico and Oklahoma over 1 million acres.

This bill I have offered provides the university with land to support itself financially and to continue, obviously, to act as a responsible steward of the land for the education of our greatest resource, our children.

Specifically, this bill would grant the university 250,000 acres of Federal land within our State. I might add that the Federal Government has approximately two-thirds of the landmass of our State, which is somewhere in the area of 200 million acres. So we are not talking about transferring very much. We are talking about 250,000 acres out of 200 million, or thereabouts.

In addition to this initial grant, if the State of Alaska chooses to grant the University land, we propose an acre for acre match, up to 250,000 additional federal acres. This option would be solely at the option of the State.

Again, the bill would provide 250,000 acres to be transferred to the State of Alaska, specifically for its university land grant system, and then if the State provides additional acres, there would be a provision for up to another 250,000 acres of matching Federal land.

There are areas that the university cannot select land from within the Federal domain. They cannot select land within conservation units; they cannot select land within the LUD II areas designated in the Tongass National Forest. They cannot select land conveyed to the State or Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act Corporation land. They cannot select land with connection to any Federal military institution.

This legislation also provides for what we think is a legitimate exchange, because the university does hold some rather sensitive land. They have land on the Alaska Peninsula in the Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. The university has land in the Kenai Fjords National Park. The university has lands in the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve and the Denali Park and Preserve. The University would be required to relinquish these lands under this legislation.

To give you some idea of some of the inholdings the university has, many, many years ago there was a major discovery in Glacier Bay National Park by the Newmont Mining Company, and that was a large nickel reserve. It has never been mined, but it was patented. The patent was turned over to the university. They are willing to give some very sensitive environmental lands back to the Federal Government in exchange for a fulfillment of their federal land grant.

It is not without equity, Mr. President. I know of no other State that has given lands back to the federal government in exchange for lands given to it for its higher educational system.

S. 660 allows the State the option to participate in the process, as I indicated. I think it is time the Federal Government lived up to its commitment to the State of Alaska, as it has to the other States, by allowing Alaska to participate in a realistic Federal land grant for the education of the young people of our State.

Let me advise the Presiding Officer how this process would basically be addressed. The University of Alaska, like most universities, has a board of regents. In our case, the board of regents is appointed by the Governor. They bear the responsibility of responding not only to the legislature and the Governor but the people of Alaska on how they utilize the land.

Clearly, some of the land would be for development to help fund the university and would set up an endowment. We often look with envy to our sister State, the State of Washington to the south, where the University of Washington has large landholdings in the downtown Seattle area. From those leases which the university holds, there has been significant real estate development. The funding from the lease payments goes to the university, an endowment of sorts, and funds the university's needs.

Some have expressed the concern that this land may be developed and there will not be the careful consideration given relative to the balance associated with how the land is used. But that is a legitimate responsibility of the board of regents. My answer is, if you cannot trust the board of regents, appointed people who are accountable to other Alaskans, as well as our Governor and the legislature, who can you trust?

So I think what we have here, Mr. President, is an issue that begs the question of why Alaska should be treated any differently than any other State. We should have a reasonable amount of land for our land-grant college.

We are faced with a situation where we have an institution somewhat in crisis because it does not have the ability to have funding from an endowment, and, as a consequence, its entire operational budget must be met annually by the State legislature, which has resulted in a decline in maintenance

and other normal types of expenditures that most land grant university systems enjoy from the endowment that is generated from the landholdings that they have. But that is not the case with Alaska, and that is why we feel it is so important to rectify this situation.

I conclude by indicating that some of America's environmental groups are in opposition to this. They are fearful that the university will make Federal land selections and develop that land. My answer to that is, what is wrong with responsible development? It provides jobs, it provides a tax base, and it would provide a regular source of funding for the university. To suggest that we cannot develop certain areas within strict accordance with environmental considerations I think is really selling Alaska and America's can-do technology short. We can responsibly develop these areas if given the opportunity.

In the interest of equity and fairness, I encourage my colleagues to reflect on the merits of treating Alaska in the same manner in which other States were treated when they came into the Union by adequately funding their land-grant holdings so that they can meet the needs of the higher education system; namely, the University of Alaska.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Senate continued with consideration of the treaty.

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

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I know we have a pending amendment. I would like to speak on the whole issue of NATO enlargement at this time because I was not able to make my opening statement yesterday at the appointed time because we had the other amendment of which I was cosponsor with Senator SMITH.

I believe this Senate will not vote on a more important matter than the one before the Senate this week. The advocates of unfettered enlargement of NATO argue that we are expanding the frontiers of freedom in Europe. It is true that freedom won the cold war. But the spirit of that freedom was the American commitment to defend Europe against the Soviet Union.

Therefore, at the heart of this debate is a simple question: Is the United States prepared to add countries to the list of those that we pledge to defend as

we would our own shores? In answering that question, the Senate should look to the future. Instead, many supporters of the resolution have been talking about the past.

They have argued, not without merit, that expanding NATO is necessary to correct the map of Europe that was drawn incorrectly at the end of World War II. And many argue that it is right and just that these three countries before us today become part of the West, since the West turned its back on them at Yalta more than half a century ago.

I think the Senate should be looking to the future to decide if this idea is the right one at this time. What are the future threats to Transatlantic security? Is expanding the alliance the best means of addressing those threats? Must the United States continue to be the glue that holds Europe together, as was necessary during the cold war?

This is an interesting time to consider expanding our military obligations. Today, the President has said the United States will have an open-ended commitment of thousands of U.S. troops in Bosnia. This mission has already cost the United States \$8 billion. That is in addition to our NATO requirement, our commitment, our allotment. It appears likely that a major conflict will break out in the Serb province of Kosovo, raising the question whether U.S. troops will be drawn deeper into the morass.

We have also learned just this week that the chief U.N. weapons inspector has declared that Iraq's Saddam Hussein has not complied with U.N. resolutions to destroy his biological and chemical weapons, so the allies may have to take military action to force him to comply. Again, that will mean a disproportionate burden for the United States.

While we are adding new commitments, our military readiness is in decline. Last year, the military had its worst recruiting year since 1979. The Army failed to meet its objective to recruit infantry soldiers, the single most important specialty of the Army. At the National Training Center, where our troops go for advanced training, units rotating in typically come with a 60-percent shortage in mechanics and a 50-percent shortage in infantry. These are often due to the fact that these personnel are deployed abroad for missions such as Bosnia, so advance training is suffering.

This year, more than 350 Air Force pilots have turned down the \$60,000 bonuses they would have received to remain in the cockpit another 5 years. A 29-percent acceptance rate for the bonus compares with 59 percent last year and 81 percent in 1995.

Recently, a lack of critical parts for F-16 aircraft forced two fighter squadrons in Italy to cannibalize grounded aircraft to ensure they can continue to conduct the NATO peace enforcement mission over Bosnia.

Mr. President, these are just some of the indicators that show our military

is being stretched too thin. The fact is, these defense cuts that we have made over the last few years of almost 50 percent have put our security at risk. This has been made worse by the diversion of U.S. resources and readiness in Bosnia and elsewhere.

In the midst of all this, the President presents the Senate with a proposal to expand NATO to include three new countries without first answering such questions as what is the mission of a post-cold war NATO? The Senate has been put in a dilemma. On one side, we have colleagues who strongly support the resolution of ratification and oppose conditions and reservations that any of us may wish to add.

Throughout this debate, I have heard supporters say that the proposal to add these new members is moral and just and needs no further thought. We have been told that the United States owes these countries membership in NATO, and it has been implied that to question this assumption is to question the very merits of the cold war and NATO's role in winning that role.

Many of us who have reservations about this proposal are the strongest supporters of NATO—I certainly am—and our American leadership in the alliance is also very important. I think NATO is the best defense alliance that has ever been put together in the history of the world. I want to make sure we preserve it, which is why I am questioning some of the assumptions about enlargement that are not based on any facts that we have seen and which have been brought up at the North Atlantic Council or in the U.S. Senate.

There are many other places in the world where only the United States can and will lead. I cherish the role that NATO played in winning the cold war, and it is because of that commitment to support NATO that I take the ramifications of enlargement so seriously.

Many of us with reservations want to see the United States take its fair place in the world and assume its fair share of the responsibility. But we do not think we should be involved in every regional conflict, dissipating our strength and endangering our role as a superpower, a superpower capable of responding where no one else can or will. This doctrine was set in this country as far back as John Quincy Adams, who said to the American people that we will be tempted to go out and right every wrong, but if we do, we will dissipate our strength and we will no longer be effective.

On the other side of the dilemma is the failure of the President to negotiate conditions that address U.S. costs and the heavy burden for European security that we already bear. He promised the three countries under consideration—all of whom are worthy countries—that their admission into the alliance was a fait accompli.

But too many issues remain open, and it has been left to the full Senate the responsibility, a responsibility unsuited to a legislative body, I might