



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1998

No. 105

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, You have loved, forgiven, and cared for us. In Your holy presence, any self-sufficiency fades like a candlelight before the rising sun. Awaken us again to the wonder of Your unqualified grace. May the radiance of Your Spirit invade our hearts, vanishing all the gloom and darkness of worry and fear and anxiety.

Father, set us free to do our work today with joy and gladness. The people in our lives desperately need Your love. Liberate us with the sure knowledge of Your unfailing love so that we will be able to be free to love unselfishly. Speak to us now so that we may be energized with new life and new power. We claim this in the assurance of Your love divine, all loves excelling! Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I will lay out the plan for today.

This morning, the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 9:30 a.m. Following morning business, under a previous order, the Senate will begin consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill. All Members are encouraged to come to the floor early during today's session to offer and debate any amendments to the defense bill. The first votes of to-

day's session will occur in a stacked series beginning at approximately 2 p.m. These votes will include any remaining amendments to the Treasury appropriations bill and possibly several amendments to the defense bill. Members should expect votes late into the evening during today's session, as the Senate attempts to complete action on the defense bill.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY and Mr. HAGEL pertaining to the introduction of S. 2371 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2371 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the defense appropriations bill, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2132) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have given the clerk a list of staff members. I ask unanimous consent that these staff members associated with our presentation of the bill be allowed the privilege of the floor during consideration of the defense bill.

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

The list is as follows:

Sid Ashworth, Tom Hawkins, Susan Hogan, Mary Marshall, Gary Reese, John Young, James Hayes, Justin Weddle, Carolyn Willis, Jennifer Stiefel, Frank Barca, and Kristin Iagulli.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senate begins consideration today of the 1999 Defense appropriations bill, to fund the military activities of the Department of Defense for the upcoming fiscal year.

This bill provides \$250.5 billion in new budget authority for 1999, an increase of \$2.8 billion over the amount appropriated in 1998.

The committee reported this bill on June 4th. Unforeseen circumstances delayed the consideration of the bill, but I believe it is vital that we pass the Defense funding bill prior to the recess.

The military must know how much money it will have to meet critical

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S9323

operational and modernization requirements at the beginning of the fiscal year, October 1.

Fiscal year 1999 represents the first budget cycle under the 5 year bipartisan budget agreement—the amount requested by the President corresponds to the cap agreed to for Defense.

That results in a fundamentally different dynamic for balancing this bill compared to fiscal years 1996, 1997 and 1998.

For the previous three fiscal years, Congress and the White House were at odds over the total level of funding for Defense. The budget submitted by the Pentagon failed to fully accommodate the readiness and modernization priorities of the Joint Chiefs.

For 1999, the committee received a budget proposal consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement—not enough for Defense, but at the level agreed to last summer at the summit.

The content of that budget reflected the priorities and strategy of the Quadrennial Defense Review, submitted by Secretary Cohen and Gen. Joe Ralston last spring. The FY 1999 budget kept faith with the concepts and priorities advocated in the QDR.

I want to begin by commending Secretary Cohen and Deputy Secretary John Hamre for their efforts to present a budget that did not require a major overhaul by Congress.

We do not agree on every item, and fact of life events resulted in adjustments on many programs, but essentially, this budget request meets the minimum needs of the Armed Forces.

The recommendations from the committee focus on three goals: ensure an adequate quality of life for the men and women of the Armed Forces; sustain readiness; and modernize to assure future battlefield dominance by our Armed Forces, if needed.

To achieve needed quality of life for our troops, and their families, this bill fully funds the 3.1 percent authorized military pay raise.

During consideration of the DOD authorization bill in June, I joined the managers of that bill in co-sponsoring an amendment to increase the pay raise to 3.6 percent for 1999.

The first amendment that Senator INOUE and I will jointly offer to this bill will provide the additional appropriation for the 3.6 percent raise.

Additionally, the Treasury-General Government bill that we will pass later today provides a comparable pay raise for civilian Pentagon workers. Those amounts are funded from within the general operation and maintenance appropriations.

The pay raise solves only a part of the compensation crisis facing the Department of Defense.

My discussions with the service chiefs, the service secretaries, field commanders and the men and women of the Armed Forces, serving in my State of Alaska and around the world, lead me to conclude that an equally pressing challenge is retirement pay.

The changes adopted by Congress in 1986 reflected the cold war priority of attracting men and women to serve a full 30 year career in the Armed Forces.

Our victory in the cold war led to a wrenching realignment of the force, and radical new personnel priorities.

There is great pressure today for individuals to spend only 20 years in active service. The revised retirement plan puts them at an unfair, and unacceptable disadvantage, as compared to serving a full 30 years.

It is my intention to work with the leaders here in Congress, and with the Secretary of Defense, to put us on a track to fix the retirement system—in my mind, there is no higher defense funding priority, for it has led to a series of decisions by men and women in the services, not to continue because of their feeling about the unfairness of the retirement policies.

The considerable operational demands on our Armed Forces dictate that we also ensure the welfare and quality of life for those on active duty now.

Based on the committee's recent trip to Bosnia and Southwest Asia, a new \$50 million MWR and retention initiative is included in this bill.

These funds will provide added resources and flexibility to address the tough living conditions and family separation challenges of deployments to Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

More than \$100 million is added for quality of life enhancements in the service O&M accounts, to upgrade barracks, dormitories, and other personnel support facilities.

Our second focus, maintaining readiness, has been stressed by overseas deployments during the past three years.

For 1998, this committee succeeded in providing needed contingency funds as an emergency, without disrupting other Defense programs.

For 1999, the recommendation adds funds for flying hours, depot maintenance, training, and base operations.

We recommend savings resulting from changed economic factors, such as fuel costs, foreign currency, and inflation—but restore all those amounts to the O&M appropriations.

There is no option to trade near term readiness for future modernization. As long as our Armed Forces face the range of missions overseas underway today, we must sustain the O&M accounts at least at the levels provided in this bill, and the House bill.

No sector of Defense has suffered more the past few years than acquisition. We must invest more to protect the technological superiority that our smaller military force counts on.

These recommendations fully fund the combat priorities advocated by the Joint Chiefs: F-22, the Crusader, F-18, new attack submarine, the JASSM missile, V-22, and national missile defense.

In many instances, the recommendations add funds for technology development programs, to look even further

down the road, past the systems we will deploy over the next ten years—out for the next thirty years.

Achieving these three priorities was especially challenging given our fixed budget caps.

Every dollar shifted among programs came from a reduction to an item in the budget request—there were no additional dollars to spend this year for Defense.

Senator INOUE and I sought to allocate the resources available to the subcommittee as equitably as possible, and consistent with the military needs identified by the Chiefs.

In most cases, we could not provide large increases in existing procurement programs, or to restore programs already terminated.

No member of this committee, or the Senate, secured every priority which he or she advocated to the committee. On the other hand, we reviewed all of them, and have done our best.

I believe the recommendations are fair and achieve a balance between the budget and the priorities of Congress. It is my intention to do everything we can to work with all of our colleagues to meet the needs they have brought to the Committee.

Finally, there is one notable change from the bill reported last year by this Committee—in the area of medical research.

In the bill we reported last year, we provided \$176 million for medical research. Coming out of conference, that total grew to \$344 million, almost twice the level of the Senate.

In the context of adding \$6 billion to the budget, that total was manageable.

Let me explain that again. Last year, we had an additional \$6 billion by the time we came out of the conference, and it was possible to increase that amount. This year, we have no top line margin to allocate. Whatever is added to this bill will come out of either readiness, or future acquisition, or the quality of life concepts that I have discussed.

For 1999, Senator INOUE and I recommended a new appropriations of \$250 million in the defense health program for medical research grants.

This increase over last year's appropriation provides adequate resources to sustain growth in the breast cancer and prostate cancer programs, while enabling the Department of review other research programs and opportunities. The report lists all the programs seeking funding this year.

The bill establishes a floor for breast cancer and prostate cancer research at the minimum; at least they must be provided at the level that we finally agreed to in conference in 1998.

The bill also seeks to address the funding priorities of the National Guard. In testimony before the subcommittee, the Army Guard identified as shortfall for 1999 \$634 million for their operational requirements—not for future involvement for just their operational requirements.

The bill reported by the committee provides an additional \$20 million for the Guard counterdrug operation, \$225 million for the Army Guard O&M account, and \$95 million for Army Guard personnel account.

A total of \$475 million will be added to the National Guard and Reserve equipment. That is a cut, however, of 25 percent from the level appropriated in 1998.

Finally, the bill reported by the committee did not include the \$1.9 billion requested by the President as emergency spending for Bosnia.

The Senate considered several amendments during debate on the defense authorization bill concerning our future force levels and operations in Bosnia.

Later this morning, I know Senator HUTCHISON, Senator BYRD, and others will raise at least one amendment related to our presence in Bosnia.

At the time we considered this bill in the Appropriations Committee, it was premature for this committee to consider funding for that mission for 1999.

Based on our visit to Bosnia in May, and to NATO headquarters after that, it is clear that a long-term presence in Bosnia is envisioned by NATO and the administration.

That long-term role cannot in the future be funded on an annual emergency basis. The Congress must be part of the decision on the size of the force, the duration of the mission, and the cost of the operations.

Mr. President, we bring this bill to the Senate with the hope of commencing the August recess tomorrow. Securing passage of this bill at a reasonable hour will require the cooperation, consideration, and assistance of every Senator.

It is my hope that we will obtain early today an agreement to have all amendments filed at the desk so we can most efficiently dispose of those amendments—accepting some, debating some, and encouraging Members not to raise others.

This bill has been available to all Members since June 5. The bill closely approximates the level authorized in the defense bill we passed last June.

That authorization bill is in conference with the House, and we have continued to work closely with Senator THURMOND, Senator LEVIN, and others on that committee to support the priorities passed by the Senate in that bill.

Mr. President, the presentation of this bill to the Senate would not be possible without the leadership and partnership that I have enjoyed with my friend from Hawaii, Senator INOUE.

This is the tenth year that the two of us have come to the Senate jointly to present and recommend the defense appropriations bills. Six of those years Senator INOUE served as chairman, and I have enjoyed that privilege for the past four.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to work with the Senator from Hawaii on

defense matters and other matters. I enjoy our personal friendship. And the opportunity to bring this bill to the Senate on a full bipartisan basis is one that I think comes from the tie between us that we enjoy.

Mr. President, I yield to Senator INOUE for his statement.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, may I first thank my dear colleague from Alaska for his very generous remarks. It has been a pleasure to work with him for the past 10 years. We hope that together we have been able to present to the U.S. Senate a bipartisan approach to this very important subject.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999, S. 2132, as reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill contains funding for the Department of Defense for the upcoming year, excluding amounts for military construction.

The total recommended is \$250.5 billion. This is about \$840 million less than was requested by the administration, but about \$2.8 billion more than funded for fiscal year 1998.

Within these amounts, the committee has recommended full funding to support our men and women in uniform.

This includes a 3.1-percent pay raise as requested by the President. Later today, the chairman will offer an amendment to increase that to 3.6 percent, the amount authorized by the Senate last month. I strongly support this amendment.

Also at the chairman's initiative, the committee is recommending \$50 million to initiate a new fund for morale, welfare, and recreation.

This new appropriation account will support the personnel support needs of our men and women serving on contingency deployments in Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

Last May, Senator STEVENS led a delegation of members from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

It was apparent in our discussions with these units that the deployments for these contingencies were beginning to impair the retention of critically skilled individuals and that morale was starting to suffer.

The delegation unanimously concluded that we needed to do more to support our troops serving in these areas.

The chairman's initiative will help ease the burden of these long overseas deployments and show our men and women in uniform that the Congress has not forgotten them.

Mr. President, this is a very good bill, which meets the national security needs of our Nation, but within the fiscal constraints that have been agreed upon in this balanced budget environment.

I should point out to my colleagues that this bill does not provide any funding for Bosnia.

The President submitted a budget amendment to the Congress requesting an appropriation of \$1.29 billion in emergency funding to maintain our troops in Bosnia.

When the committee marked up this bill, it was unclear what action the Senate would take on Bosnia.

It is my hope that this matter will be resolved in conference or through a supplemental spending measure at a later date.

Let me assure my colleagues that the committee will not shirk from our responsibility to support funding for our forces assigned overseas, no matter where they are located. This matter will be addressed at a later date.

Mr. President, I want to close by commending our chairman and his staff for the fine work that they have done in putting this bill together. As many of you recognize, this is a huge bill. Nearly half of our Government's discretionary resources are contained in this one appropriations bill.

There are an enormous number of programs that must be reviewed and recommended by the chairman and his staff before this measure can be reported to the Senate. That task is made more difficult by the thousands of requests for billions of dollars that are made by the Members of this body.

I want to salute the majority staff which really has done yeoman's work in putting this bill together for the Senate. It is a small staff, many have been with the Appropriations Committee for several years. They transcend the political divisions that sometimes divide this Senate. The staff is led by Steve Cortese who has been by the chairman's side for the past decade and it includes, Sid Ashworth, Tom Hawkins, Susan Hogan, Mary Marshall, Mazie Mattson, Gary Reese, John Young, Justin Weddle, and on assignment as a legislative fellow, Ms. Carolyn Willis.

Mr. President, the Senate owes them a deep debt of gratitude.

Under Chairman STEVENS' leadership, the resulting bill is a well-balanced product, crafted in a completely bipartisan fashion. It meets the needs of the military services and also fully considers the priorities of the Senate and the American taxpayers.

This is a good bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Before ending my presentation, I would like to reflect upon a few things that have just come across my mind in the past few minutes.

Chairman STEVENS and I are what some of us call dinosaurs of the Senate. Admittedly, we are chronologically a bit old. Both of us served in World War II, the ancient war. I would like my colleagues to recall that in that war 16 million men and women served—16 million. Today, we are calling upon less than 1 percent of our Nation's population—one-half of 1 percent—to stand

in harm's way for us, to risk their lives for us. Some have suggested that this is too much spending. As far as I am concerned, if any person is willing to stand in harm's way in my behalf, he or she gets the best.

There are many programs that have been carried out at the chairman's initiative that he is too humble to even mention. He has been in the forefront of medical research, and I am proud to say that, working with him, we have been able to come up with a breast cancer program that is being acclaimed worldwide—not just nationally. Scientists from all over the world come to work with the Army Research Center. It may not be evident to many of my colleagues, but some of the best research being done on AIDS is being done by the U.S. Army. The same can be said for prostate cancer and other tropical diseases.

I began my closing remarks by saying there were 16 million American men and women who served with us in World War II. It was at a time when our population was about 100 million. Today, our population is over 250 million, and we are asking 1.3 million to defend all of us.

I concur with my chairman: This is the minimum, this meets the minimum needs of our military. If budgetary constraints were not placed upon us, I am certain we would come forth with something a bit more generous. After all, Mr. President, you and I want our children and our grandchildren to go to college, we want to be able to have a car in the garage, three meals a day. That is part of the American way of life. I believe that men and women in the service should also aspire to the American way of life, and I am sorry to say that this measure may not provide all that is necessary, but we are striving for the best.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I reciprocate in thanking my good friend for his comments. It is interesting when we reflect back on World War II. We as a nation knew who we were, what we were doing, and we had unanimous support for what we were doing. Today, each of us faces comments from time to time about our commitment to defense and questions of whether we could not cut this budget. If anything, we should have a great deal more money. I shall speak to the Senate later about that during the consideration of this bill.

Let me point out to Members of the Senate that we have knowledge of 46 amendments on this bill. We have reviewed them with our staff and with the staff of those who will present those amendments, and 23 of them we are prepared to accept. Of the balance, 13 of them we have not seen. It would be very helpful if Members will bring their amendments to us so that we can look at them and determine whether or not we can work with the person who

wishes to present the amendment and accept it or modify it in a way that it becomes acceptable. I expect we will have some substantial votes today and into the night. But it will be much easier for all of us if we can see these amendments and we can try to find some way to accommodate the needs of the Senate and the demand of our defense spending with the individual desires of Members of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 3391

(Purpose: To provide a 3.6 percent pay raise for military personnel during Fiscal Year 1999)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I mentioned in my statement that we have a 3.1 percent pay raise in this bill. I want to send to the desk, and do send to the desk, an amendment. It is sponsored by myself and my friend from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and Mr. INOUE, proposes an amendment numbered 3391.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, in between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104(a) On page 34, line 24, strike out all after "\$94,500,000" down to and including "1999" on page 35, line 7.

(b) On page 42, line 1, strike out the amount "\$2,000,000,000", and insert the amount "\$1,775,000,000".

(c) In addition to funds provided under title I of this Act, the following amounts are hereby appropriated: for "Military Personnel Army", \$58,000,000; for "Military Personnel Navy", \$43,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$14,000,000; for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$44,000,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$5,377,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$3,684,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$1,103,000; for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$1,000,000; for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$9,392,000; and for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$4,112,000".

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount available in this Act for "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense", real property maintenance is hereby decreased by reducing the total amounts appropriated in the following accounts: "Operation and Maintenance, Army", by \$58,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", by \$43,000,000; "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", by \$14,000,000; and "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", by \$44,000,000.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading "National Guard and Reserve Equipment", is hereby reduced by \$24,668,000.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment will raise the military pay to 3.6 percent. This pay raise will add \$185 million to the Active Forces, Guard, and Reserve pay accounts. Over the last year, our committee has heard repeatedly in both hearings with the service chiefs and during field visits to Bosnia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Alaska,

and other places throughout the world that our military members perceive an erosion of existing benefits. This adjustment in pay matches the private sector wage growth at a time when many service members are questioning the value of continued service due to an increasing pace of deployments.

Some economists estimate that the pay gap between the private sector and the military may be as high as 13.5 percent. This amendment will, at a minimum, provide a fairer base for military pay raises in the future.

I ask if my friend has any comments to make in regard to this amendment. He is a cosponsor.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, my only comment is that I wish we could have provided much more than this.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for adoption of the amendment. That is consistent with the authorization bill, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3391) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3392

(Purpose: To provide additional funds for U.S. military operations in Bosnia as an emergency requirement)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we have tried to be consistent with the authorization bill. As this bill came out of committee, the authorization bill did not meet the contingency operations in Bosnia as requested by the President. I send to the desk an amendment and state to the Senate that, if it is adopted, it will conform the handling of the moneys in this bill for Bosnia with the authorization bill as it has been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 3392.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. . For an additional amount for "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund," \$1,858,600,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, the defense health program appropriations and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided*

further, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Mr. STEVENS. This does conform, as I indicated, with the decision of the defense authorization committee for the handling of the Bosnia money.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am pleased to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further discussion, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3392) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nancy Gilmore-Lee, a fellow assigned to my staff, be provided floor privileges during consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that James Bynum, a Capitol Hill fellow serving on Senator McCain's staff, be granted privileges of the floor during debate and any votes concerning this bill, as well as any related amendments.

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

Mr. STEVENS. My previous request and Senator INOUE's request applied to time during votes, Mr. President.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3393

(Purpose: To impose a limitation on deployments of United States forces to Yugoslavia, Albania, or Macedonia)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] proposes an amendment numbered 3393.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 99, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8104. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under

this Act may be obligated or expended for any deployment of forces of the Armed Forces of the United States to Yugoslavia, Albania, or Macedonia unless and until the President, after consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the Senate, transmits to Congress a report on the deployment that includes the following:

(1) The President's certification that the presence of those forces in each country to which the forces are to be deployed is necessary in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The reasons why the deployment is in the national security interests of the United States.

(3) The number of United States military personnel to be deployed to each country.

(4) The mission and objectives of forces to be deployed.

(5) The expected schedule for accomplishing the objectives of the deployment.

(6) The exit strategy for United States forces engaged in the deployment.

(7) The costs associated with the deployment and the funding sources for paying those costs.

(8) The anticipated effects of the deployment on the morale, retention, and effectiveness of United States forces.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a deployment of forces—

(1) in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 795; or

(2) under circumstances determined by the President to be an emergency necessitating immediate deployment of the forces.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, the United States and the rest of the Western European countries are on the verge of a very deep and expensive and very dangerous involvement in yet another area of the Balkans, the Serbian province of Kosovo. Unfortunately, and once again, it seems to me the administration has yet to explain to the Congress or to the American people why it is in our vital—again, I emphasize the word "vital"—national interest to get in the middle of this growing conflict.

Let me make it clear I think a case can be made that, under certain circumstances, it is in the U.S. national interest to get involved in the conflict in Kosovo. But in my view, it is the responsibility of the President of the United States and the administration, i.e., the national security team, to explain to the American public and the U.S. Congress why such an involvement is in our vital national interest before our troops are committed.

The reports on CNN are clear that the Yugoslavian leader, Mr. Milosevic, is taking hard and very brutal action against the ethnic Albanians who are living—and, by the way, they comprise, Mr. President, 90 percent of the total population—in Kosovo. Certainly, this should be of no surprise since this is the same kind of activity that he directed in the breakup of Bosnia.

Our diplomatic efforts are active, but they keep changing in purpose and intent. The all too frequent U.S. diplomatic technique has been employed. Several lines in the sand have been drawn, with threats of severe reprisals if the Serbian action against the Alba-

nian population does not cease, but, regretfully, nothing positive to date has come from our diplomatic initiatives or threats. So these lines in the sand are crossed and the fighting has intensified, resulting in increased human suffering.

The Albanian rebels, known as the KLA, are growing in strength and the fighting grows more fierce, with no peaceful solution in sight. The United States and NATO have threatened military action, and they gave a military demonstration consisting of a determined flight involving a considerable amount of aircraft. They called it "Determined Falcon." I am not sure how determined the falcon was. At any rate, neither side has offered to end the conflict. In fact, the KLA is actually buoyed by the apparent Western support for their cause, and therefore they are not interested in backing off now. Mr. Milosevic, having observed our unwillingness to carry out our threats when he crossed the lines in the sand, and coupled with the strong support of the Serbian people to put an end to the rebel uprising in Kosovo, has no reason to back off either.

We have now started an international monitoring program, Mr. President, in Kosovo. It is "aimed at bringing peace to this strife-torn region." I don't know of any Senator or anybody or any observer who would object to that. But it is not entirely clear what these observers will accomplish other than to report on the obvious, and that is, there is a small war in Kosovo and we have been unable to influence its cessation.

This observer group is comprised of about 40 diplomats and "military experts" attached to the embassies in Belgrade. Our "military experts" are unarmed U.S. military forces from the European Command, and they are specifically trained for this mission.

Here are my concerns: In Kosovo, we are, once again, backing into a military commitment, just as we did in Bosnia—and I hate to use this example but I think it is applicable—and in Vietnam. The term of "unarmed military observers" or "experts" brings back some pretty sad memories of other wars that we have backed into. We are running a great risk that our military experts or diplomats could be in harm's way. As a matter of fact, in terms of hearings yesterday in the Intelligence Committee, we were talking about the priorities in regard to intelligence assets in certain countries, and force protection, obviously, plays a big role in that. So if we have our intelligence assets certainly supporting our troops in that part of the world, it gives real evidence that this is the case.

NATO is conducting contingency planning that could involve thousands of military troops to separate the warring factions or impose peace—it has been estimated anywhere from 7,000 to 25,000 troops, even more.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, at a briefing when the Secretary of State briefed a bipartisan group of Senators on what was happening in regard to India and Pakistan, actually warned the Secretary of State and said we do not have the personnel, we do not have the means, we do not have the materiel to commit those kinds of troops, that kind of involvement with regard to Kosovo, without emergency funding, without certainly stepping up our support, both in terms of funds and in terms of troops.

The costs of involvement in Kosovo, both in dollars and the impact on an already-stressed military, are potentially devastating. The chairman indicated that in his discussion with the national security team and with the administration.

There are many unanswered questions of how this conflict in Kosovo is in our vital national interest. I think a good case can be made for our involvement in Kosovo. I just came back with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee from taking a look at the three new NATO countries, what our intelligence assets are there and what the situation is there. Every official there, every foreign minister, every president indicated that Kosovo was in the interest of NATO and peace in Europe. But there are some very serious unanswered questions, and there are unexplained scenarios of the conflict in Kosovo leading to a larger war in Europe if this war is not ended now.

But my primary concern is that this whole business has yet to be addressed by the administration or, for that matter, to some degree, the Congress in any substantive way. He cannot, nor will Congress let him, commit the men and women of our Armed Forces without defining our national interests, the objectives, and the exit strategy for any involvement in Kosovo.

In the military, Mr. President, there is a term called a warning order, which is sort of a heads-up that some action is coming your way and, as the commander, you should start planning on how you would handle that action.

The amendment I offer today, which is consistent with the amendment that was accepted on a bipartisan basis during the last defense appropriations bill in regard to Bosnia, is a kind of a "warning order." The intent is to let the administration know that before they decide to deploy the military to the region as a result of the conflict in Kosovo, we need to address some salient points before Congress will fund the deployment. It is that simple.

The Congress and, more importantly, the American people need to understand at least the following information, and information required by the amendment. They are as follows:

No. 1, certification that such a deployment is necessary in the national interests of the United States;

No. 2, to explain the reasons why the deployment is in the national security interests of the United States;

No. 3, to define the number of U.S. military forces to be deployed to each country;

No. 4, to explain the mission and the objectives of the forces to be deployed;

No. 5, to discuss the expected schedule for accomplishing the objectives of the deployment;

No. 6, what is the exit strategy for U.S. forces engaged in deployment, if that is possible;

No. 7, what are the expected costs associated with the deployment and the funding source for paying these costs.

I am going to terminate my remarks very quickly, because I know the time schedule here. Let me point out that when Ambassador Gelbard and General Wesley Clark appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee and reported again on Bosnia and again said that the mission had changed and again said that the objective or the end game could not be defined, I pointed out that it could be in our national interest that we are in Bosnia and that while it was ill-defined, while the mission was changed, my main complaint—and I think one of the complaints shared by the distinguished chairman—is that the administration didn't fund it and the money is coming out of readiness and procurement and modernization, and that has to stop.

What are the expected costs associated with the deployment and the funding source?

What are the anticipated effects of the deployment on the morale, retention, and effectiveness of U.S. forces?

I think, Mr. President, that Bosnia is the perfect example of why such a "warning order" is necessary. We have expended over \$10 billion in Bosnia.

We have yet to answer most of the questions contained in this amendment: Why is it in our national interest to continue to be there? How many troops do we need? How and when do we get out? And how are we going to pay for it?

I am a strong believer, Mr. President, that once the U.S. flag—the U.S. credibility—is "planted," that we must support the U.S. position rather than embarrass or put our troops at risk. My intent is simply to go on record now before we get involved in yet another entanglement in yet another region of the Balkans—before the flag is planted and the troops are deployed.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend Senator ROBERTS. He is following the path that he followed last year. The Senate adopted his amendment that he presented last year, which has had a salutary effect on the considerations involved in Bosnia. And we will soon have announced the basic reduction in forces in Bosnia, brought about in many ways because of the study that Senator ROBERTS' amendment last year mandated.

I have reviewed this with my friend from Hawaii. And I note that he has put in even another provision this year that recognizes that there might be an emergency that would be such where the President would not have time to prepare the report that is listed. I think that is very wise to offer that flexibility to the administration.

I am prepared to accept this amendment. I ask the Senator from Hawaii what his views would be concerning Senator ROBERTS' amendment?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join my chairman in commending our dear friend. Once again, he has taken the initiative and leadership in this important area. Thank you very much.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3393) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington wishes to speak on a subject that is not related to the bill. I am pleased to afford my good southern friend that opportunity. I ask him, how much time does he wish?

Mr. GORTON. Ten minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have 10 minutes for a statement as in morning business.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska for the use of this time, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas, who is here with an important amendment, in granting me this time.

THE PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we have heard a large number of words and speeches on this floor, of course, in the last 2 or 3 months on the plight of the American farmer. Many called for a return to the policies of yesteryear. I am here this morning in contrast to talk about 10 impediments or evidences of indifference on the part of this administration to the farmers and the agricultural communities of the State of Washington, the Pacific Northwest, and all of America which can be solved simply by the administration's willingness to care about those Americans who produce our food and fibers.

So in the classic way that we give lists of 10, I will start, Mr. President, with number 10, the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Program. A bloated attempt begun 4 years ago, to have lasted 1 year would cost \$5 million, which is now approaching \$40 million in 4 years, and has antagonized