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 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, and we need to come back with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee 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 he, commit the time, 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, 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 sources of 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 and the money is continuing 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 want 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 the Committee for focusing on 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 get the reports that I 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. INOUYE. 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. INOUYE. 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 PLEIT 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 the impediments 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 Plan. As I said 4 years ago, to have lasted 1 year would cost $5 million, which is now approaching $40 million in 4 years, and has antagonized
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all of the private interests in the Interior Columbia Basin, all of the Members of Congress who represent any part of that basin, but the continuance of which is demanded by the President as the price of signing an appropriations bill for the Department of Interior.

I held a field hearing on this subject in Spokane, WA, with unanimous or near unanimous opposition to the program as it is being conducted at the present time. Both the bill that I am in charge of and the bill that has already passed the House of Representatives dramatically changes and minimizes that program.

At the behest of this administration, however, a Seattle Congressman put up an amendment to restore the program to its present pristine size. Every Member of the House of Representatives representing any part of the Columbia Basin voted against that amendment, and yet the administration continues to demand of all of the interference of private agriculture that it entails.

No. 9, the Department of Agriculture budget—welfare over farmers. Two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture earmarked for food and for welfare programs. The essential research conservation and on-the-ground farmer programs get lost in the shuffle. Only when there is a crisis does the Secretary of Agriculture pay any attention to them.

For 3 consecutive years, the administration's request for farmer programs have decreased while the amount requested for food and nutrition programs has increased. No one disputes the importance of those food and nutrition programs, but we cannot very well feed America without providing the funding and infrastructure necessary to enhance the production of the most healthy, abundant, safe and inexpensive crops in the world.

No. 8, Columbia-Snake River dams. The President's Council on Environmental Policy of the Department of the Interior had made it quite clear that major dam removal is very high on their agenda of courses of action for the Columbia and Snake Rivers. The Columbia Basin in eastern Washington, in eastern Oregon, and in Idaho, was literally a dust bowl until the introduction of irrigation. Without it, those States would not lead the country in apple, pears, asparagus, and potato production.

The Columbia Basin is a cornucopia for the Nation's food supply. Dam drowndown or removal would shut down agriculture in the region. In addition, of course, the rivers provide the avenues of transportation to get those agricultural products to market, a transportation system that would be destroyed by dam removal.

No. 7, China trade policy—Washington whose farmers seem not worth helping by this administration. For more than 20 years, China has refused to import Pacific Northwest wheat because of unfounded, nonscientific phytosanitary reasons. They call it "TCK smut." TCK smut has never been detected in Washington wheat. It does exist, however, in the fields of our wheat-growing counterparts—Canada, France and Germany; but China imports and allows them to grow the food and fiber that the Nation needs.

No. 6, repeated efforts to eliminate agricultural research. For the past 2 years, the administration has recommended zeroing out all of the national regionally based agriculture research programs. These programs conduct research necessary to all food-producing regions of the country. The administration's insistence on eliminating these programs is ludicrous. Obviously, cotton research cannot and should not be conducted in eastern Washington; and red delicious apple research is not conducted in Mississippi. These regional programs have bolstered our already strained land grant education university programs. They are absolutely essential, and yet the administration would wipe them out.

No. 5, no movement on fast-track trade authority. Fast-track is essential to establishing trade relations with Chile. Currently, the United States exports face an 11-percent tariff in that country, giving our competitors an 11-percent advantage. Yet, because of objections from members of his own party, the President has abandoned the cause of fast-track trade authority.

No. 4, the agricultural labor shortage—not our problem. The administration insists on ever more rigid environmental roadblocks and headaches for farmers from Washington State all across the United States to Florida. No one knows the land better than America's hard-working farm families. The District of Columbia, the administration, and AL Gore should not be dictating to America's farmers how to till, harvest, irrigate, employ, and manage their farms. AL Gore and his administration need to focus on foreign trade and agricultural research, not on locking up private property and over-regulating the family farm.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. Hutchison. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ed Fienga from my staff be allowed on the floor during the debate on the defense appropriations bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Feingold. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. S397

(Purpose: To achieve the near full funding of the Army National Guard operation and maintenance account that the Senate provided for in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 (H. Con. Res. 28), as agreed to by the Senate, and to offset that increase by reducing the amount provided for procurement for the F/A-18E/F aircraft program to the amount provided by the House of Representatives in H.R. 4163, as passed by the House of Representa-

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

Washington farmers and many others more than any other environmental regulation, and yet the administration, rather than assist in reasonable amendments to the Endangered Species Act, insists on ever more rigid enforcement and ever more interference with the ability of farmers to grow the food and fiber that the Nation needs.

No. 1, AL Gore. President Clinton has officially tagged the Vice President as the administration's environmental leader. He is the promulgator of most of the policies that I have already discussed and has constructed environmental roadblocks and headaches for farmers from Washington State all across the United States to Florida.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ed Fienga from my staff be allowed on the floor during the debate on the defense appropriations bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Feingold. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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