

question is, what happens if bombing does not succeed? There are very few operations, historic examples, where air power alone has succeeded in meeting our military objectives. Some have made the argument here today that air strikes were the key to bringing the Bosnian Serbs to the peace table in Dayton. I had the opportunity to visit with two people last week who were intimately involved in the Bosnia crisis—former British Defence Secretary Michael Portillo and former U.N. High Representative in Bosnia, Carl Bildt. Both of these men told me that air strikes were an important part, but not the decisive factor in ending the fighting in Bosnia. History records that the Croatian offensive against the Serbs, and the fact that the parties were all exhausted from fighting were of equal significance to the important air campaign by the United States and our allies. Today, that is not the case in Kosovo—the parties there are, regrettably, ready to fight.

My point is,—there is risk in relying on air strikes, alone, to stop the fighting in this crisis. We must know what our next steps will be and how far we are ready to go with other initiatives to stop the fighting in Kosovo. If this first military action is taken—which in my view this contingency is tantamount to an act of war—what comes next and how far we are willing to go? We must have in mind not simply our first step, but our second, third or fourth steps before we commit U.S. troops.

While one of my main concerns in this is the credibility of NATO now that we have threatened military action for many months, we must ask ourselves what happens to NATO credibility if the air strikes fail to accomplish their objectives? That would be a devastating blow to the Alliance if we take the drastic step of attacking a sovereign nation, and are not successful in the ultimate objective.

What of the credibility of the United States and our leadership on the continent of Europe, in military as well as economic or diplomatic partnerships? What of the credibility of the U.S. military as a partner in other actions? There are important issues that can be debated in the context of the pending amendment.

The Smith amendment provides that the Congress must be on record as supporting this operation before we commit the U.S. military to the crisis in Kosovo. I agree. We owe it to the men and women of the Armed Forces to act on this issue. For that reason, I will support the Smith amendment and vote for cloture on this amendment.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 544, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 544) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for recovery from natural disasters, and foreign assistance, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Hutchison amendment No. 81, to set forth restrictions on deployment of United States Armed Forces in Kosovo.

Lott amendment No. 124 (to amendment No. 81), to prohibit the use of funds for military operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) unless Congress enacts specific authorization in law for the conduct of those operations.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 124

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present business is amendment No. 124 offered by the majority leader.

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment to the Hutchison amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. The Kosovo question is the pending issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have listened with interest at the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. And he has some very good points. My memory of the conversations that were held at the time President Bush made the statement that the Senator from Delaware referred to was that the President was talking about racial cleansing, or genocide, on the part of the Serbs versus the Kosovo population—not just a military incident, but an act of genocide, but an act of racial cleansing in the magnitude of a national aspect.

There is no question that there is a dispute here. And the Senator from Delaware has heard my comments that I made to the President. I believe that article V of the NATO agreement does not authorize bombing in Serbia.

I was very interested over the weekend to listen to people talk on the radio and television about Yugoslavia. It seems that we are slipping back now, that it is a Yugoslav question, not just a Serb-Kosovo question, that is being raised now by the media. But in any event, I think this would be the first time in the history of NATO that NATO has taken offensive action against a nation that has a dispute within its borders. I think it is a horrendous proposition that the Serbs are

presenting to Kosovo. “Either leave, or be exterminated.”

But the question really is, What is the proper justification for this action at the present time? If it is genocide, then I think we have really ample cause to be involved. If it is a matter of relocation of people within a nation, based upon whatever power the nation claims to relocate people within their boundaries, it is a different issue.

I must admit to being torn, as one who has attended the NATO meetings many, many times in the past, of what will be the future of NATO, if this action is taken.

I think the threat that President Bush made is the threat that all Americans would support; that is, that we would use military force to retaliate against a nation that instituted a process of racial cleansing, racial extermination within its borders, to the extent that it was contemplated at the time.

But I have to also raise the question: Where were we in Cambodia? Where were we in Ethiopia? Where are we going to be as this type of process continues in Africa? And we are reading more and more about that. Even this last weekend, juxtaposed to the story about Kosovo, is the story about the new racial cleansing commencing once again in Ethiopia.

It is not an easy issue. And I think it is one that we ought to pursue, because, from the point of view of this Senator, I do not like to set the precedent that an administration informs a foreign nation to sign an agreement, or, if you do not sign the agreement, we are going to bomb until you do. That to me is a precedent of which I don't want to be a part.

If we make a statement, as President Bush made, that if you engage in a process that is really against a whole concept of humanity, we are going to be first in line to punish you for doing it. Somehow or other, there is a place here where we can find a common position and support taking action as a nation. But, for myself, I just revolt at the concept that we are going to send people out to negotiate peace agreements, or whatever other kind of agreement it is, and authorize them to say, “Unless you agree with us, we are going to bomb you, and we are going to bomb you until you change your mind, and, if you do not change your mind, within our period of time, we are going to bomb you again.” In this instance, the process would require taking down the air defenses of another nation in order that we might attack the forces that are on the ground.

I assume that most Members of the Senate have been there now and know what they are talking about. This is the most mountainous country of Europe. It is a place where, as I recall, some 20-odd divisions under the command of Adolf Hitler got just absolutely tied down by the actions of the