

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, we are now in morning business, according to the order, and I control 45 minutes of time.

#### DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL AND INTERNATIONAL MILITARY COMMITMENTS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the reason that I asked for the time this morning is I think we have a very crucial decision that is being made right now in our Nation's Capital, and that is how much we are going to fund the defense of our country. In fact, Congress is in a dispute with the President, as we speak, about how much we should spend to defend our Nation.

I find it ironic, if not sad, that as 3,500 of our American troops are on their way to Kuwait right this minute that the President would be threatening to veto the Defense appropriations bill if \$2 to \$3 billion is not cut from that bill.

Our troops are on their way, possibly for a conflict. We hope not. But, as you know, as the distinguished Presiding Officer is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the President pro tempore of the Senate, this is not the time to let down our defenses. This is not the time to say that we should be shifting valuable weapons systems for the protection of our troops and for their ability to protect the interests of the United States into unnamed other programs—social programs, perhaps education programs.

I don't know what the President has in mind. But I do know that the President of the United States is today saying he will veto an appropriations bill for the Defense Department at the same time that he is ratcheting up a conflict in the Middle East.

Mr. President, several people would like to speak on this issue. I have more to say, but at this time, I am going to yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho, LARRY CRAIG.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have comments that will take probably up to about 8 minutes. The Senator from Arizona is with us, and I understand he has a scheduling conflict, so I will be more than happy to yield to him.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who has provided so much leadership in our Nation's defenses, and ask how long, approximately, he would like.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I inform the Senator from Texas, probably about 5 minutes, if that is acceptable.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. That is acceptable. Thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, first of all, let me say the Senator from Texas is to be complimented for beginning this very important discussion which I think, frankly, is going to have to go on for some time here until we can get this matter resolved.

It boils down to something very, very simple. On the one hand, you have the administration making substantial international commitments for the deployment and use of American military forces which will cost billions of dollars of money, and, at the same time, you have the administration suggesting that unless the Congress is willing to take money from the defense budget and spend it on other things that the President wants, there is the possibility of a Presidential veto of the defense appropriations bill.

Mr. President, we have been, I think, appropriately discreet here in this body in sharing our views on international policy, especially as it relates to the Middle East and the President's action in Iraq. We passed a resolution here overwhelmingly supporting the action that the administration took and supporting our troops in Iraq. We have not gone out of our way to criticize the President's policy there, even though many of us have grave concerns and questions about where that policy is leading us.

But when it comes to passing the defense authorization and defense appropriations bill, this body has a responsibility to ensure that our military forces have what they need to carry out these commitments. And nobody, Mr. President, more than you, as the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has fought harder over the years to ensure that our troops have what they need.

I remember that after the Persian Gulf war was over and everyone was passing out compliments to Secretary Cheney and to President Bush and to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, they all pointed out that what won that war was the character and skill of our men and women who were fighting there and the decisions that were made 10 or 12 years before by the Senate, by the House, and by the administrations at that time to begin the research and development of the smart weapons and other weapons that we used in the Persian Gulf war. That is what enabled us to win that war quickly and with a minimum of casualties.

Now we are again engaged in conflict in Iraq, and we are again using those same weapons, and at the same time the President is suggesting that we have to cut the defense budget because he wants to spend more money in other areas. I remind my colleagues that last year we added money back into the defense bill to buy Tomahawk missiles, more than the President requested. He did not request that money. We said, you are going to have to buy more Tomahawk missiles because that is what we are going to need if we have

another conflict in the Middle East. And what happened? We had another challenge from Saddam Hussein, and the President ordered the firing of Tomahawk missiles. I am glad that the Senate disagreed with the President on that last year, added that money in, and we had those Tomahawk missiles ready to go to fight this conflict.

Now we have the same issue again. Are we going to be permitted to properly fund the military forces? What we are suggesting is still far less than the military was provided last year. So this is not an increase over last year's spending. It is less money. It is more money than the President requested, and that is because we have identified some areas in which we think the administration's request was deficient, just as it was with the Tomahawk missiles last year.

Mr. President, it boils down to this. I have a lot of statistics here and might ask for unanimous consent to submit some matters in writing that gets into the specifics, but I know that my other colleagues here wish to add their voices to this concern. So I am just going to make this statement very generally.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this statistical information and related material.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Press release from the House Appropriations Committee]

LIVINGSTON TO CLINTON: NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO FURTHER CUT DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, DC.—Charging that President Clinton is putting the nation's servicemen and women at risk overseas, House Appropriations Committee Chairman Bob Livingston (R-LA) urged the President to reconsider reports that his Administration is now seeking \$3 billion in additional cuts to the defense bill.

"Further cuts to the defense bill will mean less medical care funding for military personnel, a weakening of the drug war, and an inability to relocate troops in Saudi Arabia. If the President wants \$3 billion more cut from the defense budget, he should present our committee with a list of cuts and we'll be happy to consider them.

The defense conference report added nearly a half billion dollars to the President's request for medical care, which was cut in the Clinton Budget; added \$600 million to the President's request for barracks and base repair; and added \$165 million to the President's request for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities.

"President Clinton claims Congress wants to spend \$10 billion more than he wants, but he won't admit that he asked for \$10 billion less than last year's funding level for defense. This cut comes at a time when our nation's military is preparing for a new round of bombing in Iraq; facing more than \$100 million in costs for troop relocation in Saudi Arabia; and underfunding Bosnia by more than \$200 million to date. It is a bad time to cut defense, yet that's all the Commander-In-Chief offers in relation to negotiations on unfinished appropriations bills," said Livingston.

Even more disconcerting is the fact that the President holds the Defense Appropriations bill hostage to more spending cuts,

while he vows to sign to the \$265.6 billion Defense Authorization bill (which actually authorizes more funding than the appropriation bills spends). When adjusted for inflation, defense spending actually declines between FY96 and FY97 marking the twelfth consecutive year defense spending has come down.

"I am simply amazed that the President thinks he can dupe the American public into thinking that he is pro-defense by signing the authorization bill, while threatening to veto the legislation that actually pays the defense bills. The President's veto would deny a 3% pay raise for military personnel, deny funding for a half billion dollar shortfall created in the President's request for medical programs, and deny essential upgrades to our nation's aging weapons systems, which the President's own Joint Chief of Staff say falls more than \$100 billion short over the next five years," said Livingston.

#### ANOTHER CLINTON FOREIGN POLICY FAILURE— CRISIS IN IRAQ WORSENS

On August 31, 1996, Saddam Hussein sent 40,000 troops to seize the northern Kurdish city of Irbil.

The U.S. responded to this with cruise missiles in the South and by extending the "no fly."

Clinton declares this a success.

Rhetoric (declared victory) is inconsistent with the reality in the region.

Hussein has expanded his power over the whole Kurdish region.

A major CIA-funded effort to destabilize Saddam is virtually defunct.

The Gulf War international coalition is fractured. Kuwait balks at accepting U.S. troops and few voice opposition to Saddam's moves.

The 1991 humanitarian relief program is in shambles.

If the President is serious about achieving what he believes are U.S. goals, he must act now to set his case before the American people and to include their elected representatives in the Congress in his deliberations. Anything less would be a major failure of leadership.

3500 (not 5000) Fort Hood troops are enroute to Kuwait beginning this morning.

23 F-16s will go to Bahrain to help enforce the "no-fly" zone.

8 F-117 Stealth Bombers are in Kuwait with 4 B-52s at Diego Garcia.

Within days, the force will include 2 aircraft carriers with more than 150 Navy aircraft and more than 20 other warships and submarines.

Actions thus far are a replay of Administration actions in previous events, e.g., Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, all of which are unraveling or failing to meet original administration promises.

No notification by the Administration.

No consultation with Congress.

No strategic goals/objectives presented to the American people.

Failure to state what actions Hussein must take to satisfy the U.S.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President.

Just to summarize it this way, nothing is more important than the defense of our country and ensuring that when the Commander in Chief gives the order for our young men and women to go into combat, to risk their lives, that ensuring that they have the means of achieving their missions in the safest way possible.

As I read a couple days ago about the first F-111 pilot at the beginning of the gulf war, on the very first night, who had to fly through the flak over Bag-

dad, he drew the lucky straw, or the unlucky straw, as it may be. He and his wing man told the story about how the night was black, it was eerie, but he could see the lights of Baghdad in the distance. And he said, as he got closer, it looked like a big fireworks display, there was so much flak over that city. He knew he had to fly through that. But he had the training and he had the equipment because we provided it, and he got through in good shape and performed his mission.

We can never shortchange the men and women that we send into combat without adequate equipment. That is why it is so important that the President get on board here and agree with us to fund the military to the degree that is necessary, to the degree that your committee has recommended.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield up to 10 minutes of our time to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Texas for requesting this morning business and special order to talk about not only the situation of Defense appropriations, but the impending foreign policy crisis in this country. And as we begin to look seriously, Mr. President, at ending this legislative session and completing our work, there are some remaining appropriations bills that simply must be dealt with in a fair and honest way to effectively close down the Congress. One of those is the 1996 Department of Defense appropriations bill.

In short, Mr. President, saber rattling by this administration has occurred in places other than Iraq. Recent indications that President Clinton will veto the bill that the Senators from Arizona and Texas and I are talking about this morning, which provides funding to our Nation's armed services—including the current deployment in the gulf and those now preparing to respond to the President's call of another 3,500 troops to be deployed, and who may well be in the air at this moment headed for Kuwait—is, to me, a position that our President should find unconscionable, but yet at this very moment the message coming out of the White House is, veto Defense authorization.

The brave men and women serving this Nation and protecting our security and the Nation's interests should not be turned into pawns for Presidential election politics. I cannot begin to express my frustration over this situation because the timing for this President and his political agenda appears to be extraordinary. Therefore, I hope the President will respond by indicating his support for our Armed Forces and his willingness to sign this critical piece of legislation.

The deployment of our troops does not occur without cost. The Senator from Arizona has already referenced that very effectively. The President has deployed U.S. forces widely in peacekeeping efforts, and it is time to respond in kind by paying for it. That is what the American public would expect of a Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, I would like also to take a moment to again address some of the concerns that I mentioned last Friday in the press about the ongoing situation in Iraq, because it is fair to talk about that situation in the context of Defense appropriations, all in one statement, because they fit so well together. As I have said, they clash at this moment in what appears to be a Presidential political agenda that just does not fit.

What is our policy? What is our mission? What is our goal in Iraq? It is a straightforward question that deserves to be answered. The President, as I mentioned, is now deploying troops to Kuwait. More American lives could well be on the line. And it is past time—it is clearly past time—for this President to tell the American people what his answer to those three questions are.

Reports yesterday from CNN stated that 3,500 troops are headed to Kuwait. Claims were made that calling off the deployment now would send the wrong message of weakness to Iraq. I would argue that the message has already been sent in the form of a lack of foreign policy to address this situation. The deployment of troops to Kuwait is clearly a case in point. This announcement of sending 3,500 troops comes on the heels of comments by the President that he was reconsidering a decision to send several thousand troops to Kuwait.

The Washington Post quotes President Clinton as saying this:

We have sought no confrontation with Saddam Hussein. We never did, and we don't now. My concern is that we limit Saddam Hussein's ability to threaten his neighbors, that we do it with the "no-fly" zone, and in so doing, we keep our pilots safe.

I am not here to criticize the worthy goal of keeping our pilots safe. However, this administration's policy is changing daily. The White House has not had its press conference this morning, so we do not know what the foreign policy of today is. We were told the actions of expanding the southern no-fly zone was a reaction and a lesson to Saddam Hussein that his use of force would be met with force. However, the message did not register. We did not address the area of violation, which was the introduction of 30,000 Republican Guard troops into the Kurdish safe haven at the request for help from one of the Kurdish factions. In addition, our reaction did little to dissuade Iraqi activities.

The administration claimed that our actions were justified because of the inhumane actions of the Iraqis against the Kurds. However, we have already lost that battle.

Hussein's troops moved into the safe haven under the vigilant watch of our intelligence sources and they have remained. We have done nothing to respond to Saddam Hussein's actions. In a recent article printed by the Canadian news magazine Maclean's, an unidentified State Department official was quoted as saying:

By attacking in southern Iraq rather than striking at the forces that Saddam used against the Kurds in the north, the United States sent him a clear signal that it is concerned only about the security of the oil supplies from Kuwait and other Persian Gulf states, and does not care much about what he does inside his own borders. . . . We've not demonstrated [in all fairness, Mr. President] a lot of courage. . . . Our actions have not left the region any more secure. [Bluntly put] Saddam has gotten away with it.

Mr. President, this concern is not isolated but has been quite widely reported in news from Government officials and independent analysts.

These criticisms do not question the need to respond to Hussein. Rather, they question the nature of the response chosen by our President. An action was necessary, but it should have reflected Hussein's aggressive behavior. Brent Scowcroft, former national security adviser under Presidents Ford and Bush, put it very succinctly in an article printed in the September 23 edition of Newsweek.

We were right to strike back, but we did so in a way that did no lasting military damage to him and inflicted significant collateral damage on us. The cruise-missile attack was quick, clean, and easy. But, it may have sent Saddam the wrong message—that he would only pay the price of a pinprick. When the smoke cleared, it looked to most political leaders around the world as though Saddam was better off and the United States was worse off than before the current crisis began.

Mr. President, the article covers a number of other cogent issues on this situation. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CRAIG. In addition to the loss of this high-stake game, I argue that Saddam Hussein won the divide-and-conquer battle. It is disturbing to note how many nations who were supportive of active participation in the coalition developed by President George Bush in the gulf war, have either failed to offer support or have condemned the American strikes and the American actions.

The Russians not only opposed United States actions, but they went so far as to criticize the administration for playing electoral politics. France, once an important ally in the region, has refused to participate in patrolling the expanded area of the southern no-fly zone. Turkey, an ally since World War II, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have all expressed concern and refused to allow the United States to base some of their actions in their countries.

By moving unilaterally, the President has isolated the United States in the region and weakened our position not only in the gulf, but it could spill over into other regional issues such as the U.S. effort to further the Middle East peace process.

One point that has come to light which bothers me greatly is the lack of action to address growing concerns about the division and strains against the various Kurdish factions. Efforts to push diplomatic negotiations could have prevented the situation from escalating to the point that both Iran and Iraq were called into the conflict for support by the various factions.

In addition, when new intelligence reports indicated troop movement, why were there no efforts to deter the looming action before troops were allowed to reach the Kurdish safe haven and quickly move into Irbil, remove the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, and execute approximately 100 non-Kurdish Iraqi dissidents who based their anti-Hussein activities out of the area?

Mr. President, the \$1 billion-plus that the United States has spent establishing and maintaining the Kurdish safe haven is also lost. It has been acknowledged by U.S. officials that Saddam Hussein has left a massive security presence. That presence will keep his political opponents muted, and serve as a constant reminder to Iraqis and, indeed the world, that he intends to regain control of his entire country. Saddam is here to stay.

In closing, while I appreciate the President's efforts to brief congressional leaders yesterday, I remain frustrated at the lack of a clear and precise direction on the part of the administration in dealing with Saddam Hussein. He is not going away, and neither are our interests in the region. We have lost ground during this go-around. But, we have been given a reprieve by the Iraqis, who recently announced a discontinuance of attacks on United States aircraft patrolling the no-fly zone, and ceased efforts to rebuild air defense systems destroyed by our missiles. Therefore, time is of the essence, and the President must get his policy on track, and this situation back into balance.

And, President Clinton, you do accomplish this by vetoing the very bill that will fund our efforts in the Middle East and keep our men and women in uniform safe.

I say in conclusion that it is time that the White House woke up, that America demand the answer to the fundamental questions: Why are we there? What is our mission? What is our end game?

I must say to President Clinton, you have not demonstrated even the simple logic of why you would want to veto a defense appropriations bill at a time when you are offering expanded activities in an area where no mission is clear. I say, Mr. President, step up to the mike and step up to the country. Do what you are supposed to do as our

Commander in Chief. Respond, in a clear, unequivocal message, as to what is our mission and work with us to not only defend our troops but to finance them, because as you send them in harm's way, you have a simple and most important obligation as our Commander in Chief, and that is to make sure that they are well financed and well cared for.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From Newsweek, Sept. 23, 1996]

WHY WE STOPPED THE GULF WAR

(By Brent Scowcroft)

We have been listening to the same sad refrain for five years; if only George Bush had finished off Saddam Hussein when he had the chance at the end of the gulf war, we wouldn't be in this mess today. There are two things wrong with this reinterpretation of history. The first is that we never had the objective of destroying Saddam's regime during Desert Storm. The second is that had we continued the war and overthrown Saddam, we might be worse off today.

We had a crucial but limited objective in the gulf war, to reverse Iraqi aggression, and to cripple Saddam's offensive military capabilities. The international coalition that President Bush put together to fight the gulf war was based on this carefully defined goal. We certainly hoped that Iraq's defeat would lead to Saddam's collapse, but we viewed that prospect as a potentially beneficial by-product of our victory.

If we had made Saddam's overthrow part of the objective, there would have been no international coalition; even during Desert Storm, our Arab allies stopped their troops at Iraq's border because they wanted no part of an attack on Iraqi territory. If we had continued to prosecute the gulf war after we achieved or stated objectives, we would have destroyed the coalition and squandered much of what our victory had achieved.

So if we had pressed on to Baghdad in 1991, we would have been on our own. And if we had succeeded in overthrowing Saddam, we would have confronted a choice between occupying Iraq with thousands of American troops for the indefinite future and creating a gaping power vacuum in the Persian Gulf for Iran to fill. There was no support among the American people for the first alternative in 1991, and even less so today. The second alternative would have put our vital national-security interests in jeopardy.

Put simply, we recognized that the seemingly attractive goal of getting rid of Saddam would not solve our problems, or even necessarily serve our interests, any more than the overthrow of Diem was a silver bullet to the conundrum of Vietnam. So we pursued the kind of inelegant, messy alternative that is all too often the only one available in the real world. Having driven Saddam out of Kuwait and destroyed much of his offensive military capabilities, we concentrated on keeping the pressure on Iraq so that it could not and would not once again threaten its neighbors. This is the policy that the Clinton administration inherited. Saddam may have made his move into northern Iraq two weeks ago because he thought that with a presidential campaign underway in the United States, we would not respond. Not for the first time, Saddam miscalculated. We were right to strike back, but we did so in a way that did no lasting military damage to him and inflicted significant collateral political damage on us. The cruise-missile attack was quick, clean and easy. But it may have sent Saddam the wrong message—that he would only pay the price of a pinprick. When the smoke cleared, it looked to most political

leaders around the world as though Saddam was better off and the United States was worse off than before the current crisis began.

A far more effective military response, though a more dangerous one, would have targeted the Republican Guard units that moved into northern Iraq. An air attack on those forces would have put Saddam on notice that he must pay a real price for his defiance. It also would have put on notice Iraqi soldiers—on whom Saddam depends to remain in power—that any time they march out on Saddam's orders, they will be subject to devastating aerial bombardment.

Now we are into the next round. Saddam has fired missiles at our aircraft patrolling the no-fly zones. In return, we have threatened a further "disproportionate" response and are ostentatiously augmenting our military forces in the area.

The next time we hit Saddam, we should hit him hard, and where it hurts him most, so that he cannot mistake our message. Air strikes will have to focus tightly on Iraq's military machine, making it clear that we intend to punish Saddam, not harm the Iraqi people. The Republican Guard is an obvious target.

The key point, however, is that the "Iraq problem" is not susceptible to quick fixes. Dealing with Iraq will continue to require patience and persistence, leadership and skill. For the foreseeable future, a successful and sustainable—if unsatisfying—policy is likely to share the same objectives as the one we have followed since the end of the gulf war: relegating Saddam to the category of a nuisance and preventing him from re-emerging as a threat to his neighbors or our vital interests.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified at the end of 40 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent the remainder of my 45 minutes then be delayed until 10:55.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Idaho for talking about General Scowcroft, who is one of the great foreign policy minds of our country, and I thank the Senator for talking about the principles that we should have in foreign policy. I think it is very important we look at the principles of foreign policy with the eye toward letting our enemies, as well as our allies, know what they can expect from us.

Mr. President, what we are talking about today is a very important issue that is to be discussed in the Capitol, and that is defense spending. In fact, the President asked for \$234 billion for defense spending. Congress asked the President to sign a bill for \$244 billion. There is a difference of \$9.5 billion between the President's request and that of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, we are in military operations in Haiti, in Bosnia, we have been in Somalia, which cost precious defense dollars, we now have an escalation in the Middle East, we have 3,500 troops as we speak on their way to Kuwait because we have an escalation there, and yet the President of the United States, while putting our troops into these missions that are costing approximately \$10 billion all together, nevertheless is asking us to cut \$10 billion from the defense budget.

Now, I point out some of the things that Congress would like to have in the defense budget that the President did not request. Two additional F-16's, to replace fighters that are lost due to combat, such as Captain O'Grady, who was shot down and was a true hero in surviving after being shot down by the Serbs. And, in fact, we are also sending F-16's right now to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia to try to make sure that we have enough F-16's, which are such an important base of our operations in the Middle East. In fact, we are sending 23 F-16's right now. We are asking for two additional ones, which the President wants us to cut from the budget.

We added \$66 million above the President's request for additional up-armored Humvees. I am sure my colleagues will remember that it was up-armored Humvees that saved the life of one of our soldiers in the early days of the Bosnia conflict when his vehicle was destroyed—actually, it was struck by a landmine, but was not destroyed, because it was one of the up-armored Humvees. We want more of those to protect our troops if they are going to be in harm's way. But the President says "no," he wants to cut those, even though they are proven to have saved at least one life in the Bosnia operation.

Next, \$190 million for additional scout helicopter aircraft. They are playing a major role in Bosnia today, and the Army is critically short of these scout helicopters. We are asking to upgrade the fleet of helicopters because they are such an important part of our military readiness. But the President says "no."

Then there is \$53 million for night vision devices that allow our soldiers to fight and win at night against this adversary that can't see us. That's what we are asking, Mr. President, among other things, for the readiness of our forces. Yet, the President, as the troops are going into harm's way for the protection of our interests, says he will veto a defense budget, unless we cut \$2 to \$3 billion out of it. Mr. President, you can't have it both ways. You cannot send our American troops into the world to be police and peacekeepers and to secure the interests of America—you can't ask them to do that if we don't have the equipment and the protection for them with theater defenses. Mr. President, you can't do it.

Why would you threaten to veto a bill because it has \$2 to \$3 billion you would like to put somewhere else, when you are asking more from our military and they are performing? Mr. President, they are performing as they always do. They are performing with guts, with patriotism, and with belief in our country. They are representing our country. Mr. President, now is not the time to argue about cutting the defense budget.

How much is this operation in Kuwait going to cost to defend against an aggression that might occur from Iraq? How much? We don't know how much.

So, of course, the idea of cutting our defenses beyond bone, beyond muscle, but into contingencies, does not make sense.

How could our Commander in Chief be talking about vetoing the Defense appropriations, the Defense appropriations bill? How could he be talking about vetoing the Defense appropriations bill at the time that he is sending our troops into a heightened area of awareness and caution and readiness in the Middle East? How could he do it, Mr. President?

It's not right, and we, today, are calling on the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, to work with us to keep our defenses funded. He is commanding our armed services, and he must fund them. Congress is trying to do that. Mr. President, work with us. If you expect our troops to do the great job they always do, you must fund them. You must give them the equipment. You must give them the ballistic missile protection in the theater.

From my home State of Texas, we are sending 3,500 troops on the ground to Kuwait. We have sent about 120 from Fort Bliss, with the Patriot missiles, to protect them. Mr. President, we even have missiles that the President, the Commander in Chief, did not ask for, that have already been used in this conflict with Iraq. As the Senator from Arizona has said, the President did not ask for the missiles that he has already used. We must have the replacements. We have already used them. How could he at this time be talking about cutting \$2 to \$3 billion out of our defense budget at the same time we are having cost overruns in Bosnia that will have to be funded, and we don't even know what Iraq will cost? This is not the time, and this is not leadership.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished President pro tempore, the dean of the Senate and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has done so much to make sure that our men and women that serve our country are equipped and trained and protected, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able Senator from Texas on this special order to have a discussion on this very important matter. She is a very able member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and stands for a strong defense. She does all she can to promote the welfare of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in urging President Clinton to show his support for our men and women in uniform by indicating his support for the fiscal year 1997 Defense appropriations bill and conference report.

In his radio address on September 7, just days after he authorized the cruise missile strikes against Iraq, President Clinton indicated that he would sign the Defense authorization bill. This legislation, the result of our work on

the Senate Armed Services Committee this year, authorizes appropriations for defense.

In expressing his support for the Defense authorization bill, President Clinton stated:

Once more, we have seen that at home and abroad, our servicemen and women go the extra mile for us, and we must go the extra mile for them. This bill makes good our pledge to give our Armed Forces the finest equipment there is so that they have the technological edge to prevail on the battle fields of tomorrow . . . it also carries forward our commitment to give our troops the quality of life they deserve by funding family and troop housing improvements that we want and by providing a raise of 3 percent . . .

Mr. President, I believe the President was absolutely right in these statements of support for the Defense authorization bill and his decision to sign it. Yet, here we are within only a week or so of these statements, the administration is attempting to negotiate substantial reductions in the Defense appropriations bill.

I have tried to determine why the President might not want to support the Defense appropriations bill. What events have transpired that might have caused him to think that the Defense appropriations bill has too much money for defense?

The President has sent additional airpower, seapower, and ground troops to the Middle East to bolster our military force in that troubled region. Every day, it appears more likely that the United States will have to continue some kind of military presence in Bosnia past the December 20 deadline currently set for the withdrawal of our forces currently serving in Bosnia. In addition, United States forces were recently dispatched to Haiti to help stabilize the government of President Preval.

Mr. President, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1997 authorizes for appropriations \$265.6 billion—\$11.2 billion above the President's budget request. However, in real terms, this bill provides \$7.4 billion less than last year's defense bill. Mr. President, this is a very modest bill. Is there a Senator here who believes that our military forces will be called upon to do less next fiscal year than we have done in this fiscal year?

Mr. President, the Congress has indicated strong support for the amounts of money provided for the Department of Defense in the Defense authorization bill and the Defense appropriations bill. We passed a budget resolution bill which supported this amount for defense. We passed a Defense authorization bill, voting several times in support of the amounts for defense in this bill. I do not believe we should now be negotiating these funds away for what appears to be political gamesmanship.

It is clear that this administration relies greatly on our military services. The President must recognize that we must maintain a strong military, capable of performing anywhere in the world and at a moment's notice.

Now is the time when the Congress and the administration must stand together in support of our men and women in uniform, as the President himself has stated, "our service men and women go the extra mile for us, and we must go the extra mile for them."

I urge the President to indicate clearly his support for the Defense appropriations bill as he has for the Defense authorization bill.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 3 of the 5 minutes that I have remaining at the end be allocated now to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, it is my understanding that we provided 45 minutes of morning business to begin at 9:30 for the majority side of the aisle, with 45 minutes of morning business to follow by our side of the aisle beginning at 10:15. My understanding is that the unanimous-consent request was previously propounded without objection, I think, by anyone on our side of the aisle, to segregate the first 45 minutes so that the last 5 minutes of it would occur at the end of the hour and a half block.

If the Senator from Texas wished to change the agreement that was made last evening about morning business, then I would urge that we make that change in a manner that allows the additional 5 minutes between 10:55 and 11 to be controlled by the Senator from Texas and 5 minutes controlled by me from 11 to 11:05.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Reserving the right to object, I do object, Mr. President. What I would like to do is ask that 3 of the 5 minutes from my last 5 minutes go to the Senator from Idaho now, and then I would like to have the last 2 minutes of the morning business time. So if you would like to extend for 5 minutes, would you be willing to extend 5 minutes from 10:58 to 11:03?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the request. My intention is not to prevent the Senator from Idaho from speaking in any order. My only point was that, if we are intending to change the agreement that was made last evening without consultation, then the agreement should provide, if the Senator from Texas has 5 minutes, at 10:55 to 11 o'clock, that we would have 5 minutes from 11 to 11:05.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Let me add this. If you are wanting the last 5 minutes, how about your taking 10:55 to 11 and letting me have my last 5 minutes, giving 3 minutes to the Senator from

Idaho at this time, and then 2 minutes, before you go into your last 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. The only caveat to that would be, why don't we just provide that our side will have 45 minutes? To whatever extent that takes us over the 11 o'clock hour, it does. We would want to have the full 45 minutes. We have Senator FEINSTEIN who wants to speak, and Senator BIDEN may be here to speak on a couple of things. I would like to make sure that we have equal time.

I was surprised that the agreement last evening, which was 45 minutes on each side, was changed this morning without consultation. I have no objection to anyone speaking at any time except that we would like to have the last 5 minutes in this block today. So the Senator from Texas apparently now has, by unanimous consent, 5 minutes from 10:55 to 11, and she is asking consent that the Senator from Idaho be included in that.

Is that correct?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I am asking consent that we also in that request add that we would have 5 minutes additional from 11 to 11:05 for our side to close in morning business.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Let me see if I can make this easier. Let me just take my last 5 minutes right now and then the Senator can have—if you are still wanting to go over, I am concerned about going past 11 just because of the order of voting and what Senators have been told. So if you would like, the point is you would like to have the last part of the debate, would you be willing to let me give 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho, let me finish with 2 minutes, and then you take until 11. Would that be acceptable?

Mr. DORGAN. No. The agreement last evening was that we would have 45 minutes. We would insist under the agreement that our side receive 45 minutes. It is certainly acceptable to having you complete your morning business now. In fact, if you wanted a couple of extra minutes, that is fine with me. We would simply provide that we would want an equal amount of time on our side.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. At this point, then, I would like to reserve my 2 minutes at the end and give the other 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't mean to quibble about this. But does that include the opportunity for our side then to extend beyond 11 o'clock, as I have indicated?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Let me ask if we could do this. Let me ask the Senator from Idaho to have up to 3 minutes now, and then the Senator from North Dakota would be able to get 45 minutes, and then I would have 2 additional minutes, whatever that would take.

Mr. DORGAN. I would object. Let me say to the Senator from Texas with

great respect that we had an agreement last evening about morning business. Without consultation, we have a unanimous-consent propounded and agreed to because no one on our side was on the floor. If you wish to propound a further unanimous-consent request, I will object unless we restore the agreement that was obtained last evening of 45 minutes on each side. You are certainly welcome to 5 minutes toward the end, provided you accord the same opportunity to us. If you choose not to do that, I would be constrained to object.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. In an effort to give the Senator everything I think he has asked for, not to be quibbling, the only reason that I would give up what I have by unanimous consent is because the Senator from Idaho has been waiting, and in order to give him 3 minutes I am going to give you whatever you want. So I will say that I will ask unanimous consent that the 3 minutes of the 5 minutes that I have left be given to the Senator from Idaho, and that then I will have 2 additional minutes for my 45 minutes, and then the Senator from North Dakota will control 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. These are precious 3 minutes. I will make the best use of them.

For the 11th year in a row, we have cut the defense of this Nation—11 years. Last year, the administration assured the Senate Armed Services Committee that this year there would be no further cuts and that we would see the adding of funds for procurement so that we could buy the ships and the tanks and the trucks our men and women in the military so critically need.

As passed, the current budget for the Department of Defense, the budget that is now in question and we are talking about this morning, does not even keep up with inflation. What is in it? Things that are so straightforward, such as a 3-percent pay increase for men and women in the military, a very real issue, and all of the equipment that they need.

Later today, the Senate Armed Services Committee will hold a hearing on General Downing's report on the terrorist bombing of Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. Nineteen Americans lost their lives in that bombing.

Yesterday, the President announced he was sending an additional 5,000 American soldiers to Kuwait to keep Saddam Hussein in Iraq. In Bosnia the elections have taken place. Now the administration is considering keeping the American soldiers in Bosnia after the 1-year deployment we were told would do the job. These so-called peacekeeping missions have shown us repeatedly that the world remains a very dangerous place for Americans and cer-

tainly for the men and women in uniform. We must make the hard decisions and spend what is required to protect our Nation's vital interests.

If the President wants to once again reduce funding for defense, I would ask him, which requirements does he propose to cut? Which requirements does he propose to cut? Is the President ready to remove our troops from Bosnia? If so, declare it. Is the President ready to end our enforcement of the no-fly zone over Iraq? If so, declare it. Is the President willing to now say there is no need to send the troops to Kuwait? If so, declare it. What do the cuts do to the responsibilities he is giving to our troops? We continually ask our troops to do more and more and we ask them to do it with less and less. That is wrong. That is not what a Commander in Chief should be asking of those troops that are under that Commander in Chief's command.

Last night, we had the celebration of the 180th anniversary of the Senate Armed Services Committee. We acknowledged the leaders that have been in that position. We acknowledged Senator STROM THURMOND and Senator SAM NUNN, who I believe are together on this issue. There was an interesting quote that was pointed out to us last night by President Calvin Coolidge who said:

The Nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten.

I think that says it all. Let us not forget our defenders. Let us not forget the men and women in uniform that we repeatedly ask to put their lives on the line.

No more cuts, Mr. President. No more cuts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 45 minutes under the previous order.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think the previous order was that I had the last 2 minutes after Senator KEMPTHORNE's 3 minutes and then the Senator from North Dakota would have 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator wishes to take the time now, that is fine, if there is no objection.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. That was the agreement. I thank the Chair.

I think the Senator from Idaho said it all. If you are going to cut the defense budget at the same time that you continue to ask our military to do more with less, tell us where you want to cut.

The President of the United States is now threatening to veto the Defense appropriations bill if we do not cut \$2- to \$3 billion out of it. As 3,500 troops are on their way to Kuwait to defend the interests of this country, the President is threatening to veto the Defense appropriations bill. How could he do it? With troops going into Haiti, with troops in Bosnia, overruns there right now, and more troops on the way to a hot spot in the Middle East, and he is

telling Congress cut \$2- to \$3 billion out of the defense budget.

Mr. President, where do you want to cut? Are you going to cut F-16's, as you send 23 more to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia? Or are you going to cut the cruise missiles that you did not put in the budget in the first place which have already been used in your operation over Iraq? Is that what you want to cut? Or do you want to cut the Humvees with the added armor that has already saved one life in Bosnia when a landmine was run over by a Humvee but the protection was there and an American life was saved? Is that what you want to cut?

Those are the things in our budget that the President did not ask for and would be asking us to take out. Mr. President, step up to the line. If you are going to cut the defense budget, you tell us where you want to cut. It is very clear we are going to need Stealth bombers. We have already used them. Are we going to start cutting Stealth bombers as we are sending them into harm's way?

Mr. President, step up to the line. Tell us where you want to cut. Let us be responsible. Let us fund our men and women who are defending the interests of this country.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous consent agreement, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I shall not use the entire 45 minutes. Senator FEINSTEIN from California is here. I believe Senator BIDEN wishes to speak. I do want to call a couple of items to the attention of my colleagues and I do want to respond some to the comments that have been made this morning in the previous 45 minutes.

#### THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple of comments, first, about the Federal Reserve Board and a piece in this morning's newspaper about the Federal Reserve Board and, second, about the issue of confirming U.S. judges. First, the Federal Reserve Board.

Page 1 references the story on page 2 about the Federal Reserve Board. Next Tuesday, the Federal Reserve Board is going to meet in secret and make a decision about whether or not it wants to increase interest rates in our country. Apparently 8 of the 12 regional Federal Reserve Bank boards have made a recommendation to the Federal Reserve Board that they ought to increase interest rates and somehow that was leaked to the press. "Newspaper Story's Apparent Leak of Advice on Rates Shocks the Fed. Regional Banks' Opinions Are a Tightly Held Secret."

Why is this interesting? Because next Tuesday the Fed will make a decision that will affect every single American. If they increase interest rates, they will tax every single American with