

quite amazing. The press gives the impression that it has invested so much capital in the search for a scandal that it cannot drop it when the scandal evaporates. The Republicans give the impression that if one slander does not work, they will try another. No wonder the nation holds Congress, the White House and the media in such contempt; the people know that the press seems to be acting like a baby—a huge appetite at one end and no sense of responsibility at the other.

We have a topsy-turvy situation here. The Republicans win the case on merit over balancing the budget but are losing it politically on the basis of public perception. The Clintons have the better case on Whitewater but are losing it politically because of smear and slander, a situation compounded by their defensive behavior. The media seem unwilling to focus on the substance of either issue. So much for a responsible press!

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

#### EUROPEAN ARMIES DOWNSIZE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I read with great interest an article in the Washington Times a few days ago. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 26, 1996]

EUROPEAN ARMIES LOSE SIZE, EFFICIENCY  
CONSCRIPTION NOT WORKING; ALL-VOLUNTEER  
TOO EXPENSIVE

(By John Keegan)

LONDON.—The state may not be withering away, as Karl Marx predicted it would, but Europe's armies are.

Only seven years ago, Europe was awash with combat units. Now they are so thin on the ground that governments can scarcely meet their military commitments. And the situation is getting worse.

The problem is conscription. Young Europeans do not want to perform military service, even for as little as a year, now the norm.

Paradoxically, the generals are not keen on conscription either. As a result, the big armies, such as those of France and Germany, are planning either to increase the proportion of volunteers or to scrap conscription altogether.

France announced Thursday the most sweeping changes in its military since it developed nuclear weapons nearly 40 years ago, saying it will shrink its armed forces by one-third in six years and eliminate the draft. The French want a force of 350,000 by 2002, all of it volunteer.

Smaller armies in Europe have taken similar steps. The Netherlands will call up no new conscripts and release all those in service by Aug. 30. Belgium stopped conscription in 1993. Austria, not part of NATO, is talking of substituting an armed police for its army.

In the former Soviet bloc, the situation is confused at best, chaotic at worst.

Russia's problem is that young men of military age do not report for the call-up. In some military regions, the proportion of those who do is as low as 10 percent, and they tend to be unqualified—often dropouts who cannot find a place in the new free-enterprise economy. That does much to explain the poor performance of Russian units in Chechnya.

The Russian army has been humiliated by the collapse of the Soviet empire, of which it

was the guardian. Russian officers resent the diminution of national power as much as they are frustrated by the drop in their units' ability to perform. Inefficiency is so glaring that self-appointed volunteer formations, often calling themselves "Cossacks," are springing up.

Military disgruntlement in circumstances of political weakness always bodes ill. The need to put the former Soviet armed forces on a proper footing is now urgent.

Poland, where the army is a revered national institution, still operates a successful conscription system. Neighboring states, such as Belarus and Ukraine, are laboring to decide what sort of army they want. They look to the West for advice.

The British Defense Ministry held a conference in London last year to explain the options to them. The British model of all-"regular"—that is, career or volunteer—forces is much admired, but is too expensive for many. Conscription staggers on but does not produce combat units worth the money they cost.

The crisis in France and Germany is of a different order.

Conscription in France, since the French Revolution, has always been given an ideological value. Military service, the French believe, teaches the "republican virtues" of equality and fraternity, besides patriotism and civic duty.

There have been ups and downs in the system: exemptions for the well-educated, substitution for the rich. Since 1905, however, all fit young Frenchmen have had to serve a year or two in the ranks.

The logic is different from that held by Britons, who pine for the days before 1961, when conscription was abolished. They see it as a recipe for an end to inner-city hooliganism. In France it has a higher motive. Military service makes Frenchmen into citizens.

In Germany, conscription also acquired an ideological justification in the post-Hitler years.

Under the kaiser, it was intended to produce the biggest army in Europe, but also to make German youth respectful of their betters and obedient to all authority. The imperial officer corps took trouble to see that their authority was obeyed. Regular officers remained a caste apart from civilians, even under Hitler.

When postwar West Germany rearmed, its democratic government harbored understandable fears of creating such an officer corps again. It saw in conscription a check against military authoritarianism. Conscripts were guaranteed their civil rights, military law was abolished, and conscientious objection was made easy.

Too easy, it has proved.

More than half of the 300,000 annual conscripts now opt for alternative, non-military service. There are simply not enough men to keep units up to strength.

What makes things worse is that Chancellor Helmut Kohl, with his passion for European integration, is pushing for more inter-allied units, with Germans serving beside French, Spanish and Belgian soldiers.

Spain retains conscription, though the short term of service makes its army of little use. If French and Belgian troops are to be regulars in the future, the difference in quality between them and their German and Spanish comrades-in-arms will become an embarrassment.

The solution may be to make all soldiers regulars, to go for what Europeans increasingly call "the British system." The problem is cost.

Regulars are at least twice as expensive as conscripts, requiring either a bigger defense budget or smaller armed forces. No one

wants to spend more on defense, particularly when social budgets are crippling national economies. It seems inevitable, therefore, that armies must grow smaller but become all-regular if they are to meet international standards of efficiency.

The French appear to have accepted that logic.

President Jacques Chirac is about to be advised that France should withdraw the 1st Armed Division, its main contribution to the Franco-German Eurocorps, from Germany and disband several of its regiments, together with many others in metropolitan France. The army would be halved.

That may make good military sense, but it is likely to cause a political storm. Democratic France, like Germany, harbors suspicions of regular forces. They are thought to be anti-popular and all too readily turned against elected governments.

French history, like Germany's makes such fears realistic.

Napoleon III came to power through a military coup mounted with long-service troops. Charles de Gaulle faced another coup mounted by the Foreign Legion in Algeria. The Foreign Legion has never been allowed to serve in mainland France during peacetime because of fears about its loyalty.

In Germany, which already has some all-regular units, the public is probably no more ready to face a transition to the British system than is Mr. Kohl. The paradoxical outcome may be to leave Germany with the least efficient of armies among major European states.

German generals, who increasingly count on existing all-regular units to fulfill their NATO commitments, will not be pleased. They are likely to press for an end to conscription but unlikely to get it.

The difficulties involved in a change from conscript to regular forces are not easily understood in Britain, nor is the political debate it causes. The British take their system, together with the political stability of their armed forces, for granted.

What is not perceived is that such stability is the product of 300 years of unbroken constitutional government, during which the officer corps has completely integrated with civil society. There is, indeed, no "officer corps" in Britain, where soldiering is seen as a profession akin to others.

In Germany and France, with their different traditions, it may not take 300 years to change the relationship between army and society, but it will still take some time. In the former Soviet bloc, time may not be on the military reformers' side.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this article was written by John Keegan of the London Daily Telegraph in which he stated the historical perspective of how the principal European nations and Great Britain have, through the years, raised their Armed Forces, and how the future portends that they are going to depart from these time-honored methods, and, as a consequence, the likelihood of their level of manpower could significantly drop in the coming years.

I promptly sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable William J. Perry, addressing my concerns.

The letter said:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to bring to your attention the enclosed article, "European Armies Lose Size, Efficiency," which appeared in the "Washington Times" on February 26.

According to this article, European nations—many of which are Members of

NATO—are in the process of dramatically reducing the size of their ground forces. Such developments could have adverse consequences for the future of NATO, and require ever-increasing U.S. military contributions to the Alliance to compensate for European shortfalls. In such developments continue, NATO's ability to fulfill its commitments under Article 5 of the "NATO Charter" could be called into question.

As Chairman of the AirLand Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee—the Subcommittee with primary jurisdiction over NATO and the European Command—I will need information from the Department of Defense in order to assess the impact on the United States of the issues raised in the enclosed article. In particular, I am concerned about the long-term plans for meeting our NATO commitments in light of the reductions planned by our European allies; the need for increased U.S. military contributions to the Alliance to offset the European reductions; and the adequacy of current U.S. force structure planning to meet our NATO commitments in light of these changes.

During a time when NATO expansion is being actively considered, by some, these issues must be thoroughly examined. I ask that you provide your assessment as soon as possible in order for my Subcommittee to incorporate this information into its upcoming budget review and schedule of hearings. I am hopeful your reply will be detailed, as I view the representations in this article with deep concern.

#### SENATOR THURMOND APPOINTS ROMIE L. BROWNLEE AS NEW SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE DIRECTOR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I compliment the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator THURMOND, for his selection of Col. Les Brownlee as the new staff director of the Armed Services Committee. Colonel Brownlee has served me with extraordinary professionalism for 12 years. He brings to this position a record of significant achievement as a highly decorated career military officer for his valor in combat, service with the Army Secretariat, special assistant to the undersecretary of the Army, and many other qualifications.

I wish to compliment the chairman for the selection of Colonel Brownlee, who, although he has been in my employ, so to speak, for a dozen years, now will owe his total allegiance to the chairman and all other members of the committee. I was so pleased when Chairman THURMOND consulted me on this nomination that he had in mind some days ago. Of course, I strongly recommended Colonel Brownlee, and I am pleased that the chairman did select him from the strong field of candidates to become the staff director.

Colonel Brownlee is well known throughout the Senate and the staffs. He has worked here by my side and by the side of many others, including Senators Tower, Goldwater, NUNN, and many members of the committee, in the preparation of our legislative responsibilities, which have been discharged here on the floor through these many years. I would like to think that

the men and women in the Armed Forces on active duty today, and, indeed, the retired military, will receive with pride the news that one of their own, one who has distinguished himself so well in uniform, as well as in service to the committee, has been selected to this very, very important post.

I add, Mr. President, the fact that while Colonel Brownlee had not in any way actively looked at outside opportunities because he is a strict adherent to the rules of conflict of interest here, it was clear to me in our conversations that, in all probability, having spent 12 years on the committee and having many years before him of useful and productive life, thoughts were given to the more lucrative opportunities that are frequently offered by the private sector. But he clearly decided, once again, on the offer to serve his Nation, serve this Senate, and indeed serve the Armed Forces of the United States. The call came, and he responded unhesitatingly.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release accompanying the announcement by Chairman THURMOND be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THURMOND APPOINTS NEW SASC DIRECTOR

WASHINGTON, FEB. 27, 1996.—Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee Strom Thurmond (R-SC) today appointed longtime committee staff member Romie L. Brownlee as the new Staff Director for the Committee.

Brownlee, a retired Army Colonel, has worked on defense issues in the Senate since 1984, when he began his career in the Legislative Branch as a National Security Assistant to Senator John Warner (R-VA), and then joined the Committee in 1987 as the Deputy Staff Director for the Minority. Before being named Staff Director, Brownlee was responsible for handling issues related to the Army and Marine Corps land forces, Special Operations Forces, and drug interdiction.

"Les Brownlee is extremely well qualified to serve as Staff Director of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as he is a man with a keen intellect and proven abilities," said Thurmond. "He is widely respected by senior members of the armed forces, by Senators serving on the Armed Services Committee, and by his fellow staffers. We are fortunate to have him as our new Director."

A native Texan, Brownlee was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of Infantry following his 1962 graduation from the University of Wyoming. Brownlee served two tours in Vietnam, including one as a Company Commander with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. During his career, Brownlee earned a number of decorations including two Silver Stars, three Bronze Stars, and a Purple Heart. In subsequent years, Brownlee would hold postings that included serving as Commander of the 3rd Battalion, 36th Infantry, and at the Pentagon as the executive officer for the Under Secretary of the Army. He earned a Master's of Business Administration from the University of Alabama, graduated from the Army War College, is a distinguished graduate from the Army's highly demanding Ranger Course, and is an Honor Graduate of both the Infantry Officer Advanced Course, and the Command and General Staff College.

Brownlee is replacing retired Brigadier General Richard Reynard, who is resigning

from his position as Staff Director to return to the private sector.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NEW MEXICO, THE LAND OF ENCHANTMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, once again, 1 of our 50 is missing. If that seems like an enigmatic statement, bear with me a little longer. I have a story to relate to you that proves true once again the adage that truth is often stranger than fiction.

On Tuesday of this week one of my constituents, a man named Wade Miller, of Santa Fe, NM, called the Olympic ticket office in Atlanta, GA, in the United States—Atlanta, GA, USA. He was calling them to request tickets for the Olympics, I say to my friend from New York. Instead, imagine his surprise when he was told that since he was calling from New Mexico with his request, he would need to consult with the Mexican or Puerto Rican Olympic Committees in order to get tickets—not the Olympic office in Atlanta, which, I repeat, is in Georgia, USA.

Keep in mind that the area code for New Mexico is 505. The area code for Atlanta is 404. I checked it myself, and this does not register as an international call. If it was, my poor constituent, who argued with them for a half hour to 45 minutes trying to convince them that New Mexico was, indeed, in the United States, would have a real telephone bill. There was even some debate about old Mexico versus New Mexico. But when all was said and done they still told him that, no, you cannot buy any tickets from us. You have to get them from either the Mexican or Puerto Rican—they were not sure, I guess—Olympic office.

Finally, Mr. Miller produced a mailing address in Arizona and asked if his tickets could be mailed to that address. They established on the phone that yes, Arizona was in the United States and that tickets could be sent there. Alas, the identity crisis for New Mexico, USA, seems to continue. And while I'm pleased we could all agree that Arizona, our distinguished neighbor to our west, is a State, I must point out that New Mexico was actually a State even before Arizona, although not by much.

So, as the Senator from New Mexico—although I guess the Olympic Committee would simply call me a delegate, not a Senator—I must once more rise to refresh everyone's memory. New Mexico—that large span of land between the oil wells of Texas and the saguaros of Arizona—is in the United States. I flew home during the last recess and they did not book me on an