

arises, forces performing operations other than war will have to be withdrawn in order to go to a second major regional conflict.

Mr. President, that is a vast difference from what the base force that President Bush envisioned would be capable of doing. That takes away the ability to have simultaneous conflicts that we would win, and says nearly simultaneous because we would have to rush out and retrain troops that were in an operation other than war because they are not trained and ready for combat when they are performing humanitarian or peacekeeping missions.

We have a large force in Bosnia today. We have sent an entire Army division plus support troops to Bosnia totaling 20,000 personnel with 5,000 at least in Croatia and Macedonia and with thousands more supporting this operation from Hungary, Italy, Germany, the Mediterranean and the United States. This deployment is said to last for a year, and during that time we are not able to have our troops in training for their combat missions. The Bosnian deployment will cost us billions of dollars in unprogrammed contingency defense expenditures in addition to the billions that we know it will cost up front. The military services could have to deplete vital training accounts to pay for these unplanned operations.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I am alarmed by the cuts that I see being contemplated in our Armed Forces. In my view, many of the reductions which have occurred in the past 5 years have seriously undermined the capability to support a national defense strategy in which we must be prepared to fight and prevail in two major regional conflicts simultaneously. In fact, I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that in rapidly reducing our Armed Forces from 2.1 to 1.4 million we have already reduced their size to a level that is inadequate to meet our needs, and we can reduce no further.

When General Sullivan, the former Chief of Staff of the Army, assumed his position his watchword as the draw-down began was no more Task Force Smiths. He was referring, of course, to the task force commanded by Lt. Col. Bradley Smith which was rushed into battle in Korea in July 1950 to counter the North Korean attack. This courageous American force was sent into battle outgunned, ill-equipped, and ill-prepared, and was quickly and easily overrun by the Soviet-equipped North Korean force. At the time Americans were shocked to learn that the same military which defeated the Japanese and the German armies 5 years before had so quickly become a hollow force.

Last summer, our Nation dedicated a memorial to those who fought in the Korean war. That honor was long overdue. My husband served in the Navy during this time. He and I went to see the Korean monument. And I am going to tell you that visiting the monument to our veterans of the Korean war is

one of the most poignant and beautiful experiences that I believe I have ever had.

It is a real tribute to those valiant warriors. Now as we consider the 1997 defense authorization bill, we should reflect not only on those who died in Korea but on the lesson that we should have learned from that war. One of the finest books written about that Korean war is "This Kind of War: a Study in Unpreparedness," by T.R. Fehrenbach, a fellow Texan and close friend of mine. As an infantry commander, he experienced the conflict from a unique vantage point, and his book, first published in 1962, remains in print today. I commend this book to my colleagues because what Mr. Fehrenbach is saying is we must always have a trained and ready field force, that whatever we try to do from the air is not going to win a war and we are not going to protect our freedom throughout civilization if we do not have the ability to go into the field, and place soldiers on the ground, well equipped and well trained.

Mr. President, what we are talking about today is making sure we have it all—that we have the technology, that we have the airlift and the sealift that will allow us to take that very last step, which is placing our troops on the ground. We are talking about having the training and arming our troops who must capture hold that ground while at the same time that we are making sure we have all of the strategic and technological advances which would keep them from having to go in the first place. But if we must send our forces, we want them to have all of the protections we can give them. So we need the technology; we need the equipment; we need the personnel; and we need the training. That is what we are talking about in this bill today.

We are having a major conflict with the President and the Congress on just what we need in terms of military capability. Congress is trying to get the military spending up so that we will not have a hollow force, so that we will be able to win two major regional conflicts simultaneously, because that is what a ready force is, and so that we will be able to prevail in two major regional conflicts quickly and with the fewest possible casualties.

That is our goal, and that is why Congress wants to spend \$10 billion more than the President wants to spend to make sure that when the troops are in the field they are trained and equipped, to make sure they have the air cover they need, to make sure they have the equipment they need to protect them if they are in the field, and to make sure our shores are protected from any kind of incoming ballistic missile, which we now know 32 countries in the world have the capability to produce and someday soon send to our shores. We even have groups that are not countries with that capability. And with open borders, we could be vulnerable if we do not do what is right and make the strategic

decisions that will protect the people who live in our country and will protect those who are protecting our freedom anywhere in the world in any theater from coming into harm's way if we can prevent it.

Mr. President, those are the decisions we are making with this bill. I hope we can sit down with the President to make sure we are doing what is right for our troops in the field today, for the protection of freedom today, and to make sure we will not wake up 5 or 10 years from now and realize that we have allowed another task force Smith; that we did not do what we needed to do in terms of the strategic thinking necessary to make sure we were not vulnerable to any kind of attack from any source in the world.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina for his leadership. I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able Senator from Texas for the excellent remarks she has made on this bill. She has made a fine contribution to this debate.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 2:15.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:25 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we are working with the Democratic leader and trying to get agreements on how we can proceed on this bill and other

issues. For the information of all Senators, the Democratic leader and I have been negotiating on the minimum wage issue since Friday of last week. This Senator believes that we are making good progress and may yet today be able to reach an agreement that would satisfy all Senators.

With that in mind, I will now outline the agreement that we have been discussing. The agreement is as follows: On Monday, July 8, at a time to be determined later, the Senate would begin consideration of H.R. 3448, the House-passed minimum wage bill, which also contains the small business taxes, and at that time Senator KENNEDY would offer his amendment with a 1-hour time limit. The amendment would then be laid aside, and I would offer an amendment on behalf of Senator BOND, with an hour time limit. The Senate would then vote, first on the Bond amendment, to be followed by a vote on the Kennedy amendment.

Following the two minimum wage votes, the bill would then be opened to two tax-related amendments, one to be offered by each leader and debated separately and limited to 2 hours of debate each. I want to emphasize again that this has not been agreed to, but this is an outline of what we are talking about.

It seems to me this is a fair agreement; that it also offers a date specific that we would take these issues up and act on them. If the Democratic leader is optimistic some agreement along these lines can be reached, then it would be my intention to ask unanimous consent that no minimum wage amendments be in order during today's session in order to make progress on the DOD bill while negotiations are ongoing with respect to this minimum wage issue.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. I understand the Democratic leader has no objection to this, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that no minimum wage amendments be in order during the remainder of the session of the Senate today, Tuesday, June 18, 1996.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be set aside until the close of business today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. There was no objection heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no objection.

Mr. LOTT. Senator GRASSLEY has one on infrastructure; Senator BINGAMAN has one on ASAT; Senators SIMPSON and THOMAS have one with regard to a Wyoming project; Senator FORD, DOD/DOE chemical munitions. We are not asking at this time for any time agreement on these amendments, but these Members and amendments are ready to go. We need to get started on the amendment process.

It would be the intention of the leadership that we go ahead and take these amendments up and try to get agreement on a time where votes would be agreed to. Perhaps, even, we would stack some of them at a time certain. We will notify the Members as soon as we can get that agreed to.

At this time, we would like the committee members to go ahead and proceed with the DOD bill and amendments that are ready to go.

With that, Mr. President, I turn the floor back over to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Montelongo, a fellow in Senator HUTCHISON's office, be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of S. 1745.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Comdr. Thomas Vecchiolla, a Navy fellow in Senator COHEN's office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate on the fiscal year 1997 national defense authorization bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, Senator GRASSLEY, I believe, will be here momentarily. I believe that Senator BINGAMAN is here ready to go.

I see Senator GRASSLEY is on the floor. We will be ready to go momentarily.

CHURCH BURNINGS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 265, submitted earlier today by myself, the Democratic leader and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 265) relating to church burnings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this Senate resolution condemns the arson and other acts of desecration against churches and other houses of worship.

Senator DASCHLE and I are joined in the cosponsorship of this resolution by Senator HUTCHISON, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, Senator GRAMM, Senator HELMS, Senator FAIRCLOTH, and Senator D'AMATO. I hope Senators during today, if they have an opportunity, or later on this afternoon, and would like to speak on this issue, that they will feel free to do so.

Mr. President, my State of Mississippi was gravely wounded last night.

Two churches burned in Kossuth, a small town in the northeast corner of our State. The Mount Pleasant and the Central Grove Missionary Baptist Churches were lost to flames.

The fires, like several others that have hit churches elsewhere in the country in recent months, were, as the official reports say, of suspicious origin.

In time, the truth will be uncovered. And if these fires were not accidents, if they were set by the hand of evil, then justice must be done.

The good people of Kossuth will rebuild their churches.

Bill Dillworth, a deputy sheriff and a deacon at Mount Pleasant Church, affirmed, "We will always survive. You look to the Lord at times like this. He will be your guide."

I hope that same spirit prevails in the meeting President Clinton has scheduled for tomorrow with several of the Nation's Governors, to discuss ways to combat church arsons.

It will not help the situation to turn these tragedies into a racial or regional issue. Attacks on churches and synagogues are attacks on religion itself.

James Glassman's column in today's Washington Post lays out the sad statistics. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has investigated 123 church burnings over the last 5 years. Of those, 38 have been at black churches.

Attacks of any kind against any of our places of worship should unite Americans in outrage and in resolve. That is why, early this year, a coalition of pro-family organizations—the Christian Coalition, Eagle Forum, Family Research Council, and others—publicly appealed for action to protect churches—all churches.

In response to their petition, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings in May. And the Christian Coalition offered a \$25,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of a church-burner.

Those were constructive steps in the right direction.

Perhaps additional legislation is needed to make it easier for Federal prosecutors to intervene in cases of church burnings.

On the other hand, perhaps the administration should take a closer look at the extraordinary powers to protect churches which congress gave the Justice Department 2 years ago in the clinic access bill.

That legislation, designed to protect only abortion clinics, was expanded, at