

recognized commissioned officer. When I asked Mr. Keller how he obtained the rank of O-5, he replied, "he was elected to this rank".

6. Mr. Keller was again advised they would not be allowed to use the range and to return the range flag and radio to Operations. Mr. Keller stated he would file a protest with the Department of Defense, Director of Civilian Marksmanship, and he was advised by me that he should go ahead and do so. All members of this DCM Unit cooperated and pleasantly left the range and turned in range equipment.

GARY J. MCCONNELL,  
LTC, EN, MI ARNG,  
Training Site Manager.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. While not stipulated, I would certainly agree to dividing the 5 minutes that we have as close to evenly as possible if the Senator from Idaho wanted to say a few words, if the Chair would watch the clock.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. With that agreement, I ask that I be allowed to proceed no longer than 2½ minutes on the issue of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey by his amendment is attempting to block or wipe out an action that this Senate took in 1996 in the Defense authorization bill to create the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety, and in doing so to privatize the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

As a result, the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety was created. This is a private, nonprofit, self-sustaining entity. It will have a board of directors appointed by the Secretary of the Army. The corporation will be allowed to raise money, just like any other not-for-profit association.

Of course, the intent of this organization is to instruct marksmanship, conduct national matches and competition, to award trophies, prizes, badges and insignias, and to promote the sale of firearms, ammunition, and equipment.

Under this new action, in addition, the corporation would be permitted to sell an existing 373,000 rifles and use money to fund the Civilian Marksman-ship Program.

The Senator from New Jersey has for a good number of years tried to discontinue this program. The Senate clearly recognized the value of it and in so doing recognized that it probably ought not subsidize it anymore and allow it to be privatized so that it could continue in that nature.

I hope that the Senate would reject the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and vote to table this action. We are now in the midst of organizing this Civilian Marksmanship Pro-

gram as a private nonprofit. I think it ought to be allowed to move forward in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will try to be brief. I hear references here to the fact that this organization will be self-sustaining. That is wonderful. Just give them \$76 million worth of goods to start with and then from then on we are self-sustaining. It is taxpayers' money. That is what we are giving away.

The Army says it has this kind of value. The value has been disputed, the value being \$76 million, which is conservative because as we have heard from the Senator from California and my personal investigation. I called a gun dealer that I know in Colorado. It may surprise some around here to know that I know a gun dealer, but I do not buy guns from him. He confirmed that an M-1 can be anywhere from \$400 to \$500, and so when we multiply that by 176,000 weapons, we know pretty well what kind of value we have.

Very simply, Mr. President, this is not a gun control measure. If people choose to have target practice, learn how to use rifles, practice gun safety, that is fine with me. Let them pay for it. When we send teams to the Olympics or we encourage sports, we do not pay for ping-pong paddles or ping-pong balls or tennis rackets or tennis balls or baseball bats or mitts.

That is not the Government's responsibility. This is something that ought to be discontinued. These weapons should be destroyed. They ought not to be out in the population. I hope that we will have support for our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to table.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator withhold for a unanimous-consent request before we start?

Mr. President, since Senators COHEN and MCCAIN have been trying to get recognized and I had to interpose an objection before they were recognized, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of this vote, the 4 o'clock order be delayed by 8 minutes, with the Senator from Maine having control of that 8 minutes for the purpose of making a statement.

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced, yeas 71, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

#### YEAS—71

Abraham	Frahm	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Baucus	Glenn	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Robb
Burns	Heflin	Rockefeller
Campbell	Helms	Roth
Coats	Hollings	Santorum
Cochran	Hutchison	Shelby
Cohen	Inhofe	Simpson
Coverdell	Inouye	Smith
Craig	Jeffords	Snowe
D'Amato	Johnston	Specter
Daschle	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Domenici	Kerrey	Thompson
Dorgan	Kyl	Thurmond
Exon	Leahy	Warner
Faircloth	Lieberman	Wellstone
Ford	Lott	

#### NAYS—29

Akaka	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Bryan	Hatfield	Pell
Bumpers	Kennedy	Pryor
Byrd	Kerry	Reid
Chafee	Kohl	Sarbanes
Conrad	Lautenberg	Simon
Dodd	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 4218) was agreed to.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Under the previous order, the Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN, is recognized for 8 minutes.

#### BOB DOLE AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, early this week Senator Dole delivered an important speech to the Philadelphia World Affairs Council in which he addressed the need for leadership in the 21st century.

Senator MCCAIN and I were privileged to have witnessed Senator Dole's first speech on foreign policy dealing with our relations with our Asian allies and friends. But in Philadelphia, Senator Dole called attention to our relationship with Europe, an area which, of course, by his previous service in World War II, he is infinitely familiar with. He talked about the need to call our attention back to leadership.

He said our success has not been the result of luck, but of leadership. I think he was absolutely correct in pointing out that communism and the Berlin Wall did not fall. They were demolished by a clear vision and consistent leadership.

I recall, Mr. President, that once when Mikhail Gorbachev came to the United States, he made a statement, I believe out in San Francisco, and he said: "The cold war is over. Let's not

debate or argue about who won the war." That prompted a prominent columnist to observe that would be the equivalent of having Max Schmeling knocked out by Joe Louis and getting up from the canvas and saying, "This fight is over. Let's not argue about who won the fight." It was worth arguing about who won the fight because of the demands placed upon the American people and their agreement to measure up to those demands itself.

Senator Dole touched on many aspects in his speech. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the full statement be included in the Record. But he noted, for example, that when the United States was focused almost exclusively on Mikhail Gorbachev, he was one who reached out to Boris Yeltsin, who at that time was being shunned by virtually everybody. He realized before Gorbachev's star was eclipsed that others had to follow. Others recognized his demise later. So Bob Dole was in the forefront of not just focusing on one individual, but focusing on our relationship with the country.

Mr. President, instead, we seem to have pursued a grand bet instead of a grand bargain. We are betting once again on an individual. We had stuck with Mikhail Gorbachev even as Yeltsin was coming up to the forefront. Now we have shifted to a fascination with Boris Yeltsin, who once mounted a tank in the streets of Moscow, who is now mounting tank assaults in the streets of the cities of Chechnya, killing thousands of innocent citizens, going from fighting a coup in the Kremlin to fomenting coups in the independent republics of the Caucasus.

Mr. President, we need to make very clear, in terms of our relationship with Russia, that we intend to maintain help, maintain the independence of countries in Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, some of whom will become as important to the United States as the gulf states have been over the years, and whose states we fought a war to preserve that independence.

We need to make clear, as Senator Dole did in his speech, "that Russian economic blackmail and military meddling in their former empire will carry costs in terms of relations with the United States."

Mr. President, I have a number of other points I would like to make. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Dole's address to the Philadelphia World Affairs Council be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Remarks prepared for delivery by Bob Dole, Republican candidate for President of the United States, Philadelphia World Affairs Council, June 25, 1996]

#### LEADERSHIP FOR A NEW CENTURY

America came of age in the middle of this century, when the interests and ideals of Western democracies faced their greatest moment of peril. Our rite of passage is marked by neat rows of white crosses in

quiet corners of Europe where America left to rest so many thousands of her sons and daughters. Buried with them was any belief that America could prosper undisturbed by Europe's recurrent calamities. We accepted then and recognize now that our security and Europe's are joined, and that our alliance offers the best hope for resisting any threat to the peace in Europe and to the civilization we share.

In this city, this cradle of democracy, just steps from the Liberty Bell, stands the house of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the 18th-Century Polish patriot whose love of liberty brought him to Philadelphia as one of the first foreign volunteers in our struggle for independence. Kosciuszko understood that a love of liberty unites citizens from across the world. We have an interest in helping Poland consolidate its hard-won freedom today, just as a son of Poland once supported ours.

America's interests in Europe are as compelling and as urgent as they were before the Berlin Wall was breached by the stronger forces of human yearning. Yet President Clinton has persistently deferred to our allies and to the Russians, subordinating American interests to the interests of a dubious or ineffective consensus. That's not leadership. And that has harmed the interests of all of us—Russian, Europe, and American alike.

What is urgently needed is a restoration of American leadership in Europe—leadership that understands the purpose and promise of America's role in Europe. Let us begin by reaffirming that Europe's security is indispensable to the security of the United States, and that American leadership is absolutely indispensable to the security of Europe. The Cold War's successful conclusion has not altered this fundamental premise of our engagement in Europe.

Let me be absolutely clear. With the end of the Cold War, we should be building firm foundations for a century of peace, fulfilling the promise of a new future for Europe. Instead, Bill Clinton's policy of indecision, vacillation and weakness is making the world a more dangerous place. And we are missing an opportunity that may never come again.

As president I will restore decisiveness and purpose to America's foreign policy.

Today's great tragedy is that this administration is squandering the inheritance that America—through 45 years of struggle and sacrifice—won for free peoples everywhere when we won the Cold War.

This victory for freedom in the Cold War was achieved through leadership—leadership that understood the vital importance of America's power and America's example to the world.

Bill Clinton and his advisors didn't understand that then. They don't understand it now. It's time we had an administration that did. I intend to give America that administration.

The need for change could not be more urgent.

In an era of tectonic shifts in world affairs, we must not continue to entrust American leadership to would-be statesmen still suffering from a post-Vietnam syndrome. This historic moment will not wait upon Administration officials who believe that our Cold War mission was mistaken—not principled and noble—and who are still suffering from the illusion that communism merely fell instead of being pushed.

It is time to take our foreign policy out of the hands of an administration engaged in the dreamy pursuit of an international order, that cherishes romantic illusions about the soul of a former adversary—an administration that doubts American power, questions American purpose, and cannot fulfill American promise.

It is time for a restoration of American leadership based on the democratic values that are shared by our allies—and increasingly by other nations as well.

For fifty years, American statesmen from both parties—Democratic and Republican—have understood that the security of Europe is vital to the security of the United States.

For fifty years, Americans have understood that aggression and conflict in Europe could lead to the domination of Europe by a hostile power, and that if all the power in Europe were in hostile hands, the United States would be directly threatened.

For fifty years, Americans have understood that the economic strength and growing prosperity of Western Europe were critical for our own economic success.

For fifty years, Americans have understood that Germany's full integration into the security structures of the West solved a hundred-year-old problem that had made the 20th Century one of the most violent in recorded human history.

These are America's interests in Europe. They are just as compelling and urgent today as they have ever been.

Nothing better illustrates President Clinton's failure of leadership than his uncertain and vacillating policies toward Bosnia.

After three years of opposing Congressional efforts to enable Bosnia to defend itself—arguing that lifting the arms embargo would involve America in a Balkan quagmire—President Clinton committed American military forces on the ground in Bosnia. Although I believe this commitment would not have been necessary if we had done what I recommended from the start. I made the decision to support our troops. It was not popular, but I learned a long time ago that young Americans risking their lives should never doubt the support of this government and the American people.

After haphazardly getting America into Bosnia, President Clinton now has no idea how to get Americans out or how to accomplish the mission they went to fulfill. President Clinton promised to lift the arms embargo, and then changed his mind. He allowed NATO to act as a subcontractor to the whims of the United Nations bureaucrats and Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. He refused to allow the Bosnian people the fundamental right to defend themselves, and instead gave a green light for the terrorists of Tehran to establish a beachhead in Europe. And, at long last, under Congressional pressure, he committed the United States to the arming and training of Bosnia—"I give you my word"; he wrote. Yet six months after the Dayton Accords, not a single bullet has been delivered, and Bosnia remains outgunned.

American Presidents from Truman to Reagan proclaimed doctrines that affirm the right of self-defense against aggression. Yet President Clinton still will not do what he has promised since 1994; give the Bosnian people the right to defend themselves. Does the "Clinton Doctrine" provide for the right of self-defense only if it is done covertly by sworn enemies of the United States?

Unless we vigorously move to train and equip the Bosnians, the U.S. and NATO will face a "stay or fail" dilemma in Bosnia; either pull out and ignore the resulting disaster, or become involved in an open-ended commitment with no clear purpose, no achievable mission, and no realistic exit strategy.

Today, the credibility of NATO is on the line in Bosnia and, once again, American leadership is lacking.

Today, the Bosnian people do not have freedom of movement, but war criminals do.

Today, reports about widespread violations of the Dayton Accords are suppressed by order of the Clinton Administration.

Today, despite the fact that conditions for free and fair elections quite plainly do not exist in most of Bosnia, the Clinton Administration continues to push for them anyway. The whole world knows the Clinton Administration has its eye more on American elections in November than Bosnian elections in September.

Let me turn now to Russia.

President Clinton's misguided romanticism towards Russia has led him and his advisors to try to fine-tune the intrigues of Russian domestic politics instead of guarding against the nationalist turn in Russian foreign policy that has already occurred. Post-Soviet Russia has proved all too willing to repeat old patterns, challenging the interests of America and the West. And many of those challenges were excused, ignored and even encouraged by the Clinton Administration.

Just over a week ago, President Yeltsin narrowly won the initial round of Russia's first direct presidential elections. The second round has been scheduled for July 3rd. President Yeltsin appears to be ahead. President Yeltsin has had a central role in the demise of the Soviet Union. He has earned his place in Russian history. I remember going out to meet him at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington in June of 1991. I was virtually alone at the time, but I was convinced that his contributions and his potential to change his country should be recognized. The next year, he and I took a memorable trip to my home state of Kansas.

Boris Yeltsin has changed Russia—its neighbors are independent, its economy is open, and its people are free. President Yeltsin has taken positive steps since the first round of elections, such as dismissal of hard-line advisors. I hope he wins next month's elections. I hope the Russian people decisively reject their communist past. But whatever happens, America has interests that must be protected and values that should be promoted.

I am not here to engage in a debate over "Who lost Russia." Russia was never ours to lose. Russia is a great and powerful nation with a proud people and a vibrant culture. Its future is for the Russian people to decide. But I am here to ask "Who looks out for American interests in Central and Eastern Europe today?" And if we answer that question properly, we can avoid debates tomorrow over "Who lost Ukraine?" or "Who lost the Baltics?"

Make no mistake: I want the Russian people to succeed in their quest for enduring liberty and democracy.

I have a vision of: a free and prosperous Russia living at peace with its neighbors; a new democratic Russia entering the G-7 after its reforms have been consolidated; a Russia with a special relationship with an enlarged NATO; a Russia willing to respect the independence and sovereignty of all its neighbors; a Russia able to harness the energy of its people and the resources of its territory to realize the promise of its future.

But we should have no illusions about Russia's journey: it will be long, it will be difficult and it will be uncertain.

As president, my foreign policy will strive to consolidate our Cold War victory in Europe. I will replace President Clinton's misguided romanticism with leadership for a new century—a century that can realize the peaceful promise of a new Europe . . . leadership that will avoid the mistakes that led to so much bloodshed in the century we are now leaving behind.

My policy will reinforce the independence of all the states of the former Soviet Union, will support the new democracies of Europe, will lead to the enlargement of the North Atlantic alliance, and will advance effective

counter-proliferation measures. In doing so, I will deal with the Russia that exists today—not the Russia we all hope to see.

Let's look at the reality.

Russian hard-line security services have regained much of their previous power. The communist-controlled Duma voted in March to annul the treaty that formally dissolved the Soviet Union. Too often, the privatization of state-owned enterprises has served to enrich pervasive organized criminal networks. The Jewish Agency, laboring mightily to aid emigration from Russia, has been shut down, and ominous signs of anti-Semitism are reappearing.

Since December 1994, the world has witnessed the specter of a Russian democrat, Yeltsin, permitting the bombing of cities in Chechnya to appease Russian nationalists. More than 30,000 people have been killed, the vast majority innocent bystanders. Yet, President Clinton's misguided romanticism led him to compare Russian brutality in Chechnya to the American Civil War. This is a comparison as naive about history as it is offensive both to the memory of Abraham Lincoln and the brave people in Russia who have called for an end to the bloodshed.

By remaining passive in the face of these and other troubling developments, President Clinton has given a green light to the most dangerous tendencies in the New Russia. I will not let illusions about the Russia we hope to see prevent me from seeing clearly the Russia that truly exists.

Forces in Russia have waged a campaign of subversion, intimidation and economic blackmail against other independent states of the former Soviet Union—from the Baltics and Ukraine to the Caucasus and Central Asia. In 1994, the stirrings of Russia's neo-imperial policy were excused by President Clinton in this astonishing statement: "There will be times when you are involved, and you will be more likely to be invoked in some of these areas near you, just like the United States has been involved in the last several years in Panama and Grenada near our area."

Now, President Clinton may not know the difference between the liberation of Grenada from communist thugs and Russian intimidation of Georgia or the Baltic states, but I do.

I will make clear the U.S. interest and desire to maintain the independence of countries in Europe—from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea—and in the Caucasus and Central Asia.

I will make clear that Russian economic blackmail or military meddling in their former empire will carry costs in relations with the United States. Anything less sends a signal that the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 is reversible and that the hard-fought freedom of formerly Captive Nations is not our concern.

Russian officials have conducted a campaign of threats against NATO expansion, and President Clinton got the message. He deferred and delayed—placing the threats of Russian nationalists before the aspirations of democrats in countries like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. It is an outrage that the patriots who threw off the chains of Soviet bondage are told that they must wait.

I will stand firmly with the champions of democracy. I will not grant Russia a veto over NATO enlargement. The Russians should be told that NATO is a defensive alliance. It is not now and has never been the NATO of old Soviet propaganda. Stable and secure democracies in Central Europe will be good for America, good for Europe, and, yes, good for Russia.

My policy toward Russia will employ effective measures to defend against weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles.

While the threat of immediate nuclear holocaust has receded, the risk of accidental launch has increased. This makes missile defense more feasible and more necessary. Yet President Clinton is unwilling to have the United States defend itself against even a single incoming nuclear missile.

At the same time, President Clinton has been silent about Russian violations of arms control treaties such as START I and the Biological Weapons Convention. He has ignored the Russian decision to abandon the Bilateral Destruction Accord on chemical weapons. He rewarded Russian violations of the conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty by giving Russia a better deal.

As President, I will not renegotiate arms control agreements to indulge Russian ambitions in the Baltics, the Caucasus or anywhere else.

As President, I will link Russian adherence to existing arms control treaties to the provision of U.S. assistance.

I will end the misguided efforts to include theater missile defenses under the ABM treaty—no more "dumbing down" our missile defenses and dulling our technological edge. The Clinton Administration views the ABM treaty as the cornerstone of its arms control policy. I view it as an historical relic that does not reflect the new realities of proliferation, and seeks instead to preserve the Cold War balance of nuclear terror.

Russia also faces a growing threat from missile proliferation. As President, I will engage the Russians in a direct discussion about the mutual benefits of missile defense and urge them to cooperate with us on this critical issue.

But one thing will be certain in my administration: the American people will no longer be left vulnerable to ballistic missile attack. When I am President, we will deploy an effective national missile defense. We can afford it. We can do it. We should begin now.

We must also understand that the linchpin of U.S. and European security is NATO. But as the world has changed, so, too, must NATO change. As former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher recently said, "Our energies must be directed toward strengthening NATO, which is as important in the post-Cold War world as in the circumstances of its creation." And while our allies can and should take a greater share of the burden, we should not nurture the illusion that this is a substitute for American leadership.

We have the opportunity to forge a new consensus in support of a common defense that includes Central and Eastern Europe.

Fifty years ago, in Fulton, Missouri, Winston Churchill spoke his famous line: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent." Today, the iron curtain has been raised, but a security vacuum remains in Europe—from the coast of a democratic Poland to the shores of a free Slovenia.

As the nations of Central and Eastern Europe stretch out their hand to the West, as they offer to stake the lives of their people in the common defense of our democracies, the Clinton Administration proudly proclaims their policy is "slow but deliberate." Seven years after the collapse of communism, it is clear President Clinton's policy is deliberately slow. If the Clinton Administration's confused and timid approach had been followed in 1990, we would still be studying German unification today.

The enlargement of NATO will strengthen security, freedom and peace in Europe. It will secure the gains of democracy in Central Europe. It will stabilize the security of Europe in which Russia also has a stake. It will ensure that security concerns in Eastern Europe are addressed through NATO. It will demonstrate to post-Soviet Russia that the

freedom that Eastern and Central Europe gained in 1989 is permanent. And it will be an unmistakable safeguard against a reversal of democratic trends in Russia.

Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic should be offered full NATO membership today. Many other nations from Slovenia to the Baltics rightly aspire to this goal. And Ukraine, despite the great pressures of its geography, remains a willing, dedicated, and welcome participant in cooperative activities with NATO. As I said, NATO enlargement is a process that should begin with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—but it should not end there.

When I am elected President, I will urge NATO to begin accession talks with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, and to set the goal of welcoming new NATO members at a summit in Prague in 1998—the 60th anniversary of the betrayal of Munich, the 50th anniversary of the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia, and the 30th anniversary of the Soviet invasion. There could be no more appropriate year or appropriate place to declare that Central Europe has become a permanent part of the Atlantic community.

I will actively promote cooperative efforts in NATO to develop and deploy Europe-wide missile defenses to protect against missile attack by rogue states poised on NATO's southern flank.

I will support the integration of Central and Eastern European militaries into the NATO defense structure, using the Defense Export Loan Guarantee program—ignored by President Clinton.

I fully recognize the importance of friendly relations with Russia. Lest we forget, in 1993 during a summit in Warsaw, President Boris Yeltsin and then-President Lech Walesa issued a joint declaration affirming that Poland's desire to join NATO did "not run counter to the interests of any state, including Russia." But, as Bill Clinton dragged his feet, extremist elements in Russia began to set the agenda in Moscow again. We should not be surprised that hesitation and vacillation fueled those who thought threats would deter us.

As President, I will not grant Russia a veto over NATO enlargement but I will offer Russia serious dialogue on long term relations with NATO. NATO is a defensive organization by its very nature, and its interests collide with Russia only where Russia intrudes upon sovereign nations. A non-expansionist Russia is not threatened by an enlarged NATO.

The hope of the world still rests, as it has throughout this century, on American leadership. There is no escaping the fact that only America can lead—others cannot, or will not, or should not. How firmly we grasp the remarkable opportunities before us in Europe will determine whether the next century repeats the violence and tragedy of the last or opens up a new era of peace, freedom, and security.

The promise of the future has never been greater. With strong, decisive American leadership, we can make that promise a reality for ourselves and the generations to come.

Thank you and God bless America.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, we need to make it clear, that we will not ignore continued Russian violations of biological, chemical and conventional arms control agreements.

In contrast to an approach based on romanticism, Senator Dole outlined:

An approach based on realism and a clear understanding of American interests.

A strategy that will reinforce the independence of the states of the former Soviet Union, that will support the new democracies of Europe, and

that will strengthen NATO and lead to its enlargement.

A policy that will deal with Russia as it exists today, so that we can effectively use what leverage we have to encourage Russia to become the country we hope it will be—free, prosperous, respectful of and cooperative with its neighbors.

But not a policy that is based on the illusion that Russia already has reached this stage of development.

Mr. President, there are many important elements to Senator Dole's speech, and I urge all Senators to take the time to read it.

Mr. President, I now yield my remaining 4 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to join my friend and colleague from Maine in congratulating Senator Dole on his second very important foreign policy/national security speech, this time concerning our relations with Europe. I believe that he is establishing a conceptual framework with a clear vision and clear idea as to what we want the world to look like in the next century and a clearer definition of those threats as they are today and as we envision them in the future.

Although the speech was about Europe, I think it is important, although tragic, to note that an act of terror was committed just about the same time this speech was given, which is a compelling statement as to how fragile democracy is throughout the world and how easily acts of terror can be committed which take the lives of American citizens.

Mr. President, one of the major parts of the Dole speech given in Philadelphia was the subject of NATO. In it he says:

We must understand the linchpin of U.S. and European security is NATO. But as the world has changed, so, too, must NATO change. As former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher recently said, "Our energies must be directed towards strengthening NATO, which is as important in the post-Cold War world as in the circumstances of its creation." And while our allies can and should take a greater share of the burden, we should not nurture the illusion that this is a substitute for American leadership.

American leadership is what the Dole speech was all about, Mr. President, American leadership in a world that is fraught with danger, that has become much less dangerous, but a much less predictable one. This speech that is articulated by Senator Dole is a clear vision and a clear call and challenge to the American people to again recognize that we cannot discard the mantle of leadership which was handed down to us early in this century.

Finally, Mr. President, Senator Dole said—I think it is worth repeating—

The hope of the world still rests, as it has throughout this century, on American leadership. There is no escaping the fact that only America can lead—others cannot, or will not, or should not. How firmly we grasp the remarkable opportunities before us in Europe will determine whether the next century repeats the violence and tragedy of the

last or opens up a new era of peace, freedom, and security.

Mr. President, I want to again congratulate Senator DOLE on an outstanding speech. I commend it to all of my colleagues and the American people. I yield the floor.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4365

(Purpose: To provide equitable relief for the generic drug industry)

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me. For the benefit of our colleagues, Mr. President, let me state what has gone on today and what I think will go on for the next hour to hour and a half.

Mr. President, first, I am going to be sending an amendment to the desk in the first degree. Immediately following that introduction, the Senator from Utah will offer his amendment in the second degree to my first-degree amendment. We will debate these issues and vote on the Hatch amendment some 45 minutes later. After that vote, it will be very possible that I will offer the same amendment as my amendment in the first degree, which we will debate for 45 minutes and then vote.

I know this is somewhat of a Byzantine situation, Mr. President, but I have been attempting since December 7 to have an up-or-down vote in this Chamber on my amendment. It appears I am not going to get a clear up-or-down vote, but this is as near as possible.

Mr. President, with that explanation, hoping our colleagues understand the nature of this issue and the procedure that we will be following, I send my amendment in the first degree to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 4365.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X add the following:

### SEC. 1072. EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR THE GENERIC DRUG INDUSTRY.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the generic drug industry should be provided equitable relief in the same manner as other industries are provided with such relief under the patent transitional provisions of section 154(c) of title