

Breaux	Frist	McCain
Brown	Gorton	McConnell
Bryan	Graham	Nickles
Bumpers	Gramm	Nunn
Burns	Grams	Pryor
Campbell	Gregg	Reid
Chafee	Hatch	Robb
Coats	Helms	Roth
Cochran	Hollings	Santorum
Cohen	Hutchison	Shelby
Coverdell	Inhofe	Simpson
Craig	Johnston	Smith
DeWine	Kassebaum	Stevens
Domenici	Kempthorne	Thomas
Faircloth	Kyl	Thompson
Feinstein	Lott	Thurmond
Ford	Lugar	Warner
Frahm	Mack	Wyden

## NAYS—37

Baucus	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Heflin	Murray
Bradley	Jeffords	Pell
Byrd	Kennedy	Pressler
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
D'Amato	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Snowe
Dorgan	Leahy	Specter
Exon	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	
Glenn	Mikulski	

## NOT VOTING—3

Hatfield	Inouye	Murkowski
----------	--------	-----------

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 5197) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5190

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on amendment No. 5190 by the Democratic leader, Mr. DASCHLE. Pursuant to rule XVI, paragraph 4, the Chair submits the question to the Senate; namely, Is the amendment germane subject matter of the bill? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute of debate.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as a requirement of the 1991 Agent Orange Act, after a thorough analysis of all relevant scientific evidence, the National Academy of Sciences announced in March a link between agent orange exposure and the presence of spina bifida in offspring.

My amendment would extend health care, vocational rehabilitation, and monetary benefits to Vietnam veterans' children born with spina bifida, a serious birth defect that requires life-long medical care. It is completely paid for with a non-controversial savings provision.

While this should be an honest vote on the proposal itself, some have chosen to cloak it in a procedural question. I ask my colleagues to vote against the germaneness point of order. Of all amendments we have debated and voted on today, this amendment is clearly a veterans' issue on this veterans' bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. This is a perfect example of why this country has a \$5 trillion debt. On the basis of one study, one study which the author testified before the House we should not rely on, the

minority leader wants to create on an appropriations bill a brand-new entitlement program which has not been heard in the authorizing committee, which is not based on sound science. If you believe sound science rather than emotion should be the basis of our action, then you could not support this proposal. But it is an effort to establish over the objections of the authorizing committee chairman an entitlement program on an appropriations bill, and it was for that reason I raised the point that this amendment is not germane.

I ask that the Members support the argument that this is not germane, and I ask they vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair submits to the Senate the question, Is the amendment germane? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Leg.]

## YEAS—62

Abraham	Feingold	Mikulski
Akaka	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Glenn	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Nunn
Boxer	Grassley	Pell
Bradley	Harkin	Pressler
Breaux	Heflin	Pryor
Bryan	Helms	Reid
Bumpers	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kennedy	Shelby
D'Amato	Kerrey	Simon
Daschle	Kerry	Snowe
DeWine	Kohl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Exon	Lieberman	Wyden
Faircloth	McConnell	

## NAYS—35

Ashcroft	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Bond	Gramm	McCain
Brown	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Gregg	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchison	Simpson
Coats	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Kassebaum	Thomas
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
Frahm	Lott	

## NOT VOTING—3

Hatfield	Inouye	Murkowski
----------	--------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 35. The judgment of the Senate is that the amendment is germane.

The question now occurs on agreeing to the Daschle amendment, No. 5190.

The amendment (No. 5190) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## UNITED STATES RESPONSE TO IRAQI AGGRESSION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate now is Senate Resolution 288, offered by the majority leader and minority leader regarding the United States response to Iraqi aggression. There are 2 minutes equally divided.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle who deserve our gratitude for the effort put forth in the last couple of days to bring us to this point. I will not name them now. I will name them later.

Let me simply read the resolving clause:

The Senate commends the military actions taken by and the performance of the United States Armed Forces, under the direction of the Commander in Chief, for carrying out this military mission in a highly professional, efficient and effective manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader for framing a very difficult compromise which has, given the proximity to a Presidential election, a great deal of emotion associated with it.

I believe this resolution achieves the goal that we seek of expressing our appreciation and our gratitude for the outstanding men and women who serve in the military. It is obvious that those men and women serve under the Commander in Chief, and that is appropriate to be mentioned in this resolution.

Mr. President, I don't know how this whole situation is going to evolve, nor do we know exactly what has taken place. But I do know, as always, we can thank and be grateful and in our prayers be grateful that we have the finest men and women that this world has ever seen serving in our military who, again, responded to the call of the Commander in Chief in such an outstanding fashion.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting this resolution. When the President, in his unique capacity as Commander in Chief, orders our Armed Forces into action, Congress has an obligation to both affirm our support for the men and women of the United States military who have been ordered to undertake the mission, and our respect for the President as the constitutional officer responsible for the conduct of our military and foreign policies. This is the purpose of the resolution before us,

and it is wholly appropriate that the Senate adopt it without dissent.

Such an affirmation does not, however, signal Congress' intention to relinquish our responsibility to make critical judgments about the President's decision, the goals which his decision are intended to achieve, and the efficacy of his administration's policies to secure United States security interests in the Persian Gulf region. Political custom and the importance of assuring our servicemen and women of Congress' support, as well as the necessity of presenting a united front to America's adversaries oblige Members of Congress to refrain from criticizing the administration while military operations are underway. But, we are not expected to permanently defer our constitutional responsibility to either concur with or oppose the President's policy.

I have never shied away from criticizing administration policies in the Persian Gulf or elsewhere when I found them wanting. Neither have I refrained from offering my support to this administration when I believed such support was warranted. I am on record criticizing administration policies for Iraq and the region prior to the initiation of the recent military operation there. I stand by that criticism, but will refrain from elaborating it further until I am confident that the immediate military exigency has passed.

I will reserve judgment on the efficacy of these strikes, and the advisability of the President's subsequent policies in the region until the administration has provided Congress with sufficient information upon which to base an informed judgment.

Toward that end, Mr. President, let me suggest that the administration in briefings and testimony before Congress be prepared to answer certain obvious and basic questions about its purposes and policies in the region beyond simply providing bomb damage assessments and analyses of Iraqi responses to our missile strikes.

Speaking for myself, and, I suspect, many of my colleagues, the necessity of taking some military action against Iraq is apparent. Whether the action ordered by the President was the appropriate response to the threat posed by Saddam Hussein cannot be determined until we have a much fuller understanding of the administration's overall strategy for reducing instability and countering threats to our security interests in the region.

The administration should explain what precise purposes our cruise missile strikes were intended to serve. Were they intended to compel Iraq's complete withdrawal from the Kurdish city of Irbil in the north of Iraq and to cease all aggression against Kurds? Were they intended to persuade Saddam against contemplating renewed aggression against his neighbors to the south? Were they intended to foment

opposition to Saddam within the Iraqi military? Was the limited dimension of this operation dictated by the opposition of our allies in the region or does it represent some other consideration which the administration has yet to disclose?

Should Saddam test American resolve further by continuing hostilities in the north, launching new operations against the Shiite minority in the south, flaunting the new no-fly restrictions, firing missiles at U.S. and allied warplanes, or again threatening the territorial integrity of U.S. allies in the region, is the administration prepared to take significantly greater military actions? Will they rebuild the coalition of Desert Storm allies that will almost certainly be necessary if we are obliged to increase our military response? Without the use of bases in Turkey and Saudi Arabia, our military options are obviously very severely limited.

Most important, Mr. President, what are the geopolitical circumstances which the administration wishes to obtain in the Persian Gulf region, and what is its overall, coherent strategy for achieving them which integrates our bilateral policies for all the countries of the region? Until these basic questions are answered, neither I nor any Member of Congress, nor the public we serve can judge not only the efficacy of these strikes, but the administration's ability to protect our most vital security interests in the region, interests for which this country has already paid a very high price to defend.

Mr. President, let me reiterate that none of these unanswered questions cause me nor should they cause any Member of Congress to withhold his or her support for our military personnel tasked with executing the President's decision. Nor should we begrudge the President our respect for his authority or our prayers for the success of his policy. This is the time to give voice to that support as I am confident we will do when we shortly vote on this resolution. The time for critical analysis also begins now. Our conclusions must await another day. That day, however, will not be too distant.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 277 Leg.]

#### YEAS—96

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frahm	McConnell
Bennett	Frist	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Bradley	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Pell
Brown	Harkin	Pressler
Bryan	Hatch	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burns	Helms	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Santorum
Coats	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnston	Shelby
Cohen	Kassebaum	Simon
Conrad	Kempthorne	Simpson
Coverdell	Kennedy	Smith
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Kohl	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Exon	Lieberman	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lott	Wyden

#### NAYS—1

Gorton

#### NOT VOTING—3

Hatfield Inouye Murkowski

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 288

Whereas the United States and its allies have vital interests in ensuring regional stability in the Persian Gulf;

Whereas on August 31, 1996, Saddam Hussein, despite warnings from the United States, began an unprovoked, unjustified, and brutal attack on the civilian population in and around Irbil in northern Iraq, aligning himself with one Kurdish faction to assault another, thereby causing the deaths of hundreds of innocent civilians; and

Whereas the United States responded to Saddam Hussein's aggression on September 3, 1996 by destroying some of the Iraqi air defense installations and announcing the expansion of the southern no-fly zone over Iraq. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the United States Senate, That:* The Senate commends the military actions taken by and the performance of the United States Armed Forces, under the direction of the Commander-in-Chief, for carrying out this military mission in a highly professional, efficient and effective manner.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.