

thanks and best wishes to Karl, and John, Jeff, Greg, Bryon, Shandon, Howard, Greg, Antoine, Adams, Chris, Stephen, and Coach Sloan and his staff. And, as a word of warning to all the teams in the NBA—David slew plenty of Goliaths this year; watch out, we'll be back next year with a hand full of stones.

Go, Jazz!

#### THE LANDMINE ELIMINATION ACT OF 1977

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, last Thursday, 55 of us joined Senators LEAHY of Vermont and HAGEL of Nebraska in cosponsoring the Landmine Elimination Act of 1977. This landmark legislation will bar, as of January 1, 2000, the use of any U.S. funds for new deployments of antipersonnel landmines.

I am proud to be one of the cosponsors of this legislation, which addresses a subject of terrible urgency. Every hour, more innocent civilians are killed or wounded by landmines in Angola, Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia, Ecuador, and elsewhere. The scourge of landmines is so great that the United States and other governments have special aid programs to help locate and destroy landmines left over from the wars of the past.

The United States is pursuing many avenues to battle this plague. We are a signatory of the antipersonnel landmine protocol to the Convention on Conventional Weapons, which I would hope the Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of that protocol sometime this year. That protocol bans undetectable mines, such as the toy-like plastic butterfly mines that maim so many children. The United States is well on its way toward converting all its nondetectable mines, so there will be very few costs associated with ratification of this protocol.

We are also engaged in negotiations in Geneva and working with the Government of Canada on the projected Ottawa convention in hopes of obtaining a worldwide ban on antipersonnel landmines. But those negotiations have left the United States in a quandary. Russia and China—the world's major suppliers of antipersonnel landmines—have refused to participate in the Ottawa process to achieve an immediate ban on these mines. And Mexico has blocked the U.N. Conference on Disarmament from opening the formal negotiations in which Russia and China are willing to participate.

Nobody is clear on whether Mexico's step reflects frustration with the idea of gradualism in eliminating antipersonnel landmines, or a desire to continue using such mines in Mexico's own war against the domestic guerrilla movements. What is clear, however, is that bold steps are needed to regain momentum in the crusade to end this most horrendous aspect of modern warfare.

Two years ago, two-thirds of this body voted for a moratorium on new

antipersonnel landmine deployments, beginning in February 1999. The Landmine Elimination Act of 1977 will go a giant step further, by committing the United States to just say no to these mines on January 1, 2000. This action will put the United States on a higher moral plane than ever before on this issue. With a legally binding commitment to end our own role in sowing needless destruction, perhaps we can more effectively influence Russia and China and Mexico to step up to the responsibility of protecting the innocents even when we make war on our enemies.

S. 896 is a carefully constructed bill, Mr. President, and that is a sign of the seriousness with which this body approaches the topic of landmines. Subsection 2(d) of the bill permits the President to delay application of the ban with respect to the Korean peninsula on a yearly basis if he determines that new deployments would be indispensable to the defense of the Republic of Korea if war should occur there. This is a broader exemption than that in the moratorium we passed 2 years ago, which allows such mining only along international borders and in the DMZ. Given the risk that a dying Stalinist regime in North Korea might throw all its forces into a last-gasp effort to conquer the South, this broader exemption is sensible indeed.

S. 896 also is clearly limited to the most heinous landmines: Mines delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar, or similar means, or dropped from an aircraft. The bill goes to state, at subsection 4(b): "The term 'anti-personnel landmines' does not include command-detonated Claymore munitions."

Command-detonated landmines do not cause the many civilian casualties that have prompted work action. They are generally set off either by a nearby soldier, who waits for the enemy to approach, or by a tripwire in an ambush. They are used often to blow up tanks, and do not leave the indiscriminate killing fields that so plague farmers and travelers and children today.

Nobody is comfortable manufacturing any instrument of death. But at least Claymore munitions are targeted munitions, designed to kill the enemy rather than his neighbors and his children.

The care with which S. 896 has been drafted makes this a bill that all of us can support. I am happy to cosponsor it and I am confident that it will be enacted into law.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—H.R. 363

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, when the Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production, and Regulation of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee filed its report on H.R. 363, to amend section 2118 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to extend the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination

program, the estimates from the Congressional Budget Office were not available. The report has now been received and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the public.

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

*H.R. 363—An act to amend section 2118 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to extend the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination program*

Summary: H.R. 363 would extend and modify the authorization for a multiyear initiative focused on the health effects of electric and magnetic fields. This interagency research effort, which is funded jointly with the private sector, is administered by the Department of Energy (DOE). The current authorization allows the appropriation of up to \$65 million over a multiyear period ending in 1997, provided that nonfederal sources match the federal funds. Since the program's inception in 1993, appropriations have totaled \$20 million and have been matched by a corresponding amount of nonfederal support. Enacting this legislation would enable the program to receive funding through 1998, and would reduce the multiyear authorization ceiling to \$46 million.

Assuming funds are appropriated for these activities in 1998, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 363 would result in additional discretionary spending of \$4 million over the 1998-2002 period. The legislation would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The legislation does not contain any intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Estimated cost to the federal government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 363 is shown in the table on the following page. For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that appropriations for this program would total \$4 million in 1998, the amount provided under current law for 1997, and that this amount would be matched by nonfederal sources. Although the amount authorized to be appropriated in 1998 could total up to \$26 million (the balance between the \$46 million cap and the \$20 million appropriated to date), CBO estimates that the program only needs about \$4 million to complete its mission. We assume outlays would follow historical spending patterns for such research and assessment activities at DOE.

#### SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Spending under current law:						
Budget authority <sup>1</sup> .....	4	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	5	2	1	0	0	0
Proposed changes:						
Authorized level .....	0	4	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	0	2	1	1	0	0
Spending under H.R. 363:						
Authorization level <sup>1</sup> .....	4	4	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	5	4	2	1	0	0

<sup>1</sup> The 1997 level is the amount appropriated for that year.

The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 270 (energy).

Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 363 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, and would not impose any costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Previous CBO estimate: CBO has prepared cost estimates for two other versions of H.R. 363. On March 6, 1997, CBO transmitted a cost

estimate for H.R. 363 as ordered reported by the House Committee on Commerce on March 5, 1997. On April 17, 1997, CBO prepared an estimate for the version ordered reported by the House Committee on Science on April 16, 1997. The three estimates for H.R. 363 are identical.

Estimate prepared by: Kathleen Gramp.  
Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine,  
Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. ARMY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 222d BIRTHDAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the primary mission of any army is to fight and win the wars of the nation which it protects. For the past 222 years, since June 14, 1776, the soldiers of the United States Army have valiantly and successfully defended the interests, ideals, and people of our Nation.

The American Army that was born on that June day a little more than two centuries ago is very different from the military force that meets our Nation's security needs as we prepare to enter the new millenium. The soldiers of our first Army were largely untrained, were poorly and infrequently paid, and faced tremendous logistical burdens. It is truly testament to the leadership abilities of General Washington that he was able to hold his troops together in the face of such odds. Of course, the men and women who serve in today's Army receive months of intensive and excellent training before they join their units, are paid fair wages on a regular basis, and benefit from a commitment to creating a professional, career oriented force. Despite these differences, one thing that has remained constant about those who have served in the United States Army over the past 222 years is that these are largely men and women who are selfless individuals and who are motivated by a patriotic desire to make a difference. From Valley Forge to Sierra Leone, no nation's army has benefitted more from the efforts of a finer array of people than our's.

Throughout its history, the American Army and its soldiers have served with distinction on literally every continent of the world. Minutemen, Johnny Reb & Billy Yank, Rough Riders, Doughboys, Dogfaces, and GI Joes have stood up to dictators, deposed tyrants, beaten back communism, defended freedom, and protected all that we hold dear. Additionally, our soldiers have served as a grassroots diplomatic corps in combat boots, spreading to people around the globe the knowledge that Americans are peaceful, that there is no finer form of government than democracy, and that we prefer building friendships with the citizens of other nations to fighting them in wars. There is no question that in many ways, a candy bar given to a small child from a smiling GI is the best form of foreign aid and diplomatic relations that can be undertaken by the United States.

While the battlefield accomplishments of the United States Army are impressive and unequalled in history, the missions of today's Army go far beyond that of warfighting. In addition to being able to act and react decisively to threats to our Nation no matter where they might arise, our Army is now tasked with a number of non-traditional missions which range from providing fresh water to refugees in Rwanda to keeping the peace in Bosnia. Though these missions are more varied and decidedly different from simply containing or destroying our enemies, our soldiers have characteristically embraced their new responsibilities without complaint and are carrying out their duties professionally.

As we approach the new century and look to the future, Americans have good cause to be optimistic. Our Nation is enjoying a period of prosperity, the world is in a relatively peaceful state, and we no longer are in a Cold War contest with another superpower, however, we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a state of complacency. While things are calm now, we must remember that threats to our security and interest can crop up suddenly and we must remain vigilant for such developments. We cannot ignore our military and those who serve in them, to do so would undermine years of hard work and the significant investment we have made in building the finest and most technologically advanced fighting forces ever known to man. Clearly the Army will continue to have a critical role in assuring that the United States remains secure and that the world remains a stable place where disputes are resolved in manners short of warfare.

Mr. President, as the Army celebrates its 222nd birthday, it is important that we pause from our duties to remember the men and women who have served in the ranks of this service throughout its history. It is easy to forget that those who protect us and who carryout the policies we develop in this Chamber are individuals who are young, making many sacrifices, and have volunteered to protect the Nation. Their service is invaluable and they should be commended for their efforts. On this occasion I say to each of these soldiers, from the newest graduate of Fort Jackson to Chief of Staff Reimer, a happy 222nd birthday and thank you for all you do to keep the United States free and safe.

#### OBSERVATIONS REGARDING A TRIP TO LEBANON

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I visited Lebanon over the Memorial Day recess in order to assess the security situation there. A number of my Lebanese-American constituents have contacted me to request that the State Department's travel policy for Lebanon be changed, and I also decided to see firsthand the situation there.

Pursuant to United States law, the Secretary of State may restrict the use of United States passports for the travel of U.S. citizens to countries with which the United States is at war, where armed hostilities are in progress, or where there is imminent danger to the health or the physical safety of United States travelers. The Secretary of State has exercised that authority in the case of Lebanon and consequently U.S. passports are not valid for travel to, in or through Lebanon unless special validation has been obtained. The passport restriction includes landing at the Beirut airport en route to another destination.

Special validation is possible for professional reporters; representatives of the American Red Cross traveling pursuant to an officially-sponsored Red Cross mission; compelling humanitarian considerations such as a critical illness of an immediate family member; family reunification such as a situation where a spouse or minor child is residing in Lebanon, with and dependent on, a Lebanese spouse or parent for his or her support; or where the travel is found to be in the national interest.

In view of the limited exceptions to the travel restriction, a number of Americans have resorted to the practice of acquiring a Lebanese visa on a piece of paper separate from their American passports so that they will not encounter any difficulty from U.S. authorities upon returning to the United States. I have been advised that forty to fifty thousand Americans travel to Lebanon by this means each year. In doing so, they may be violating U.S. law. Countless other Americans, despite their earnest desire to visit relatives or friends in Lebanon, await a change in U.S. policy.

I traveled to Lebanon with the approval and support of the State Department. I arrived at the U.S. Embassy compound via U.S. Army helicopter from Cyprus in mid-afternoon on May 29th, spent the night on the embassy compound, and returned to Cyprus by the same means in mid-morning on May 30th.

While in Lebanon, I had a busy schedule. I met at length with our Ambassador Richard Jones. I also met with Nasrallah Sfeir, 76th Maronite Patriarch of Antioch and all of the East; Mohamed Rashid Qabbani, Grand Mufti of the Republic; IMAM Mohamed Mahdi Shamseddine, President, Higher Islamic Shi'a Council; Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri; President Elias Hrawi; and General Emile Lahoud, Commander of the Lebanese Armed Force. In each instance, the meeting was held at the place where the religious figure or government official was located, requiring travel throughout the city of Beirut and its environs. Additionally, I met with a number of government officials, members of the Lebanese Parliament, and Lebanese businessmen at a dinner at the American Embassy hosted by Ambassador Jones.

I made it a point to ask each individual with whom I met about the United