

Cross to deal with the needs of the region. Both the UN and the Red Cross claim that they will be able to keep people fed, clothed and sheltered through the upcoming winter. Yet, I have received a number of credible reports in recent weeks which indicate that in fact we will witness a humanitarian catastrophe in the region in the months ahead because of a lack of shelter, heat, food and medical care.

I am aware that there are individuals in the foreign policy community who are opposed to providing significant assistance to the people of Serbia. They believe that humanitarian suffering will lead to political discontent which will, in turn, lead to a popular movement that will bring about the removal of Slobodan Milosevic. I disagree.

With the exception of South Africa, crippling sanctions have not successfully brought about a change in political leadership. Just look at Saddam Hussein in Iraq. We don't know what is going on there anymore.

To emphasize this point, Professor Julie Mertus of the Ohio Northern University wrote an excellent piece which was recently published in the Washington Post. Professor Mertus specializes in international law. Here is what she has to say:

How does a freezing and hungry Yugoslavia advance U.S. policy goals? Certainly Milosevic will not be hungry this winter. The idea is that the pain and suffering among the lowest strata of society will "trickle up" to the higher echelons. Protests by discontented citizens will lead to policy changes and perhaps even the removal of Milosevic. The problem is that humans do not behave this way. Cold, dispirited citizens do not take to the streets. Rather, they draw up inside their own homes and try to survive. If the going gets tough, they try to exit, often leaving the country. Only the few with hope continue to fight, and even they cannot persist for long when they are isolated from supportive networks.

Our sanctions policy has allowed Milosevic to blame Serbia's faltering economy, declining humanitarian situation and international isolation on the West. He has been able to deflect the ire of the Serbian people who have little access to independent media.

We must pursue specific courses of action that will help us get rid of Milosevic once and for all.

No. 1, we must continue to squeeze Milosevic so that his allies inside and outside the Serbian government will see that he is vulnerable and his hold on power is tenuous. Milosevic is an indicted war criminal, and we have to make his allies understand that his fate is their fate. In other words, leave now, or pay later.

No. 2, we should work with our allies to announce a detailed humanitarian and economic aid package that would be available to the people of Serbia once Milosevic is removed. The importance of this kind of package to the success of democratization was underscored recently when several of us met with the leaders of the anti-Milosevic force right here in the Capitol.

They talked about how important it was we have a clear, defined package that says, if he goes, here is what we are willing to do.

No. 3, we should provide as much assistance as we can, including such things as heating oil, food, clothing and direct financial assistance, as soon as possible to the Serbian opposition groups, particularly the mayors, who are struggling to bring about democratic change.

No. 4, we should continue to support President Djukanovic of Montenegro with whom I met two weeks ago. He is a bright and energetic leader and a key ally for peace and prosperity in Southeast Europe.

No. 5, we must undertake a massive effort to overrun Milosevic's monopoly control on Serbia's mass media. Milosevic's distorted information must be countered with the truth; a commodity we must get to the Serb people whatever way possible.

As I mentioned earlier, I held a meeting recently with a number of ambassadors and senior embassy staff from the nations of Southeast Europe to get their reaction to the Stability Pact initiative. And they were honest; they said things were not going well. They were very clear that it was essential that the United States be at the table to provide leadership and contribute our fair share.

Without our presence, they are not confident that our NATO allies will make good on the promises they made at the end of the war. And, quite frankly, I think it is up to us to make it clear to our European allies that we expect them to adhere to their commitment.

We are going to be at the table. We are going to have leadership. We are anteing up, and it is time for you to ante up and make good on your promises.

The best way I can summarize the attitude at the meeting I had with the ambassadors, and the meeting I had with the Serbian opposition leaders is a word in Serbo-Croatian—"edemo"—which means, "let's get going!"

On balance, I believe there has been some real progress made on a number of fronts in our policy towards Southeast Europe in recent months. The Stability Pact is moving ahead—albeit slowly and indeed need of some additional leadership, particularly ours. The policy toward sanctions seems to be finessed a bit and real work finally is being done on the ground in the region to deal with humanitarian concerns. I am pleased the administration is starting to soften up on this a little bit.

The administration is meeting with Serbian opposition leaders and financial support is beginning to trickle into the movement. Southeastern European nations are beginning to think regionally with the understanding they have a symbiotic relationship in their efforts to promote and develop their economies. That is wonderful.

Although in many respects, things are much better off today than they were after the war, the momentum has to be increased significantly, and that is the challenge of this Congress and this administration.

The administration, working through the State Department, bears the responsibility of bringing about real change in Serbia and honoring the commitments the United States has made to friendly governments in Southeast Europe. Congress has an obligation to provide oversight and support to the administration's policies towards the restoration of peace and stability in the region.

To that end, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the next session of Congress to loosen some of the restrictive language that was placed in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, language that the State Department claims has made it difficult, and continues to make it difficult, for them to do the kinds of things they would like to be doing in Southeast Europe.

The Senate has already made a positive start with the recent unanimous passage of the Serbia Democratization Act. I believe we need to build on that progress.

Southeast Europe is strategic to our national interests and key to our efforts to maintain peace in the world. Until the nations of Southeast Europe are welcomed into the broader European community, those efforts will remain unfulfilled. The United States must provide the leadership because we do "have a dog in this fight."

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MILITARY STATE OF READINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was presiding when the distinguished Senator from Ohio was talking about the problems the U.N. faces in Kosovo. I share all of the concerns the Senator from Ohio expressed. In addition to that, since I am the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee, I have another concern, and that is the deployment of troops in 1995 into Bosnia, then again to Kosovo, and the way they are being deployed today has put us in an apparent condition in terms of our state of readiness.

It is very unfortunate that during this administration we have had a cut in our force strength by approximately 50 percent, only to find out just last week that two of our Army divisions are now rated at C-4. That means they are not capable of combat today. Those

two divisions are the 10th Army Division, of which most are located in Bosnia, and the 1st Infantry Division located in Kosovo.

This means that if something should happen, we are not in a ready condition to defend America, where we do have national security interests which, in my opinion, we do not have and never had in either Bosnia or Kosovo. I stood side by side with the Senator from Ohio in trying to keep us from making that deployment. We were not successful. I do believe we should be looking very soon at any way we can bring our troops back to a state of readiness, to do what we are supposed to be doing, the No. 1 function of Government, and that is to defend America.

VIEQUES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been a little disturbed not knowing the certainty of the schedule and how long we will have to get some things done at the last minute. I want to bring up one issue that has to be discussed briefly, and that is the issue of the range that has been used for 58 years on the island of Vieques located 6 miles off the shores of Puerto Rico.

I am concerned about this because we started using this range 58 years ago. We have become dependent upon it because it is the only range we can use that offers an integrated three-level type of training—first, high-altitude bombing; second, the type of protection that comes from the ships to the shore using live fire; and third, the Marine expeditionary amphibious movements. All three of those can be done simultaneously and have been done successfully over the last 58 years.

The problem we have with this range is that there is no place else in the Western Hemisphere that we can actually give the training to our troops. Right, now we have deployed into the Persian Gulf the U.S.S. *Kennedy*. Because this President put a moratorium on training in Vieques, only half of those deployed on the U.S.S. *Kennedy* have ever had the necessary training should they have to become involved in combat.

We have scheduled for the 18th of February the deployment of the U.S.S. *Eisenhower* Battle Group. If this battle group goes through the Mediterranean and goes to the Persian Gulf, the chances are better than 50-50 they will see combat. If we do not allow them to have the training on the island of Vieques prior to their deployment, they will have to go into combat very likely without ever having any live ordnance training. This goes for the pilots flying the F-18s and the F-14s that will be deployed off the U.S.S. *Eisenhower*.

I was there 3 weeks ago and watched them during their training, but they were unable to use live ordnances and use that range. It goes for the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit and the others who would be deployed at the same time.

I would like to quote, if I could, Gen. Wes Clark. Of course, he is one for whom we all have a great deal of respect. We watched the way he worked commanding the European forces and the NATO forces. He said:

The live fire training that our forces were exposed to at training ranges such as Vieques helped ensure that the forces assigned to this theater—

We are talking about Kosovo, those 78, 79 days—

were ready-on-arrival and prepared to fight, win and survive.

What General Clark is saying is, we were successful. Even though we should not have been in Kosovo to start with, once we made that decision, we were successful in dropping our cruise missiles in there and our bombs because of the training those pilots had on the island of Vieques.

Capt. James Stark, Jr., the commanding officer of the Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, said:

When you steam off to battle you're either ready or you're not. If you're not, that means casualties. That means more POWs. That means less precision and longer campaigns. You pay a price for all this in war, and that price is blood.

We are talking about American blood. I am very proud of all the military, uniformed and others. This is the first time in the years I have served in the Senate that they have been willing to stand up for something they know is right, not knowing for sure where the President is going to be on this issue.

The President has imposed a moratorium on training on the island of Vieques. We are going to try our best to encourage him, for the lives of Americans, to allow us to use it to train those people who are on the U.S.S. *Eisenhower*, ready to be deployed.

Richard Danzig, the Secretary of the Navy, said:

Only by providing this preparation can we fairly ask our service members to put their lives at risk.

In a joint statement between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, they said: Vieques provides integrated live-fire training “critical to our readiness,” and the failure to provide for adequate live-fire training for our naval forces before deployment will place those forces at unacceptably high risk during deployment.

This is military language to mean casualties, those who can be killed in action.

I am proud of Admiral Johnson, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Jones, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, when they say: Without the ability to train on Vieques, the U.S.S. *Eisenhower* Battle Group and the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit scheduled for deployment in February 2000 would not be ready for such deployment “without greatly increasing the risk to those men and women who we ask to go in harm's way.”

Lastly, Admiral Murphy, the Commander of the Sixth Fleet of the Navy, said: The loss of training on Vieques would “cost American lives.”

It is a very serious thing. I sometimes listen to the complaints we hear from some of the Puerto Ricans, but mostly from the people of the island of Vieques, who say: Wait a minute. How would you like to have bombs dropped and live ordnances fired where you are?

You can't do anything about that. They actually have a 10-mile buffer range between the bombing range and where people live.

I happen to represent the State of Oklahoma. We have a very fine organization there called Fort Sill, where we do all our artillery training. I have said on the floor here several times before that, while on Vieques they have a 10-mile buffer zone, we have only a 1-mile buffer zone in the State of Oklahoma between a population of 100,000 people living in Lawton and the live-fire range.

So let me just wind up and conclude by saying that many of us, including Senator WARNER, the chairman of our Armed Services Committee, are asking the President and pleading with him to work out some type of arrangement to, at the very least during this interim while we are in recess, provide for training on the island of Vieques because if that does not happen, we will lose American lives.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chair be kind enough to tell me what the order of business is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business until the hour of 12 o'clock and under the minority's time.

Mr. DURBIN. I understand that my colleague, Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts, will be joining me on the floor shortly. I will certainly yield at that point.

VIDEO CAMERAS IN THE COCKPITS OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address several topics that I think may be of interest to those who are following the debate in the Senate. One in particular has become a focal point of the news media across the United States and literally around the world. That was the crash of the EgyptAir aircraft just a few weeks ago and the loss of over 200 lives.

I find it interesting, as we try to piece together all the information to determine what happened in that aircraft disaster, how limited we are with