

means it. [I think he does.] But then what? Clinton also has promised that U.S. troops will not be sent into a "non-permissive" environment. They will enter Kosovo, in other words, only when Milosevic welcomes them in.

"These are incompatible objectives." [He is quoting my colleague and my friend from Oregon, Senator GORDON SMITH, who said in an interview—and, by the way, Senator SMITH is the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe] [he] is no isolationists; he has said he would support a dispatch of U.S. troops to Kosovo under the right circumstances. But he worries that [there is] no credible plan.

Perhaps a round of U.S. bombing will compel Milosevic to call off his war against Kosovo civilians, sign a peace treaty and admit NATO troops. But what if it doesn't? What if Milosevic responds, instead, with a bloody crackdown in Pristina and villages throughout the province?

That is happening as I speak.

Clinton, to assuage his fretful military commanders—who have good reason to fret—has already promised not to follow air power with troops. But air power can't solve every problem.

If NATO bombs, [Senator] Smith said, it should no longer pretend to be neutral. "The problem is Milosevic," he said. "If you go along that path, go to win."

I certainly associate myself with the comments of Senator SMITH.

Is Clinton [is this Congress and are the American public] prepared to see it through? On Friday, he made a case for bombing [and the intervention] but did not explain what might come next, nor why those next steps would be worth the risk to U.S. life and treasure. Time enough tomorrow, or maybe the day after.

That was the conclusion of the editorial.

I have questions, but I am not going to take too much time to go over all the questions I have as a result of the statements that have been made. But in regard to Kosovo, what is the end state? What do we want to see in Kosovo once we are done doing whatever it is we plan to do?

If we don't want to support the independence and secession of the Kosovars, why are we serving as their air force?

How do we know we have ever attained our aims?

What are the measures of merit?

How long might it take?

We have talked about an exit strategy. I think we should focus on strategy; that is, on what we are trying to achieve, through what means, and how do we know we are done?

I don't accept the argument in regard to NATO credibility, or that NATO credibility is on the line, as an answer to why we should go there. NATO's credibility is sky high. Just ask all the nations who want to get in.

How is bombing conducive to peaceful conflict resolution? Have we ever been able to bomb a country into submission so that they would agree with our point of view? What if initial strikes don't attain the desired effect? How far are we willing to go to compel the Serbs to bend to our will? What are the risks? Why send peacekeepers when

there is no peace to be kept and neither side wants to compromise? It seems that is the case.

Why are we seeking to compel a sovereign nation—by the way, Yugoslavia was a founding member of the U.N.—to cede its territorial sovereignty to a guerrilla movement? What message does this send to other secessionists worldwide?

How do you explain supporting Yeltsin in fighting to keep Chechnya within the Russian Federation, at a cost of about 50,000 casualties—indeed, comparing the Russian action to the American Civil War and, by implication, Yeltsin to Lincoln—and bombing the Serbs for trying to keep their country together? That is a point of view.

Which of the many Kosovar factions are we supporting? How much top-down control and professional discipline do we expect from all sides involved?

The mission order for Bosnia, which has been referred to as a good case study for Kosovo, was, "Attack across the Sava River," and we went in with overwhelming force, which we then scaled down as the threat receded. We are doing it the other way regarding Kosovo. Why aren't we following that model? Remember the strategic insight of an 18-year-old Marine in Beirut: "If we are here to fight, we are too few; if we are here to die, we are too many."

All of these questions I have mentioned—some of which I share with a great deal of support from others—I think certainly should be debated, should certainly come to the floor. That has not been the case. I do hope the administration will submit their report soon. I hope they don't submit the report after the President has given the order and the troops are there, for at that time every Member of the Senate and House will certainly want to support our troops.

I worry about this, Mr. President. We are going to war. The President has spoken to the issue, other Cabinet officials have spoken to the issue, but many questions remain.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes at this time.

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

TOBACCO SETTLEMENT FUNDS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is vital to improving health care in America—specifically, whether the States are actually going to use a portion of the billions of dollars they received in tobacco settlement funds to keep America's youngsters from starting to smoke. The Senate has discussed this issue over the last few weeks, but I think it may be appropriate to have a new context as we go forward with these discussions.

To get an indication of how the tobacco industry believes it is doing and why the Senate ought to be concerned about this issue, you can take a look at how the tobacco industry assesses its executives' job performance. Recently, the public got a look at information concerning the 1998 compensation packages for several of the CEOs of the major tobacco companies. The combined compensation package for the CEO of Philip Morris and the CEO of RJR equals \$36 million.

Last week, Mr. President, you and I marked up the Federal budget in the Budget Committee with our colleagues, but even when you spend a week dealing with the Federal budget, \$36 million certainly sounds like a lot of money.

I am not against CEOs being compensated for their work. My guess is that the CEOs, in this case, earn their salaries. I don't think they would be pulling down \$36 million a year unless they were doing a pretty good job of keeping the ashtrays filled in America.

Now, the combined compensation packages for just these two CEOs is more than 39 of our States and the District of Columbia would have received under the legislation Congress voted on last week. Let me be clear. Two of the tobacco CEOs were making more money in 1998 than the vast majority of our States would have received for programs to keep young people from getting started with tobacco.

For example, my home State of Oregon would receive just over \$15 million under the legislation which was considered last week. That is less than half of the CEOs' compensation. The State of Wyoming would have received \$3.61 million, 10 percent of the combined compensation packages. I believe that the traditional targets of tobacco in harvesting new smokers—women, children, and minorities—are certainly worth 10 percent of the combined compensation for 1 year of these two executives.

Let us also remember that it is not just the money the tobacco industry is spending on high-priced executives that the Congress should be concerned about. There is another threat to our children, and that comes from the \$5 billion the tobacco industry spent last year on advertising and marketing. That is \$96.2 million every week, or \$13.7 million every day. Again, that is far more than many of our States would have received to protect young people from smoking.

Last year, in the Senate Commerce Committee, I wanted to make sure that the individuals who had historically been targeted by the tobacco companies would have been eligible to receive funds for tobacco control and prevention programs. I wanted to make sure that just as the tobacco companies have poured billions of dollars into advertising in the inner cities and for ads targeted to children, the Federal Government would make a special effort to prevent smoking in those communities.

I continue to believe the Federal Government needs to play an activist role in assuring that populations which historically have been targeted by the tobacco industry would be armed with good information and good preventive kinds of services, so that the tobacco companies would know that our communities are fighting back.

Let me give you an example of some of the steps that the tobacco companies may be pursuing in the days ahead to circumvent efforts by the Federal Government such as those we discussed last week.

We know the tobacco companies are now test marketing cigarettes which produce less smoke so that individuals around the smoker will not be bothered in the same way as they were so often in the past. Yet, one of the cigarettes, the Eclipse, made by RJR, is showing even more signs of being dangerous to the smoker. With the Eclipse, the evidence shows that smokers may actually be breathing in glass fibers in addition to other carcinogens.

I think it is important that the Senate understand this as we go forward with further discussions about how the tobacco settlement funds are going to be used. If the Federal Government wishes to waive its portion of the billions of dollars involved in the tobacco settlement, let's make sure that at least a portion of this money—at least a modest portion—is used to protect future generations of Americans against the tobacco industry.

I hope the Congress won't pass up another opportunity to protect America's youngsters. I urge my colleagues to continue to try to assure that some portion of the dollars secured in the tobacco settlement are actually used for health services for American's children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared by the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids which compares the compensation package of just two of the tobacco CEOs with the money that would have been received by the States under the Senate legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPARISON OF AMOUNT STATES WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO SPEND ON TOBACCO PREVENTION UNDER THE SPECTER-HARKIN AMENDMENT WITH CEOS' COMPENSATION FROM RJR AND PHILIP MORRIS

States	15% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	20% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	Combined total CEO's compensation for 1998 (millions)
Wyoming	\$2.71	\$3.61	\$36
Alaska	3.72	4.96	36
South Dakota	3.80	5.07	36
Idaho	3.96	5.27	36
North Dakota	3.98	5.31	36
Delaware	4.31	5.74	36
Vermont	4.48	5.97	36
Montana	4.62	6.16	36
Utah	4.84	6.46	36
Nebraska	6.48	8.64	36
New Mexico	6.49	8.65	36
Hawaii	6.55	8.73	36
Washington, DC	6.61	8.81	36

COMPARISON OF AMOUNT STATES WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO SPEND ON TOBACCO PREVENTION UNDER THE SPECTER-HARKIN AMENDMENT WITH CEOS' COMPENSATION FROM RJR AND PHILIP MORRIS—Continued

States	15% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	20% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	Combined total CEO's compensation for 1998 (millions)
Nevada	6.64	8.85	36
New Hampshire	7.25	9.67	36
Rhode Island	7.82	10.43	36
Maine	8.37	11.16	36
Arkansas	9.01	12.01	36
Kansas	9.07	12.10	36
Iowa	9.47	12.62	36
West Virginia	9.65	12.87	36
Oklahoma	11.28	15.04	36
Oregon	12.49	16.65	36
South Carolina	12.81	17.07	36
Colorado	14.92	19.90	36
Arizona	16.04	21.39	36
Alabama	17.59	23.45	36
Kentucky	19.17	25.56	36
Connecticut	20.21	26.94	36
Indiana	22.20	29.60	36
Virginia	22.26	29.67	36
Washington	22.35	29.80	36
Wisconsin	22.56	30.07	36
Louisiana	24.55	32.73	36
Maryland	24.61	32.81	36
Missouri	24.76	33.01	36
Mississippi	25.20	33.60	36
North Carolina	25.38	33.84	36
Tennessee	26.57	35.42	36
Georgia	26.72	35.62	36
Minnesota	37.02	49.36	36
New Jersey	42.09	56.12	36
Massachusetts	43.96	58.61	36
Michigan	47.37	63.16	36
Illinois	50.66	67.55	36
Ohio	54.83	73.10	36
Pennsylvania	62.55	83.40	36
Florida	80.40	107.20	36
Texas	94.20	125.60	36
New York	138.91	185.21	36
California	138.93	185.24	36

In 39 states and the District of Columbia the use 20% of their total settlement dollars is less than the combined compensation of the top two tobacco industry CEOs Geoffrey Bible, of Philip Morris Inc. and Stephen F. Goldstone, of RJ Reynolds Tobacco. The compensation total includes base salary plus bonuses and stock options (source: USA Today, 3/19/99 & 3/16/99).

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Under the previous order, the time between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might use. If others arrive on the floor and I have exceeded my 10 or 12 minutes, I will yield to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week we will have the budget for the Nation before the Senate for consideration. I want to speak now on that budget, and give special focus and attention to the concerns I have about how that budget was put together and its particular implications with regard to Social Security and to Medicare, and also with regard to other domestic priorities. Then I will express my con-

cern on the priority that the Republican budget has given to tax cuts and how that relates to the Nation's priorities and to the Nation's needs.

Mr. President, the Republican FY2000 budget resolution fails to meet the nation's priorities.

It claims that it will extend the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. In reality, it would prevent President Clinton's proposed transfer of surplus funds to protect this important program for future generations.

The Republican budget claims that it will set aside money for Medicare. In reality, it squanders those funds to pay for a tax cut for the rich.

The Republican budget claims that it will improve education. In reality, it slashes funds for critical programs like Head Start, job training, and student aid to pay for increases in education.

On the subject of Social Security, the Republican budget is an exercise in deception. The rhetoric surrounding the budget itself conveys the impression that the majority have taken a major step towards protecting Social Security. In truth, they have done nothing to strengthen Social Security. Their budget would not provide one additional dollar to pay benefits to future retirees, nor would it extend the life of the trust fund by even one day. It merely recommits to Social Security those dollars which already belong to the Trust Fund under current law. That is all their so-called "lockbox" does.

By contrast, President Clinton's proposed budget would contribute 2.8 trillion new dollars of the budget surplus to Social Security over the next 15 years. By doing so, his budget would extend the life of the trust fund by more than a generation—to beyond 2050.

Not only does the Republican plan fail to provide the new revenue to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund, it does not even effectively guarantee that the existing payroll tax revenue will be used to pay Social Security benefits. In essence, there is a trapdoor in the Republican lockbox. Their plan would allow Social Security payroll taxes to be used to finance unspecified "reforms". This loophole opens the door to schemes to privatize Social Security by turning it over to the tender mercy of the private insurance industry. Such a privatization plan could actually make Social Security's financial picture far worse than it is today, necessitating deep benefit cuts.

A genuine "lockbox" would prevent any such diversion of funds. A genuine "lockbox" would guarantee that those payroll tax dollars would be used to protect Social Security, not undermine it.

While the Republicans claim that they, too, support using the surplus for debt reduction, they are still unwilling to use it in a way that will help save Social Security for future generations. There is a fundamental difference between the parties on how the savings