

and the genocide that has been occurring in Kosovo.

I believe it is in our national interest to respond in these circumstances when we see genocide being committed. When we see ethnic cleansing on the scale as has been committed in Kosovo, we have a responsibility as a community of nations to respond to it, to try to help and to save the lives of those poor, innocent people who are being repressed and in a good many cases murdered, and certainly in hundreds of thousands of cases removed from their homeland, by a tyrant, by someone who does not respect international law. Over 630,000 refugees have been forced from their homes in Kosovo, 25,000 of them loaded on trains in scenes that are reminiscent of the late stages in World War II, sending of the folks to the death camps in the Second World War. Reports of mass executions, burned villages, rapes and robberies—all of this is rampant.

I supported the airstrikes as part of a NATO response to stop this ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. The United States is doing this as a part of NATO, but the United States shoulders the bulk of the burden of the airstrikes in that region. There are 400 U.S. war planes, 400 U.S. aircraft involved in this operation, and about 200 aircraft from the allied nations. During the first week of the war, the United States flew about 90 percent of the sorties. In other words, 90 percent of the pilots and about 90 percent of the airplanes during the first week of that war were U.S. planes and pilots.

I expect we will have briefings this week about the consequences of the airstrikes that have been launched. We have seen substantial television coverage. There has been a great deal of news analysis of all of this, and I think probably everyone here in the Senate is concerned and nervous about what is happening. There is discussion now about whether ground troops ultimately will be needed in that region in order to complete the mission of NATO. I do not know the answer to that, but I do feel very strongly that the introduction of U.S. forces on the ground in the Balkans could be a very, very significant mistake.

The NATO allies, it seems to me, the NATO countries, particularly the European countries, have a greater responsibility, especially in their neighborhood, in their area of the world, to do what is necessary to make the commitment if ground troops are necessary to support this effort. We do not know the consequences of NATO action. We know the consequences of taking no action. That would be the continuation and perhaps the finality of ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, perhaps the murder of tens of thousands of additional people, certainly the displacement of hundreds of thousands and more from Kosovo to refugee camps and to other places in the world.

That is unacceptable. None of us want 5 and 10 years from now to look back and say, "What shame has been

wrought upon this world with this ethnic cleansing and this genocide that we did nothing about it." That is the reason I think this country and the NATO allies decided we will not allow this to stand; we must take action. So we took action with airstrikes, and those airstrikes continue.

The next decision, I think, will be, Will there be ground troops needed? I will just say, speaking for myself, I am very concerned about the introduction of U.S. ground forces in the Balkans. I believe very strongly that the NATO countries, particularly the European countries, must bear a greater responsibility of that burden. If ground troops are needed for intervention in the Balkans, then I believe that the European countries ought to commit under NATO those ground troops. But I would be very concerned about a decision to commit U.S. ground troops in the Balkans.

Those of us in leadership on the Republican and Democratic side, both in the Senate and in the House, have been invited to meet with President Clinton tomorrow at the White House late in the morning. We will be discussing this issue, I suspect, in greater detail: What have the airstrikes accomplished? What is the mission? How does that mission now continue toward some kind of conclusion, and what might we expect that conclusion to be?

I do not agree with my colleagues at all who say our mission must be to be successful; our mission must be to win with respect to the goals we have established in this area. But no one should mistake that this is a very difficult set of circumstances. We acted because we had to, but this remains a very difficult set of circumstances for this country and for the NATO allies.

It is my hope that very soon Mr. Milosevic will understand that he cannot continue, that this country and many of us in this body view him as a war criminal. I am one who believes he should be tried as a war criminal in front of an international tribunal. I know some are reluctant to do that because then they say you are negotiating ultimately with a war criminal if you negotiate an end to the hostilities.

The fact is, because genocide is being committed, we are persuaded to go in to stop it. By definition, when we began this process, we decided this person was a war criminal at the start. Why are we reluctant now, at anyplace along this process, to ask an international tribunal to brand him, try him in absentia, if necessary, as a war criminal?

There will be much more to discuss on the subject of Kosovo in the coming days. I will be interested, as well, in the views of my colleagues and interested in the meeting with President Clinton tomorrow with the joint leadership of the House and the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on a different subject, the subject of family farming and agriculture, for another 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FAMILY FARMING AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me, as we turn towards the agenda before the Senate, from now perhaps until the Fourth of July, to understand that we face an urgent situation in rural America. Family farmers today, in my State and your State, if you represent the farm belt, went to the bank and were told that their investments, all of their 20 or 30 years invested in their farm are gone. They will not be able to plant the ground and raise a crop this year because they are out of money.

I want to read a letter I received from a woman. I talked to her by phone this morning. I was so struck by it, because she represents so well the dilemma and the urgency that we face in family farming.

This is a woman named, Susan Jorgenson, who is from North Dakota. Her husband died last August. She said that he had diabetes. She writes:

... what I really feel caused his death was trying to make a living as a farmer.

I had an auction last week to sell the [farm] machinery, so that I can pay off some of the debt that [we] incurred after 26 years of farming. I have a 17 yr. old son who would not help me prepare for this auction and did not get out of bed the day of the [auction] sale, because he is so heartbroken that he can not continue [to farm] this land.

My husband was an excellent manager and fully educated.

He had a masters degree.

He chose to farm rather than to live in Phoenix where he had a job with Motorola [early on], because he wanted to raise his children in a place with clean air, no crime and good schools. He worked very hard, physically and emotionally to make this farm work and its failure was ... no fault of his own.

What do we say to families who live on America's farms when prices collapse for the product they produce? And when they take a truckload of grain to the elevator, that elevator operator says, "Well, the grain market for this grain you produced has no value"? The farmer who worked to plant and harvest the crops, risked the money to farm to get that grain to the elevator thinks, "Gosh, that's a strange set of circumstances. I'm told my crop has no value, and yet much of the world goes to bed with an ache in their belly because they don't have enough to eat."

People are starving in other parts of the world. We have images of old women climbing trees scavenging for leaves to eat because there is nothing else to eat. We had a report recently noting a country with a million to a million and a quarter people on the abyss of starvation, and our farmers are told their crops have no value.

The challenge for us in this Congress is to decide whether family farmers matter in our country.

I have a chart that shows all of those counties in America, shown in red, where they have lost more than 15 percent of their population. Largely, it shows in the center part of our country, the farm belt, that people have moved out. Our farm belt is being depopulated.

A century ago we had the Homestead Act to persuade people to come out and begin farming. If you moved out there, the Federal Government gave you 160 acres of land. You were a homesteader; you farmed the land. And we populated the farm belt.

Now look at what has happened: The farm belt is being depopulated for a good number of reasons, the most important of which, in my judgment, is we have a farm program that does not work. The farm program says, "You're on your own. When market prices collapse, we're not going to provide decent support prices."

We need to reconnect with decent price supports. We need a Fair Price Plan for Family Farmers, and we need it soon. This Congress has a responsibility, in my judgment, between now and the July 4 recess, to address this urgent situation on America's family farms and to say to family farmers, "You matter, the products you produce make a difference, they have value, and this country stands behind what you represent in our country."

We need to do a number of things. We need to pass a better Farm Bill, as I said, a Fair Price Plan. We need meat labeling that will help our ranchers. Let people know what they are eating and where it came from. We need price reporting. Let's see fair prices and full price reporting on livestock prices. Let's break up some of the monopolies that exist in the slaughterhouses. Eighty-seven percent of America's fat steers go to four slaughterhouses to be slaughtered. What that means is, you pass that monopoly pricing back on family farmers. They are the ones who are already losing money.

Isn't it interesting that every firm in this country who touches what a farmer produces, whether it is a steak or a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn, is making money. The railroads are making record profits hauling it. The cereal manufacturers are making record profits crisping and puffing it, putting it into a box and selling it as cereal. The folks that slaughter the beef, the pork, the poultry, and the sheep are making record profits. It is the farmer who rises to do the chores, to plant the ground, to harvest the crops, who is going broke because they are told their commodities have no value.

That is a bankrupt approach for this economy. The economy, if it rewards hard work and the production of things people in this world need, will do well. But we decided that the all-star economic producers in America, the American family farmers, don't matter and we passed a farm bill that says, you're on your own; you deal with the marketplace and we don't care what the

marketplace looks like. The farm bill is stacked against you, it favors monopolistic businesses, it presses its heavy boot upon you and you can't do anything about it. That is tough luck because it says we don't need you anymore, we don't need family farmers, all we need are giant agribusinesses. If that is the position that is taken in this country, this country will have taken a giant step backwards.

So I am saying that in the coming 2 or 3 months we must recognize the urgency of the situation on the family farm. Farmer after farmer after farmer in State after State are going broke, through no fault of their own. This young boy, who could not bear to attend the auction sale at his own farm, because it broke his heart not to be able to farm that land that his dad and his granddad and great-granddad farmed, this boy ought to hear from this Congress that we stand ready to help, that we care about preserving families on America's farms, that the decentralization of food production, a network of family farms dotting this country's prairies, strengthens America, that producing food that a hungry world needs is something that is an asset in this country, not a liability.

So I hope in the next 2 to 3 months those who care about family farmers will join those of us who come from the farm belt to pass aggressive, good, strong legislation dealing with concentration, monopolies, price reporting, meat labeling, and a decent price support—all of those issues and more—that will finally say to family farmers, you have a decent opportunity to make a living on America's family farms.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. But before I do, I thank my colleague from Maine for waiting patiently.

Ms. COLLINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for up to 15 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 765 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, at the close of business Friday, April 9, 1999, the Federal debt stood at

\$5,661,252,699,346.90 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-one billion, two hundred fifty-two million, six hundred ninety-nine thousand, three hundred forty-six dollars and ninety cents).

One year ago, April 9, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,542,953,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred forty-two billion, nine hundred fifty-three million).

Fifteen years ago, April 9, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,486,873,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred eighty-six billion, eight hundred seventy-three million).

Twenty-five years ago, April 9, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$472,761,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-two billion, seven hundred sixty-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,188,491,699,346.90 (Five trillion, one hundred eighty-eight billion, four hundred ninety-one million, six hundred ninety-nine thousand, three hundred forty-six dollars and ninety cents) during the past 25 years.

#### TRIBUTE TO KYLE MANGINI

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to an extraordinary young man from Blandford, Massachusetts. Kyle Mangini is a 13-year-old Boy Scout who, while on vacation with his family, saved his 16-year-old cousin, Santiago Garcia, from drowning.

Santiago was swimming and suddenly began to drown, sinking to the bottom of the pool. Kyle saw his cousin and immediately realized that he was in great danger. He leaped into the pool and pulled his older, much larger cousin out of the water.

Kyle's quick reaction saved precious seconds and probably saved Santiago's life. Santiago was successfully resuscitated by an emergency medical technician. It was Kyle's lifesaving training as a Boy Scout that prepared him for the emergency. Had it not been for Kyle's brave and timely rescue, his cousin Santiago could have suffered serious brain damage or death.

Kyle Mangini is a credit to the Boy Scouts and a true profile in courage for the State of Massachusetts. It is an honor to pay tribute to him today, and I ask unanimous consent that an article on his action be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Country Journal, Apr. 1, 1999]

QUICK-THINKING BLANDFORD BOY SCOUT  
SAVES COUSIN'S LIFE  
(By Mary Kronholm)

Not every vacation is an adventure, nor is every vacation fraught with life-threatening incidents. But vacations are supposed to have happy endings.

Kyle Mangini was enjoying the last day of his Christmas vacation with his father, Dan Mangini, on Nevis, an island in the West Indies. His cousin, Santiago Garcia from Manchester, Conn. was with him.

The boys had become accustomed to visiting the beach and pool at the next door resort, Nesbit Plantation, and went for a final