

over the years, even though I suspect that during many of those 12,000 roll-calls—literally thousands of them—they voted on opposite sides, sometimes with views that were very strongly held.

I think it is only the Senator from West Virginia and perhaps the President pro tempore who will cast more votes than Senator STEVENS, who I note now is here, and I would rather he speak for himself.

But I say, Mr. President, through you to the Senator from Alaska, that I was privileged to hear the eloquent remarks about the Senator from Alaska on this occasion that the Senator from West Virginia made. They do great credit to him, and they do equal credit to the Senator who made them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his very gracious remarks.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am embarrassed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. My daughter just graduated from high school. We had a little event. They called to tell me that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, was making remarks about my having followed him to this floor for 12,000 times. We have been partners for a long time. I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for his comments. I look forward to reading them. I am sad that I was not here to listen to them. But knowing the Senator, I know they were eloquent, and I am proud to be the recipient of his comments.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me thank and join in with the comments made by our distinguished leader, Senator BYRD from West Virginia.

No one knows the history and appreciates the history of the Senate better than Senator BYRD and the compliment thereof. He reminded me, when he talked about the fatal crash that Senator STEVENS was involved in, I had just traveled with Senator STEVENS and his first wife, Annie. We were in Cairo, Egypt, out on the Nile to a conference with Anwar Sadat. We stopped in Madrid. I will never forget it. My wife and Annie took a quick trip, as we were being briefed. There was the purchase of a cut-glass bowl, and Annie Stevens had that in her lap, and that plane went head over heels. It broke Senator STEVENS' arm, and it cost her life, but there was not a crack in the bowl.

I can tell you from the early days when I first got up here in 1966 that I used to hold the hearings for Senator Bob Bartlett up there in Seattle with Dixie Lee Ray and John Lindberg and all on oceanography and what have you, and then go up to Alaska to Point Barrow.

There is no closer friend in the Senate to me than TED STEVENS of Alaska.

I am his admirer. I like his fights. Senator BYRD was more tactful about describing it, but I am telling you right now, when he gets worked up, get out of the way right now, because he is going to get it done one way or the other, and he is not yielding. He has that conviction of conscience that really guides all of us in our service up here.

Over the many years, we visited, we traveled, we worked together, and we have been identified both on the Appropriations Committee and on the Commerce Space Science Transportation Committee. Senator STEVENS long since could have been chairman of that Commerce Space Science Transportation Committee, but he elected to take over at the appropriations level. As a result, Alaska is well served. I can tell you that. It is filled up.

They used to say about my backyard with Mendel Rivers that if he got one more facility, Charleston, SC, was going to sink below the sea. I think second in line for that kind of result would be Alaska as a result of the diligence for the local folks.

I will never forget; we traveled up to Point Barrow. The Natives had erected a cross and a statue to Annie Stevens who was lost in that wreck.

I want to emphasize that more than anything else—of course, his wonderful wife, Catherine, and his daughter, Lily—that he might make 12,000 votes, but he will miss votes, I can tell you, to be there with Lily. In fact, we had planned during the August break to take another survey trip, and he said: Oh no. Lily goes to Stanford then. We have to put it off until later.

You have to admire that about an individual, as busy as we get and as wound up as we get with the important affairs of state, to never forget the personal responsibilities, and the love and that TED has for his family, and, of course, for each of us in the Senate. He is most respectful. He works both sides of the aisle. As a result of that, he is most effective.

I yield the floor.

Y2K ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California is now back on the floor, and we are dealing with her amendment.

There was an extensive effort to reach agreement on a form of that amendment. Regrettably those efforts were not successful. There simply is a significant difference of opinion on the policies that it propounds. I intend to speak for a relatively short period of time in opposition to the amendment. I am certain that the Senator from California would like to speak for her amendment. I know the Senator from Connecticut is here, and I know the Senator from California wishes to speak.

Shortly after that succession is completed, if there is no one else who wishes to participate in the debate, there will be a motion to table the Boxer amendment.

The Boxer amendment requires, as a part of the remediation, that a manufacturer make available to a plaintiff a repair or replacement at cost for any product first introduced after January 1, 1990, and at no charge under the same circumstances for a product first introduced for sale after the end of 1994.

The amendment is overwhelmingly too broad. For example, the Internal Revenue Service allows, at most, 5, and in many cases only 3, years in which to write off the cost of products of this nature, determining that is their useful life. If they are used in a business, therefore, they have been depreciated to a zero value in every case—not every case covered by this matter, but in the vast majority of the cases covered by this amendment.

In many of these cases, under the second subsection, it simply means that the plaintiff is entitled to absolutely free replacement. That computer, if it is a home computer, may long since have been relegated to the attic, unused. Yet the original manufacturer would have to replace it. In many cases, the new parts would not work. A 1990 computer is not very readily upgradeable. It does not have the speed or the memory of a 1999 computer. Y2K problems are probably the least of the problems with which such a manufacturer is faced.

I spoke yesterday on the bill as a whole, the tremendous way in which our lives and technology have been changed by this revolution; 1990 is several generations ago with respect both to hardware and to software. How do we go about doing this? Precisely what products are covered?

We simply have a situation in which the amendment is too broad and missing in specificity. We have an attempt to amend a bill that is designed to discourage litigation and to limit litigation that, if adopted, will significantly increase the amount of litigation and the number of causes of action that would take place without any legislation at all.

In other words, this amendment would create new causes of action that probably do not exist anywhere under present law. Under those circumstances, while we should certainly encourage remediation and fixes, this might well have exactly the opposite impact. We have all kinds of duties listed in here with respect to manufacturers—and to others, for that matter. It is not only unnecessary to add this new duty and this new potential for causes of action, this proposal is 180 degrees in opposition.

Therefore, with regret and sorrow that we were not able to work it out, I must for myself, and I suspect for a majority of the Senate, object to the amendment and trust we will soon have a vote on that subject.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for not moving to table at this time so I have an opportunity to respond to his comments.

I want the Senate to understand those who are supporting this bill came back to this Senator with a suggestion on how I could change the amendment so it would be agreeable to them. We agreed with their changes. We said fine, we are willing to back off a little bit.

Guess what happened? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle still would not accept it.

It is not the Senator from California who was unwilling to make the amendment more workable to the other side. It was the other side who recommended a change. When we said OK, they decided it was still unacceptable.

I don't quite understand it. Now there is going to be a motion to table this amendment.

I see the Senator from Illinois is on the floor. I wanted to make sure he understood we were negotiating to try to reach an agreement. We were offered some changes. Even though we did not think they were perfect, we accepted them. The other side, however, continues to resist.

I don't know whom they checked with, but it was not the consumers, because this is the only proconsumer amendment that I thought had a chance to make it into this bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. Did I understand the Senator from California to say this was part of the original legislation on this subject, the idea that the businesses which bought the computers and the software that didn't work would at least have some help in repairing it so they could keep their businesses going and not shut down and cost jobs? Is it correct that this was originally part of the proposal?

Mrs. BOXER. The Senator is exactly right.

The proposal I had in the form of this amendment was taken almost verbatim from a bill that was offered by two Republican House Members, CHRIS COX and DAVID DREIER, very good friends of the business community. The concept for my amendment was essentially taken from that bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the gentlelady yield?

I think the Senator makes a very good point. The Senator said at various times this is a consumer amendment, this is a probusiness amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. No question.

Mr. DURBIN. We are talking about small and medium-sized businesses, dependent on computers, that discover, January 2, the year 2000, they have a serious problem.

What the Senator from California is suggesting is, if it is an old computer, one that goes back over 5 years, they would have to pay the cost of whatever

the repair; if it has been purchased in the last 5 years—a period of time when everyone generally sensed this problem was coming—the computer company would fix it without charge.

A lot of businesses would retain the ability to keep going, making their products and keeping their people working.

This is not just proconsumer, this is probusiness. It troubles me to see so many business groups lined up against this amendment. It seems to me counterintuitive.

I think what the Senator from California is doing is showing sensitivity that virtually all friends of business should show in this legislation.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

I think the amendment pending—which, unfortunately, the other side is going to move to table—is a proconsumer, probusiness, pro-ordinary person amendment. It is a common-sense amendment.

It simply says to the manufacturer, if you have a fix available and you determine you do, then fix the problem. We are only talking about computers that were made in the last 10 years. We are exempting all the rest.

We are not adding an undue burden. There are a lot of good people out there who are making the fixes. We are saying to the rest of business, emulate that, fix the problem, and there will be no lawsuits, no waiting at the courthouse door; you will be able to get your computer back in operation, you will be able to keep your business going and growing.

For some reason, the other side cannot see their way clear to accepting this.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

I want to credit Senator DURBIN for educating this Senator. These fellows have to come over from the House and tell Senators how to act. I never heard "gentlelady," but now I like it.

If the distinguished gentlelady will yield, I have been here since, of course, the beginning of the debate. It has been what they call predatory legalistic, predatory legal practices, lawsuits, racing to the courthouse, running to the courthouse, picking out someone down the line with deep pockets.

The distinguished Senator, as I understand it, is only asking for a fix. The amendment is not asking to race to the courthouse, but to race away from the courthouse.

Mrs. BOXER. Exactly.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Just get a fix.

And now they don't even want to agree on fixing the thing.

Mrs. BOXER. Right.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Maybe if we keep to this debate long enough, they, on the other side of the aisle, will ask us to send money to the poor computer industry. We ought to take up contributions. We have to change the laws for them. All we want to do is get the computer fixed, but now they even oppose that.

Is that the case? Isn't that the amendment, really—to get it fixed? It has nothing to do with bringing a legal proceeding or economic loss or any of that?

Mrs. BOXER. My friend is so right. We do not touch one thing in the underlying bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I see. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. As it relates to lawsuits, it has the same exact provisions. All we say is, if a manufacturer has a fix available, do the fix. Be a good actor. Be good corporate citizens. Do what most of the fine companies are doing up and down the State of California and throughout the country. They knew this problem was coming, and the good ones have done something about it. This amendment, frankly, was brought to me by the consumer groups. They said: You know, no one is really talking about fixing the problem. They are all talking about legalisms here. It made so much sense to me.

It was brought to me by the consumer groups, taken straight out of the Chris Cox-David Dreier original Y2K legislation. But we cannot even get ourselves here to support this very simple matter.

As a matter of fact, Cox-Dreier went even further than my amendment. Let me tell you what they said. They said, if you do not do the fix and you had the fix, you do not get the protections of the underlying bill. Imagine. DAVID DREIER and CHRIS COX. And when I looked at that, I said, that is a little tough on my computer people; I am not going to go that far. All we say is, if you have a fix and you do not do it, then if you do sue, the judge has to consider all these facts when he or she determines the damages to be awarded, if any.

So here we have a proconsumer amendment. My friends on the other side come back with some changes to it. I say: Fine, I am willing to do it. And they say: Oh, never mind, never mind.

If we vote down this amendment, I say to my friends, there is nothing in this bill, that I see, that does anything for consumers. There is nothing in this bill that helps them. There is nothing in this bill that helps, by the way, the good corporate actors out there who are already doing the right thing. All this is about is protecting the bad actors, the bad folks who are not doing the right thing, who, if they are listening to this debate and if they are smart—and believe me, they are smart—what are they hearing? Hey, if you are really fixing matters now, cool it. Why do it? Why spend any money? Under this underlying bill, you do not have to do a thing.

I am just a normal person here, not a lawyer, OK? Maybe that is part of my problem. They call it a remediation period: 30-day notice. You notify the manufacturer that you have a problem. They have to write back. Good, that is

the McCain bill. They have to write back.

Then you have a 60-day remediation period, but nothing is required of you. What are you remediating? We say, if there is a remediation period, let's make that terminology mean something: Remediate. It is a 60-day period. We ought to fix the problem.

The Boxer amendment, supported by Senators DURBIN and HOLLINGS and TORRICELLI and others, simply says let's make the remediation period true to its name.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield? Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to.

Mr. DURBIN. As I look at this legislation which we are considering, the underlying bill, it is hard to argue with it. It starts out saying:

The majority of responsible business enterprises in the United States are committed to working in cooperation with their contracting partners towards the timely and cost-effective resolution of the many technological, business and legal issues associated with the Y2K date change.

That is the first paragraph of this bill. It is a perfect description of the Senator's amendment, because it says responsible businesses will be working to solve problems. In my colleague's situation, she is providing a means of resolving the problem short of going to court. That is what this is all about.

Mrs. BOXER. Exactly.

Mr. DURBIN. So those who are truly interested in the damage done to businesses must really step back and say the Boxer amendment is one that really addresses the damage that businesses will face—repeating, again. These are businesses depending on computers that may shut down because the computer they purchased is not proper, is not ready to deal with the new century.

That is what this legislation, the amendment, is all about: Find a way to help these people stay in business. Responsible businesses dealing with responsible businesses, not racing off to court, not playing with lawyers. I am stunned that at this point the amendment by the Senator from California just has not been adopted. It troubles me when I think about it in the context of the underlying bill.

If the people who are bringing this bill to the floor do not care that much about small and medium-sized businesses that will face the delays, face the layoffs, because of Y2K problems, this is not a probusiness bill. This is for an elite group of bad actors in an industry who have not done their homework and do not want to be held responsible for their bad conduct. That, to me, is not what we should be doing on the floor of the Senate.

I think the Senator from California, when you take a look at the first paragraph of this bill, really has an amendment that addresses the bottom line.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

As we pointed out earlier in this debate, when I hear people get up and

talk about the high-tech industry and how great the high-tech industry is, I know it firsthand because I come from Silicon Valley country. I meet these people. I am in awe of them. And they are good. They are good at what they do. The vast majority of them are taking care of this problem. They ought to be encouraged to continue taking care of this problem. We should not reward those who are not taking care of the problem, who are riding along as if they did not know.

I just love that quote from the Apple people. I do not have it here in front of me, but it is something like:

We may not know a lot of things, but we knew the century was ending.

At some point people said, "Whoops, there is going to be a problem." I guarantee it was well before 1990. But I think we are being very careful in this amendment not to place an undue burden on these people. We are saying you can recover your costs from 1990 to 1995; prior to that, you can charge anything you want. We really are being fair in this amendment.

I am stunned we did not get this amendment accepted. I cannot tell you the feeling I have. I am amazed, because when I think about the beginnings of this bill—I remember being excited I was going to be the Chair on the Y2K problem, because I was in line to take that. I asked Senator DODD if he could do it, because it was a tough time for me; I had an election, and I had my regular job. I knew I could not do it justice. I knew this was going to be a problem, and I wanted to make sure we could help consumers fix the problem and we could do it in a way that was fair to business.

The 90-day cooling off period is a good idea, in my opinion. That is why I supported the Kerry bill, and I hope eventually that will be the bill that will become law. But the 90-day cooling off period does not mean you sit there with a fan. That is not my idea of a 90-day cooling off period.

A 90-day cooling off period should be a time for everyone to sit back, see what the problem is, fix it, and remediate the problem.

I have to ask my friend, Senator HOLLINGS, who knows this bill like the back of his hand far better than I do, I keep reading to see what the requirement is in this cooling off period for the businesses. All I come up with, and please correct me if I am mistaken, is that once a company is notified that a consumer has a problem, under this bill, to get the protections of this bill, all that company has to do is write back to the consumer and say: Yes, I got your letter; I am looking at the problem; I don't know what I am going to do, but I will stay in touch with you.

That is my understanding of what you have to do to meet the requirements to be protected by this, essentially, rewrite of the laws of our land. I want to know if I am correct or incorrect.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The distinguished Senator from California is manifestly

correct. We all live in a real world, and then what really happens, as we learned from Rosemary Woods, if you want to get rid of evidence, if you want to lay the blame—I am the lawyer for the computer company, and when I am notified about this particular claim and it comes across my desk, let's find out now why this thing really occurred, and if we can put it off and save the company some money on that part made in India, then we will get on to that or we will move it around here.

What that does is it gives them 60 days to prepare all the defenses and even engage in interrogatories and depositions, which you are not allowed to do because you are the one required under this bill to stand back and cool off; whereas, I can come immediately then with my interrogatories and my depositions and pretty well have the case lined up during that 3-month period. Then I will know whether it pays for the company, because I am the lawyer, and I want to stay on it as a lawyer, my game is to save the company money. I say: Look, don't worry about that; we are going to send them to India to try that case and let them keep on making motions, because it is going to cost you \$30,000 to fix it.

They just sent a doctor in New Jersey \$25,000 as a fix for a purchase he made the year before for only \$13,000. That is why it is silent. Everybody knows how they draw up these bills and what really occurs. The company is allowed to engage in all kinds of shenanigans—depositions, interrogatories, prepare defenses—and the poor plaintiff, the injured party, is going out of business; he is losing his customers. He tells his employees: I cannot make this monthly payment. I am not getting any money. I am closing down.

The employees are angry. What the Senator from California has in her bill is just perfect: a fix. That is all we want. Out with the lawyers, in with the fix. That is the Boxer amendment. The way the bill reads, the Senator has it analyzed correctly.

Mrs. BOXER. Basically, what we are saying is the amendment is: Remediate and you will not need to litigate. That is basically this amendment. Remediate and you will not have to litigate. Just fix the problem, and let's get on with our lives.

I want to ask my friend another question. Let's say in this year, today, I am a small businessperson. I run a small travel agency, say, out of my home. I am very computer dependent. I go to a store. I buy a computer. They say it is Y2K compliant; it is not going to be a problem. I have it just a few months, say, 6 months. I wake up on that day and it is down, and it is down the next day, and it is down the next day.

I want to talk about what happens under the McCain bill. What do I do? As I understand it, I write to the company, and I say: I am stunned. I bought it 6 months ago. I spent \$15,000 for it, and it isn't working.

Under this bill, as I understand it, if they do not accept this Boxer amendment, which clearly they are not, and if it is not adopted, which it probably will not be, as I understand it, all the company has to do is write back and say: We got your notification; we will stay in touch with you.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Exactly.

Mrs. BOXER. Right? Now they qualify for the special protections under this law. They do not have to fix it. They certainly do not have to fix it for free.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Exactly.

Mrs. BOXER. If they fix it, they can charge more than what the computer costs. My friend has proof of that; does he not?

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is exactly right. That came out at the hearings. Witnesses have attested to it.

Mrs. BOXER. The bottom line is, if we do not adopt this Boxer amendment, then what is in this bill to encourage fixing the problem? This is ironic, because the idea is to stop the litigation, fix the problem, have a cooling off period where we remediate the problem.

DAVID DREIER and CHRIS COX in 1998 understood it. They put it in their bill. My friends on the other side, having indicated they would be inclined to take this amendment with some changes, I agreed to those changes. Yet, we were still unable to reach an agreement.

I am perplexed, I say to my friend. What are we doing here anyway? What is this about? Is this about protecting the consumer? Is this about getting things fixed? Is this about standing proud of the good computer companies that are making the fix?

Mr. HOLLINGS. The last thing a computer purchaser, a user wants to get involved with is law. That is the last thing. That is what they are saying in the bill. The intent of the McCain measure provides you do not get into racing to the courthouse.

The answer to the Senator's question is, that is exactly what is required; namely, I am a computer purchaser and user and it goes on the blink. I am trying to get in touch with them, and they know the laws. I never heard of the law. They will not hear of it, whatever it is. I have written a letter, and I keep calling, and like the doctor from New Jersey who testified before the Commerce Committee said, he called at 2 weeks, 3 weeks and nothing happened. They like that, because the computer operator and purchaser do not know anything about these special laws and provisions of the McCain measure.

What happens is, it puts them into a bunch of legal loopholes. It actually engages a consumer in a bunch of laws that are unique only to him, and he never has heard of and he is going to have to learn the hard way about putting a letter in, certain days to cool off, then do this, and all these other measures.

Heaven's above, it is so clearly brought out in Senator BOXER's amend-

ment that all we want to do is get the blooming thing fixed and get away. Out with the lawyers and in with the fix. That is what the Senator is saying, but they do not even accept it.

Mrs. BOXER. I know, and I am just completely astounded. I have to believe the people who vote against this amendment may not want to be around here on January 3, or whenever it is we get back. People are going to be calling. They are going to say: We heard all about this Y2K bill; didn't you fix our problem?

Mr. HOLLINGS. No, we created a problem.

Mrs. BOXER. Right. They are going to call up their Senator: Senator so and so, you were proud to stand here for that Y2K bill. What did it do?

I view it as an insult to the good people in the Silicon Valley, to the good people in San Diego, to the good people in Los Angeles who work at this night and day, who knew the century was going to end and took steps to prepare for this day, who are making fixes.

Now what happens? The people who were irresponsible are getting a loud message from this Senate, particularly when they vote down this Boxer amendment: Oh, boy, we did the right thing by not fixing anybody's computer. We did the right thing just to sit back and see what happens. We have been protected by the most deliberative body in the world; they protected us from not doing the right thing.

I just do not get it around here. Sometimes I wonder for whom we are here. I do not get it, because to not have this amendment accepted, the only people you are helping are the people who do not want to make the fix. It is outrageous to me. This amendment is probusiness, it is pro the good businesspeople, the good corporate citizens. I just do not get it. It would reward those who have not done the fixes.

I have run out of arguments. I have a hunch that minds are made up. I don't know how I get that feeling. But I have a feeling that minds are made up on this, that this is going to be tabled. We will have a bill, then, that has not one thing in it for the consumers of this country. I have news for the people who are not going to vote for this: Every single American is a consumer, bottom line. I hope they rethink their position. I was willing to compromise and get a good amendment through, but, unfortunately, the other side could not agree to that. Let's get on with the vote. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it constantly amazes me, whether the subject is education or business regulation or computer software, that Members in this Chamber know much more about the subject than do those who are in the business. It is the very companies the Senator from California so praises is doing things right that have felt, in order to concentrate on fixing Y2K

problems, rather than having run the gauntlet set for them by trial lawyers, that this legislation is necessary.

It is simply because they prefer to fix the problem in the real world than to face endless litigation that we are here today. That same group of highly responsible organizations thinks this amendment will actually create more litigation, that it ought to be entitled "The Free Computer Act of 1999," because really the only way to make sure you are not sued will be to replace the computer lock, stock, and barrel, even if it is three generations out of date, even if it is in the attic.

So the reasons to oppose this amendment are quite easy to determine. They are that we want the problem fixed, we want the problem fixed in the real world, not for years and years thereafter, after expensive litigation, punitive damages, consequential damages, everything that afflicts our legal system today.

I had hoped we would complete the debate and begin the vote at this point. We have, however, taken too much time. There is now a markup of the Senate Appropriations Committee that involves both me and two of the three other Senators on the floor at the present time. In order to not disrupt that markup, I announce that a motion to table will be made immediately after that Appropriations Committee markup has been concluded.

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

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

THE SETTLEMENT IN KOSOVO

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to very briefly speak about the settlement in Kosovo. I speak with a sense of relief that we now have moved toward a diplomatic settlement. At the very beginning, I think it was a very difficult vote for all of us as to whether or not to authorize airstrikes. We had pretty close to an equal division of opinion. I voted to do so.

I had hoped that we would be able to stop the slaughter. I thought that it was a certainty that Milosevic would move into Kosovo and people would be slaughtered. We were not able to really do that with airstrikes, not in any way that I had hoped we would be able to, but I do think—and I want to give some credit where credit is due—there are two things that have happened that are very important for the world.