

So all of our efforts, not only to disrupt production in Colombia and elsewhere, but also to suppress demand here in the United States would, I think, be helpful.

But this particular plan, if it works—and there is a reasonable probability that it will work—could materially and, I hope, effectively lead to sincere and renewed peace discussions within Colombia.

There is also a consequence for failure if we fail to approve the resources or if the plan fails for other reasons. At least one result would be that President Pastrana, and his government, in the middle of the process, would likely also fail. That could lead to several consequences.

First, he could be replaced by someone who is less amenable to the peace process. Given the tides of violence in Colombia, there could be a resurgence or the surfacing of an authoritarian figure who would be much less sensitive to the peace process.

Another possibility would be a recurrence of what happened in a previous administration under President Samper, where, effectively, the President of Colombia was subverted by narcotraffickers, by drug money, and the country was close to falling under the sway of narcotics dealers rather than the elected representatives of the people of Colombia. So there are consequences with which we must wrestle.

All in all, our most promising option is to support this bill and support Plan Colombia. To do nothing renders a severe psychological blow to the people of Colombia and to the administration of President Pastrana, who is committed not only to fighting the drug war, but also waging a peace process in negotiations with the insurgents.

I think we ultimately have to conclude that our best course of action is to provide the kind of support that is outlined in this legislation, support that goes to the military aspects that have been created by the collision of the cocaine cultivation in the hinterlands, where armed bands roam and derive profit from coca production, together with a balanced approach that emphasizes economic development, particularly alternative development for the campesinos, the peasants, that strengthens the governance of Colombia, with particular emphasis on the judicial system and the penal system.

This comprehensive approach, representing about \$1.6 billion in American resources, about \$4 billion of Colombian resources, and hopefully contributions from other countries around the world, is, I believe, at this point the best hope of significantly undercutting drug production in Colombia, reducing the flow of cocaine into the United States, making our streets safer, and giving Colombia a chance to move to a peaceful, stable, civil society, which has alluded them for many years.

With that, Mr. President, I conclude my remarks.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HONORING ELIZABETH MCGARR

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I think we all agree how important it is for our young people to understand the history of our nation and how the events of the past have helped to shape our country today and will continue to shape it in the future.

On August 3, 1949, Congress designated June 14 as Flag Day. Last week, a Dallas Morning News editorial reminded us of the origins and meaning of this national day of commemoration. Flag Day was established to ensure that each year on that day we recall our nation's proud history and its role as a symbol of freedom and democracy to our citizens and to people around the world fighting for justice. I was much surprised to discover that this editorial, written with great wisdom and eloquence, was penned by Elizabeth McGarr, an intern at the Dallas Morning News in her first week with the newspaper.

America is a diverse and culturally rich country, but as Elizabeth points out in her editorial, we are all able to unite around the flag and celebrate our commitment to the ideals embodied in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Elizabeth, who has just graduated from the Hockaday School in Dallas and will attend the University of Texas in the fall, is an outstanding role model for her peers and every American.

I ask unanimous consent that Elizabeth McGarr's editorial be entered into the RECORD.

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

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 14, 2000]

FLAG DAY: CELEBRATION HAS EVOLVED OVER NATION'S HISTORY

On June 14, 1777, almost a year after the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Continental Congress proposed that we should display our own flag instead of flying the British Union Jack. Our own national flag. One that would symbolize the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that the Founders emphasized in the Declaration of Independence. One that would represent America through battles foreign and domestic, through victories and defeats.

Each year on June 14, on Flag Day, we celebrate the "birthday" of our nation's flag.

On the 100th anniversary, in 1877, Old Glory flew outside every government building to honor the adoption of a national flag. Philadelphia observed the first official Flag Day in 1893, and New York followed suit in 1897. In 1916, President Wilson proclaimed June 14 National Flag Day, and some states and communities did celebrate this anniversary of the Flag Resolution of 1777. Yet it wasn't until 1949 that President Harry S. Truman fi-

nally authorized June 14 as Flag Day nationwide.

The American flag is one of the most complex flags to make, as evidenced by the 64 pieces of fabric needed to put it together. Its red, white, and blue parts stand for courage, purity and justice, respectively.

But on Flag Day, we celebrate more than the colorful cloth. We celebrate our struggles, trials, travails and victories from the Halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. And most important, America celebrates all that the country has accomplished and all that it can achieve with a positive attitude and an optimistic spirit.

Often concerned with political correctness or societal standards, we too quickly judge people on the basis of skin color, religion or background. In truth, we are more alike than we are different. Is there a more united scene than a crowd of people at a baseball game removing their hats for "The Star Spangled Banner," or schoolchildren placing their hands over their hearts to recite the Pledge of Allegiance? Where the Stars and Stripes is concerned, we are as united as can be, and on this June 14, we celebrate our devotion to country and the patriotic unity that arises when witnessing Old Glory wave in the wind.

EXPLANATION OF VOTES—S. 2549

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday a delayed flight due to weather and the closing of flights through Chicago caused me to miss votes on the Murray Amendment (No. 3252), the Hatch Amendment (No. 3473) and the Kennedy Amendment (No. 3473) to S. 2549 the Department of Defense Authorization Bill. I would like to state for the record what my votes would have been had I been able to make those votes.

MURRAY AMENDMENT NO. 3252

Had I been present, I would have voted to table the Murray amendment. I do not believe we should turn our military medical facilities into abortion clinics. The Senate rejected this amendment last year, and I see no reason why the Senate should change its position.

Though military facility abortion advocates try to present the situation as otherwise, it is not the case that women in the military are deprived of the option of getting an abortion, if they chose to have one. They are simply not able to obtain an abortion in a military facility as an elective procedure.

Furthermore, as Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I know our military medical resources are spread too thin as things are. Not only is allowing abortions in military medical facilities an insult to many of the taxpayers who have paid for those facilities, it forces the hospitals to divert resources that could have been used for preserving life to do the opposite. This amendment does nothing but support an agenda that promotes abortion. To that I am opposed.

HATCH AMENDMENT NO. 3474

I realize that many in the Senate viewed the Hatch Amendment as a viable alternative to the Kennedy Amendment on hate crimes.

As with the Kennedy Amendment, the Hatch Amendment gives statutory credence to creating a special class of protections for crimes committed against a behavior driven lifestyle. To place sexual orientation on par with race, color, gender, religion, and national origin is simply a terrible precedent for the Senate to be setting.

Before anyone accuses me of supporting violence directed against any particular person or group of persons, let me say clearly, I unequivocally oppose violence against anyone. Any crime of violence is a hate crime and should be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

I appreciate the Senator from Utah's efforts to provide what he sees as an alternative to what I think we would both agree is a worse piece of legislation. However, had I been present, I would have opposed his amendment.

While some may say that my NAY vote on the Hatch Amendment would have changed the outcome, the fact is this issue will be rewritten during conference.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 3473

I would have voted against the Kennedy amendment on hate crimes because I do not believe it is Constitutional, nor do I think it is good policy.

As with the Hatch Amendment, to place sexual orientation on an equal level with race, color, gender, religion, and national origin is wrong.

Again, I unequivocally oppose violence against anyone. Any crime of violence is a hate crime and must be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

As a conferee on the Department of Defense Authorization bill, I will work vigorously to drop this language from the bill.

HONORING THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED OUR NATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, Tony Snow wrote an editorial in the Washington Times. In this editorial he captures the very essence of service to this Nation by those who have worn the uniform of our Nation throughout its history.

This weekend, I and others will be attending ceremonies in recognition of those who served in the Korean war. A few days ago, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Presiding Officer, I, and other Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives attended a magnificent ceremony in honor of those who served during the Korean war.

I was privileged to be in the Marine Corps and served in the 1st Marine Airwing for a brief period in Korea as a communications officer. I have an indelible memory of the sacrifices of many others, those particularly, not myself included, who had to serve in a position in harm's way and paid the ultimate price in life or in many cases in limb, and the suffering of their families.

Upon their return home, unlike World War II, in which I served a brief

period towards the end, America did not welcome them with open arms. They were returned home from an operation of our military which was indecisive and inconclusive. Those wonderful veterans, these 50-some odd years, at long last deserve the recognition. I think Mr. Snow's article captures it exceedingly well.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the article to which I referred.

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

[From the Washington Times, May 28, 2000]

(By Tony Snow)

On certain spring mornings, warm winds coax fog from the waters of the Potomac River. Clouds rise in wisps from the banks and march up nearby hillsides, sometimes as high as the quiet hills of Arlington National Cemetery.

At those times, the nation's most famous burying ground takes on an ethereal look, its plain white grave markers rising not from earth, but cloud. And on these rare mornings, dewy and warm, one cannot help but feel a sense of sacred awe, looking at the headstones, with the Potomac and the nation's capital spread out below.

Most of the men and women who rest here were of minor consequence as far as the history is concerned. They did not serve as presidents, or prelates, or executors of high office. They did not invent great new machines or conquer disease. Many died before they were old enough to make an enduring mark on the world.

Yet, they all earned their place among generals and presidents because they did something few of us have done. They marched willingly into battle for the sake of our country.

This kind of heroism is becoming increasingly unfamiliar to us. We have not fought an all-out war in a quarter-century, and the nation has not united behind its military in more than 50 years. The draft expired long ago, and the bulk of our young no longer consider service as a career or even as an occupational way-station.

Furthermore, technology has brought us the possibility of "bloodless" wars, such as the Kosovo incursion—operations in which we kill others from afar, while denying enemies the chance to kill our own. We no longer speak of "patriotic gore" or assume we pay for freedom with blood and treasure. For that reason, we don't appreciate fully the lives and deaths of those we commemorate on Memorial Day.

But we owe it to ourselves to try. The rows of markers at Arlington and other national cemeteries serve as stark reminders that evil lives and thrives in the world. Humans instituted and maintained slavery for centuries, and Americans tried to maintain discrimination through force of terror for nearly a century after the Civil War. Our fellow humans venerated such butchers as Adolf Hitler and Josef Stalin—treating them as living gods and worshipping them as men of surprising vision and virtue.

It has become unfashionable to talk in stark terms of good and evil. We like to pretend they are antediluvian categories that have given way to "subtler" distinctions—between justice and injustice, for instance, or between fairness or unfairness. But our own wooziness on matters of morality does not change the fact that good and evil exist—and that most evils flourish under the care of men and women who claim to be doing good.

The hills of Arlington attest to this.

They tell us more. America became a superpower less than a century ago. We are relatively inexperienced at the business of maintaining peace. But history does disclose a few lessons about how to avoid trouble. The most important is Teddy Roosevelt's injunction that we carry a big stick.

Potential enemies don't care much about our prosperity. Many despise it. Would-be assailants worry instead about whether we have the might and will to thrash those who attack us. In the years following the First World War, we converted our swords into plowshares. A grinding depression struck the nation, leaving us both weak and poor—and this combination of unpreparedness and irresolution emboldened the Japanese to bomb Pearl Harbor.

Today, we devote less of our federal budget to national defense than we did on the eve of that attack. The president and his party actively have opposed the development of defenses that could protect us against such likely threats as random ballistic-missile attacks. They sneer at strategic defense—not because they have arguments against it, but because they despise the fact that Ronald Reagan thought of it first. And we seem scarcely interested in new forms of warfare—technological espionage and the potential for devastating bio-weapons.

Military history teaches us an important lesson about such attitudes. When great powers refuse to keep up with the latest developments in technology, they fall. The best example of the phenomenon took place centuries ago, when Mongol hordes overran China. The attackers prevailed because they moved more swiftly and nimbly on the battlefields. They had adopted the very latest innovation—stirrups on saddles.

Memorial Day delivers an important lesson to those who will hear: When nations drop their guard or ignore the reality of evil, innocent people die. Nations endure crises and epidemics, but nothing sears the heart as much as war. If we want to avoid the necessity of building more Arlingtons, we should hear the testimony of those who repose there now: Walk softly. Carry a big stick. And never forget.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through June 19, 2000. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2001 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 290), which replaced the 2000 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 68).

The estimates show that current level spending is above the budget resolution by \$2.3 billion in budget authority and by \$6.8 billion in outlays. Current level is \$28 million below the revenue floor in 2000.

Since my last report, dated March 8, 2000, in addition to the changes in