

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 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

budget authority, outlays, and revenues from adopting H. Con. Res. 290, the Congress has cleared, and the President has signed, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (P.L. 106-181) and the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200). The Congress has also cleared for the President's signature the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559). This action has changed the current level of budget authority, outlays, and revenues.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2000.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables for fiscal year 2000 show the effects of Congressional action on the 2000 budget and are current through June 19, 2000. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, which re-

placed H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2000.

Since my last report, dated March 6, 2000, in addition to the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues from adopting H. Con. Res. 290, the Congress has cleared, and the President has signed, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 106-181) and the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-200). The Congress has also cleared for the President's signature the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559).

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. LIEBERMAN

(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosures.

TABLE 1. FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF JUNE 19, 2000

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget resolution	Current level ¹	Current level over/under resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,467.3	1,469.6	2.3
Outlays	1,441.1	1,447.9	6.8
Revenues	1,465.5	1,465.5	(?)
Debt Subject to Limit	5,628.3	5,558.0	-70.3
Off-budget:			
Social Security Outlays	326.5	326.5	0.0
Social Security Revenues	479.6	479.6	0.0

¹ Current level is the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest information from the U.S. Treasury.

² Equal less than \$50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES, AS OF JUNE 19, 2000

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	0	0	1,465,480
Permanents and other spending legislation	876,140	836,751	0
Appropriation legislation	869,318	889,756	0
Offsetting receipts	-284,184	-284,184	0
Total, enacted in previous sessions	1,461,274	1,442,274	1,465,480
Enacted this session:			
Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-176)	7	3	0
Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act (P.L. 106-181)	2,805	0	0
Trade and Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-200)	53	52	-8
Total, enacted this session	2,865	55	-8
Cleared pending signature: Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559)	5,500	5,500	0
Total Current Level	1,469,639	1,447,878	1,465,472
Total Budget Resolution	1,467,300	1,441,100	1,465,500
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	2,339	6,778	n.a.
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	28
Memorandum: Emergency designations for bills enacted this session.	0	0	0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: P.L.=Public Law; n.a.=not applicable.

AGAINST AMNESTY FOR MILOSEVIC

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on an opinion piece in the June 20 edition of the Washington Post written by Mr. Milan Panic, former Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, and an American citizen.

In this article, Mr. Panic argues for getting Russian President Putin to agree to offer Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic asylum, in a deal approved by the international community.

This is an appalling idea whose time, thank heavens, has not come. At least it would appear so, since it has been widely reported that at their recent summit meeting Putin told President Clinton that Miami seemed to be as good a place for Milosevic as Moscow.

President Putin may not be turning out to be a model democrat, but no one has accused him of being dumb. He ob-

viously feels that having Milosevic enlivening the Moscow scene would not exactly burnish his own credentials.

All kidding aside, the idea of blithely pronouncing all of our efforts in the former Yugoslavia over the last decade a hopeless failure and then letting the architect of the carnage skip off with his family to exile is both morally reprehensible and politically catastrophic.

The international community has labored long and hard to set up the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in the Hague, and then to get it up and running.

Over the past year the number of individuals indicted for alleged war crimes in custody has risen dramatically. Why should we totally undercut the Hague Tribunal, just when it is hitting its stride?

Why should we undercut the new, reformist government in Croatia, which has reversed the obstructionist course of the late strongman Tudjman and has

begun cooperating with the Hague? If Milosevic is given a suspension of prosecution, then why shouldn't all the Croats in custody get the same deal?

In arguing against undercutting the Hague Tribunal, I do not wish to imply that it has been a complete success. What is missing from the jail cells in the Hague, of course, are the really big fish—the chief villains of the massive slaughter in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo.

I am, of course, talking about Radovan Karadzic, Ratko Mladic, and, above all, the boss of all bosses Slobodan Milosevic. That's the point! To make this promising international effort work we need to do precisely the opposite from granting amnesty to public enemy number-one. We need to add him to the growing list of indicted suspects in detention.

The Panic op-ed argues that we won't be able to capture Milosevic. In the short run, we probably won't. But as