

I saw this again in 1996 when I was running for the U.S. Senate. It was the closing days of a very close race. DALE and my predecessor, Senator David Pryor, were campaigning for my opponent in a fly-around of the State. I suppose DALE was returning the favor from a decade before when I was campaigning for his opponent.

In the closing days, my son Timothy was involved in a tragic and terrible automobile accident. Timothy was seriously injured, and I was in the hospital room, not sure whether he was going to make it or not. The phone rang, and it was DALE BUMPERS. He called to assure me of his thoughts and his prayers and to tell me that he and David were suspending campaigning until it was clear that my son was going to be OK.

DALE, we will miss you around this place. I won't miss your votes, but I will miss you. I will miss your stories, and I will miss your humor. I will miss your eloquence, and I will miss your passion. I am grateful that our Senate careers overlapped for these 2 years. Thanks for your advice and counsel, and best wishes on this next phase of your life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2563 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry.

Under the order, how much time does each Senator have in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask I be given the 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

KOSOVO AND MILITARY READINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have asked for this time today to address two serious and interrelated concerns: One, the President's plans to intervene in Kosovo; and, two, the already evident crisis in readiness of the U.S. military.

There are some who believe that these two concerns should be dealt with separately. Some may argue that linking the two is merely an excuse for U.S. inaction. I wish to be very clear. Developments in Kosovo may compel the United States and our allies to intervene. However, this intervention should not be paid for by further hollowing out of the Armed Forces.

I and many of my colleagues, will not support airstrikes in Kosovo, and especially a ground force presence, unless the President agrees to submit a budget that addresses the related readiness and operational tempo requirements of the U.S. military.

Also, we must be careful not to believe that there is an easy or inexpensive long-term solution to the problems in Kosovo. The administration would have us believe that NATO airstrikes will somehow solve the problem. I, and many colleagues, disagree.

The recent massacre of ethnic Albanians in two small villages in Kosovo has heightened awareness and condemnation of Serbian aggression. Powerful airstrikes and military action could send a strong and unambiguous message to the Serbian leader. As in Bosnia, empty threats of NATO action never does anything to get the job done.

There is good reason to be concerned about 400,000 Albanians forced from their homes as winter approaches. I am concerned. I am deeply concerned about that. But I am more concerned about involving U.S. lives in ill-conceived military campaigns. I am deeply concerned that we will be sending an already weary and overextended military into a situation for which there is no quick and easy solution.

Mr. President, as you know, the U.S. defense budget has declined for the past several years. At the same time, nontraditional deployments have stretched an already extended military force to its limits. This is largely the result of downsizing of our force structure while increasing the number and the frequency of deployments overseas for purposes other than a war.

We have been asking our Armed Forces to do more with less for several years. They are finally admitting that they cannot do more with what the President has given them. Yet, the administration is asking them to still do more.

Now I and many of my colleagues wish to ask the administration one question: Will you do more? Will you ensure that readiness does not suffer further? Will you stop the hollowing out of our military forces?

Some may think that this readiness issue isn't real. I am sure there are those who think that there is no crisis in readiness. Well, I believe that a few examples of the crisis in readiness are absolutely persuasive.

Here are just a few of the symptoms of this crisis:

One, Navy pilot retention has sunk to an all-time low of 10 percent. This is the lowest in recorded history of pilot retention programs.

Air Force pilot retention is at 30 percent, and it is projected to decline further. The Air Force is now 700 pilots short.

The aircraft deployed on primary, peacekeeping deployments—such as Bosnia—are being "cannibalized," meaning, they are being stripped for

spare parts to keep at least a few flying. It is not uncommon for this to happen at a low-priority unit in the United States; however, allowing this to happen in the front-line deployments like Bosnia where we might soon go into combat is inexcusable.

Aircraft carriers are being deployed with personnel slots empty. A recent report has one carrier on a peacekeeping mission with a crew that is lacking 1,000 persons to perform the essential tasks. In other words, the United States has aircraft carriers on missions that are lacking about 20 percent of what is considered a full crew. How ready are these carriers to perform their missions?

We have Army units arriving for critical combat training at the Army's national training center in California with mechanics and "mounted" infantry simply missing. These units have junior noncommissioned officers filling roles traditionally filled by senior experienced noncommissioned officers.

This is a problem that permeates every branch of the Armed Forces. We simply are not retaining the seasoned, well-trained military personnel and professionals. I and Senator STEVENS are commissioning an important study by GAO to find out exactly why our military persons are leaving the service in unprecedented numbers.

The troops that I personally visited in the Persian Gulf made it clear that morale is low there. They are tired of constantly being separated from their families. I believe this separation would be tolerable if the operational tempo required of them were humane.

I believe the separation would also be eased, if they were assured that their families had adequate housing and food on the table.

I believe the separation would be tolerable and their loyalty to the military secure, if it weren't for the fact that they also question the purpose of the missions.

Mr. President, I believe we are failing our own soldiers on all counts.

That brings us to the question of money. There is simply not enough money in the defense budget as it is currently projected to do everything that needs to be done. There is an effort underway to provide emergency supplemental funding for military readiness. I support that effort. However, this will not solve the bigger problems.

The U.S. defense budget has been in a constant decline since 1985. In the case of Bosnia, the administration has relied on Congress to repeatedly supply "emergency supplemental" moneys to provide for a "contingency" operation that started in December, 1995. We are currently supporting over 8,000 troops in Bosnia, and the President persists in asking us to join him in a charade that the U.S. presence in Bosnia is an "unforeseen emergency."

The budget shortfalls are eroding readiness, but, more importantly, they

are contributing to a precipitous decline in the moral of the soldiers in uniform.

Mr. President, we believe it would be an unacceptable policy to send our troops into harm's way without addressing the scarcity of spare parts and relevant readiness issues that currently permeate the forces. Of course, I am not prepared to support the half baked, not thought through ideas that I fear are still being contemplated by this administration for what currently serves as our "policy" in Bosnia and Kosovo.

We must send a clear signal to the administration that we will not paint ourselves into another Bosnia, especially without the administration's assurance that our military will not once again be asked to do more with even less.

Before we commit American lives to another dangerous mission overseas, we must clearly define our objectives and be realistic in the commitment required to achieve them. More importantly, we must give our men and women in uniform sufficient assurance that their loyalty is not a one-way street. This can only be achieved by stopping the decline in defense budgets and ensuring a higher quality of life for our soldiers.

I am pleased to be joined by the distinguished Senator from Texas in these remarks this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to really follow on what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was saying, because I think he laid out very well the problems that we are facing with our military today. No one questions the job our military is doing. They are doing their jobs well. But it is clear that we are losing our experienced people.

As the Senator from New Mexico has just pointed out, we are losing our experienced pilots, we do not have enough parts to keep the airplanes running, and the Army had its worst recruiting year last year since the late 1970s.

At the time that we are looking at mission fatigue, our troops being over-deployed away from their families on missions that are not security threats to the United States, we are now seeing a mixed message from this administration about yet expanding their responsibilities.

We were told in the last few weeks that NATO is contemplating airstrikes in Serbia. This is, of course, a terrible and tragic situation in Kosovo. And, clearly, we want to try to do everything possible to curb atrocities that are happening and may happen in the future in Kosovo. But, Mr. President, a superpower cannot fling around the

world without a plan, without a thought, and have credibility.

I ask the question of the administration, Have we done everything we can do at the bargaining table with Mr. Milosevic? Have we put every economic sanction that can be put? Have we isolated this country to the extent that we can—as we have also tried to do with Iraq—to show this leader that he cannot continue to act in an irresponsible manner toward human beings in his own country and get by with it?

Have we done everything we can do first? If we have—and I don't think we have—if the administration makes the case that we have, then, and only then, should we be considering other options.

Mr. President, if we are going to bomb another country because of a civil conflict, a sovereign country that is in a civil conflict, have we thought through what the exit strategy is? Have we thought through what our responsibility is going to be for doing that? I haven't seen a plan. I haven't seen any kind of "after plan" after bombing. Yes, we have talked about bombing. But if we are bombing for the purpose of saying to Milosevic, "You must withdraw your police so that the Albanians who live in Kosovo can come out of the hills and go into their homes," how is that to be enforced?

We have been told by administration officials that there would not be American troops on the ground unless there is a peace agreement, something to enforce. Yet yesterday the Secretary of Defense opened the door on American troops on the ground with NATO forces. Yet we haven't seen a plan. We haven't seen what the American role will be. We have certainly not been consulted to determine if the United States is ready to expand its mission in the Balkans.

We were told we would be out of Bosnia a year ago. We were told a year and a half ago, we were told 2 years ago that our mission in Bosnia would be complete when the parties were separated and the elections had been held. The parties are separated. The elections have been held. Yet American taxpayers have spent \$10 billion in Bosnia, and the President is now saying there is an "unending mission" there. He has refused to put a timetable on it. This week the President has asked the U.S. Congress for \$2 billion more for Bosnia in a supplemental appropriation, as if this were an emergency. Why didn't the administration put this in the budget? He says it is an unending mission, yet we have an emergency appropriation.

I conclude by saying we cannot fling ourselves around the world without a clear strategy and a clear role for the United States. I am looking to the President for leadership and I haven't seen it.

I yield the floor.

DON'T TAMPER WITH THIS JURY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have recently read several articles in the press

which are cause for concern. One such article appeared in the Sunday, October 4, edition of the Washington Post, titled "Bid to Trump Inquiry Shelved."

The piece discussed White House efforts to produce a letter signed by at least 34 Democratic Senators declaring that they would not vote to convict the President, should the House decide to write articles of impeachment. According to the report, Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE has discouraged such an attempt.

I commend the Democratic leader, Mr. DASCHLE, for his wise and judicious counsel on this matter. He has done the White House, he has done the President, he has done all Senators, and, indeed, the entire nation a great, great service.

I am concerned about the ugly and very partisan tone that has enveloped many discussions of this matter, and about the extreme polarization which has already occurred. The House Judiciary Committee has voted to begin an impeachment inquiry. I have had nothing to say about that. I don't intend to have anything to say about that. This is the House's business. There is a constitutional process in place. That process has begun. The ball is in the field of the House of Representatives at this point. We here in the Senate should await the decision of the House of Representatives as to whether or not articles of impeachment will, indeed, be formulated.

Senators may at some point have to sit as jurors. Let me say that again. Senators may at some point have to sit as jurors in this matter and will be required to take an oath before they do. I read this oath into the RECORD a few days ago. I want to read it again, because the Senate will shortly be going out, not to return at least until after the elections, and perhaps not until the new Congress convenes in January.

To repeat this oath at this point, might be well advised. The Bible says, "a word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver," and so I think it is a good time to repeat this oath, which will be incumbent upon every Senator, should articles of impeachment come to this Chamber. Here it is:

I solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment now pending, I will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws: So help me God.

Note the word "impartial." We all need to remember the solemn responsibility we may be required to shoulder.

I would suggest by way of friendly advice to the White House, don't tamper with this jury. Don't tamper with this jury. I have been in Congress 46 years. I have been in this Senate 40 years. There are some people here who take their constitutional responsibilities very seriously. This will not be politics as usual if articles of impeachment come to this body.

My friendly words of advice to my colleagues are these: We may have to