Mr. ENZI. This was cleared on both sides.

Mrs. BOXER. Then I have no objection.

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

Mr. ENZI. In light of this agreement, the first vote today will occur at 4:30 p.m.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Let me take us back from before the unanimous consent request was made and kind of summarize where I was going.

We had a statement by Governor Bush. The statement was that he wanted to see all of those peacekeeping troops come home from the Balkans. He said we should not be involved in peacekeeping, only in fighting. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am concerned and clearly our NATO allies are concerned. Lord Robertson, the NATO Secretary General, again, has said this could undermine our relationship with our NATO alliance.

The Washington Post says one European Ambassador was quoted as saying: If the U.S. says it will not perform certain tasks, then the basic consensus of NATO begins to unravel.

Now, I remember being very surprised, because I was at the second debate, when Governor Bush made the point that we were carrying the load in the Balkans in terms of the peacekeeping troops. I knew that was incorrect. The fact is, American troops are no more than 20 percent of the total. American aid represents no more than 20 percent of what is being provided to Bosnia and Kosovo.

I would hate to see us walk away from peacekeeping and tell everyone we are the fighters; and then have our allies say: OK, you do the fighting; we do the peacekeeping. It is of great concern to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorials that have been written on this subject by the New York Times, the Washington Post, and USA Today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 2000]

RISKING NATO

Gov. George W. Bush wants a new ''division of labor'' within NATO, the U.S.-European alliance that has helped keep the peace for the past half-century. His proposal would more likely lead to a division of NATO itself—to the end of the alliance.

Mr. Bush hinted at this view before, with his denunciation of U.S. ''nation-building'' in the Balkans, but it was his national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice, who spelled out exactly what he means in a New York Times interview published Saturday. Ms. Rice said that America's allies in Europe should furnish the ground troops for missions such as peacekeeping in Kosovo and Bosnia, while the United States should offer ''the kind of support we can provide, such as air power.'' In other words: You Europeans take all the risks while we hover safety above the fray. No allies would long accept such a deal, nor should they be expected to.

The proposal is particularly misguided given that European allies already are bearing the brunt of peacekeeping duties in the Balkans. They provide about four-fifths of needed troops. The United States has deployed some 11,000 troops in Kosovo and Bosnia, less than one percent of its active duty force. For the United States, this is a win-win situation: Its policy is implemented, but the burden of implementation is widely shared. Under Ms. Rice's proposal, which was officially endorsed by Bush campaign headquarters, the United States would lose its ability to steer policy, risk the world's most successful alliance—and very likely inherit a far larger burden once the Balkans erupted again.

The Clinton Administration has picked an unfortunate argument in response. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, again to the Times, said that even raising the issue was dangerous to U.S. interests. This recalls the Gore-Lieberman campaign's contention that Mr. Bush's criticism of U.S. military readiness is dangerous because it comforts U.S. enemies. This effort to squelch debate is preposterous; these are precisely the kinds of issues that should be aired in a campaign.

The more sensible response would be to point out that the Clinton-Gore policies seems to be having an effect. The Balkans are at peace; democracy is sprouting almost everywhere; even the apparently invulnerable Slobodan Milosevic has been knocked from his perch. Of course many problems remain, the gains are fragile and, yes, U.S. troops will be needed for some time. But surely helping democracy take root throughout Europe is worth the modest price of that modest deployment.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 2000]

NO TIME FOR A BALKAN EXIT

Sharp contrasts emerged over the weekend in the way the Bush and Gore campaigns view America's proper military role in Europe. The debate began when Condoleezza Rice, one of Gov. George W. Bush's leading foreign policy advisers, told The Times's Michael Gordon that a Bush administration would ask European members of NATO to gradually take over full responsibility for providing peacekeeping forces for Bosnia and Kosovo. Vice President Gore countered that carrying out such a policy could destabilize the Balkans and jeopardize the future of NATO, America's most important military alliance.

Debates over how and where United States military forces should be stationed are a healthy part of presidential contests. Ms. Rice's proposal is consistent with the Bush campaign's view that extended peacekeeping missions degrade the combat readiness of American military forces and that the Pentagon should concentrate its resources on preparing for crises where Washington alone has the might to deter, and, if necessary, combat aggression, whether in the Persian Gulf, the Korean Peninsula or a future military conflict in Europe.

But on the specifics of America's role in the Balkans, Ms. Rice's proposal is misguided for several reasons. The job of securing peace in Bosnia and Kosovo is far from complete. The American share of the peacekeeping has already been substantially reduced. Finally, the NATO alliance has been built on a concept of shared risk that is inconsistent with a total withdrawal of American ground forces from Balkan peacekeeping.

It is true that military conditions in Bosnia are now more stable than they were when NATO troops were first introduced five years ago and that the situation in Kosovo has also improved in the year since Serbian forces withdrew. But in neither place is there yet enough security for displaced refugees to return to their homes or for elections to take place without the risk of physical intimidation. The departure of Slobodan Milosevic from Yugoslavia's presidency creates new opportunities for easing tensions in both Bosnia and Kosovo, provided local troublemakers can be kept in check. That will require a continued strong NATO presence.

The Clinton administration, meanwhile, has done a good job of insisting that America's share of peacekeeping responsibilities be steadily reduced. There are now only 11,400 American troops in the Balkans, about one-fifth of the NATO total. When NATO first went into Bosnia, about a third of its 60,000 troops were Americans. Balkan peacekeeping costs account for just over 1 percent of the Pentagon's $280 billion budget, leaving more than enough for military needs elsewhere.

Asking Europe to accept a total withdrawal of American ground forces from the Balkans needlessly challenges some of the basic assumptions of the Western military alliance. NATO was formed not just to counter Soviet bloc military threats. It was also designed to eliminate some of the historic military rivalries in Europe that led to two world wars. NATO provides a framework for European and American forces to cooperate in joint operations under a single overall commander—traditionally an American. Europe cannot be expected to accept an alliance in which Washington exercises political and military leadership but does not subject its own forces to any of the risks of ground operations. The Bush campaign is right when it insists that the United States must be selective in where it stations ground forces. But the Balkans is not the place to cut back.

[From the USA Today, Oct. 24, 2000]

BUSH TAKES UNWISE STEP AWAY FROM PEACEKEEPING

TODAY'S DEBATE: U.S. AND EUROPE

OUR VIEW: FOR THE U.S. TO LEAD NATO, IT MUST PARTICIPATE

Most Americans want to see their country as a world leader, but they are unenthusiastic about the human and financial costs of doing what may be necessary to lead. So it's no surprise that both presidential candidates have treaded carefully on defining America's future role in peacekeeping.

But during the weekend, the Bush campaign refined its position in a way that's likely to win votes while weakening the United States' leadership role in Europe.

In a proposal that plays into the public's ambivalence, George W. Bush's senior national security aide, Condoleezza Rice, suggested that a Bush administration would tell NATO that Europeans should take over peacekeeping in the Balkans. The U.S. would focus instead on potential trouble spots where it alone can act, she said, such as the Persian Gulf and the Taiwan Straits.

Her remarks were an effort to flesh out Bush's repeated theme that U.S. forces should focus on the ability to fight wars, not what he derides as ''nation building.'' It's appealing logic to a country that has never been enthusiastic about long-term foreign commitments. But it is rooted in the dubious assumption that the United States can effectively lead NATO, the West's primary defense alliance, without being a full player.

Both the recent history of the Balkans and the longer-term history of Europe say that is shortsighted.

The tragedy of post-Cold War Europe in the '90s was that our allies were unable to deal with chaos, ''ethnic cleansing'' and the serious threat of an expanding war on their doorstep until the United States belatedly got involved. In both Bosnia and Kosovo, European governments squabbled among themselves until the United States finally agreed to share some of the risk on the ground. The ethnic cleansing was curtailed without a single U.S. casualty.

Today, Americans comprise less than 20% of the Bosnia-Kosovo peacekeeping force, a contribution former NATO commander Wesley Clark calls the bare minimum if the United States wants to have any influence on NATO actions there. If the United States were to pull out, the record suggest it would be naive to expect Europe to respond meaningfully to the next Bosnia or Kosovo.

The deeper risk extends beyond the Balkans to the overall U.S. role in NATO. Since NATO's formation in the wake of World War II, it has served to quiet the continent's longstanding rivalries. Weakening U.S. leadership would set off a counterproductive race to fill the gap, with unfavorable consequences for U.S. interests.

A core part of the Bush argument is that the armed forces are too stretched to manage peacekeeping and prepare for war effectively. But the U.S. deployment to the Balkans is less than 10% of our military in Europe, and the cost is scarcely 1% of the Pentagon budget. Whatever shortcomings there may be in defense readiness or troop morale, blaming them on Balkans peacekeeping defies logic.

Vice President Gore, who played a central role in the Clinton administration's policy in the Balkans, accused Bush of a ''lack of judgment and a complete misunderstanding of history.''

Expecting Europe to act decisively on its own or to accept U.S. leadership without at least token U.S. involvement in the field is sadly unrealistic.

Mrs. BOXER. I am going to read a little bit from those editorials when I can find my glasses, which is an important thing. Here they are. When I started out in politics, I did not need these reading glasses. So that shows you how long I have been around.

This is from the Washington Post:

The Balkans are at peace; democracy is sprouting almost everywhere; even the apparently invulnerable Slobodan Milosevic has been knocked from his perch. Of course, many problems remain, the gains are fragile and, yes, U.S. troops will be needed for some time. But surely helping democracy take root throughout Europe is worth the modest price of that modest deployment [of peacekeeping troops].

The New York Times says that George Bush's adviser's proposal is misguided. That is the proposal to say that we will no longer participate in peacekeeping.

The job of securing peace in Bosnia and Kosovo is far from complete. The American share of the peacekeeping has already been substantially reduced. Finally, the NATO alliance has been built on a concept of shared risk that is inconsistent with a total withdrawal of American ground forces from Balkan peacekeeping.

Now, we know that America's share, they say, of peacekeeping responsibilities is steadily reducing.

There are now only 11,400 American troops in the Balkans, about one-fifth of the NATO total. When NATO first went into Bosnia, about a third of its 60,000 troops were Americans. Balkan peacekeeping costs [are only] 1 percent of the Pentagon's . . . budget. . . .

Asking Europe to accept a total withdrawal of American ground forces from the Balkans needlessly challenges some of the basic assumptions of [our] western military alliance.

Our Western military alliance has served us well. Why would we now—when we see the tinderbox over in the Middle East—come up with a plan that would shake up our allies, that would worry our friends? This is the time not to make those kinds of proposals. And those proposals themselves are dangerous for the world.

I will also quote from USA Today. So you are seeing a whole number of newspapers coming out against this Bush plan.

They say:

The deeper risk extends beyond the Balkans to the overall U.S. role in NATO. Since NATO's formation in the wake of World War II, it has served to quiet the continent's longstanding rivalries. Weakening U.S. leadership would set off a counterproductive race to fill the gap, with unfavorable consequences for U.S. interests.

I have to believe this kind of a policy—either it was not thought out or it is a radical departure from what has worked for us not only through the cold war but after the cold war. Governor Bush says we can't do all this alone. And I agree with him; we can't do all this alone. But the bizarre thing is, he is pulling us out of a situation—or would want to, if he were President—where we are only about 20 percent of the force. This is an example of the way we ought to integrate all of the responsibilities of the various allies. I find it amazing that this policy would come up at this time when we have the world in such a precarious position as we look at what is happening in the Middle East.

So in any event, in closing, I will make these points in two areas: education and foreign policy.

I think there are some interesting new developments the American people ought to look at. One, we have a candidate for President, who is the Governor of Texas, who is using Texas as the model. We just learned that Texas is almost dead last as a place people would want to raise their children. That is an unbiased report that came out. We have a Rand study, which is a study that Bush himself has cited, which says these kids in Texas are simply not making it.

We now have this foreign policy fiasco. While the Republicans want to look at what went on in 1995 between Russia and America, we now realize that what we ought to be looking at is this latest proposal by Governor Bush, and to try to debunk it, that would say we ought to pull our peacekeeping troops out, that America should not even have a role in peacekeeping. It is rattling our NATO allies.

Again, NATO has served us well. Why? Because we all cooperate and we work together and we come up with plans together. And to have this, if you will, ''Molotov cocktail'' from George Bush just thrown out—unprovoked—to shake up our NATO allies, and say, ''We are not going to do peacekeeping; we are going to do fighting,'' I say to this Senate that I do not like that division of responsibilities, where America does all the fighting and our NATO allies do the peacekeeping.

I do not like shaking up our allies at this time. I think it shows a certain recklessness, a certain lack of experience, a certain misunderstanding of history of what it has been like for us to build these alliances. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am very concerned by this proposal. I believe it will have a very negative impact.

I am someone who has fought long and hard for burdensharing. I have offered a number of amendments in the House and the Senate asserting that it is important our allies carry their fair share. I will go on record as saying 80 percent of the troops in the Balkans is a fair share; 80 percent of our commitment in the Balkans is being paid by the Europeans, 20 percent by the Americans. That is good. That is a fair share. That is working.

To throw this kind of a proposal out there at this time when the Middle East is in crisis, when we need our allies at the table, when we need good relationships with our friends, shows a certain irresponsibility and riskiness upon which the American people are not going to look very kindly. And certainly, while the Foreign Relations Committee is beating up on the Vice President 2 weeks before an election about Russia-United States relations; our problem today isn't Russia-United States relations; our problem today is trying to do the best we can with our allies in the world to end some of these tragedies going on in the Middle East, to work for a new Yugoslavia that is democratic, to make sure we build on Madeleine Albright's seeming success in North Korea where, by the way, we have 37,000 troops. Maybe my friend from Illinois knows this. I did not hear any comments about pulling out troops from the Koreas, but maybe that is his next proposal, where we have kept the peace and stability.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from California will yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. She has raised an important point. Most people would agree that the Governor of Texas has limited personal exposure and experience when it comes to foreign policy issues. That does not mean he is disqualified. There have been Presidents who have been Governors. But we have to judge him on what he has said.

His suggestion of the withdrawal of troops in some parts of the world raises serious questions as to whether or not he has considered the consequences. The United States made a commitment, for example, in Europe after World War II to stop the spread of communism. It cost the American people

trillions of dollars. It paid off: 250 years later, communism is virtually wiped off the map and these countries, the Balkans and eastern European countries, now enjoy democracy and freedom.

There was only one country in the world that could do that, and that was the United States. We have military skill, the great men and women in uniform, and we have a reputation of involving ourselves in foreign policy—not to come away with any property or treasure; we are there to try to promote the ideals and values of our country.

So when Governor Bush suggests withdrawing troops in some parts of the world, you have to wonder, has he really reflected on this? Has he taken the time to try to measure why he would change policies that even his father supported, perhaps President Reagan supported, and now he wants to change these policies and approaches?

This is an important element. Thank goodness we live in a world that is generally at peace, but it is a dangerous world that at any moment can flare up. We need leadership in the White House that understands the consequences of its actions.

I salute the Senator from California. What we are seeing happen today in North Korea—where they are finally talking to us; they are finally agreeing to perhaps end the missile testing—is a very positive development. It is only because the United States made a commitment in South Korea with the lives of our service men and women and then kept troops there to protect it that we have reached that point today.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes following the completion of my time.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes when I conclude my time.

Mr. KYL. I object, Mr. President, on the ground that I was going to speak at a quarter till.

Mr. DURBIN. May I make an inquiry of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to be fair to my colleagues. It was my understanding that the Democratic side would have the first 25 minutes in morning business and then the Republican side. But in the interest of my colleagues who have given up their own time, I am happy to work out an arrangement with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the objection over adding 5 minutes or taking the 5 minutes?

Mr. KYL. Let me withdraw the objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I was just making sure that Senator DURBIN would be recognized for the next 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I withdraw my objection. I did not understand the Senator's request. My understanding was that the minority time would have expired about now. I understand that is not the case. Therefore, I do not object to the request of the Senator from California to have Senator DURBIN speak next. I was hoping to be able to speak before noon, but that may not be possible.

Mr. DURBIN. May I ask for clarification? How much time does the Democratic side have remaining in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic side has a little over 24 minutes. The Republican side has 20 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chair make an inquiry of my two Republican colleagues as to how long they would like to speak.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I could clarify, it is no big deal. What we had was the morning business time divided between Republicans and Democrats. The leader's time took some of that, so we didn't have enough. We ought to share equally what remains. Whatever that division is, it ought to be divided between the two of us.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may restate my unanimous consent request, understanding that we have 24 minutes remaining, I would appreciate it if Senator DURBIN could follow my remarks so we have some train of thought. Then we can take the next 10 minutes from the Republican time, if they would like to use it. I don't think Senator DURBIN has a problem; I don't have a problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. If we would determine exactly the time that is remaining and then maybe add to that my opportunity to speak after Senator DURBIN.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to.

Mr. KYL. If we could suspend one moment.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to do that.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask if we could suspend the request for one moment. Senator THOMAS is technically in control of the time on our side. He should be the one who understands this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senator from California finishes, the Senator from Illinois will speak for 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Out of the 10 minutes I originally had, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used her time.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds to recap what I said before the time goes to Senator DURBIN.

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

Mrs. BOXER. We have taken longer deciding who is going to talk than we have on what we really want to say. I will sum up my points today.

I think two issues are coming to the floor in this election. Education is one of them. We have the Governor of Texas saying his kids in Texas are doing great. We learned today that was based on a State test, not a national test. So that is something we have to look at. We have a new study showing that Texas is one of the worst places to raise a child. That is from another objective, nonpartisan study.

Now we have a hearing going on in Foreign Relations beating up on Vice President GORE for something that happened in 1995, when not one Republican ever complained about it until 2 weeks before the election, when Governor Bush has now made a proposal that in essence threw a bomb into NATO—figuratively, not literally—and our NATO allies are worried and concerned that suddenly we have on the table a proposal—not very well thought out, in my view—that would drastically change NATO and would say, in essence, that the United States will be the fighters, someone else will be the peacekeepers.

I think it is more dangerous for our people to take that on alone. It is a big worry I have. It shows in this sensitive time why we need proven, effective, experienced leadership in the White House. We don't want to have someone coming in and throwing this kind of proposal into NATO. We need our NATO allies now more than ever. We have great opportunities for peace in the world. We are not going to make them come true if we dissect NATO and destroy it.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the sake of my colleagues on the floor, Senator THOMAS and others, it is my understanding that I am to speak for 10 minutes, and then the Republican side will be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was made for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Five minutes, fine. I will confine my remarks to 5 minutes in the interest of my patient colleagues. After Senator THOMAS and Senator KYL, I would like to reclaim the Democratic time under morning business.

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

MAKING TOUGH CHOICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 2 weeks the American people are going to face one of the toughest choices they have had perhaps in modern memory.

This Presidential race is not just a choice between two individuals and whether, frankly, one has a better image on television, or more experience, or a better speaking voice. It comes down to basic questions of values envisioned for this country. There