

He is presently the senior adviser to the Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs. He is a career member of the Senior Foreign Service at the class of minister-counsellor, clearly a very distinguished and recognized public servant in our diplomatic corps.

Next is Mr. Kenneth Quinn, Kenneth Michael Quinn, who has been nominated by the President to the position of Ambassador to Cambodia. He is presently a special project officer for the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs in the Department of State—again, a career of foreign service, class of minister-counsellor.

I would just point out parenthetically here, Mr. President, that I can remember years in which we had great debates on the Senate floor expressing concerns about the political nature of the appointments being made by one or another President to some ambassadorial positions. In this group of 18, all but 4 of the 18 are career Foreign Service officers, have devoted their entire career to working in our diplomatic corps, and the four who are not career Foreign Service officers I think are recognized by all to be well qualified to take important positions like this.

After the Ambassador to Cambodia is Mr. William Itoh, the President's appointee as Ambassador to the Kingdom of Thailand, presently a student in the Capstone Program at the National Defense University—again, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service with the class of counsellor.

Next is a gentleman I referred to in my statement this morning, Mr. Stapleton Roy, who has been nominated by the President as Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia. He again is a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of career minister. I would point out that he was born in China. He has spent much of his life in the Far East and China in particular. He is extremely well recognized as an expert on that part of the world and has served our country extremely well in important positions including Ambassador to China. He now, of course, is being considered for this other very important position for which I hope we can confirm him.

The next after Mr. Roy is Thomas Simons, Jr., who is nominated by the President as the Ambassador to Pakistan. He is presently the Coordinator of U.S. Assistance for the New Independent States. His Foreign Service grade is career member of the Senior Foreign Service, a career diplomat, as many of these nominees are, and somebody who clearly has earned the respect and confidence of the President.

Next is Frances Cook, who has been nominated by the President to be the Ambassador to Oman, presently the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Political Military Affairs—again, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service.

Next is Richard Henry Jones, who has been nominated by the President

as Ambassador to Lebanon. And again we have a person who at the present time serves as Director of the Office of Egyptian Affairs in the Department of State, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service with a class of counsellor.

Next is James Collins. Mr. Collins has been nominated by the President as Ambassador-at-Large and Special Adviser to the Secretary of State for the New Independent States, and again a career member of the Senior Foreign Service with the class of minister-counsellor, also a very distinguished career which I think well equips him for that position.

Next is Charles Twining, who has been nominated by the President as Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, presently the Ambassador to Cambodia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service with the class of minister-counsellor—again, a very distinguished public servant in our diplomatic corps.

Next is James Joseph. The President has nominated James Joseph as Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa. He presently is the president of the Council on Foundations and has a very distinguished career in a great many different areas, but obviously has the President's confidence.

Next is Joan Plaisted. Joan Plaisted is the President's nominee as Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, now presently serving as Director of the Office of Thailand and Burma Affairs in the Department of State, another career member in the Senior Foreign Service with the class of counsellor.

Next is Don Gevirtz, who has been nominated as Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, to the Republic of Nauru, to the Kingdom of Tonga and Tuvalu—again, a very distinguished individual whose present position is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Foothill Group, Inc., in California.

Next is our own former colleague, Senator Jim Sasser, who is presently an attorney here in the District of Columbia as well as in Nashville, TN, earlier this year was a fellow of Harvard University and is now, of course, the President's nominee as Ambassador to Beijing. And I think all of us who have served with him would agree that he will perform in an exemplary fashion in that position as he would in any position for which the President would nominate him.

Next is David Rawson, whom the President has nominated as Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, presently the Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of counsellor; again, a very distinguished career in our diplomatic service.

Next is Robert Gribbon, who has been nominated by the President as Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda. His present position is Ambassador to the Central African Republic, another career member of the Senior Foreign

Service, with the class of counsellor; a very distinguished career, formerly a Peace Corps volunteer in Kenya.

Finally, Gerald Wesley Scott, who has been nominated by the President as the Ambassador to the Republic of the Gambia. He is presently the Deputy Chief of Mission in Zaire and in the American Embassy in Kinshasa, Zaire, another career member of the Senior Foreign Service with the class of counsellor.

Mr. President, I have gone through this list and given a little information about each of these individuals just to make the point that this is not some kind of political effort on my part or on the President's part or anybody to get these people in these new positions.

These people have devoted their careers, their entire professional lives, to serving this country in often very difficult circumstances. They have been chosen by the President to serve in these important positions, and we owe it to them as well as to those people we represent in our home States to get on with approving their nominations so that they can continue to represent this country in those important positions.

That is the list of ambassadors that are presently being held up in the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope very much that we will be able to get an agreement here today, or very soon, to have all of those nominees reported to the Senate floor and have a vote on those nominees as well as on START II before we adjourn this session of the Congress. I think that would be a very major accomplishment and something that would allow us to feel we had done our duty under the Constitution, which I think is certainly what all of us are intending to do. So with that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that all of us are concerned about and all of us are thinking about, and that is the President's policy to put United States troops on the ground in Bosnia.

First, let me make it clear that I am opposed to that idea. I had an opportunity about 5 weeks ago to go to Sarajevo along with some other of my associates here. We went to Stuttgart in

Germany and visited for a day with the supreme commander there. I was impressed by the preparation, by the way, of our military, as always. I am sure they will be able to carry out whatever mission is assigned to them.

We spent some time in Croatia talking particularly to the Defense Minister there in terms of the Croatians' activities and their concerns. We spent a portion of our time in Sarajevo where we visited with the President of Bosnia, had a chance to talk with the U.N. commander there, and also spent some time coming back through Brussels in Belgium, and spent some time with the NATO commander and all 16 of the Ambassadors that were there.

Certainly, I am not an expert in the field, having been there just a few days, but I have to tell you that you do get a sense, you do get a sense from being there as to what the feelings are, a sense that, as you would imagine, those people are tired of fighting and looking for some resolution. You get a feeling, also, however, that there is not a willingness to give up some of the positions that people have taken and will maintain, antagonistic positions and conflicts that are very long lasting and have been there for hundreds of years.

So, Mr. President, I came back having not changed my opinion. I do think we need to continue to be involved. I think we have had an excellent representation there in terms of the negotiation. I congratulate the negotiators. We met yesterday with Secretary Holbrooke. But I was no more convinced of the responsibility to have 20,000 or 30,000 troops on the ground there and of our chances of coming away in the period of time, as described by the President, of 1 year, or that the solution is any better than it was before.

Let me say, however, that we are going to have differences of view here. I hope we have an extended discussion of the issue here on the floor. I think everyone who comes forward will honestly have their views—and I do not impugn anyone's motives as to why they are where they are.

Let me comment on a number of things that have concerned me. One is the process and the process of involving American citizens, through their Congress, through their elected representatives, in this decision. And I have to tell you that it is my observation that the Congress has essentially been co-opted in this decision.

It started some 2 years ago when the President, for whatever the reason, indicated that he would place 25,000 troops in Bosnia, at that time mostly to remove the U.N. forces if that was necessary. So that was the first indication why it was 25,000. Why it was not 20,000, why it was not 40,000, why it was not 10,000, I am not sure. No one has ever been able to tell us that.

So, then not much happened, and the Congress then passed resolutions saying we ought to lift the arms embargo on the Moslems. However, that was not

pushed by the administration. That was not something that the administration worked hard to encourage. But shortly thereafter, I think it did cause some action. Shortly thereafter, the United States then moved to get NATO to do some airstrikes, which tended to bring together then the Croatians and the Moslems to a federation that sort of equalized, began to equalize the forces there, and so we saw a change, I think prompted, at least partially, by the action of this Congress to recommend that we lift the arms embargo.

So then we saw some effort to come to a peace agreement. When I was there, there was just recently installed a cease-fire. I think it was the 31st cease-fire, however. Nevertheless, it was an effort to do that. Then we moved toward the peace agreement and a meeting in Dayton, OH, or wherever, to do that. So the administration said, gosh, we cannot really talk to you about what is in the wind here because we are having a peace conference and it would disrupt the peace conference.

We had a number of hearings, and we did not get too much information, because they said we cannot do that. So then, for whatever commitment there is to it, there was a peace agreement initialed in Ohio. I am glad there was and I congratulate those who helped bring it about. No one is certain what it means and how much commitment there is to it. Then we are told by the administration, "Well, we have a peace arrangement now. We can't really talk to you much because we can't change that."

The next thing we knew, the President was in Europe on a peace mission talking to a number of countries, including NATO and European countries, saying, "We are willing to bring these troops in." Of course, it was received with a great deal of enthusiasm. Who would not? If we agreed to do most of the heavy lifting, you would imagine that.

So then following that comes the commitment for troops, and some preliminary troops are there now.

Mr. President—and I asked this question of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense in a hearing last week—what is the role of Congress? I did not get an answer, other than provide the money. I do not think that is appropriate.

I do not want to get into the great discussions of the constitutionality of the President's authority. There is disagreement about that. I do not happen to think the President has unlimited authority because he is named Commander in Chief in the Constitution.

Nevertheless, there must be a role here for the Congress. I think it has been handled very poorly, frankly, in terms of some involvement and commitment.

It seems to me—and I am sorry for this—it seems to me the administration is more in the posture of defending their decision and winning the argu-

ment than really talking about the substance of why we should, in fact, be in Bosnia. We can talk about details, and that is what we hear, all the details of how we are going to train, how we are going to move, all these things, but the real issue is not the details, as important as they may be. The real issue is, why are we there and what is the rationale and reason and the vital American interests for us to be there.

We hear some saying, "Well, we're going to put troops in harm's way." Of course, no one wants to put troops in harm's way. On the other hand, that is what troops are for. The question is not are they in harm's way, the question is, is there a good reason and rationale for them being in harm's way?

We hear, "If they don't go, there will not be any peace." I am not sure that is true.

Until these warring parties are prepared, genuinely, to have peace, I suspect there will not be peace. We are told, and I think sincerely, that we are there to keep peace, not to make peace. There is a little different term this time, it is called enforce peace, which is a bit hard to define. But when we asked the question, what do we do when there is an organized military resistance to the U.S. forces that are there, NATO forces, the answer was, "Well, we're not there to fight a war, we're not there to fight, we are there to keep and enforce the peace." We were led to believe we probably would withdraw.

So, Mr. President, it is awfully hard to know. Some say, "Well, we have to have leadership, we're isolationists." I do not believe for 1 second that anyone can think of this country, the things we are involved in both in security and trade, that would cause anyone to suggest this country is isolationist. That is ridiculous.

Some say, "Well, NATO will dissolve without us." I do not believe that. NATO was designed, of course, to bring together the North Atlantic nations to resist the Soviet Union, and they still have a mission, certainly. Although I must tell you, having been there, I think there is some search for a mission going on. NATO will continue to exist; NATO has a legitimate purpose. I do not know whether its purpose is to quell civil wars within Europe.

So, Mr. President, we are in a sticky wicket here, and I guess the stickiest thing—and I, frankly, did not get a chance to ask the Secretary yesterday—is, what is our policy in the future, what is our position going to be with regard to our role in civil disturbances, our role in civil wars, our role in ethnic disturbances throughout the world, and there have been a number and there will continue to be.

Is our role to place troops and keep the peace, enforce the peace? I do not know the answer. But we will have to make a decision with respect to policy, so that we know where we are, what people can expect from us. We want to be a leader in the world; we will be, we

should be, we are the superpower. People should have, however, a reason to anticipate that our position will be based on policy.

Mr. President, I think we find ourselves in a very difficult position, one in which honest people can disagree. I happen to believe it is a mistake for us to put U.S. troops on the ground there, a mistake in terms of policy, a mistake in terms of alternatives. There are alternatives. It is not that or nothing.

We can continue to be involved with diplomacy. We can continue to support NATO. We can give other kinds of support there. It is a question of what happens when we leave. What do we do to ensure that having spent whatever it is—I suspect even though the administration says \$1.5 billion, maybe plus \$600 million in nation building, a little over \$2 billion, I would be willing to bet you that is not right. We spent nearly that much in Haiti, and this place will be three times as expensive.

So the question is, what is the basis, what is the rationale for that kind of commitment? I hope we have an opportunity to discuss it soon. I had hoped we would this week. Apparently, it will be next week. We ought to keep in mind the mass troop movement has not taken place. We have some folks in there, some troops in there early to prepare, but the troops are not there. We still need to make a decision. We still need to say to the President, if that is what we believe, that we think this is the wrong decision. No one here, however, will resist supporting troops once they are there. We are not talking about that at this point; we are talking about the decision to be there. It is a tough one. We should face up to it, come to the snubbing post and make decisions. I am sorry we have not made them before now. We shall. It is our responsibility.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, is recognized.

OPERATIONAL TESTING AND EVALUATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to address the Senate for just maybe 3 or 4 minutes, 5 or 6 at the most, on something that Senator PRYOR and Senator ROTH have already addressed, something that we three have worked on over quite a few years. It deals with a matter of defense and an operation within defense that is going to make sure that we get the most money for our defense dollar and to make sure that a weapon system that we are producing is effective and safe.

Mr. President, I am amazed that I have to stand before you to say what I am about to say. I never thought I would have to rise to speak out to defend this program. But, then again, I continue to be astonished by the shortsighted and misguided actions of so many people in this town.

Nearly 12 years ago, there was a bipartisan effort to create the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation [OT&E] at the Department of Defense. OT&E was created in response to a very simple idea: We should not spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers money before we know that a weapons works and will be safe and effective for our men and women in uniform.

The OT&E Office has been an unqualified success. It has saved the taxpayers billions. The cancellation of that boondoggle, the Sgt. York [DIVAD] antiaircraft weapon, was due in part to the work of OT&E. Cancelling the DIVAD saved the taxpayers billions. More important, it ensured we didn't give our soldiers poor, unsafe equipment.

But far more important, OT&E has saved lives. There is no question that the modifications made to the Bradley fighting vehicle to enhance its survivability ensured that many young soldiers came home from the Persian Gulf.

Former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney said that the vigorous, independent testing oversight put in place with the creation of OT&E by Congress saved more lives than perhaps any other single initiative.

Now, what is our response to these accolades? To these successes? Why of course, we get rid of it. Incredibly this is actually being proposed right now by the DOD authorization conferees.

OT&E asks the tough questions on weapons effectiveness, and it looks closely at the answers. It does this independent of the services and the procurement bureaucracy at the Pentagon. So why would we want to eliminate this important check and balance?

Simply put, OT&E is a vital check in ensuring that the taxpayers get the best bang for the buck and that the safety of our troops is the top priority.

The people who are clamoring to get rid of OT&E are upset because OT&E is a roadblock to their top priority: ripping the money sacks open at both ends, and pitchforking dollars to defense contractors as quickly as possible.

These are people who must believe DOD exists merely as an expressway to pad the coffers of contractors. And they want to get rid of this small speed bump, the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation, because it slows down the flow of money.

Mr. President, I am particularly saddened that this is happening under a Republican Congress. I have been assured by Republican House leaders that Pentagon reform is around the corner, even though in the DOD authorization bill we are throwing more money at the Pentagon. But I must say, if this is their idea of reform, they'll have an unexpected battle on their flank. And I'll be leading the charge once again, just as I did in the mid-1980's. And we will win again.

House Republicans say they want to reform the Pentagon so much that it

will become a triangle. This action undermines any claims by Republicans in the Congress that they are for reforming the Pentagon.

I am very fearful that this Congress has badly confused its principles. Being for a strong defense means ensuring that our troops get the safest and most effective weapons for our troops. It does not mean ensuring only a steady and increasing cash flow for defense contractors.

And let me say, while the actions of the Congress are inexcusable, the administration's actions are no better.

We have heard not a word from the administration about the elimination of OT&E. How the administration, in the middle of sending our troops into Bosnia, can sit idly by and say and do nothing while OT&E is being eliminated is beyond comprehension. What kind of signal does that send to our troops?

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning of my speech, I am astonished that I am standing on the Senate floor having to debate this issue. This is a sad day for the taxpayers and even a sadder day for our troops.

I strongly hope the conferees will reconsider this disastrous proposal and not bring the DOD authorization bill to the floor until it is resolved.

I also wish to commend my colleagues, Senator ROTH and Senator PRYOR, for their staunch support for this office, both at its creation, and especially now. Their eloquent speeches on this floor earlier today speak to their leadership on this issue. And I would like to add my support to their effort to give our troops the very best equipment for their safety.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FLAG DESECRATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Democrats will not let us get beyond the motion to proceed on Senate Joint Resolution 31, the proposed constitutional amendment to grant power to the Congress and the States, the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. This is an important issue which should be submitted to the American people in the form of a proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, today we begin consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 31, a proposed constitutional amendment authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the American flag. I am pleased