AMENDMENT NO. 837

(Purpose: To provide an additional $60 million for ''Former Soviet Threat Reduction'' activities for fiscal year 1998)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 837.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, line 5, strike the number ''$2,431,741,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,411,741,000'';

On page 28, line number 9, strike the number ''$2,865,800,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$2,832,800,000'';

On page 20, line number 12, strike the number ''$322,200,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$382,200,000''.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this will restore $60 million to the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction Program. We call it the Nunn-Lugar Program. It will fully fund the program. We had reduced $60 million in accordance with the Senate Armed Services Committee's original reduction. During debate on the floor last week of the Armed Services bill, this item was increased. Since it is the only one that was really a substantial increase, we seek to have this adopted.

We have no jurisdiction over Department of Energy funds, and we have used different offsets to restore this $60 million, but we seek to have this amendment adopted because it is a major difference between the Armed Services bill and this bill represented by our committee.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am pleased to say this matter has the concurrence on the minority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 837) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senate that while we have been told there are some possible amendments, I have not been informed of any Senator's intent, for sure, to offer an amendment. I do want to tell the Senate I intend to move to go to third reading if there are not amendments brought to us and offered for debate.

We have a very long program for appropriations this week and we hope to finish three, maybe four, maybe even five of the bills this week. If this bill is not going to be the subject of amendments today, we should know that soon. We are obligated to go to debate on the cloture motion at 6 o'clock, but we could, if the Senators would bring their amendments over here prior to that time, finish the debate on significant amendments and vote on them after the consideration of the cloture motion or as soon as the vote on cloture is over, and enable us to move to another appropriation tomorrow.

It is our hope that Senators will present their amendments now. It is hard to get people to listen, but I hope they will listen because I am going to move to go to third reading if we do not have substantive amendments presented here before that time comes.

Mr. INOUYE. If I may, Mr. President, I wish to most vigorously associate myself with the remarks of my chairman. He means what he says. If my colleagues do not have amendments ready, we are ready to go to third reading. This is an important measure and therefore it should not be held up. I hope our colleagues will respond to our chairman's request that amendments be brought up.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the two of us wish to emphasize to the Senate that this bill came out of our committee by unanimous vote. It has been a long time since that happened. But we have personally reviewed the requests from every Member of the Senate presented to our committee and we have done our best to allocate the moneys that were available. Not all of those requests were satisfied, I am sad to state. But under the circumstances, I do not expect substantial disagreement with this bill. But if there is any disagreement, we would like to know it now because we do intend to move forward to other bills, if we can. The energy and water bill is ready to come before the Senate as soon as this one is over.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I understand the distinguished Senator from West Virginia will have a statement to make. Following that statement I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

JOE CAMEL'S DEMISE

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, on Friday, July 11, I read of the retirement of the giant advertising mogul, the macho, motorcycle-riding, man-beast, popularly known as Joe Camel.

Apparently old Joe is throwing in the towel and forever taking off his black, wrap-around shades to pack his hump and slip quietly off to the anthropomorphic rest home for flashy marketing tools. It is rumored that his bunk mates will be that patch-wearing, black-and-white spotted seller of Budweiser, Spuds McKenzie and Alex, the Golden Retriever who finally wore himself out retrieving bottles of Strohs beer from the refrigerator for his ever-demanding master.

I, for one, will not lament Joe's departure from the American advertising scene. Maybe R.J. Reynolds' decision to retire him from the murky business of luring impressionable young people to ''light up'' will influence other corporate giants like Budweiser to ''kick the habit'' and ask their famous monosyllable frogs to croak their last croak. Budweiser might even finally be moved to blow the whistle on the ''Bud Bowl.''

Our kids are faced with enough temptations through peer pressure, and because of the influence of a fast-paced, morally anemic society without the influence of cute and clever cartoon seducers such as Joe the Camel; the Budweiser frogs; football-helmeted, dancing beer bottles; or pomp and circumstance parading dogs, holding bourbon bottles instead of diplomas in their mouths.

All of these Madison Avenue devices, designed to project harmless or hip images to young impressionable minds, only serve to reenforce the lure of a sterile, pleasure-seeking existence which suggests no goals, but a good time on Saturday night.

I, for one, am delighted with the news of Joe Camel's departure and heartened by the fact that at least some in our attention-fractured, apathetic society have been outraged by the not-so-subliminal attempts to use children to fill up corporate coffers. There is a lesson here for those whose allegiance to profits outweighs any sense of moral obligation. It is, to paraphrase a famous quote, that those who ride the back of the tiger, or the camel for that matter, might just end up inside.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I ask that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:03 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mrs. HUTCHISON].

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, again, I will state to the Senate we are awaiting any amendments that may be offered to this bill, the Defense appropriations bill for 1998. And if we do not soon have one, we will take that as an indication that there are no amendments and move to third reading.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the quorum be rescinded.

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

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, what is the pending order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending order is S. 1005, the armed services appropriations bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 839

(Purpose: To correct the source of the funding provided in the bill for procurement of digital terrain systems for F–16 aircraft)

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk in behalf of Senator MIKULSKI, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 839.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 29, line 15, strike out ''$6,375,847,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$6,390,847,000''.

On page 33, line 16, strike out ''$14,142,873,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$14,127,873,000''.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, this amendment was considered by the Senate in the authorizing session. It was cleared by the Senate and I ask the Appropriations Committee to incorporate that in the bill. It has been cleared by both sides.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, this corrects the account in which this money was supposed to appear. There is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 839) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 840

(Purpose: To provide $4,500,000 for an authorized joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs program of cooperative clinical trials at multiple sites to assess the effectiveness of protocols for treating Persian Gulf veterans who suffer from ill-defined or undiagnosed conditions)

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Mr. DODD of Connecticut and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 840.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 32, line 25, after ''1999'' insert the following: '': *Provided*, That, of the amount appropriated under this heading, $4,500,000 is available for a joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs program of cooperative clinical trials at multiple sites to assess the effectiveness of protocols for treating Persian Gulf veterans who suffer from ill-defined or undiagnosed conditions''.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, this amendment was considered during the debate of the authorization bill and it provides $4.5 million for Persian Gulf illness treatment. It has been cleared by both sides, Madam President.

Mr. STEVENS. There is no objection to this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 840) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 841

(Purpose: To earmark $5.0 million from the funds appropriated for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide for a facial recognition technology program)

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk for Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 841.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, before the period on line 3, add the following: '': *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be available for a facial recognition techology program''.

Mr. INOUYE. This amendment has been cleared by the authorizing committee. It has been cleared by both managers.

Mr. STEVENS. There is no objection to the Kennedy amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 841) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 842

(Purpose: To increase by $2,000,000 the amount appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense, in order to provide for a joint service core research program to develop a prototype hybrid integrated sensor array for chemical and biological point detection)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk in behalf of Ms. SNOWE and Ms. COLLINS and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for Ms. SNOWE, for herself and Ms. COLLINS, proposes an amendment numbered 842.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, line 3 at the appropriate place insert the following: '': *Provided*, That, $2,000,000 shall be made available only for a joint service core research project to develop a prototype hybrid integrated sensor array for chemical and biological point detection.''

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, this amendment earmarks $2 million for a project that was inserted into the Defense authorization bill by amendment in this last week's consideration. We ask for its consideration.

Mr. INOUYE. No objection.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 842) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, and the ranking minority members, Senator INOUYE, for accepting this very crucial amendment which I have proudly cosponsored with Senator SNOWE.

With the recent proliferation of chemical weapons and the increasing uncertainty of rogue nations' ability to wage chemical and biological war, I strongly believe that this additional $2 million in funding is essential to properly address this very serious threat.

A joint service core research program will make possible the development of a prototype hybrid integrated sensor array for chemical and biological point detection for personnel use on the battlefield. While it is my hope that some day sensors of this type are not necessary, until such time, I will continue to ensure that our service men and women are not left unaware or unprotected.

Again, I extend my sincere thanks to Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUYE for supporting this critical amendment and I thank my fellow Maine colleague, Senator SNOWE, for her leadership on this matter as well.

AMENDMENT NO. 843

(Purpose: To earmark $6.0 million of the funds appropriated in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide for a conventional munitions demilitarization program)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator SESSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. SESSIONS, proposes an amendment numbered 843:

On page 34, before the period on line 3, add the following: ": *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $6,000,000 shall be available for a conventional munitions demilitarization demonstration program".

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, this amendment would appropriate an increase of $6 million to the budget request for the Explosive Demilitarization Technology Program [PE 63104D] to conduct a demonstration program at Anniston Army Depot. This is a much-needed demonstration of current commercial off-the-shelf blast chamber technology as an acceptable alternative to open burning/open pit detonation [OB/OD] by reducing significantly emissions and noise caused by OB/OD. The demonstration has nationwide application if successful and is in keeping with the military's program of continuing technology evaluation of demilitarization methods for existing conventional ammunition as described in the Joint Demilitarization Study, September 1995, page II–4–14, a study prepared for the Director, Environmental and Life Sciences, Defense Research and Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Annually we spend millions of dollars on the production of new munitions of all types. At the other end of the pipeline however is the vexing problem of disposing of outdated munitions of all types. The enormity of the problem for this Nation is this: The stocks managed by the Army, DOD's Manager for Conventional Ammunition [MCA], currently stored in 26 States totals approximately 449,308 tons of material and costs over $12 million annually to store according to a DOD 1995 Joint Demilitarization Study. More serious however is the fact that the study predicts an additional 730,420 tons will be generated into that stockpile by the end of fiscal year 2001.

Let me state again the magnitude of the problem for the Nation: through the end of fiscal year 2001, over 1.2 million tons of material will pass through or reside in the military conventional ammunition account. This is enough ammunition to exceed 2,800 earth-covered magazines and will cost over $1.2 billion to destroy if we assume that it costs approximately $120 million to destroy 107,000 tons of material using fiscal year 1995 projections. The technology in the COTS blast chamber has the potential of mitigating local environmental concerns; the potential of increasing destruction throughput; and is capable of destroying in a safe and environmentally sound manner greater than 98 percent of the explosives the DOD stores utilizing particulate bag house technology at locations in America, Europe, and the Pacific.

Alabama stores in excess of 22,437 tons of material ranking us fifth in size of stockpile. Environmental considerations are of paramount importance to me and to a balanced national level demilitarized program. I think DOD, the Army, and the Joint Ordnance Commanders Group, Demilitarization and Disposal Subgroup, are playing a major role in ensuring that our various storage sites, to include Anniston Army Depot, are in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations. Likewise, I think the DOD is also quite sensitive to public opinion. While better cost-efficient ways must be found to destroy this seemingly unlimited amount of material, we must take advantage now of new technologies in the R&D stage to compliment the current OM/OD method of destruction, with the view that not in the too distant future those technologies will not only replace aging organic demilitarization facilities, but close the chapter on the risky OB/OD method before the environmental challenges close the book for us.

The JOCG cited three environmental challenges in a study to be considered in life cycle management of the demilitarization program. They are: permitting facilities, disposal of residuals, and cleanup. With new technologies the effects of each can be mitigated and give local communities new hope that their environment will no longer be fouled by OB/OD.

On June 19 Anniston Army Depot received permission from the State of Alabama to proceed with the construction of its chemical weapons disposal facility. This is an emotionally charged issue, but one that will be managed every step of the way with safety of the operation and concern for the community as its highest priorities. Previous plants in our country are proving that this can be done. However, conventional ammunition destruction lags behind, in my opinion, on both counts. For this reason I strongly believe that a demonstration program at Anniston involving COTS blast chamber technology begins the long awaited opportunity to rid north Alabama of another type of munition material, that only grows more unstable with time and will furnish the data upon which the JOCG can make full-scale development decisions for other locations in the country.

Today, TOW missile rounds, currently in storage, are experiencing storage problems and must be dealt with as a higher destruction priority over older missiles. Storage quantities for TOW missiles reaches nearly 400,000 rounds. I cannot conceive that OB/O, in Alabama or anywhere else in the Nation, is the most efficient and most responsible method of destruction for these missiles. Other methodologies must be utilized and they must be demonstrated now.

The COTS blast chamber I am recommending for this demonstration program is totally enclosed, constructed of steel and consists of a hydraulic chamber door, exhaust fan and overpressure controls. The chamber is large enough to accommodate the TOW missiles I described above and allows the military additional flexibility in destroying some of those munitions even as the demonstration matures. Noise measurement of 0.5 percent of what is allowable by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration are cited by the manufacturer. Emission controls for exhaust rates and temperatures are also controlled. The chamber will work with Anniston's current Subpart X permits, and according to the manufacturer the blast chamber is 80 percent cleaner than OB/OD. These are pluses for any community in our country.

In sum, the people of this Nation should not have to wait for the perfect system to evolve when a very good system is currently on hand and available to demonstrate that it can do the job for which it was designed more efficiently. Our environment will not wait; the munitions will not wait, and the people should not have to wait for the slow wheels of government to find the perfect solution. Let us begin moving now, by bringing this demonstration program on line in fiscal year 1998 and see if we as a country cannot benefit from a simple technology that can get the job done.

Madam President, I would like to personally thank Senator STEVENS for his support and for including this important DOD appropriations bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, this amendment shifts $6 million to cover a demonstration project that was authorized by the Defense authorization bill pursuant to an amendment offered by Senator SESSIONS.

Mr. INOUYE. This has been cleared on the Democratic side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 843) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 844

(Purpose: To reduce to $1,000,000 the threshold amount for the applicability of the requirement for advance matching of Department of Defense disbursements to particular obligations)

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 844.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. . Effective on June 30, 1998, section 8106(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under section 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), is amended by striking out ''$3,000,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$1,000,000''.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I understand the committee is prepared to accept my amendment on Department of Defense [DOD] disbursements.

My amendment is simple and straightforward.

It says that each disbursement made by the DOD over $1 million must be matched with the correct obligation before payment is made.

It also says that this threshold must be met by June 30, 1998.

This is the next, logical step in a process that began with section 8137 of the fiscal year 1995 DOD Appropriations Act.

My amendment is fully consistent with the policy first adopted in 1994.

This policy has been developed under the leadership of my friend from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, and my friend from Hawaii, Senator INOUYE.

This policy has been incorporated in the last three appropriations bills—fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997.

The policy is embodied in section 8106 of the current law.

The current law says that all disbursements over $3 million must be prematched. That's down from $5 million the previous year.

What we are trying to do is gradually ratchet down the dollar thresholds. I think there is a general consensus for cranking down the thresholds. The DOD inspector general [IG], Ms. Eleanor Hill, has said we need to do it.

This is what she said in a letter to the committee Chairman:

We agree with the plan to continue lowering the dollar threshold for prevalidation of all contract payments made by DOD.

Mr. Richard Keevey, Director of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service [DFAS] has said exactly the same thing but in stronger terms.

This is what Mr. Keevey said in testimony before the Governmental Affairs Committee on May 1:

To prevent future problem disbursements, the department will require that every disbursement be prevalidated, that is, matched to an obligation before payment is made. . . . Our ultimate goal is to validate all disbursements to zero.

DOD has a plan for meeting the dollar thresholds set in law.

There is one small problem, however. The problem is at DOD's major contract payment center at Columbus, OH. DOD says the Columbus center cannot meet the $1 million threshold until June 1999. When we launched this policy back in 1994, DOD claimed it would be years before it could make the required matches.

Well, despite all the bureaucratic roadblocks, DOD found a way to get the job done. DOD is making the matches today.

Second, meeting the $1 million threshold should be no big deal.

With all of DOD's cutting edge technology, it should be a piece of cake. DFAS Columbus processes no more than 11,000 payments annually that exceed the $1 million threshold.

That's chicken feed, Madam President.

Banks, for example, routinely handle 500,000 account matching operations in a single day. So why can't DOD do it? DOD seems to be working hard to meet the dollar thresholds mandated by Congress. I feel like the momentum is in the right direction.

But recent GAO and IG audits clearly indicate we still have a long way to go. There's still much more work to be done.

My amendment will help to keep the pressure on. It will help the Department reach the ultimate goal: to validate every disbursement prior to payment.

Until we reach that goal, DOD's financial accounts will remain vulnerable to theft and abuse.

Madam President, I thank the chairman and ranking minority member for their leadership and support on this issue.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, Senator GRASSLEY and the Defense Comptroller, Mr. Hamre, have been negotiating concerning this subject. It will reduce the deviation ceiling and billing for the Department of Defense on June 30, 1998, to $1 million. It is being offered by me on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY with the understanding that the Department of Defense does concur in this amendment.

Mr. INOUYE. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 844) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, that was the work product of our hotline so far. We are trying to work out amendments as they are received. Again, we urge that Members bring their amendments to the floor and notify us of their intention to do so. At this time, we only know of one amendment that is to be forthcoming. My understanding is that that Senator will present it soon. Meanwhile, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, we are still awaiting the arrival of Senators who have indicated they may have amendments to offer.

I ask that the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:23 p.m., recessed until 4:01 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. STEVENS].

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will shortly offer an amendment to this bill. It is an amendment that many of us are working on. We worked on it last week for the Defense authorization bill. It deals with Bosnia and exactly what our mission is in Bosnia, and the possibility that we are looking at a change to that mission without congressional consultation.

I want to step back and talk about U.S. foreign policy in general over the last 4 years since I have been a Member of the U.S. Senate.

What concerns me is the lack of focus and the lack of stability in our foreign policy that, unfortunately, creates a vacuum that can be filled by either our allies or our adversaries. Since the last 4 years have seen many missions with U.S. troops both under the U.N. umbrella and the NATO umbrella, I think it is important for us to take a step back and look at what happens when there is a vacuum.

As I have observed since President Clinton has been in office, it seems that someone is always wanting the United States to do more. Sometimes it is our allies asking us to send more aid, put more troops on the ground, go into police missions—missions to capture; not kill. If you look at the use of our troops over the last 4 years, we have, in fact, been drawn into conflicts sometimes not really even knowing why we were involved.

Starting with Somalia. Somalia was a U.N. mission. Our mission was to feed starving people and starving children