

the air attacks against Serbia as one more example of the unchecked misuse of American power.

I am told that our policy has only strengthened the hard-liners in Russia.

I am disturbed by the photographs of Russian Prime Minister Primakov coddling President Milosevic. We have also heard threatening statements by President Yeltsin and other Russian officials, opposing the NATO air strikes and intimating that Russia might act militarily to defend its interests in the Balkans.

No one can deny the overriding importance of our relations with Russia and the need to find a way for Russia to join with us in trying to resolve this crisis. Perhaps that includes a major role for Russian soldiers in any international security force in Kosovo.

But the fact remains that it would be foolhardy for Russia to become militarily involved in Kosovo. The NATO attacks against Milosevic are not in any way directed at Russia. All of NATO's members are collectively standing up against genocide in Europe. Russia's long-term economic and security interests are clearly better served by joining with the United States and Europe, rather than casting its lot with the likes of Milosevic.

We must also reflect on the reaction of the people of Serbia and Montenegro. For years our policy has failed to account for the complexities of the history of the Balkans, and we are paying a price for that today.

We have a tendency to oversimplify and over-personalize our foreign policy, to forget that in the past the Serbian people have suffered, too. But while we know that they also have been victimized by President Milosevic, we cannot excuse them for rallying to his defense when all of Europe is united against everything he represents.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk, both pro and con, about the deployment of American soldiers as part of a NATO ground force, in Kosovo.

As much as I hope that ground troops are not necessary, I felt it was unwise to rule them out because I believe it only emboldened President Milosevic.

I also know of no one who thinks this mission can be accomplished by air power alone, and the administration needs a more realistic strategy. We need policy based on solid plans—no policy based on polls.

Again, I think we should heed the advice of Senator McCAIN. What are our goals—NATO's goals—today? In my mind, it is to force Milosevic to agree to a ceasefire, the withdrawal of his forces from Kosovo, the safe return of the refugees secured by an international force, and autonomy for Kosovo.

If we can prove the experts wrong and accomplish that with air power alone, so much the better.

But if we cannot, if ground troops are necessary to achieve our goals, we must use them, and NATO should be

making preparations for the possibility that they will be needed. The bulk of those forces should come from Europe, but as the leader of NATO we would have a responsibility to contribute our share.

To those who complain that Kosovo is not worth the life of a single American soldier, I would say this: As Americans we cherish the life of every American soldier, and we give our armed forces the best available training and technology to defend themselves. Military missions always involve danger. In this mission, an enormous amount is at stake for our country, for NATO, for the people of Kosovo, and for humanity.

What is the alternative? To give in to ethnic cleansing after taking a principled stand against it? That would be a terrible defeat for NATO, and for the cause of international justice and security. It would be a terrible precedent for us to bequeath to the generations that will follow us in the next century.

No one can predict how long this war will last, or how it will end. Let us hope that President Milosevic soon recognizes that he risks losing everything.

In the meantime, we owe our gratitude and our support to our soldiers, and to the humanitarian relief organizations that are providing emergency food, shelter and medical assistance to the refugees.

They have been heroic.

Mr. President, I am also concerned about a disturbing report I received this morning that United States forces have used landmines against the Serbs.

I am told that these are anti-tank mines, but they are mixed with anti-personnel mines, which are prohibited under an international treaty which unfortunately the United States has not signed.

However, every one of our NATO allies except for Turkey is a party to that treaty, and I wonder if they are aware of this since our planes are using airfields located in those countries.

In fact, at last count 135 nations had signed the treaty, and 71 have ratified. The United States should be among them.

Nobody would argue that the United States is bound by a treaty it has not ratified. But it is very disappointing that at the same time that the Administration is holding itself out as a leader in the worldwide effort to ban landmines, it is using mines itself.

Mr. President, I have asked the Pentagon to confirm whether or not this report is true. I hope it is not.

But if it is true, it is only a matter of time before innocent people are maimed or killed by these weapons.

It sends the wrong message to the rest of the world. And frankly, while I support the Administration's use of force against Milosevic I do not know anyone who believes we need landmines to achieve our goals. It is unnecessary, it is wrong, and it will only further erode the Administration's credibility on an issue that cries out for the United States to set the example.

Mr. President, I am hoping this report is not true. But we will find out because if it is, we should stop using them. It is a disturbing thing that we would be so different from the rest of our allies.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SPECTER, who will be coming back here—I promised him I would do this for him—be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. BAYH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I, first, want to express my great respect for my colleague from Vermont, a man with whom I not only have the pleasure of serving, but he served with my father. The respect the Bayh family has for the Senator goes from generation to generation. It is a privilege to be on the floor with the Senator from Vermont.

COMMENDING PURDUE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 76) commending the Purdue University women's basketball team on winning the 1999 National Collegiate Athletic Association women's basketball championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak not only on my own behalf but on behalf of my senior colleague, DICK LUGAR, who, unfortunately, could not be with us at the last moment. I know he will be submitting his own remarks on behalf of the Lady Boilermakers and their outstanding victory in the NCAA women's basketball tournament this year. I know the rules prohibit me from pointing anybody out in the galleries, but I want to say how much I appreciate the presence of several constituents today; in particular, the mayor of West Lafayette, IN, several officials representing Purdue University, and several of our distinguished citizens from Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, and elsewhere across our State.

Mr. President, basketball is perhaps synonymous with the State of Indiana, not only because we love to play the game, not only because we believe in physical fitness, but because of the character, the determination, and the other fine attributes associated with that sport that are necessary for success in it.

This year's Purdue women's basketball team, perhaps better than any other, exhibits those character traits. They are an example of Indiana at its finest and the United States of America at its finest. So I rise today to salute them both as individuals and as a team for their accomplishments.

Mr. President, this team was an example of near perfection. Their record was an outstanding 34 victories and only 1 defeat. They are the first women's championship team representing any Big Ten university in any sport. Their coach, Carolyn Peck, an outstanding individual, is not only the youngest coach to lead a winning team to the NCAA tournament, but she is also the first African American one to do it. One of their star players, Stephanie White-McCarty, is not only a first-team athletic all-American, but also an academic all-American. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, she represents the rest of the team very well in that regard.

The team, as a whole, had a combined grade point average of 3.0, which is very good by today's standards, particularly with regard to the athletic community.

Mr. President, once again, I salute the Lady Boilermakers for their outstanding contributions not only on the basketball court, but because of the outstanding individuals they are.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleague from Indiana as a cosponsor of this Senate resolution commending the Purdue University women's basketball team on winning the 1999 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) basketball championship.

The Lady Boilermakers this year have made Indiana history in becoming the first women's sport to bring home a national championship title for Purdue University. They are also the first women's basketball team in the Big Ten Athletic Conference to win the NCAA title.

This resolution is a fitting tribute and a deserving honor for Coach Carolyn Peck and the team members who persevered throughout the long season and the playoffs to win the national title. Their commitment and dedication to this tremendous effort is demonstrated by their winning record of 34 games—including a string of 32 consecutive victories. Throughout this storied season, the Lady Boilers' skill and dedication was matched only by the grace and dignity with which they carried themselves as a team en route to the national title.

For departing seniors Ukari Figgs and Stephanie White-McCarty, this victory is truly special as they complete their studies at Purdue and look toward the future. Winning the NCAA title is an historic and special occasion—placing this team among a select company of national champions. Their triumph will be remembered at Purdue and throughout our State for years to come.

The dedication and sportsmanship demonstrated throughout the season by the Lady Boilers reaffirm our strong basketball tradition in Indiana. The team's competitive spirit and commitment to excellence make them deserving recipients of the accolades of the nation and the honor of this special Senate resolution.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 76

Whereas the Purdue University Lady Boilermakers (Lady Boilers) won their first National Championship in the National Collegiate Athletic Association women's basketball tournament on March 28, 1999;

Whereas the Lady Boilers finished the 1998-99 season with an outstanding record, winning 34 games, including 32 consecutive victories;

Whereas the Lady Boilers proudly brought Purdue University its first ever NCAA championship in any women's sport, and did so with skill matched by grace and dignity;

Whereas the Lady Boilers claimed the first ever NCAA women's basketball championship by any member of the Big Ten Athletic Conference; and

Whereas the Lady Boilers have brought great pride and distinction to the State of Indiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Purdue University Lady Boilers basketball team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association women's basketball national championship.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 minutes.

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

THE SENATE'S CONTINUING FAILURE TO ACT ON JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, baseball season began earlier this month and already the Senate is lagging behind the home run pace of Mark McGwire. Last summer I began comparing the Senate's lack of progress on judicial nominations with home run pace of McGwire and other major leaguers. I had tried everything else I could think

of: I had lectured the Republican majority about the Senate's duty to the judicial branch under the Constitution, I had cited the caseloads and backlogs in many courts around the country, I had introduced legislation to prevent the Senate from going on vacation while the Second Circuit was experiencing an unprecedented emergency declared by Chief Judge Winter in the face of five vacancies out of 12 authorized members of the court.

I recently attended an historic meeting of the Baltimore Orioles major league baseball team and the Cuban team in Havana. During the Easter recess the Nation's Capital witnessed exhibition baseball between the Montreal Expos and the St. Louis Cardinals and got to see Big Mac in person. Maybe another baseball comparison can inspire the Senate into action on Federal judges this year.

It is already mid-April and the Senate has yet to act on a single judicial nominee. Worse yet the Senate Judiciary Committee has yet to hold or even schedule a confirmation hearing. At this rate, I will have to start comparing the Senate's pace for the confirmation of Federal judges to the home run pace of American League pitchers. Since they do not bat, the Senate has a chance of keeping up with them.

Of course, last year the Senate had gotten off to an early lead on Mark McGwire. Last January through the end of April, the Senate had confirmed 22 judges. By the All Star break last July, the Senate had confirmed 33 judges. It took Big Mac 10 weeks to catch and pass the Senate last year.

This year, McGwire passed the Senate's total on opening day. That is because this year the Senate has yet to confirm a single Federal judge. That is right: In spite of the 33 judicial nominations now pending, in spite of the fact that at least a dozen of those nominees have been pending before the Senate for more than 9 months, in spite of the fact that four of those nominations were favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and were on the Senate calendar last year, in spite of the 67 vacancies including 28 judicial emergency vacancies, the Senate has yet to confirm a single Federal judge all year. Incredibly Mark McGwire is still on pace with what he accomplished last year. Regrettably, the Senate is not on even or on a slower pace than it was last year; it has no pace at all.

By the end of last year, the Senate finally picked up its pace and confirmed 65 Federal judges—the highest total since the Republican majority took control of the Senate. That was 65 of the 91 nominations received for the 115 vacancies the Federal judiciary experienced last year. Together with the 36 judges confirmed in 1997, the total number of article III Federal judges confirmed during the last Congress was a 2-year total of 101—the same total that was confirmed in 1 year when