

the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration under the following limitations:

One hour for debate equally divided between Senator ABRAHAM and the ranking member. No amendments or motions will be in order.

I further ask consent that following the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read for a third time at 5:30 this afternoon and that the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE WAR IN KOSOVO

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, President Clinton has just signified his intention to ask Congress for additional appropriations of some \$5.45 billion for military costs involved in the war in Kosovo and some \$491 million to pay for humanitarian assistance. It is my thought that Congress will be receptive to humanitarian aid for the thousands of refugees who have been driven from their homes in Kosovo. These requests will give us an opportunity to ask some very important questions and get some very important information to assess our military preparedness and to make the determination as to how much our allies are contributing to this effort, which ought to be a joint effort.

We have seen the U.S. military preparedness decline very markedly in the past decade and a half. During the Reagan years, in the mid-1980s, the defense budget exceeded \$300 billion. In 1999 dollars, that would be well over \$400 billion, might even be close to the \$500 million mark. But our budget for this year, fiscal year 1999, was \$271 billion, and according to the President's request, is projected to be slightly over \$280 billion for fiscal year 2000.

That raises some very, very important questions as to the adequacy of our defense and our ability to deal with a crisis in Kosovo, where we are at war, notwithstanding the fact that a declaration has not been filed. The Senate of the United States has authorized air strikes in our vote of 58 to 41 on March 23, but the House of Representatives has not had a correlating move. Constitutionally this is a very, very dangerous situation, because only the Congress under our Constitution has the authority to declare war. We have seen a constant erosion of congressional authority, which is a dangerous sign, in terms of the requirements of constitutional law—this is bedrock constitu-

tional law—and also in terms of having congressional support, which reflects public support, for the military action.

We have seen this war in Kosovo move ahead. We have seen missile strikes, air strikes. The authorization of the Senate was limited in the air strikes because of our concern about not putting too many U.S. fighting men and women in so-called harm's way. It is rather a surprising consequence to find we are in short supply of missiles. We have seen the activity in Iraq reduced, according to military reports. We know of our commitments around the globe, including South Korea. I believe this is an occasion to take a very close look as to the adequacy of our military preparations. At this time, we have some 10 divisions, 20 wings active in reserve, some 13 active wings and some 256 naval service combatants. This is very limited, compared to the power of the United States during the mid-1980s in the Reagan years.

Of course, it is a different world. It is a world without the potential clash of the superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—but it is still a world with major, major problems.

When the President comes to Capitol Hill, comes to the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, comes to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on which I serve, then I think we need to ask some very, very hard questions. Those questions turn on whether the United States is, realistically, capable of carrying on the kind of a war in which we have become engaged in Kosovo. Do we even have sufficient air power to carry out our objectives? Do we have sufficient missiles to carry out our objectives?

So far, we have bypassed the issue of ground forces. Some of our colleagues have advocated a resolution which would authorize the President to use whatever force is needed. I am categorically opposed to such a resolution. I do not believe that the Senate and the Congress of the United States ought to give the President a blank check, but I am prepared to hear whatever it is that the President requests, to consider that in the context of our vital national security interests and in the context of what we ought to do. But at a time when the Congress and the country has been put on notice that the President is considering calling up Reserves, we find ourselves in a military entanglement, a foreign entanglement and, by all appearances, we are ill-equipped to carry out the objectives and the course which the President has set out for us.

We need to know on an updated basis what is happening in Iraq and what our commitments are there and what our potential commitments are around the world.

Similarly, we need to know, Madam President, our allies' contributions. At a time when the Congress of the United States is being called upon to authorize \$5.450 billion for the Pentagon, it is fair to ask what the contribution is from

Great Britain. What is the contribution from France? What is the contribution from Germany? What is the contribution from the other NATO countries?

The morning news reports carried the comment that the French are opposed to a naval blockade to cut off Yugoslavian oil reserves. That is sort of a surprising matter. As General Wesley Clark has noted, why are we putting U.S. pilots at risk in bombing Yugoslavian oil production at oil refineries if we are not willing to take on a less drastic matter of a naval blockade? Certainly a naval blockade is an act of war, as the French have been reported to have said, but so are missile and air strikes. As we are being asked for almost \$6 billion, I would be especially interested to know the French contribution, besides their naysaying of a naval blockade to stop petroleum from reaching Yugoslavia.

The issue of the relative contribution of the United States and the NATO countries has been a longstanding controversy for the 50 years that NATO has been in existence. I recall attending my first North Atlantic Assembly meeting in Venice shortly after I was elected. It was the spring of 1981. The chief topic was burden sharing.

On the occasions when I have had an opportunity to return to North Atlantic Assembly meetings, burden sharing has always been a big question. I think it is a fair question for the Congress to ask: What is the proportion of burden sharing now in Kosovo, especially when we are being asked to ante up an additional \$6 billion.

There is another aspect to our activity in Kosovo which requires an answer, and that is, what are we doing with respect to prosecution of crimes against humanity in the War Crimes Tribunal, looking toward the prospective indictment of President Milosevic. There is an active effort at the present time to gather evidence against President Milosevic. There is a question as to why it has taken so long. In late 1992, then-Secretary of State Eagleburger, pretty much branded Milosevic a war criminal. There has been constant speculation over the course of the past 7 years about why Milosevic was not indicted, along with others in the Bosnia and Croatia crimes against humanity.

We need an answer, Madam President, as to what has happened with outstanding key indictments against Mladic and Karadzic with respect to what has happened in Bosnia. When a group of Members of the House and Senate were briefed by the President last Tuesday, a distinction was made between our military activity and collateral ways to have an impact on the war in Kosovo, such as through the War Crimes Tribunal.

There have been major efforts to locate Karadzic. There have also been major efforts to locate Mladic who is supposed to be in hiding near Belgrade.

The activities of the War Crimes Tribunal could have a very profound effect

on those committing atrocities as we speak in Kosovo—that that kind of conduct is going to be treated in a very severe and tough manner by the War Crimes Tribunal. This involves having the War Crimes Tribunal follow up on those who have been indicted, like Mladic and Karadzic, and it also involves the War Crimes Tribunal acting aggressively to gather evidence about Milosevic and any others who may be perpetrating crimes against humanity.

At a time when we are looking for a supplemental appropriation, we ought to be as certain as we can be that the War Crimes Tribunal is adequately funded. I have had occasion to visit the War Crimes Tribunal three times in The Hague and have noted a very serious group of dedicated prosecutors, headed by Chief Prosecutor Louise Arbour. But that contingent has been laboring with insufficient resources. Only recently their courtrooms have increased from one to three, and a substantial increase in their budget was achieved when the 1999 budget was increased from the 1998 level of \$68.8 million to slightly more than \$100 million to take care of the prosecutions in Bosnia and Croatia.

That leaves open the question about what is going to happen with respect to the prosecutions in Kosovo. It is vital that efforts be ongoing contemporaneously with these atrocities to gather evidence while it is fresh. From my own experience as a prosecuting attorney, I can say firsthand—gather the evidence while the eyewitnesses are available, while the recollections are fresh and while the tangible physical evidence is present.

There may be a necessity—and it is a very unpleasant subject but one of the facts of life in Bosnia, Croatia and now Kosovo—that mass graves be uncovered for tangible evidence of these atrocities. An inquiry today gave me the preliminary bit of advice that there is a request for some \$5 million for documentation support for the War Crimes Tribunal. I have made the request that further information be forthcoming so that when the Appropriations Committee considers these supplemental matters, that we have in hand the needs of the War Crimes Tribunal. This will put all would-be war criminals on notice that these matters are going to be very, very vigorously pursued. It would be a very, very strong blow for international law and international justice to have a War Crimes Tribunal indictment at the earliest possible time branding Milosevic a war criminal for all to see. I think that would inevitably have a profound effect everywhere, including in Belgrade, including in Serbia, including in the Republic of Yugoslavia.

So, these are questions which I hope we can have answers to in the forthcoming days when I do believe my colleagues will be willing to share my sense that the fighting men and women need to be supported on this \$5.45 billion request from the Pentagon and on

the almost \$500 million for humanitarian aid. But we need to use this as an occasion to find out if we have adequate military strength to carry on the war which we have undertaken and to discharge the kind of commitments that we have made worldwide. We also need to take a close look at the burden sharing with our allies and to make sure that the important work of the War Crimes Tribunal is adequately funded.

In the absence of anyone else on the floor seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING AL BULLOCK

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam President I rise to note the passing of a great Republican and a great American. Dr. Albert E. Bullock died on April 7 at the age of 72 at his home in Kensington, Maryland. He had been fighting cancer for some time.

Al, as he was known by everyone who knew him, was the husband of my able and dedicated office manager, Katja Bullock. He was also a dedicated dentist and a devoted Republican activist who lived life to the fullest and brought energy and humor to everything he did.

Born in Washington, Al served in the United States Navy during World War II and was awarded both the Victory Medal and the American Theatre Ribbon. When he was honorably discharged in 1946, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal sent him a letter expressing “the Navy’s pride” in his service. He became a life-long member of American Legion Post 268 in Wheaton, Maryland.

Al attended the University of Maryland and graduated from Georgetown University’s School of Dentistry in 1952. He served as a Clinical Instructor at Georgetown immediately after graduating and published original scientific articles in the District of Columbia Dental Society Journal and the Southern California Journal of Orthodontics. He was elected to the National Dental Honor Fraternity and named a Fellow of the Royal Society of Health.

Al was an integral part of his community. He was particularly active and important in the Montgomery County Republican Party. And his positions in the party were numerous. He served twice as Montgomery County Republican Party Chairman and was a regular fixture on the County’s Republican Central Committee between 1982 and 1994.

He also served as Executive Director of Maryland’s Reagan for President Committee and as a member of Mary-

land’s Electoral College. In 1994 he was the Republican nominee for Maryland State Senate.

During the Reagan Administration Al served on the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition and the National Advisory Committee on the National Health Service Corps.

But it was perhaps as a mentor to young conservatives that Al had his greatest effect on politics. Literally dozens of Washington interns at one time or another stayed with the Bullocks or attended one of the many events hosted at their home. Across America today, there are many active Republicans who were strengthened in their convictions by Al and Katja Bullock.

Indeed, many of us believe there is a political dynasty forming in the Bullock family. Al would allow himself to be put up for elective office in heavily Democratic Montgomery County because no one else wanted the task of losing. But he must have had some effect because his son, also named Al, made a respectable showing in his own run for public office. And everyone agrees that Al’s grandson, Al the third, who at a quite tender age was already defending his grandfather on the stump, could just be the one to turn Montgomery County Republican.

Al Bullock knew how important it is to keep active in political life. But he also knew that politics is not all of life. He was a strong family man as well as a dedicated professional who took great pride in his work and in this relations with his patients. He also was active as a member of the American Light Opera Company, serving on its Board of Trustees and as Chairman in 1965.

The story goes, in fact, that Katja fell in love with Al when, seeing him for an emergency dental procedure, she was soothed by the strains of opera as Al worked on her teeth.

I will always remember Al’s winning combination of humor and dedication to conservative principles. He led a full and colorful life, in which he met many of the great public figures of our age. It was a great honor for anyone in public life to make it to the photographic hall of fame lining the Bullock family’s front stairs. I was happy to see last Christmas that my own photo had made it to one corner of that hallway, overshadowed by pictures of more than one President.

My heartfelt condolences go to Katja, Al’s son Albert, his daughter-in-law Katie and grandsons Albert and Seamus, as well as his sister, Betty Sorrell.

Al will be sorely missed by everyone lucky enough to know him.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

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