

have to ask ourselves: (1) What is the price? (2) What is the risk? (3) What is the prize?

The main price that will be paid will be done so in human lives. There will be casualties—American and NATO troops, Kosovar civilians and refugees, Serb civilians as well as civilians in neighboring countries where we've already mistakenly dropped bombs.

We have to remember the experience of World War II, where 700,000 German troops were held-off by 150,000 Serb guerrillas. Are we willing to make such a commitment?

We also have to consider the financial impact of this war so far. Thus far, it is being paid for by Social Security. If the war escalates to include ground forces and if we're totally honest with the American people, we have to tell them that one of three things will happen to pay for this war—

(1) we'll continue to use Social Security to pay for it and the deficit will go up; (2) we'll reduce spending for domestic programs; or

(3) we'll increase taxes.

In addition, each passing day further diminishes the readiness of our armed forces. We already have a terrible readiness problem—this campaign is only making it worse.

Indeed, comments made by General Richard Hawley, head of the U.S. Air Combat Command indicate that we could run out of the state-of-the-art satellite-guided Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) for our B-2 Stealth bombers sometime this month.

He is quoted as saying "it's going to be really touch-and-go as to whether we'll go Winchester on JDAM's." That's pilot jargon for "running out of bullets." He also indicated that because more crews are being called up for this campaign, fewer crews are available should another crisis appear elsewhere in the world (North Korea, Iraq, etc.)

Our main military goal should be to ensure our readiness to the extent that our adversaries know we are prepared.

There are projections indicate that it will take at least \$30 billion to address readiness effectively.

The longer we continue our current efforts, the greater the opportunity that one or more of our NATO allies may decide enough is enough. This could leave the U.S. holding the bag! We could also stir regional resentment among Serbia's neighbors, leading to further political instability and the possibility of a wider war. There are already groups promoting a greater Albania that would include parts of Montenegro, Macedonia, and Greece.

This war could also undermine U.S. and NATO credibility and erode our ability to deter aggression globally.

If we suffer significant casualties, equipment failures, morale loss, etc. potential adversaries in North Korea, China, Iran and Iraq will take note and could react;

Our experience in the Persian Gulf bolstered our credibility but this situa-

tion is very different—different terrain, there was an international consensus that Iraqi aggression against a sovereign nation must be reversed, threat of weapons of mass destruction.

AND FINALLY—THE PRIZE

When we win—and I am confident we would win—what do we get?

First there is the need to put in a long-term occupation force to oversee the peace. I am concerned that such a force could be subject to continual guerrilla attacks which would incur casualties.

Then we would have to rebuild the infrastructure and economy of Kosovo and Serbia and that could cost as much as \$100 billion.

We would also have to build a new, Western-oriented and democratic state with whatever existing civic institutions there are available. This could lead to a period of "growing pains" where there is considerable political uncertainty for a number of years.

Mr. President, as our colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS, has pointed out, there would be a precedent for U.S. to intervene militarily when there are widespread humanitarian abuses.

We have a lot of questions to answer before we find ourselves in a war from which we cannot extricate ourselves.

Fundamentally, what Senator MCCAIN's resolution does is give our President carte blanche, and when you look at the price and the risk and the prize, you can understand why I am opposed to this resolution.

We should not give the President blanket authority to get us into another Viet Nam that could very well have much greater negative impact nationally and internationally than Viet Nam.

Two weekends ago I visited Arlington Cemetery, the Vietnam and Korean memorials and I'm going to do everything in my power to make sure that we do not have a Kosovo Memorial here in Washington.

If the Senate passes anything, it ought to be what the House did this last weekend when they had the courage to stand up and be counted.

Congress must exert its Constitutional authority in foreign policy matters and demand that the President seek a declaration of war or formal authorization before he deploys ground troops.

Again, should the Senate decide to offer alternative legislation to the McCain measure, it should include such considerations.

The way we have conducted ourselves with NATO in regard to Kosovo has created an environment that has allowed Slobodan Milosevic and the Serbs to do exactly what those responsible for bombing did not want to happen regarding human rights and ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

It has resulted in the destruction of the infrastructure in Kosovo to the extent that thousands of Kosovars will never return to their destroyed homeland.

The decision also has resulted in death and destruction in Serbia that is also unconscionable when one realizes that the alleged purpose is to force Slobodan Milosevic to sign an agreement which is tantamount to the Serbs and giving up their sovereignty.

Think about it, Mr. President. If we had not engaged in "sign-or-bomb" diplomacy, we could still be at the negotiating table with 1,600 observers in Kosovo.

The time has come, Mr. President, where NATO needs to get off its high horse, restrain its ego and instead of trying to save face over a major foreign policy blunder and start thinking about saving lives.

It's time to stop the bombing and put everyone's efforts into finding a diplomatic solution that will quickly result in the removal of Serbian troops from Kosovo, end the ethnic cleansing, return the Kosovars to Kosovo and commit to rebuilding both physical and political infrastructure of Kosovo.

We need to fully protect all minority rights including the Serbs and other minorities who live in Kosovo and full participation of all in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia including the Serbian Parliament.

Last but not least an international force to guarantee in the beginning that the agreement provisions are fully implemented and abided by all parties.

Mr. President, let's get to the peace table. Let's all of us get down on our knees and pray that the Holy Spirit will inspire us to remember Jesus' exultation to us—"Bless are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God."

This nightmare has to end now.

Mr. President, 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. DEWINE. 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. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for the next 12 minutes as in morning business.

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

REACHING OUT TO PREVENT TRAGEDY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to make a few comments regarding the tragic shootings in Littleton, CO.

Thirteen days after this tragedy occurred, our Nation is still really in shock. The hearts of my own family and all Ohio families, and, of course, all Americans families, go out to the families who have lost loved ones. There is nothing that you can say that

can take the pain away. Anyone who has lost a child understands that. The loss these families have suffered cannot be repaired. But it is important that these families know that there are people—many of us far away from Colorado—whose thoughts and prayers are with them at this terrible time.

What went wrong? Could the shootings have been prevented? What should we do to prevent other tragedies such as this from occurring in the future?

These are all very difficult questions—difficult issues for a public official to talk about, because when you do, people will think that you are claiming to have “the answer.” Let me say flat out that I don’t claim to have “the answer.”

What happened in Littleton will always to some extent remain a mystery, and why it happened. Evil is a mystery that exists deep in the human heart. But that brutal fact of human existence that we can’t come up with “the answer” does not excuse us from our moral responsibilities—our responsibilities, as legislators, as parents, as citizens. In fact, it increases our responsibilities. If we don’t have “the answer,” we have to work harder to find answers—things we can do to make a difference child by child by child. Some of the things we have to do may not be glamorous, but they will all be helpful. They will save lives.

Fred Hiatt pointed out in a powerful Washington Post article recently that 13 children a day—13 children a day—are killed by guns in this country—in effect, the Littleton massacre every day. Statistically, of these 13 children who die every day, 8 are murdered every day; 4 tragically commit suicide every day, and 1 dies accidentally every day.

Mr. President, maybe we can’t prevent a massacre such as the one in Colorado, but we can work on initiatives that would save some of the 13 children a day who are dying in gun-related deaths.

What I would like to do this afternoon is talk briefly about a few of those initiatives that I believe would save lives. We don’t know whose lives they would save, but I have had, I think, enough experience in this area to say that they would save some lives, and, therefore, we should do this.

No. 1, I have a bill, which is now included in the juvenile justice bill, that we will be considering in just a few days.

This provision provides incentives to local governments to coordinate the services they offer to the kids who are the most at risk in their county, or their area. I am referring, for example, to the children who have been duly diagnosed as having both maybe a psychiatric disorder and a substance abuse problem, or some other combination of problems. For too long, kids have been falling between the cracks of the court system, the children’s services system, the mental health system, and the substance abuse system. Other kids are

misdiagnosed or don’t get access to all the services that they need. My proposal would promote an approach that has been successful in Hamilton County, OH—in the Cincinnati area—an approach that gives our most problematic kids the multiple services they need, under the overall coordination of the juvenile court system. These kids should not fall victim of bureaucratic turf conflicts. All of them are our kids.

No. 2, parents, teachers and local service agencies need to explore ways to reach out and provide appropriate services to at-risk youth before they end up—before they end up—in the juvenile court system. That is the essence of prevention—to find ways to keep children from ever coming in contact with a juvenile court. That is why a renewed investment in mental health diagnosis and treatment is so vitally important with our children.

We have to as a country, as a people, make a more serious investment in diagnosing and treating these kids with psychological problems. Throughout the whole system, everybody—teachers, probation officers, everyone—will tell you that we do not now have enough resources.

I have talked to so many juvenile court judges who look at these kids they have in front of them, and who know they have mental health problems, and yet who do not have the resources, and try to reach these kids and turn them around, to cure them before it becomes too late. We need to get these kids early.

A third suggestion of things that are, I think, practical and that we could very easily do is keep closer track of kids who have been convicted of violent crimes. The tracking provisions I, along with Senator SESSIONS, have written into the juvenile crime bill we will be considering in just a matter of a few days will help do that.

When a young person commits a crime, and then, let us say, moves to another State and commits another crime, local law enforcement officials and judges many times do not have the available information. They do not know this person has committed a violent crime, and the reason they don’t is because we don’t have a good nationwide tracking system for juveniles, and we should. We should do it with juveniles who have already demonstrated that they will commit and can commit and may in the future commit a violent crime.

When it comes to making key decisions about juvenile offenders, judges and probation officers need to make judgments based on the best possible information. That is what my provision would give them.

No. 4, we need to get serious about background checks on gun purchases. Everybody talks about the Brady bill. But very few people realize that the Brady background checks are only as effective as the information that goes into them. That is why I have been fighting for almost 15 years for im-

proved law enforcement information systems. That means good criminal records, knowing who has done what.

Last year, I wrote a bill on crime technology. Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS were very helpful in the appropriations process in getting the money for that.

The fact is that 60 percent of the States have criminal records that are less than 80 percent complete. In other words, our criminal record system isn’t as good as it should be. The Brady bill will only work as well as the underlying criminal justice system it is based on. We need to fix it and do a better job.

No. 5, we need to get serious about confronting our cultural problems. I thank our colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and LIEBERMAN. I think they were right when they encouraged the President to call a summit meeting of the leaders in the media community—TV, radio, movies, video games and the recording industry—to talk about the responsibility in shaping the messages that we are sending kids.

We can’t force them not to air trash that is harmful to people. The first amendment doesn’t allow that. I hope the President’s summit is a success. The fact is, the President does have, as Theodore Roosevelt said, a bully pulpit, and he needs to use it on this issue. We need to be upfront about the costs of excessive violence in the media—the price paid not just in lives lost in tragic events such as the shooting in Littleton, but also in the day-to-day harm that occurs in the emotional lives of children.

Many have blamed the toxic culture for the shootings in Littleton. I personally have no doubt that if the culture were not as coarsened as it is today, those kids very well may not have committed this crime. We will never be able to prove it or know for sure. It is too simplistic to say the culture caused the shootings; but to deny a connection would also be simplistic, and, I believe, naive. The culture that thrives on cruelty and hatred did not create these killers, but it offered them an outlet, a particular way of self-expression, that ended up devastating a whole community.

We need to work on creating and promoting the alternative to a culture based on death and violence, a culture based, rather, on the value of life, on the principle that every human life is unique, priceless, and worth defending.

We can’t ban movie and video games we don’t like. But there are things that we can do. I think there are positive steps the media could take to improve our culture and protect children to some extent.

The most important measure of all is parental involvement. Parents are the most important teachers for their kids. They should be their most important influence.

We need to reach out to our children. We need to listen to them. We need to pay attention. It is not a cliché to say

that tragic events are a cry for help. It is the simple truth.

In conclusion, there is no bill we can pass to make any of this happen. For this we have to look inside ourselves. In the meantime, those who are in public life need to do everything they can to make this task just a little bit easier. I mentioned five ideas that I have. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and concerned people at the local community level in Ohio and across our Nation to make sure we are doing all that we can.

I yield the floor.

DEPLOYMENT OF U.S. ARMED FORCES TO THE KOSOVO REGION IN YUGOSLAVIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A resolution (S.J. Res. 20) concerning the deployment of United States Armed Forces to the Kosovo region in Yugoslavia.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent the time today for consideration of S.J. Res. 20 be for debate only.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know Senator BYRD wants to speak. I wonder whether I could ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from West Virginia speak, I be allowed to speak.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Today, Mr. President, the Senate should begin a constructive, long overdue, and thorough debate on America's war with Serbia. But we will not. We will not because the Senate leadership, both Republican and Democrat, with the passive cooperation of the President of the United States, has determined that we will limit debate on war and peace to a few hours this afternoon. Apparently, the hard facts of war need not inconvenience the Senate at this time, and the solemn duties that war imposes on those of us privileged to lead this nation can be avoided indefinitely.

I heard my friend, the Democratic Leader, say the other day that now is not the time for this debate. When is the right time, Mr. President? After the war ends? Shall we wait to declare ourselves until the outcome is known? Shall those who oppose NATO's attack on Serbia wait until NATO's defeat is certain before voting their conscience? Shall those of us who believe American interests and values are now so at risk in the Balkans that they must be protected by all necessary force wait until victory is certain before voting our conscience?

I would hope not, Mr. President. For that would mean that we have allowed American pilots and, possibly, American soldiers to risk their lives for a cause that we will not risk our careers for. I think we are better people than that. I think we are a better institution than that. And I think we should use this debate to prove it.

All Senators should, for a start, use the opportunity provided by debate on this resolution to declare unequivocally their support or opposition for the war. Having declared their support or opposition, Senators should then endorse that course of action allowed Congress that logically and ethically corresponds to their views on the war. If Senators believe this war is worth fighting, then recognize that the President should exercise the authority vested in his office to use the power of the United States effectively to achieve victory as quickly as possible.

If Senators believe that this war is not worth the cost in blood and treasure necessary to win it, then take the only course open to you to prevent further bloodshed. Vote to refuse the funds necessary to prosecute it. Senators cannot say that they oppose the war, but support our pilots, and then allow our pilots to continue fighting a war that they believe cannot justify their loss. If the war is not worth fighting for, then it is not worth letting Americans die for it.

Last week, a majority in the other body sent just such a message to our servicemen and women, to the American public and to the world. They voted against the war and against withdrawing our forces. Such a contradictory position does little credit to Congress. Can we in the Senate not see our duty a little clearer? Can we not match our deeds to our words?

Should we meet our responsibilities honorably, we will not only have acted more forthrightly than the other body, we will have acted more forthrightly than has the President. The supporters of this resolution find ourselves defending the authority of the Presidency without the support of the President, a curious, but sadly, not unexpected position.

Opponents have observed that the resolution gives the President authority he has not asked for. They are correct. The President has not asked for this resolution. Indeed, it is quite evident that he shares the leadership's preference that the Senate not address this matter. But, in truth, he need not ask for this authority. He possesses it already, whether he wants it or not.

I cannot join my Republican friends in the other body by supporting the unconstitutional presumptions of the War Powers Act. Every Congress and every President since the act's inception has ignored it with good reason until now. We should have repealed the Act long ago, but that would have required us to surrender a little of the ambiguity that we find so useful in this city. Only Congress can declare war. But Congress

cannot deny the President the ability to use force unless we refuse him the funds to do so. By taking neither action, Congress leaves the President free to prosecute this war to whatever extent he deems necessary.

Although I can speak only for myself, I believe the sponsors of this resolution offered it to encourage the President to do what almost every experienced statesman has said he should do—prepare for the use of ground troops in Kosovo if they are necessary to achieve victory. Regrettably, the President would rather not be encouraged. But his irresponsibility does not excuse Congress'. I believe it is now imperative that we pass this resolution to distinguish the powers of the Presidency from the muddled claim made upon them by the House of Representatives.

During the Foreign Relations Committee's consideration of this resolution, my friend, the Senator from Missouri, Senator ASHCROFT, criticized the wording as too broad a grant of authority to the President, and an infringement of congressional authority. How, Mr. President, can Congress claim authority that it neither possesses constitutionally nor, as we see, cares to exercise even if we did possess it? No, Mr. President, the authority belongs to the President unless we deny it to him by means expressly identified in the Constitution. In short, and I welcome arguments to the contrary, only Congress can declare war but the President can wage one unless we deprive him of the means to do so.

Therefore, I feel it is urgent that the Senate contradict the actions of the other body and clarify to the public, and to America's allies and our enemies that the President may, indeed, wage this war. And, with our encouragement, he might wage this war more effectively than he has done thus far. If he does not, the shame is on him and not on us.

I regret to say that I have on more than one occasion suspected, as I suspect today, that the President and some of us among the loyal opposition suffer from the same failing. It seems to me that the President, in his poll driven approach to his every responsibility, fails to distinguish the office he holds from himself. And some of us in Congress are so distrustful of the President that we feel obliged to damage the office in order to restrain the current occupant. Both sides have lost the ability to tell the office from the man.

Publicly and repeatedly ruling out ground troops may be smart politics according to the President's pollster, but it is inexcusably irresponsible leadership. In this determination to put politics over national security, the President even acquiesced to the other body's attempt to deprive him of his office's authority. He sent a letter promising that he would seek Congress' permission to introduce ground troops in the unlikely event he ever discovers the will to use them.

My Republican colleagues in the House, who sought to uphold a law that