

4,718. To date, only 2,359 police have arrived in Kosovo. It is interesting, just about half of what was projected. The United States has done its share. We have already deployed 481 police, and the remaining police pledged by the U.S.—for a total of 550—will arrive in Kosovo shortly. Others, particularly Europeans, have to do their share by providing the necessary police forces. Overall, nations have pledged over 4,400 police. They must now deliver on these pledges. Pledges do not help with the current violence. We need to put it in words that Americans understand: "Cops on the beat."

I commend my distinguished ranking member, Senator LEVIN, who has constantly hit that theme in open sessions over and over again. To a large measure, he joins me in the purport of this amendment. Hopefully, in the weeks to come, with his advice, and with others advice, we can, to the extent necessary—maybe not necessary—reconfigure some of the language of this amendment.

We had a meeting today with officials of our administration in the Armed Services hearing, again, to show the amendment and to urge them to come forward and give us such suggestions as they wish to make.

I spoke, by phone, with Secretary Cohen and National Security Adviser Berger. It is not as if we are out here operating on our own. We are trying to do our best. But remember, Congress has coequal responsibility and must exercise its best leadership.

NATO's soldiers must get out of the business of policing. That will not happen until enough police arrive. Our troops are not policemen. They were not specifically trained, as I said, to perform these tasks. It should not be a part of their continuing indefinite mission.

Since the air war began almost a year ago, the United States has spent over \$5 billion for our military operations in Kosovo—\$5 billion. It was for a good cause. But \$5 billion is desperately needed by our military today for its modernization. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, at lunch—and the Presiding Officer was there—recounted program after program in terms of the airlift, the aging C-5, the aging C-41, the need to up the buy of the C-17. That is where these needed dollars are required.

The annual price tag for the military commitment is over \$2 billion in Kosovo. This is a heavy burden on the defense budget, but we are going to, hopefully, get it in the supplemental so that we do not take it, as we say, out of their operating accounts. That is the importance of this supplemental. Plus, it is a heavy burden on the American taxpayer.

In addition to these significant sums of money, I am concerned, again, about the safety and welfare of the men and women in uniform. I will come back to that on every single pace. Each day

that I am privileged to be a member of the Armed Services Committee—and now as its chairman—I think and begin every day asking myself: What is my obligation to work with this committee to better the lot of the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families?

They are patrolling these towns and villages—as you and I are in this Chamber, and others—subjecting themselves to substantial personal risk while performing their duties. They are taking the risks. The American people take the risks.

I believe we have reached a point in time where it is the responsibility of the Congress to take action to ensure that others step up and fulfill their commitments—other nations and organizations—and that the U.S. military commitment to Kosovo not remain an endless commitment.

I place this draft in the Senate RECORD of today, rather than formally filing the amendment, to show our determination to put forth a constructive approach, not a "cut and run"—there is never any intention to do that—but accountability for all trying to secure a lasting peace in Kosovo. That is the bottom line. I did not file it, so that, if necessary—if we get a good set of suggestions—we can change this document and improve it.

I believe the American people will continue to support the U.S. involvement in Kosovo. I know they will if they know that our President and their Congress are acting in partnership, in concert, to get this job done that is fair to all. They want to see our allies also step up and be accountable and to do their part.

I think—and I say this humbly—this proposal will help do just this. We invite the comments and suggestions of all.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and others, for joining me in this effort.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT No. 1

AMENDMENT NO.—

(Purpose: To limit the use of funds for support of military operations in Kosovo)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. ____ (a) Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND" for military operations in Kosovo, not more than 50 percent may be obligated until the President certifies in writing to Congress that the European Commission, the member nations of the European Union, and the European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have provided at least 33 percent of the amount of assistance committed by these organizations and nations for 1999 and 2000 for reconstruction in Kosovo, at least 75 percent of the amount of assistance committed by them for 1999 and 2000 for humanitarian assistance in Kosovo, at least 75 percent of the amount of assistance committed by them for 1999 and 2000 for the Kosovo Consolidated Budget, and at least 75 percent of the number of police, including special police, pledged by them for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo.

(b) The President shall submit to Congress, with any certification submitted by the President under subsection (a), a report containing detailed information on—

(1) the commitments and pledges made by each organization and nation referred to in subsection (a) for reconstruction assistance in Kosovo, humanitarian assistance in Kosovo, the Kosovo Consolidated Budget, and police (including special police) for the United Nations international police force for Kosovo;

(2) the amount of assistance that has been provided in each category, and the number of police that have been deployed to Kosovo, by each such organization or nation; and

(3) the full range of commitments and responsibilities that have been undertaken for Kosovo by the United Nations, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the progress made by those organizations in fulfilling those commitments and responsibilities, an assessment of the tasks that remain to be accomplished, and an anticipated schedule for completing those tasks.

(c) If the President does not submit to Congress a certification and report under subsections (a) and (b) on or before June 1, 2000, then, beginning on June 2, 2000, the 50 percent of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading "OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND" for military operations in Kosovo that remain unobligated (as required by subsection (a)) shall be available only for the purpose of conducting a safe, orderly, and phased withdrawal of United States military personnel from Kosovo, and no other amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act or any Act enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act may be obligated to continue the deployment of United States military personnel in Kosovo. In that case, the President shall submit to Congress, not later than June 30, 2000, a report on the plan for the withdrawal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I understand that we are in morning business and that Senators may be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that I be given up to 10 minutes to make my remarks in morning business.

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

THE NEED TO CLOSE THE GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to discuss a subject that is not terribly different than the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia just now. He talks about our responsibilities, what we have to do to protect our citizens. He talked about it in a slightly different way than I am going to discuss it now.

But we are at a point in time, Mr. President, when there are 43 days on the calendar left until the 1-year anniversary of the shootings at Columbine High School in Colorado. On April 20, 2000, it will be 1 year since the country listened, in shock, to the news that two high school students, Eric Harris and

Dylan Klebold, had stormed into Columbine and systematically shot and killed 12 classmates and a teacher.

When we talk about 43 days to go, those are calendar days. If we talked about the number of days left for us to enact legislation, there are somewhere around 23 days left.

In addition to those 12 classmates and a teacher killed, 23 other students and teachers were wounded in the assault.

It pains me—and I am sure it is true for all Americans—when I think back to the picture of that carnage: Young people running in a high school, fearful that their lives may be taken away, many weeping with terror as they fled. Who could ever forget the picture of that young man hanging out of a window to try to protect himself?

But even in some ways more shocking is to see how quickly this Congress can dismiss those images. The American people must be wondering: What we have been doing since that tragic day almost a year ago? What have we done to reassure parents across the country that we are working to prevent it from happening again? We have shown no evidence of that. As a matter of fact, the evidence is quite to the contrary. The evidence says: Congress had a chance to do it, but we chose not to. We have not done anything, and it is a disgrace. I heard yesterday that there was a shooting. I have recounted several incidents in the past year when I have heard news of a shooting here and news of a shooting there. My first question is, Is it a school? Is it a schoolyard that has become another killing field? Yesterday's shooting was not in a schoolyard. But when that 6-year-old child was killed by another 6-year-old child, it was in a schoolyard. It was an adult's fault more than that child's fault—the 6-year-old didn't know any better—the man whose gun was lying casually around when this boy picked it up and took it to kill his classmate. We have not dealt with that. We have not dealt with the problem of adult responsibility, keeping guns out of the hands of children. There is no doubt in my mind that the responsibility should fall directly on the adult and have them pay, and pay dearly, for their role in the crime.

On Tuesday, the President tried to help. He met with leaders of the conference committee, where gun safety measures are stalled, to try to move this issue to the front burner. I salute his efforts. He understands the need for action. He recalls routinely the vote we took in this Chamber to pass my gun show loophole amendment. It did pass, 51-50, with the help of Vice President Gore, who voted to break the tie.

But nothing happened. The legislation passed the Senate. But the House passed a juvenile justice bill without gun safety measures. While the President tried to make positive progress, the NRA, the National Rifle Association—I name them clearly—and the gun lobby continued to obstruct every

single effort to pass commonsense gun safety measures. They do it by spreading false information about what these measures are designed to do. They distort the record to achieve their goal: no gun safety laws. That is what they want.

They said my amendment was intended to shut down gun shows. It was a lie. It was an untruth. They also misquoted my remarks at a press conference. But when the video of my speech is reviewed, you see what I said. I said, "Close the gun show loophole." These folks don't respect the truth.

My amendment would simply shut out criminals who use gun shows as convenience stores to buy the firearms they will use to rob and commit violent crimes, to kill people. That includes our police officers, law enforcement people.

The American people support criminal background checks on all gun sales at gun shows. It has to be hard for people across the country to understand that you have to get a permit, you have to get a bill of sale, to buy a car, in many cases, to buy an appliance. Why in the world would we not insist that people who are buying a gun identify themselves in some way?

The support for identification is overwhelming. We saw it in an ABC news poll. Ninety percent of the people said they want to close the gun show loophole, the loophole that says unlicensed dealers, private dealers, can go ahead and sell guns to anybody who has the money. No need to ask the question: What are you going to do with it? They ask if you are 18. If you say you are 18, that takes care of it; then they just sell them.

If you are a member of the Ten Most Wanted list, the most wanted criminals in the country, you can step up there and buy a gun. No one will ask you a question.

What about the gun owners the NRA claims to represent? In a poll that was conducted by the Center for Gun Policy and Research at Johns Hopkins University, two-thirds—66 percent—of gun owners said they favor background checks at gun show sales. Last year, the FBI issued a report which noted that between November 30, 1998, and June 15, 1999—less than a year, 6 months—the FBI failed to block about 1,700 gun sales to prohibited purchasers—in other words, people unfit, unable to meet basic standards—because it didn't have enough time to complete the background check. The FBI had to allow the gun sales to go through.

Those transactions were completed because the FBI didn't have enough time to complete the background check. So consequently, they had to issue gun retrieval notices and law enforcement had to try to track down the criminals who got the guns.

So we must not permit weakening of our criminal background check system. We should strengthen it, a system that has stopped more than 470,000 guns

from being purchased in 6 years. Half a million people, almost, who wanted to buy guns, who were unfit to buy those guns—criminals, fugitives, other prohibited purchasers—tried to buy a gun and were stopped by Federal law from doing so. I think that is a good thing for people in our country to hear. It includes 33,000 spousal abusers who were denied a gun because of a domestic violence gun ban I wrote only 4 years ago.

The NRA makes another outrageous claim, that my gun show loophole closing bill won't make any difference; in other words, if there are guns out there bought by unknown people, that it doesn't matter. They say my legislation won't make it tougher for people to buy a gun to commit a crime. That is also nonsense.

But don't take my word for it. Look at what Robyn Anderson told the Colorado State Legislature recently. She is the woman who went with Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold to the Tanner gun show in Adams County, CO. She said:

Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gone to the Tanner gun show on Saturday and they took me back with them on Sunday. . . . While we were walking around, Eric and Dylan kept asking sellers if they were private or licensed. They wanted to buy their guns from someone who was private—and not licensed—because there would be no paperwork or background check.

They needed Anderson's help because she was 18 and they were too young to buy guns. So Robyn Anderson bought 3 guns for them at the gun show, 2 shotguns and a rifle—3 guns that Harris and Klebold would use to murder 13 young people at Columbine High School.

Here is what she said. You read it and you will understand it, I hope. She said:

It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check.

How much clearer could it be? Closing the gun show loophole will make a difference. I plead with all of my colleagues in this Chamber—I don't understand how we can ignore the cries of our people—I plead with them: Follow your conscience. Let's do the right thing. Whom are we hurting if we say you have to identify yourself when you buy a weapon? We are not hurting anybody.

By not demanding it, we permit this kind of thing to take place, unidentified gun buyers. That ought to shock everybody in America. Let's do what the people of this country expect us to do. Ten months ago, the Senate passed my amendment to close the gun show loophole. Now that bill is being held hostage in a conference committee.

For those who are not aware of what it is, a conference committee is a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate. They join together—it is called a conference committee—to iron out differences in legislation they want to see passed in both Houses.

Nothing has happened. The committee has met only one time, last year. They have not debated the issues.

We are asking: Please, let that legislation go free. Don't let the gun lobby prevail over the families across this country who want to stop the gun violence.

Don't let the gun lobby rule what takes place in this Senate or in the House of Representatives. We have to do it now, before April 20, before the anniversary of that terrible day at Columbine High School. No one will forget it. No one who is alive and old enough to understand what took place will forget it. One year is time enough to act. April 20.

People across this country are asking: What has Congress done? What will they do? If one thinks they will be satisfied to hear that we have done nothing at all, I urge them to think again. And I urge people within the range of my voice to listen to what some are saying—that Congress will do nothing about it, even though children die across this country and adults die across this country. Over 33,000 a year die from gunshot wounds. We wound 134,000. In Vietnam, we lost 58,000 over the whole 10-year period that war was fought. But we lose 33,000 Americans a year—young, old, black, white, Christian, Jewish, it doesn't matter.

So I plead with my colleagues, give our people a safer country. They are entitled to that. If we have an enemy outside our borders, we are prepared to fight that enemy. We have service personnel and airplanes with the latest equipment. We try to provide our law enforcement people—the police departments, FBI, drug enforcement agents, and border patrol people—with the weapons to fight crime. But each year, 33,000 people die from gunshots in this country. We ought not to permit that. I plead with my colleagues to help our people. Let's try to move forward with gun safety legislation as quickly as we can when we return the week after next.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business up to 10 minutes.

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

FEDERAL DAIRY POLICY

Mr. GRAMS. Recently, I came to the floor to address Federal dairy policy, specifically focusing on an erroneous but often repeated claim that dairy compacts are necessary today to guarantee a supply of fresh, locally produced milk to consumers. During that time, I dealt with how this is a myth similar to urban legends that are assumed to be true because they are repeated so often. Another dairy myth that you may hear a great deal is that dairy compacts preserve small dairy farms. Mr. President, this is simply not true, and this afternoon I want to point out the reasons why it is untrue.

The Northeast Dairy Compact sets a floor price that processors must pay for fluid milk in the region. Ostensibly,

this is supposed to provide small farmers with the additional income necessary to help them survive during hard times. In its practical effect, it doesn't work that way at all. In fact, it has provided financial incentives for big dairy farms to get even bigger.

Consider the cases of Vermont and Pennsylvania. Vermont is in the Northeast Dairy Compact and Pennsylvania is not. Before the formation of the compact in 1997, Vermont had 2,100 dairy farms with an average herd size of 74 cows per farm. By 1998, the number of farms had fallen nearly 10 percent to 1900 dairy farms, but the average herd size had increased to 85 cows per farm. That is a 15-percent increase.

Meanwhile, during the same period of time in Pennsylvania—again, without the compact—the number of dairy farms fell 3 percent, from 11,300 to 10,900, but the average herd size increased only from 56 cows to 57 cows. Thus, in a compact State such as Vermont, the number of dairy farms fell significantly while the average herd size per farm increased significantly. And then compare that to the noncompact State of Pennsylvania during the same period. Their number of dairy farms dropped by a smaller number, and farm herd sizes increased by an even smaller percentage. So this does not appear in any way to be a compact to protect small dairy farms.

The extra income that the compact provides to large farms accelerates their domination of the industry by helping them get larger and stronger. Since the amount of compact premium a producer receives is based entirely on the volume of production, the small amount of additional income a small farmer receives is often inconsequential and does nothing to keep small farms from exiting the industry. In fact, during the first year of the compact, dairy farms in New England declined at a 25 percent faster rate than the average rate of decline during the previous 2-year period.

The assertion that dairy compacts do not protect small farmers is not just something that this Minnesota Senator claims but compact supporters themselves have acknowledged as much. In the latter part of 1998, the Massachusetts commissioner of agriculture declared that the compact, after 16 months, had not protected small dairy farms. The commissioner consequently proposed a new method for distributing the compact premium to class I milk, capping the amount of premium any one dairy farm could receive and redistributing the surplus. Farms of average size or smaller would have seen their incomes increase by as much as 80 percent. However, large farm dairy interests were predictably able to kill this proposal because the assistance to small dairy farmers would have come, of course, out of their pockets. So while compact supporters perpetuate a sentimental picture of compacts enabling small family farmers to continue to work the land, the bottom line is

that compacts hasten the demise of the small farmer while enriching the bigger producers.

This claim that compacts save small dairy operations is often made in conjunction with the claim that compacts are being unfairly opposed by large-scale Midwest dairy farms that want to dominate the market. Well, this, too, is untrue because the average herd size for a Vermont dairy farm is 85 cows per herd, while the average herd size for a Minnesota dairy farm is only 57 head. Thus, Vermont dairy farms average in size almost 50 percent larger than Minnesota dairy farms.

Similarly, the South, which has also sought to have its own compact, also has larger farms than the Midwest. The average herd size of a Florida dairy farm is 246 head. That is almost four times larger than the upper-Midwest average. Incidentally, Minnesota producers would love to be getting the mailbox price that farmers in Florida and the Northeast are getting.

In November of last year, the mailbox price—which is the actual price farmers receive for their milk—in the upper-Midwest was \$12.09 per hundredweight. In the Northeast, it was \$15.02. And in Florida, due to the milk marketing order system, it was \$18.72 per hundredweight. So in the Midwest it was \$12; in the Northeast it was \$15—that is \$3 per hundredweight more—and again, in Florida, it was \$18.72, or nearly \$7 a hundredweight more, or 50 percent more for milk produced in Florida than in Minnesota. How are you going to compete against this type of unfairness in the compact system and in the milk marketing orders?

So the Northeast price is 24 percent higher than Minnesota's, and Florida's price is almost 55 percent higher. Again, Minnesota farmers would love to get those kinds of mailbox prices, but our Government program—and again, the larger farmers in these areas unfairly benefit from this program—ensures that they don't and that these other regions do.

While dairy compacts are again not saving small dairy farms in compact States, they are impacting the bottom line of small-scale producers in noncompact States; in other words, those dairy farmers outside the compact. Compacts are a zero-sum game that shifts producer markets and income from one region of the country to competing regions. They don't have small family farms, and they certainly don't deserve the continuing sanction and the support of the Congress.

Again, there are other dairy myths that must be exposed, and the truth must be told. I will be back on the floor soon to take another look at a misleading claim, try to dissect it a little bit, and put some fairness into what we often hear in the dairy debates.

If we look at this system and why it is unfair, again to look at the prices farmers receive for the milk they produce, why is it fair that if you are in the Midwest, you get \$12.60 or \$12.70