

problem is, nor does it tell us what the FDA is doing and what the manufacturer is doing to resolve this problem.

We need some answers from the FDA. This is something that cannot wait 2 weeks or 1 month or 6 months. This problem has to be resolved over the next few days. It is critical for the safety of these newborn children.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have been spending all of our time this week on taxes. I am delighted the tax bill has passed. Certainly there are different views on how to do it. There will always be different views when one raises the question of taxes or spending. There are different points of view. Much has to do with the priorities of people. Much has to do with the philosophy of what one thinks the appropriate role of the Federal Government is, what kinds of programs should be funded by the Federal Government. Those are the broad issues.

I was very pleased when we did follow through, and the House, of course, passed tax relief in the amount of approximately \$1.6 trillion, which is what the President requested. The bill that passed the Senate is something less than that. It is still a huge amount of money. Most of us cannot conceive what \$1.3 trillion is, but nevertheless it is very close to the same amount and I think deals with the same principles that are so important.

Taxes are one of the highest priorities for this Congress and, indeed, should be. Taxes are high priorities for this Congress because of the fairness question. It is a question of adequately funding appropriate programs.

It is a high priority for the American people for much the same reason in that no one wants to pay more taxes than they have to, but most of us are willing to pay taxes. It is necessary to do that. Fairness is an issue. This is one of the President's first priorities.

Interestingly enough, this and education are the two highest priorities, and soon we deal with the energy issue. Those are the three things that have been talked about the most in the last several months, so it is appropriate this Congress has focused on and made progress in those areas.

The Senate will be going to conference with the House, and hopefully we will have it down to the President perhaps before this week is over. That is an excellent performance.

On the tax bill we went through 50-some votes on amendments, which gave everybody a good opportunity to talk about the different issues. Yet the bill survived pretty much as it was reported out of committee. I congratulate the committee and the leaders.

There are a number of principles involved. We talk about amount always but limited Government is part of it. One of the reasons for a return of taxes is because the citizens, the American

people have paid more taxes than are necessary, and we have a surplus. Clearly, it should go back to the people who paid it.

Quite frankly, my experience is if we have a surplus for very long, we will find a way to spend it even though it may not be one of the highest priorities. The principles of limited Government are very much a part of what we do.

There are questions as to, when one projects out 10 years, how close the projections will come to the actual surpluses. I think any economic projection for 10 years has some variability in it. However, I believe all the professionals who have made this projection indicate it is a very modest projection and, indeed, it is very likely the surpluses will, in fact, even be higher.

It is a time, too, when it is necessary to stimulate the economy. This is one of the ways the economy is stimulated—by letting people spend more of their own money. It is true it takes a while for all of this to kick in, but there will be some immediate impact, and that is vital to the economy.

Fairness in the Tax Code is very important, and we have a hard time with fairness in the Tax Code. This bill provides more fairness in the marriage penalty where two single people who earn a certain amount of money marry, and their tax on the same amount of money is increased. That is a fairness issue and needs to be changed.

It is something we need to do. We talk a lot about the simplicity of the Tax Code.

We didn't do much about that. We are always wanting to give tax credits, so the Tax Code keeps getting larger.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AGAINST WITHDRAWAL FROM BOSNIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to take strong issue with remarks by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld as summarized in the Washington Post on May 18 and subsequently reproduced in their entirety on the paper's website, that he is "pushing" to pull U.S. troops out of Bosnia. According to Secretary Rumsfeld, "the military job [in Bosnia] was done three or four years ago."

I firmly believe that Secretary Rumsfeld's analysis of the situation in Bosnia is incorrect, and that his policy prescription would be seriously detrimental to the national security interests of the United States.

First, let me turn to Mr. Rumsfeld's statement that the "military job was done three or four years ago." It is true that IFOR, and then SFOR, successfully separated the largely exhausted warring parties without much difficulty. But to assert that this separation spelled the end of our troops' mission is to define "military" in such a narrow way so as to make it nearly meaningless in the Balkan context.

Putting it in other terms, Secretary Rumsfeld seems to belong to the school

that begins talking about so-called "exit strategies" as soon as troops are committed. Of course we need an "exit strategy," and we have had one. The Clinton Administration early on outlined ten detailed benchmarks for Dayton implementation that need to be met before we can say "mission accomplished" and honorably withdraw. These are not secrets. The U.S. Embassy in Sarajevo hands out a list of the benchmarks to all visitors. I must assume that Secretary Rumsfeld is familiar with them, so it seems that he either believes they no longer apply, or that our troops no longer have anything to do with most aspects of Dayton implementation.

From Secretary Rumsfeld's published remarks, I get the impression that he sees anything short of actual combat or the separating of warring parties as inappropriate tasks for our soldiers. If he does, I disagree with him. In fact, his view strikes me as the old syndrome of "preparing to fight the last war." The last two so-called "Strategic Concepts" of NATO have made clear that the most likely security challenges of the twenty-first century will be ethnic and religious strife, transnational crime, terrorism and the like—rather than a frontal attack on the territory of alliance members.

The details bear examination. Little more than two years ago in this city, NATO celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. At that Washington Summit, NATO issued the latest version of its Strategic Concept. I would like to quote several parts of the Strategic Concept in order to show that we and our allies have clearly understood that the military's function is not bound in a narrow straightjacket.

The document, agreed upon by all nineteen NATO members on April 23 and 24, 1999, declares in Article 20 that "large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely." It goes on to say the following: "Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability."

It then graphically outlines the possible ramifications of such developments: "The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability. . . [and] could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighboring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states."

Moreover, Article 25 of the 1999 Strategic Concept specifically states that "The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognizes the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defense dimension."

How can these factors be addressed? Article 29 mentions the "Alliance's ability to contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management

through non-Article 5 crisis response operations.”

So, clearly NATO, including the United States, is on record as seeing the threats of this new century as being new, complex, and calling for a variety of responses. In that context the marvelous men and women of our armed forces serving in Bosnia and in Kosovo have taken on many tasks that military people of earlier generations, trained to stop the Red Army from pouring through Germany’s Fulda Gap, either do not understand or believe are beneath the dignity of regular troops.

But our troops understand their mission and believe in it. I have spoken at length with our soldiers in SFOR in Bosnia and in KFOR in Kosovo, and the overwhelming majority of them think that their broadly defined pacification activities are making a contribution to lessening the very threats that NATO’s Strategic Concept describes.

Skeptics may think that I have gained impressions that I wanted to get. Fair enough, I’m only human. But statistics don’t lie. Every year the Pentagon issues re-enlistment targets for troops based abroad. When I stayed at Camp Bondsteel in Kosovo this past winter, I was told that the re-enlistment figures for our Army troops in KFOR were one hundred forty-two percent of target—the highest for any foreign-based units in the entire world. Re-enlistment rates in SFOR in Bosnia are also high. So obviously our troops in the field in the Balkans seem to grasp what Secretary Rumsfeld apparently does not: that what they are doing is important to the security of the United States and is not beneath the dignity of soldiers.

I might also add that the charge that our Balkan-based troops lose their fighting ability has been shown to be another canard used to dress up neo-isolationist ideology. In fact, the U.S. Army has a well thought out program to restore so-called “HIC” or high intensity conflict skills to troops rotating out of the Balkans in a short amount of time. Equally important is the universally accepted fact that the troops who have served in SFOR and KFOR have acquired leadership skills through the missions frowned upon by Secretary Rumsfeld, which they never could have gotten sitting in bases in Germany or elsewhere outside the Balkans.

I understand full well that non-military police forces also have a role to play. That is why several years ago I began calling for the creation of a “gendarmerie” force for crowd pacification and assistance to refugees returning to their homes. In fact, so-called “MSUs” or Multinational Specialized Units were created in Bosnia. Unfortunately, though, their strength has been allowed to decrease. U.S. General Mike Dodson, Commander of SFOR, told me that while he once had nineteen MSU units under his control, the number has shrunk to eleven. They should be beefed up to their former strength.

In addition, new local police forces have been created both in the Federation and in the Republika Srpska. Some of them are functioning well, others not so well.

But neither the MSUs, nor the local police forces, have the clout or inspire the fear in the ultra-nationalists that the regular SFOR troops do. We may not like this situation, but we have to face the facts: Bosnia is not yet fully pacified, and the recipe for curing the unrest is exactly the opposite from talking of withdrawing American troops.

A few months ago, I stood here and said that we are at a critical juncture in Bosnia. The moderate, non-nationalist forces embodied in the “Alliance for Change” political coalition had just made important, even extraordinary, gains by winning, in free and fair elections, control of both the national and the Federation parliaments.

The hardline ultra-nationalist HDZ Bosnian Croat party has violently refused to yield to its democratic defeat. Rather, it announced that it was creating its own “self administration” and withdrew its troops from the Muslim-Croat Federation Army and from cantonal police forces. An international operation that seized the bank through which the HDZ conducted its nefarious activities prompted a violent riot in Mostar in which serious bloodshed was only narrowly averted. After extreme pressure from the West the Bosnian Croat ultra-nationalists have indicated that they may resume participation in government institutions, but the situation remains precarious.

In the Republika Srpska the hardliners who owe their allegiance to indicted war criminal Radovan Karadzic and who are at least rhetorically supported by Yugoslav President Vojislav Kostunica have been up to their old caveman tactics.

Two weeks ago they broke up a ceremony in Banja Luka in which the cornerstone was to have been laid to rebuild the great Ferhadija Mosque, destroyed by Bosnian Serbs in the early 1990s. They trapped two hundred Bosnian and international officials for several hours before they were rescued. As a nice reminder of their lofty cultural level, the Bosnian Serb thugs burned Muslim prayer rugs and let a pig loose on the mosque grounds. Incidentally, although President Kostunica criticized this barbarity, he added that the reconstruction of such buildings was a provocation!

Ultra-nationalists have also rioted in Trebinje and elsewhere against returning refugees.

In short, the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is hardly pacified. It is a time of great opportunity, for the hardline Serbs and Croats are reacting to their dwindling power. But it is also a time fraught with danger.

For example, one strictly military task remaining to be accomplished is the amalgamation of the rival armies. If the U.S. forces, and SFOR, would

withdraw before this occurs, renewed warfare would almost certainly break out. Instead of publicly musing about exit strategies, we need to be stressing our country’s commitment to helping Bosnia and Herzegovina move once and for all beyond the domination of the corrupt ultra-nationalist parties.

Moreover, rather than setting artificially limited goals for our military and then congratulating ourselves on fulfilling them, we need to utilize SFOR to kill the serpent that continues to poison Bosnian life: by apprehending the more than three dozen individuals indicted by The International Criminal Tribunal at The Hague for war crimes who are currently living with impunity in the Republika Srpska. This rogues’ gallery includes, above all, Karadzic and General Ratko Mladic—who, according to Carla Del Ponte, the Chief Prosecutor of The Hague War Crimes Tribunal, enjoys the protection of a security detail that is paid for by the Yugoslav army.

SFOR claims that it doesn’t know where Karadzic and Mladic are. Well, Mrs. Del Ponte, with whom I met earlier this month, has offered to use her tribunal’s capabilities to locate Karadzic and Mladic for SFOR. I think we should take her up on her offer. As long as these two mass murderers are on the loose, there will be no definitive peace in Bosnia. Our British allies have not been squeamish about undertaking risky operations to nab individuals indicted for war crimes. We must get Karadzic and Mladic, and, if necessary, the U.S. Army should be involved.

The linchpin to the strategy of pacifying and democratizing Bosnia and Herzegovina is a continued robust U.S. military presence in SFOR.

Secretary Rumsfeld’s comments are bound to boost the spirits of the ultra-nationalist hardliners who, according to a recent report published by the State Department’s Bureau of Intelligence and Research, “are gambling . . . that [if] they can intimidate or just outlast the international community, they may still succeed in dividing Bosnia into ethnic states.”

Moreover, I am certain that the Secretary’s comments have reignited concerns among our European allies that they will be left holding the bag in Bosnia.

In the Washington Post interview, Secretary Rumsfeld stressed that there was no friction between him and Secretary of State Colin Powell on this issue.

His comments, however, appear to directly undercut Secretary’s Powell’s repeated assurances to our European allies during the past several months that the United States “will not cut and run” from the Balkans, and that “we went in together with our allies and we’ll go out together.”

What on earth is going on here?

Just as Secretary Powell has spent the last six months trying to undo the damage done by similarly ill-considered unilateralist comments in a New

York Times interview by Condoleezza Rice, now the President's National Security Advisor, so the Bush Administration spin-doctors were quick to try to explain away the Rumsfeld interview by asserting that his proposals were only part of a process by which we intend to use NATO's Six Month Reviews to reduce our combat troops in Bosnia.

Well, if that's the case, we have a case of "choose your poison." One possibility is that the Bush Administration is, once again, internally out of control as President Bush showed by cutting off EPA Chief Christine Todd Whitman at the knees on carbon dioxide and Secretary Powell on his sensible support of South Korea's "sunshine policy."

The other possibility is that Secretaries Powell and Rumsfeld are, indeed, on the same page, and that "in together, out together" really means that the United States intends to use its unparalleled influence within NATO to force our allies to join us in a precipitous withdrawal before the mission in Bosnia is successfully completed.

Given the choice, I'd opt for poison number one, and wait for this Administration to finally get its act together. But I fear that poison number two is the more likely scenario.

If my fears prove correct, and we withdraw our troops, I predict that renewed fighting in Bosnia is just a matter of time. This next round would be bloody, and, inevitably, we would have to go back in again, at much greater cost in men and materiel. Because no matter how much my neo-isolationist friends salivate at the idea of sitting on the sidelines while the European Union's European Security and Defense Policy rapid-reaction force takes care of things—they will be sorely disappointed, because for the foreseeable future ESDP will need massive American support to function.

You know, I think this town has a great many very intelligent individuals, and Secretary Rumsfeld is one of the brightest of the bunch. It's difficult for me to understand how even the most Asia-centered, or missile defense-centered person, can believe that their new foreign policy emphases have a chance of succeeding if Europe is not stable. And with the Balkans still erupting, Europe will not be stable.

So let's all reread NATO's Strategic Concept and not view our military's tasks through a twentieth century prism. Let's listen to our men and women on the ground in the Balkans. Let's listen to our diplomats who know full well that a stepped up, resolute effort at Dayton implementation—backed up by a still robust SFOR—is what is called for. Let's stop talking about accelerated exit strategies before the mission is successfully accomplished.

NOMINATION ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of Senate

Resolution 8, I would announce to the Senate that the Committee on the Judiciary failed to report the nomination of Ted Olson to be Solicitor General of the United States by a tie vote of 9-9.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY AND THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I recognize National Missing Children's Day and the great work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC. The NCMEC has made an unmatched contribution in the area of missing children recovery.

At their annual Congressional Breakfast this morning, the NCMEC honored law enforcement officers from around the country for their exemplary performance in recovering missing children and in apprehending child sex offenders. Last year, we honored a Vermonter at this event for his extraordinary work in tracking down a child exploitation offender.

In 1999, I helped pass legislation that authorized funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and I am pleased to see its continued success. Since 1984, when the Center was established, it has handled more than 1.4 million calls through its national Hotline 1-800-THE-LOST; trained more than 161,728 police and other professionals; and published more than 20 million publications that are distributed free of charge. The Center has worked with law enforcement on more than 75,283 missing child cases, resulting in the recovery of 50,605 children.

In 1998 the Center launched the CyberTipline which allows Internet users to report suspicious or illegal activity, including child pornography and online enticement of children for sexual exploitation. Since its launch in 1998, the CyberTipline has received close to 37,000 leads with many of those leading to arrests.

I applaud the ongoing work of the Center, its President, Ernie Allen, and all those dedicated employees and volunteers who make this good work possible. I wish them continued success in the area of missing children recovery.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a heinous crime that occurred May 17, 2000 in Holbrook, Massachusetts. A grand jury indicted a 17-year-old high school student on seven charges for attacking a fellow student he believed to be gay.

For five months prior to the attack, the perpetrator allegedly harassed the victim. In the attack, which occurred in the school cafeteria, the perpetrator hit the victim five or six times in the head before knocking him to the floor. The attack left the victim with a punctured eardrum and internal bleeding.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, S. 805, introduced on May 1, is a vital step toward the day when advanced research will find ways to halt, and even to cure, the maladies of muscular dystrophy.

Muscular dystrophy is a genetic disorder, actually, nine separate genetic disorders, that cause wasting of muscle tissue throughout the body. A quarter of a million Americans of all ages suffer from the disease. One form of it, Duchenne's, strikes young boys, and usually takes their lives before they reach their twentieth birthday. All forms of it are disabling and costly.

Many millions of Americans know about muscular dystrophy and contribute to its relief because since 1966 the entertainer Jerry Lewis has conducted a telethon on Labor Day, calling the nation's attention to muscular dystrophy, and asking help for its victims and their families. The Muscular Dystrophy Association, which Jerry Lewis chairs, has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for the treatment and relief of this disease. It supports over two hundred clinics, and makes wheelchairs and braces available to people suffering from muscular dystrophy.

Part of the money the association raises, about \$30 million yearly, goes to support research projects. But if the breakthroughs are to occur that will enable scientists not just to treat, but to halt the disease, research funding must be substantially increased. This is the purpose of S. 805.

It calls upon NIH and the Centers for Disease Control to establish Centers of Excellence, in which intensified clinical research can be conducted that will speed the discovery of cures for the various forms of muscular dystrophy.

It provides the Director of the NIH, and the Directors of the several institutes within NIH where research into muscular dystrophy is being conducted, with authority and responsibility to concentrate and intensify that research effort, with the funds needed to conduct clinical trials. In short, it gives NIH the organization and the mandate to exploit recent advances in gene therapy. The goal is the swiftest possible rescue for children and adults whose lives will otherwise be lost or badly damaged by muscular dystrophy.