

Zito, Lynda Murphy, Tom Bowman, Joe Connolly, Steve Dunkle, Joan Mitchell, Mary Jo Bierman, Andy Wallace, and Vincent Galko.

THE CONSERVATION TRUST OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, before we adjourn, Senator MOYNIHAN and I would like to speak to an issue that has yet been unable to be resolved—the funding for the Conservation Trust Fund of Puerto Rico. The Conservation Trust was created in 1968 for the protection of the natural resources and environmental beauty of Puerto Rico.

The Trust lost much of its funding as a consequence of the decisions to phase-out section 936 and eliminate the Qualified Possession Source Investment Income (also known as “QPSII”) provision in the tax code. I hope that Congress and the Administration will continue to work together to find an equitable solution that will permit the Trust to continue its protection of the environment in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I agree with the distinguished Chairman of the Finance Committee. I would also point out that both the funding for the Conservation Trust and the opportunity to provide much needed monies to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands could have been accomplished by including the Administration's rum “cover over” proposal as part of the tax extenders package in the omnibus appropriations measure.

The needs of Puerto Rico, and the importance of this provision, were magnified by the devastation recently caused by Hurricane Georges. Despite significant bipartisan support in the Senate and the House, and a strong push from the Administration, for some reason the House refused to include this provision in the bill. I thank the Chairman for the opportunity to work with him next year to address this issue.

NATIONAL SECURITY PLANNING

Mr. WARNER. During the past two weeks, the Senate Armed Services Committee has conducted hearings on the readiness of the armed forces. Through testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the service secretaries, it has been revealed that the military is trained and being asked to perform beyond capacity. The readiness of the armed forces is clearly and unmistakably suffering. For the past several years, this has been the concern of many of the committee and in the Senate, myself included, and we have made every argument during this precipitous decade-plus decrease in defense budgeting to reduce the cuts, arguing that we've cut well beyond the fat and the flesh, and have long been cutting into the bone.

This situation is now receiving the priority so long overdue. Approximately \$7 billion of the emergency

spending supplemental currently being debated is for immediate defense readiness funding shortfalls. This is, however, only a stop gap measure, and must be the first step in a long journey to ensure the military is properly exercised and outfitted to defend U.S. national security interests.

If we are to responsibly correct this readiness shortcoming, then we must look to the root cause or causes. I believe, as do several of my colleagues on the armed services committee, and others in the Senate, that the primary and foremost reason for the readiness shortfall is an incongruity between the foreign policy goals of this administration, the strategy, and the resources to achieve those goals.

While defense spending is at an historical low, the armed forces are being exercised and deployed in ever increasing frequency and with less and less direction. Earlier this year, for example, Admiral Conrad Lautenbacher gave the remarkable statistic that since the demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the Navy-Marine Corps team alone has been involved in 93 naval contingencies in 96 months. That is an average of almost once a month that the Navy-Marine Corps team has been involved in a contingency of importance to our national security.

As the Congress prepares to adjourn, we do so in a world laden with instability, one which will demand U.S. leadership and engagement. In Kosovo, refugees—numbering nearly a quarter of a million—are fleeing from Milosevic's forces. They are cowering in the mountains where the harsh winter of the Balkan mountains will kill thousands more, or they are flooding neighboring countries for relief—but finding those countries ill-equipped to support them. I am confident NATO, under U.S. leadership, will soon take action to end the strife action which will require the deployment of a ground forces in Kosovo—with some U.S. participants in view of having an American commander of NATO.

Israel remains the flashpoint in the Middle East, but others come and go. Turkish troops are massing on the Syrian border, preparing to defend a pre-World War II territory claim and retaliate to any Syrian opposition in force. The Taliban, having secured a religious revolution in Afghanistan, have engaged Iranian forces along their common border in an escalating war between two sects of Islam.

While the Gulf War has been over for seven years, Iraq, in defiance of the world community, continues to remain armed. Two months have passed since Saddam Hussein prohibited officials from the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq from conducting inspections. Further, the testing of Vx gas by Iraq has been corroborated by independent tests in France. Questions, credible ones, still arise over their nuclear posture.

Worldwide, a proliferation of nuclear technology and the proliferation of the

means to deliver weapons of mass destruction is unrelenting. India and Pakistan now have the bomb, and unfortunately, like so many other neighbors in the world community, they also have the motive to use it against each other. The launch of the Taepo Dong 1 by North Korea was a clear and unmistakable “shot heard round the world.” Such an action by a militarized, secretive, isolated, country in the throws of an overwhelming economic depression, by a people increasingly in despair, is a harbinger of catastrophe.

This is but a brief summary—a few examples to illustrate where I see continuing and emerging challenges to United States national security interests. Clearly, the end of the Cold War was not peace, but a transformation of the world's politico-military order with unsettled ancient conflicts based on ethnic, religious or tribal differences and interests against emerging. These threats require our continued vigilance and must be our highest concerns.

It is in this context that former Secretary of Defense, Dr. James Schlesinger, examines the current administrations ability to meet these threats given current U.S. force structure and the resources accorded to achieving foreign and defense goals. In his article, “Raise the Anchor or Lower the Ship, Defense Budgeting and Planning,” published in the Fall of 1998 edition of *The National Interest*, Dr. Schlesinger articulates the dilemma with which we find ourselves in recouping the peace dividend in an unstable world that demands U.S. presence and leadership.

Dr. Schlesinger is far too modest to observe that his insights were part of the foundation that led to the increase in military funding that occurs in legislation to be adopted by Congress this week; I encourage each of my colleagues to take a moment to review the article. His forthright, candid discussion of the mismatch between the ends of U.S. foreign and defense policy and the means with which to realize those ends will be a prominent reference for the Senate Armed Services Committee and this body as we deliberate this emergency defense appropriations supplemental and future defense funding issues in the coming congress.

DALE BUMPERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as we approach the end of another Congress, we bid farewell to those Senators who will not be returning in January. Today I wish to say farewell to a good friend and one of the most honorable and respected members of this body—DALE BUMPERS.

DALE BUMPERS is the epitome of what a Senator should be. He entered public service because he believed that it was a noble profession, and throughout his political career he has performed his duties with the highest levels of integrity and decency. He has always been

guided by his heart and his mind, not by any polls.

He almost seems like a character from a Frank Capra film. He was a World War II veteran from a small town who attended college and law school on the G.I. Bill. After practicing law for 20 years in his home town, he earned a reputation as a political giant-killer on his way to the Governor's mansion and eventually the Senate. Even his home address seems straight out of Hollywood. Believe it or not, he actually lives on a street named Honesty Way.

Oftentimes when you're watching DALE BUMPERS speak from the Senate floor, you can't help but think of the character made famous by Jimmy Stewart—Senator Jefferson Smith—whose political philosophy was “the only causes worth fighting for are lost causes,” and whose most famous line was, “Either I'm dead right, or I'm crazy.”

As Senator BUMPERS said just the other day on this floor, he's probably fought more losing battles than any other Senator. I can picture Senator BUMPERS right now, speaking from the heart on some issue about which he cares very deeply. He knows that he's right, but whatever he says, he can't seem to sway a majority of his colleagues. But no matter what, he won't give up. He won't back down. And in 18 years of serving with DALE BUMPERS, I can honestly say that I never saw him waver in his beliefs or back down from a good, honest debate.

Two years ago, when DALE BUMPERS was speaking on the retirement of his former colleague from Arkansas, David Pryor, he said, and I quote, “I am not a terribly effective legislator because I have a very difficult time compromising. I have strong beliefs, and sometimes compromise is just out of the question for me.”

Maybe there is some truth to that statement. Maybe DALE BUMPERS could have scored a few more political victories if he had been more willing to compromise.

But I think that my friend from Arkansas is being a little hard on himself in his self-assessment. I think that he is an excellent legislator, and it was his candor and his devotion to his convictions that made him effective. Obviously, compromise is often essential to getting things done around here. But equally essential is having people around here who are passionate about issues and willing to fight for their beliefs in the face of opposition.

DALE BUMPERS is not only thought of highly by his colleagues, but I think that everyone in the entire Senate family thinks fondly of this man. And I know for a fact that many members of my staff share a deep admiration for Senator BUMPERS.

The past few weeks, there has actually been a “Dale Bumpers watch” in the L.A. room in my office, much like the Mark McGwire watch that captivated the country during the baseball

season. Every time Senator BUMPERS has come to the floor, hands have pulled back from keyboards and the volumes on television sets have been turned up, as my staffers have watched and wondered if this would be the last time that DALE BUMPERS will speak on the Senate floor. I only hope that they were watching C-SPAN on the afternoon of Saturday, October 10.

Of course, DALE BUMPERS will most likely be remembered for his unsurpassed oratory skills. One thing that made our friend from Arkansas such an effective speaker was that his positions were always based on common sense. Whether or not you agreed with DALE BUMPERS, you could always understand the logic behind his argument. But what set him apart was his passion. Not many people can get excited over a 120 year-old mining law, but DALE BUMPERS could speak on this issue and convince you that this was the defining issue of the decade.

I only regret that he was never elected Majority Leader so that he may one day come back to speak as a part of the Leaders' Speaker Series. Maybe we can come up with a waiver provision to let certain colleagues who were never Majority Leader speak—and call it the “Bumpers Rule.”

For DALE BUMPERS the final judgment on the merit of his arguments will not be rendered by the yeas and nays of his colleagues. It will rather be rendered by the illuminating perspective of time. And I have little doubt that time will rule in favor of the Senator from Arkansas.

Just the other day, Senator BUMPERS was on the floor talking about a speech he gave about the ozone layer in the mid 1970s. Most of his statements were considered alarmist at the time, but more than a decade later, an exhaustive study by the National Academy of Sciences confirmed that everything he said has in fact been proven true. And I am confident that time will ultimately prove that DALE BUMPERS was right far more often than he was wrong.

I also think that time will reveal that our friend from Arkansas was one of the most capable, intelligent, and principled legislators that this body has ever known. I can honestly say that it has been an honor to serve alongside DALE BUMPERS for the past 18 years. I will truly miss his friendship, and I wish him and his wife Betty only the best in all their future endeavors.

JOHN GLENN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I've been fortunate to be a member of the United States Senate for nearly 18 years, and I have seen a lot of members come and go. But I must admit that I have never seen anyone make a more dramatic exit than our colleague from Ohio. Then again, who in this Chamber would expect anything less?

JOHN GLENN is a man who has served his nation as a Marine fighter pilot in

World War II and Korea, flying a total of 149 combat missions.

He has served as a test pilot in the first era of supersonic jets—an occupation where attending a colleague's funeral was as common as a new speed record.

Then of course, JOHN GLENN became a part of our national consciousness when he was chosen to be one of the seven Mercury Astronauts. As much as any event since World War II, his historic flight aboard *Friendship 7* on February 20, 1962 united this Nation and made us believe that there are no limits on what we as humans and as Americans can accomplish.

For the past 24 years, JOHN GLENN has served the people of Ohio and this country as a United States Senator. He has performed his duties with an uncommon grace and dignity. He is a credit to this institution and I am proud to call him a friend.

And now, on October 29th, in perhaps his last act as a U.S. Senator, JOHN GLENN will return to the heavens aboard the space shuttle *Discovery*, becoming the oldest man to ever travel in outer space.

It is very common in this body to feel emotions of deep admiration and respect for one's colleagues, but JOHN GLENN is the rare Senator who inspires feelings of sheer awe.

I was trying to think of what would be an appropriate way to pay tribute to my friend from Ohio, and to put into perspective how remarkable and inspiring is his impending voyage aboard *Discovery*. And I was reminded of the famous farewell of another American hero to whom Senator GLENN is linked historically.

I'm sure all of my colleagues remember Ted Williams—and those of us from New England remember him quite fondly. The Boston Red Sox left-fielder is considered by many to be the greatest hitter who ever lived. The last man to ever hit .400 and the winner of two Triple Crowns, Ted Williams' ability to hit for both power and average has never been matched.

One fact most people don't know about Ted Williams is that he served in the same squadron with JOHN GLENN during the Korean War. Our friend from Ohio was the squadron commander, and the Mr. Williams was his wing-man. People talk about Ruth and Gehrig as the best one-two punch in history, but JOHN GLENN and Ted Williams isn't half bad.

As the story is told, when Ted Williams went to Korea, he knew he would be going into combat. Therefore, he was going to pick the best person to fly alongside him. He had been told that JOHN GLENN was one of the best test pilots in the world, so he sought out our colleague in the reception center before shipping out. And while Ted Williams sought out JOHN GLENN, in tapping Ted Williams to be his wing-man, JOHN GLENN was saying that Williams was the best and sharpest pilot he had in his squadron.