

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to meet at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 17, 1998 in open session, to receive testimony on ship acquisition in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 1999 and the future years defense program.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE CRISIS IN KOSOVO

• Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very incisive commentary on the current situation in Kosovo. My colleague from Texas, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, is the author of the opinion piece to which I refer and which was printed on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal on March 13, 1998.

Senator HUTCHISON has emerged as one of the most articulate and knowledgeable voices in the United States Senate on today's foreign policy issues and, particularly, our policy in the Balkan region of Europe. As the Clinton administration decides upon an appropriate U.S. response to the recent violence in Kosovo, it would do well to consider carefully the commentary of my distinguished colleague. I ask that the article by Senator HUTCHISON be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1998]

ONE BALKAN QUAGMIRE IS ENOUGH

(By Kay Bailey Hutchison)

In November 1995, as Congress was debating President Clinton's decision to send 20,000 U.S. troops to Bosnia, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott warned that, should Congress fail to support that decision, the conflict "could all too easily spread well beyond Bosnia." Mr. Talbott's particular concern was the southern Yugoslav province of Kosovo where ethnic Albanians, making up 90% of the population, are repressed by the Serb-dominated government in Belgrade.

Recent events in Kosovo, where dozens of ethnic Albanians have been killed in nearly a week of open fighting, would seem to validate the administration's fears. Except for one thing: The fighting has occurred even though we did send troops to Bosnia. It appears, however, that this subtlety may have been lost on the administration. In trying to rally the allies, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has warned that "the only effective way to stop violence in that region is to act with firmness, unity and speed. . . . The time to stop the killing is now, before it spreads." That's essentially the same argument the administration made to justify the troop commitment to Bosnia.

The administration's response to the crisis in the Balkans has been consistent with the Clinton Doctrine, which calls for decisive action with overwhelming American force only where our national security interests are poorly defined or nonexistent, as in Somalia and Haiti. In contrast, where the U.S. does

face a clear threat to its longstanding interests—as in the case of North Korea's development of nuclear weapons or Saddam Hussein's saber-rattling—the Clinton Doctrine dictates cutting a deal and declaring victory, preferably with the help of the United Nations.

The Kosovo crisis is a microcosm of the racial, ethnic and religious tensions, suppressed for decades, that were unleashed in the Balkans with the end of communism. Since 1981 the Albanian majority in Kosovo has sought independence or autonomy. Albanians in Kosovo have boycotted all the institutions of the Yugoslav state, including local and national elections. For his part, President Slobodan Milosevic has used his firm control of the police to brutalize and repress the Albanians. The Albanians have answered violence with violence, directed by an underground faction called the Kosovo Liberation Army.

If this story has a familiar ring to it, it should. It was Bosnia's declaration of independence that led to four bloody years of war and the involvement of 20,000 U.S. troops. Again, as in Bosnia, the U.S. finds itself serving the purposes of the most unsavory elements in an ethnic crisis. We are trying to divide the acceptable center between Serbian strongman Milosevic on the one side and a violent insurgency group, the KLA, on the other. In the meantime, ordinary people in Kosovo, both Albanian and Serbian, suffer.

We are falling into the same trap that ensnared us in Bosnia. Rather than making clear to our allies and to the belligerents themselves the limits of American involvement, Ms. Albright's comments hold out the prospect for greater involvement. We must resist it. There is no reasonable number of American ground troops that can end this crisis.

We can contain it, though, first by making clear to our NATO allies that we will not accept their involvement as belligerents in this crisis. This is important because both Greece and Turkey have subsidiary interests in the southern Balkans. At the same time, we should make it clear to Germany, Italy and others bordering the region that they have the means and the interest in resolving this crisis themselves.

The U.S. can and should provide a great deal of support, including airlift, intelligence and, most importantly, diplomatic good offices. But under no circumstances should we hold out the prospect of additional U.S. ground troops. In fact, we should use the opportunity we now have to reconvene the parties to the Dayton Accords, expand the agenda to include the troubles, in Kosovo, and revise the partitions already established in Dayton to permit an early American withdrawal.

It's time to reverse the Clinton Doctrine. If we do not, we may find ourselves not only failing to reduce our presence in the Balkans, but increasing it dramatically. Maintaining an open-ended troop commitment in Bosnia—and beginning a new one in Kosovo—would further deteriorate our ability to defend our national security interests elsewhere. As Congress considers additional funding for the mission in Bosnia, it should insist that the U.S. not add Kosovo to the long list of far-off places where American forces are present but American interests are absent. •

KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

• Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today both to remember the 15,000 innocent people who died at the Katyn Forest Massacre in 1940 and to make sure that their memory never fades from our minds.

In 1939, Joseph Stalin's army captured 15,000 Polish military officers and proceeded to perpetrate what some have called one of the most heinous war crimes in history. These 15,000 people were Poland's elite and presented a serious threat to Stalin's future control of Poland. Fearing their resistance, Stalin ordered his army to execute the Polish officers in the Katyn Forest. There was no trial. There was no justice for the victims of Stalin's excesses. Stalin did this under the cover of a forest and the shield of his authority while hiding it from the international community. The investigation conducted by this Congress found that the victims were unarmed and innocent. It concluded that the crime was concealed by the Soviet government and that its perpetrators were never brought to justice. As the years passed, the Soviet government was content to let the Nazi regime be blamed for Katyn. It avoided issuing a formal apology or attempting to even make reparations. On February 19, 1989, the Soviets finally released documents confirming the Soviet role in the Katyn Massacre.

After fifty years of lies and manipulation, an admission of complicity does not ease the pain of a nation whose entire population was affected by this horrible event. I am hopeful that as time goes by and more people learn about this massacre, we will all be able to come to terms with the memory of Katyn and the pain that it has caused. It is a memory that must be sustained to ensure that our bonds of humanity will continue on into the next millennium and that our past will not be destined to repeat itself.

Mr. President, I rise today to remember these 15,000 victims with the hope that their memory will prevent future atrocities from occurring and will crudely remind the world of its responsibility to protect the innocent at all times. In 1998, we have an obligation to one another to make sure that a tragedy like this does not occur again. The only way to do this is to make sure that the memory of Katyn lives on. •

PAUL G. UNDERWOOD, COLONEL, U.S. AIR FORCE

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, yesterday, an American hero was honored by his grateful countrymen. Air Force Colonel Paul Underwood, formerly stationed at Seymour Johnson AFB in Goldsboro, North Carolina, was laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery after having been shot down more than 30 years ago during his 22nd combat mission over Vietnam.

He was first listed as "Missing In Action" for 12 years before being officially declared deceased. But, it was only recently that his remains were recovered and brought home for a military funeral with full honors.

Col. Underwood answered the call of duty when our country was most in need, not just once, but three times. He

served in World War II, the Korean Conflict, and finally in Vietnam. He went unquestioningly wherever he was needed.

To the family and friends of Col. Underwood, I extend my deepest sympathy on this solemn occasion. Col. Underwood gave his life in the service of his country. His wife, Gloria, his children and grandchildren, and his dearest friends have all suffered the great loss that has followed Col. Underwood's selfless sacrifice in the defense of the freedom that all of us enjoy.●

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, last week, the Senate overwhelmingly passed S. 1173, the ISTEIA II bill. I supported that bill because, while it does not provide for all of New Jersey's highway and transit needs, it is indeed a better, more balanced bill than the one that was originally presented by the Environment and Public Works Committee early last September. Since September, I have managed to secure an additional \$120 million in highway funds each year for New Jersey, which brings us near to where we need to be. In addition, the Senate gave strong support to the mass transit title of the bill, which continues the federal government's solid commitment to our nation's subways, buses and commuter rail projects. Mass transit was helped by an additional \$5 billion that was provided over the life of the bill. I was pleased to join with Senators D'AMATO, SARBANES, MOYNIHAN and DOMENICI in announcing this agreement, balancing out the funds allocated to both highways and mass transit.

During these past few months, I have worked to ensure that federal transportation funding allocated to New Jersey would be enough to meet our state's tremendous infrastructure needs. The original highway title provided adequate funds to most of the United States, but not to all. It simply was not balanced. In short, the bill did not recognize the special needs of high density, high traffic states. Even with an extra \$20 million in bridge discretionary funds that the Committee agreed to provide to my state of New Jersey, my state's funding levels would have actually been lower in 1998 than in 1997 despite a 20 percent growth in the overall program. This was unacceptable and I was determined to change that bill.

New Jersey is the most densely populated state in the nation, and our roads carry more traffic per lane mile than any state in the country. We are a true corridor state. Ten percent of the nation's total freight passes through New Jersey. These conditions create burdens that have an adverse impact on the state's transportation infrastructure, environment, and economic productivity.

That's why, Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate adopted the

High Density Transportation Program which provides funds to states which share these same problems and had not done well in the apportionment formulas used in the underlying bill.

Mr. President, as we enter the 21st century, with an increasingly global marketplace, one of our most important functions will be to ensure the existence of a seamless transportation system which can carry large volumes of people and goods. But, for now, severe system failures exist in densely populated, urban areas where high volumes of traffic clog the roads and high repair costs impede routine maintenance, not to mention traffic flow enhancement. Roads in these high density States provide invaluable support to the Nation's economy by carrying high value goods and service-providers along essential trade corridors which connect nationally significant ports and economic sectors to the rest of the country. However, the intensity of traffic causes highways in these States to deteriorate rapidly. As a result, crucial portions of the interstate highway system linking all of us are in desperate need of repair. Moreover, costs are extraordinarily high for highway repair and maintenance in these high density States, especially in urban areas. The High Density Transportation Program will address these problems by providing \$360 million a year for grants to States that meet specific population density, heavy traffic, and high urbanization criteria. Under this program, eligible States, like New Jersey, are guaranteed \$36 million a year, but they can qualify for even more. These funds may be used for highway and transit projects.

Mr. President, the High Density program rounds out New Jersey's funding. Under ISTEIA II, New Jersey will receive a hefty increase each year in highway and transit funds over the funding levels in ISTEIA I. More specifically, this means ISTEIA II will provide \$1.05 billion each year for New Jersey's roads, bridges, and mass transit systems. This figure includes an average of \$660 million in highway formula funds and an estimated \$390 million in mass transit formula funds for New Jersey. By comparison, the bill as introduced last September would have only provided New Jersey with an average of \$532 million for highways and \$345 million for transit. I have fought hard to improve New Jersey's funding levels, and apparently my efforts paid off.

The Senate also took a strong stand against drunk driving in this bill. Alcohol is a dominant cause in 41 percent of highway deaths. However, because the Senate adopted my amendment to establish a national drunk driving limit of .08 percent blood alcohol content, I am confident that this grim statistic and the highway death rate in general will improve. Senator DEWINE and I fought hard to get this amendment passed, and it did, by a 62-32 vote. This amendment is estimated to save 500 to

600 lives each year. I also worked with Senator DEWINE and Senator WARNER to develop a provision that the Senate adopted that toughens drunk driving penalties for repeat offenders. And, I was a lead co-sponsor on another important anti-drunk driving measure to outlaw open containers of alcohol in moving vehicles nationwide. Alcohol has no place on our roads and this bill takes a strong stand against drunk driving.

Mr. President, I was also pleased to see the Senate adopt another amendment I developed to make "ports of entry" eligible for the planning and infrastructure funding authorized for this new trade corridor program. To qualify for funding, a port would have to show that there had been a significant increase in the transportation of cargo by rail and motor carrier through that facility since the enactment of NAFTA.

The bill also continues our commitment to technology that will increase efficiency and improve safety within our transportation system, by including a comprehensive Intelligent Transportation Systems program, authorized at \$1.8 billion over six years, that I helped author with the managers of the bill. Intelligent Transportation Systems hold the promise of increasing capacity and promoting safety through innovative technologies. A recently released report estimated that ITS projects and programs generate a benefit/cost ratio of more than 8:1 for the Nation's 75 largest metropolitan areas. Intelligent Transportation Systems provide cost-effective ways to achieve the Nation's transportation goals of mobility, efficiency, national and international productivity, safety and environmental protection. The bill incorporates ITS into mainstream transportation planning and construction process for all modes at the local, state and federal levels. It also integrates ITS technologies in the Nation's infrastructure, resulting in coordinated ITS systems that benefit the safe and efficient movement of both passengers and freight in localities, states, regions and corridors. I am pleased that the Senate adopted a strong, comprehensive program.

Mr. President, the first ISTEIA emphasized the importance of intermodalism in reducing congestion and improving mobility. One way intermodalism will be enhanced in this bill is through an amendment adopted by the Senate which I strongly supported. This amendment will boost the existing \$18 million annual Ferry Program to \$50 million for ferry operations around the country.

Another goal of ISTEIA I was the reduction of air pollution and traffic congestion. Protecting the environment remains an important element of federal surface transportation programs under ISTEIA II as well. Thus this bill increases the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program funding levels