Mr. President, this

resolution which is about to come before

the Senate will be something we

should have voted on maybe 2 weeks

ago. Unfortunately, we are voting on it

under an extreme timeframe, and I

think that is unfortunate for all of us.

If there are negotiations that have

really gone on, it has been one-sided.

The Serbs have never sat down and

really negotiated in good faith with

anyone. Only because they were asked

to show up at the table, they showed up

for a short time and left immediately.

Now the debate has shifted and is not

about peacekeeping, not about deploying

peacekeepers anymore; it is about

going to war with a foreign government.

NATO, the United Nations, have

never gone to war in a civil war situation.

That is what we are about to do,

and we have been consulted to the

point of being told exactly what the

President intends to do, whether or

not—whether or not—we agree or disagree.

In 1991, President Bush came to the

House and to the Senate and asked for

specific resolutions to go to war to defend

Kuwait against Iraqi invasion. It

was a major vote to go to war in the

House. It was a very narrow vote in the

Senate. I think by five votes they

voted to support President Bush.

I read on the Internet today what

was supposed to be a private briefing

that we all had at lunch by the Secretary

of Defense and by the head of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That private

personal briefing was totally on the

Internet this afternoon.

Let me tell my colleagues what it

said so everybody in the United States

can understand exactly what is going

to happen. There will be two different

types of airstrikes. There will be a preliminary

airstrike—and this is on the

Internet; all you have to do is look it

up—two kinds of airstrikes to force

Belgrade into accepting NATO ground

troops.

The first strike would be a demonstration

strike by air- and sealaunched

cruise missiles to soften up

Milosevic to know that we are really

serious about this. Then there would be

a pause to give the Serbian leadership

a chance to realize that we are serious.

If the Serbs do not comply, there would

be a second wave of strikes that would

be targeted to air defense and missile

installations by the same type of military

hardware. In fact, 55 percent, or a

little less, of all of the airstrikes done

will be 70 percent by U.S. hardware

and, if we use aircraft, 54 percent of it

exactly will be by U.S. aircraft.

This is in the middle of Europe. This

is not at our borders in Mexico or Canada.

The second wave

would be to take down the missile defenses.

Let me give you a little background.

In 1991, we had a briefing in the House

of Representatives by Dick Cheney,

who was Secretary of Defense, and by

Colin Powell, who was the head of the

Joint Chiefs. They both said the same

thing: The worst thing we can do is to

send ground troops into Bosnia and

Kosovo or any of that area, because of

the logistics, because of the terrain, because

of the weather. One of the things

that they also said was that airstrikes

would be very questionable. The reason

they were going to be questionable was

that the sophistication of the missile

defenses and of the air defenses of the

Serbs was much better than many

other places. The terrain is much more

difficult.

What we are doing is wrong. What

the President asked us to do at the 11th

hour is wrong. We should not be going

into an independent nation’s civil war

and imposing our will, no matter what

the situation is.

Now, the Senator from Oklahoma

brought up many other places we could

be intervening that we could save more

lives—many places in Africa. If we expend

the same amount of dollars like

we are going to expend in Kosovo, we

could save many more lives. This attack

is premeditated and the Congress

is an afterthought. They want us to

agree to it after they have already decided

to go.

This is a great institution, the Senate.

I have come to love it in a very

short time. These debates should be before

the fact, not after the administration

has already made up their mind to

bomb. The same is true about sending

ground troops.

I want to ask President Clinton these

questions: What vital American security

interests are at stake? What is the

long-term strategy for the region? Not

only do we bomb one wave and a second

wave, and a third request is to send in

4,000 additional men and women from

the United States in ground troops.

What is the long-term strategy for the

region? How do we get in and how do

we get out? How long will the troops be

deployed? What is their mission?

What is the mission they are supposed

to accomplish?

Will we be forced to deploy more

ground troops if the 4,000 are not sufficient?

Will foreign commanders be commanding

our troops under NATO?

What are the rules of engagement?

How will the mission be paid for?

What valuable dollars will be taken

away from military readiness accounts

to pay for this?

What is our exit strategy?

President Clinton, you have not answered

these questions. You have not

come before the Congress of the United

States and asked for our help. I think

it is essential that you do so before you

send one American into harm’s way

when you have not proven the need to

do it.

I yield the floor.