this opportunity to make this introduction, in the days to come I will detail for you and for my colleagues and the American public how there is no balanced budget, how we are raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the deficit that will actually exist in 2002.

IS BOSNIA WORTH DYING FOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, President Kennedy said:

> We must face the fact that the U.S. is neither omnipotent nor omniscient—that we are only 6% of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94%—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

President Kennedy was right then, and his words are good advice today.

We should follow this advice in regard to the situation in Bosnia.

Last week, the cover of Time magazine showed an American soldier and asked the question: ''Is Bosnia worth dying for?''

I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people would answer with an emphatic ''no.''

It should be for Bosnians because that is their homeland, but not for young Americans.

This is a limited ethnic conflict that has been going on for hundreds of years, and will continue unless we pour many billions in to stop it. And as soon as we stop pouring in billions, the situation will go right back like it was.

We should not send young American soldiers onto foreign battlefields unless there is a serious threat to our national security or unless there is a very real and very vital U.S. interest at stake.

Neither of these is present in Bosnia. Yet now, the President, regardless of how the American people feel, regardless of how the Congress votes, is going to send 20,000 troops into Bosnia.

We will then have another 20,000 in immediate nearby support in Croatia, the Adriatic Sea, and other places.

I had one veteran who called me last night who said that he was always told in Vietnam that it took seven troops in the rear to support one in the field.

We are making a tremendous commitment here. The worst thing is putting so many American lives at risk.

Then there is the huge money involved. We are told right off the bat that this effort will cost a minimum of $1.6 billion for the troops in the field.

We have promised another $600 million in direct foreign aid. That is an initial $2.2 billion and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

I now am told that the Bosnian leadership says they will need $35 billion in loans or aid from the World Bank or other sources to rebuild their country.

Most of this will end up coming from the United States.

B.J. Cutler, the foreign affairs columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, wrote several months ago:

> If guarding people from the savagery of their rulers is America's duty, it would be fighting all over the world, squandering lives and bankrupting itself.

He was not writing about Bosnia, but his words are certainly applicable here.

There are at least 15 or 16 small wars going on around the world at any time. Some people say many more than that.

Why then are we trying to solve this insolvable problem.

Well, I think in part it is because our national media focused on this one.

But, I think the larger reason is that some people in high positions in this country are never satisfied with just running the United States.

They want to make a place for themselves in history. They want to be described as, or thought of as, world leaders.

That is why I believe there is such a class division on this.

Many upper-crust liberal elitist types—many NPR devotees, are all for this—because they want to prove to everyone that they care about foreign policy and are concerned about world affairs.

Horror of horrors, they certainly don't want to be associated with low-class, unintellectual isolationists. That would not be fashionable, that would not be politically correct.

But, Mr. Speaker, even one American life is too many and all these billions it will cost is to high a price to pay just so a few people in our Government can display world leadership and show their superiority to their unenlightened fellow citizens.

We should not get involved in this Bosnian quagmire.

The potential dangers and costs are simply too high.

The United States leads the world in humanitarian and charitable aid for those in other countries.

No other nation is even a close second.

Most Americans want to help out in international tragedies. We are already doing far more than our share. France, Germany, Sweden, Japan, and others are not even coming close.

We have no reason to feel guilty.

And, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I said at the beginning. We do not need to get involved militarily in Bosnia or anywhere else unless there is a real threat to our national security or a vital U.S. interest at stake.

Neither of these is present in Bosnia.

□ 2015

THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF SENDING IN AMERICAN TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHRYSLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are about to be subjected to a situation where 20,000 American troops will be sent into very difficult territory in the area that we know as Bosnia-Herzegovina. Let us take a look at the circumstances under which they will have to do that. I am holding the Proximity Peace Talks, which is an outline of the circumstances giving rise to the exact language of the peace talks. Listen to the country created by these peace talks.

''The country will be known as the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but the country will be split in two because it will also have two entities comprised of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Serb Republic. The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina will control 51 percent of the country.''

I ask you, is that type of a situation tenable? Let me also throw something out here. There will not be one President on the new Constitution, there will not be two Presidents, it will be a troika, three Presidents, if that is correct. There will be three Presidents to run this country we know as the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. That will be one Moslem, one Croat, and one Serb.

Do you really think that a troika comprised of these three who have been fighting essentially for the past 1,500 years can get along? But, Mr. Speaker, more important is the fact that American troops will be sent to Bosnia-Herzegovina for the purpose of killing, if necessary, to protect the peace. That is correct. The language in this report says that the troops should use ''necessary force to ensure compliance.''

What does that mean? That means they can use the gig guns to clear out the 2½-mile-wide demilitarized zone, but it means something else. American troops actually under the NATO command will try to do one of two things. They will try to keep the big guns away from the Serbs, and if that does not work, then they will try to arm the Bosnians to try to bring about military parity.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make sense. This is a peace agreement? A peace agreement means people shake hands, repent, reconcile, and say, ''Let's go on with our lives, and put the war behind us.'' But what has happened here is the fact our President is going to put American troops in the position of fighting the war that the Bosnians have not been allowed to fight themselves. That is right. The United Nations, with the approval of the President, has steadfastly refused to allow the Bosnians to have the weapons with which to defend themselves. That has cased the tremendous amount of carnage in that country.

Now we have this great peace plan, the peace plan where Americans will be authorized to kill in order to enforce the peace. True peace in that area can only be brought about if the Americans

leave the area, if NATO leaves the area, and we allow the Bosnians to arm themselves. I ask this question: Is it right for American blood to be spilled in Bosnia when the American President has not allowed the Bosnians to fight their own war?

CONCERNS REGARDING AMERICA SENDING PEACEKEEPING TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know Members on both sides of the aisle are anguishing on whether we send troops or not to Bosnia. Let me give a few of this Member's concerns. First of all, I have had not one constituent walk up to me and say, ''Duke, send our troops.'' Quite on the contrary, it has been overwhelmingly ''Duke, try to stop it if you can.''

Second, General Boyd and General MacKenzie, both in charge in that portion of the world in Bosnia-Herzegovina have stated: ''Stay out. It will be a disaster.'' These are the two generals that headed up our forces in that particular part of the world.

I look at the cost. NATO has said that it is not $2.2, but by the end it will cost us $3 billion to $6 billion. The President just signed a balanced budget in 7 years agreement. Where is the money going to come from? Even if you have a supplemental, you have to offset it. You have to pay for it. We cannot do that.

NATO is broke today, billions of dollars. France said just 2 weeks ago that we can plan on a 20-year commitment with NATO in that portion of the world. Who is going to end up paying for that, Mr. Speaker? We are. The President said that the primary source of nation building will come from Europe. It also leaves a lot of room for the United States. We are looking at billions of dollars when we are talking about a time when balancing a budget, providing for Medicare, and a lot of other things that the other side is arguing against it.

I also look at the $4,000, much of it deemed. These are not the Bosnian Muslims, but primarily those from Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Albania, that are the radicals. If they are allowed to stay in that portion of the world, these are the ones that have sworn a worldwide Jihad against Jews, Christians, and all nonbelievers. They will attack our troops, and they have got to go. We have got to demand equal treatment.

That has not happened in the past. Have Serbs and Croatians and Muslims committed atrocious acts? Absolutely, all three groups. But we need not to train one side. Can you imagine during this peace agreement, we go in and train any side or give arms to any side? If I was on any one of the other two, I would say that is an act of war. I think that is the plan.

Who would come in with arms? France, Iran, Iraq, Russia, and yes, Mr. Speaker, even the United States, to sell arms. I think that would be disastrous.

I have another concern. President Clinton is going to be in a campaign mode over the next year. During Desert Storm, President Bush was focused. Colin Powell was focused. Dick Cheney was focused on Desert Storm, not on political activities coming up. I feel that if you look at Secretary Perry, I think he is a fairly good Secretary of Defense, but with all due respect, he is not a tactician. He is a politician and a bean counter. He is not a Dick Cheney.

I look at the problems of what we could end up with, as we did in Vietnam with Johnson and McNamara, that we are ill-suited for the job of the defense of our kids. We could get bogged down in Bosnia. I also look at what could happen to Saddam Hussein, in North Korea, and other areas, and the terrorist activities that could pick up.

We are $200 billion below the bottom-up review in defense dollars. That is the bare-bone minimum to fight two conflicts. The GAO has said we are $200 billion. the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs said is our military ready; yes, we are, but it is a paper-thin readiness that will not last more than a few weeks. If we get bogged down there, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we will be in big trouble.

I look at replies that we had from Turkey that said they would come in with 20,000 troops around Sarajevo, Russia would send in 20,000 troops to align themselves between the Croats and the Serbs, without a single U.S. soldier involved. Why has the President not taken them up on this, without committing our troops? We must not arm or disarm any party, we must not train or arm any party, we must not get involved in civil disobedience protests, we must treat all even-handedly.

We must demand that all Mideast radical 4,000 Mujahidin be eliminated, all foreign regular troops be eliminated. I would like to submit for the RECORD this article from the Associated Press on the death of an American citizen at the hands of the radical Muslims.

The material referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN SLAIN IN NORTHERN BOSNIA

SARAJEVO, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA.—An American man working for the United Nations has been murdered in Bosnia, and a U.N. official yesterday said Middle Eastern fighters backing the Bosnian government are suspected.

The body of the American citizen, whose identity was not immediately released, was found by Bosnian police Sunday evening near the town of Banovici, 10 miles northwest of Tuzla.

Tuzla is the biggest Bosnian government-held city in northeastern Bosnia, and would be the headquarters for U.S. soldiers taking part in a NATO peace mission in Bosnia.

A U.N. official said the body was found just 500 yards from where Norwegian peacekeepers were stopped last month by mujahedeen, fighters from Middle Eastern countries helping the Muslim-led Bosnian government. The official said investigators suspect the mujahedeen were responsible for the American's death.

These fundamentalist cutthroats must be out by the time our troops are in place.

CONCERN ABOUT DEPLOYING GROUND TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I too am deeply concerned about the President's announced commitment to deploy 20,000 United States ground troops in Bosnia. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that document has articulated a compelling national interest in Bosnia worth the loss of American soldiers. We have no overriding national interest in Bosnia, and there is absolutely no reason American troops should be placed in harm's way as part of an ill-defined mission there.

Mr. Speaker, calling this mission a peacekeeping mission is a misnomer. This is a tenuous peace at best, and a potential quagmire for our troops at worst.

This is clearly not a legitimate peacekeeping mission, or 240,000 troops would not be required. Yes, I say 240,500, as the spokesperson at the Pentagon was quoted in Defense News today, counting the support troops. We hear the number 60,000, including 20,000 American servicemen and women, but the total number of troops, according to this statement today, is 240,000 troops.

Mr. Speaker, this mission goes way beyond peacekeeping to nation building. History should have taught us that we cannot build a nation from the outside.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, how much longer can the United States be denying a one-one number for the rest of the world? This is a European conflict, and using United States troops as a global peace force is neither a defensible function nor a practicing pragmatic reality for our military. Using our troops as a global police force in my judgment, and I say this respectfully, but I believe that it reflects a basic misunderstanding of our military's historic mission and capabilities.

☐ 2030

Mr. Speaker, this situation is fraught with danger. Our troops will be sitting ducks, literally, physically, sitting ducks, positioned between the two warring factions.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize what is going on, what the political realities are in this part of the world. This is a war that has been going on for ethnic strife for 4,000 years. The present fighting has been going on for 40 years and longer.