

those economic indicators, which will not help the President—for that matter, will not help the Congress, and certainly will not help the country.

We are bound and determined to have just such a balanced budget. The President has now, by his signature on a bill, agreed to just such a balanced budget. It is time—it is well past time—that the President, who so eloquently disagrees with ours, produces his own so that we can work constructively toward a solution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Linda Reidt Critchfield, a fellow in Senator LIEBERMAN's office, be granted privileges of the floor for the duration of the debate.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, previously this afternoon I submitted amendment numbered 3072 on behalf of myself, Senator KEMPTHORNE, Senator BAUCUS, Senator REID and Senator DOMENICI, and that amendment was adopted. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN be added as a cosponsor to that amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

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

PEACE AGREEMENT IN BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday when I was on the floor I made some comments which I do not think were very clearly understood because I was assuming some people were aware of some of the problems that have existed since the initialing of the peace agreement in Bosnia.

It has been very disturbing to me, after having been over there, to feel that most people are laboring under the misconception that there is in fact a peace. The President himself in his message to the Nation said, "Now the war is over." I just wish the President would go over there and see that the war is not over.

But since that time, there have been some articles which I would like to read, and then submit into the RECORD. One is from the Los Angeles Times of November 25, just a few days ago.

"On Friday, November 24, approximately 200 Bosnian Government troops looted a U.N. base in the Bihac"—that is right over here, Mr. President, on the Croatian border—"manned by a Bangladeshi battalion. They fired machine guns over the heads of the peacekeepers and carried off food, fuel, and equipment including nine armored vehicles. The 80 peacekeepers returned fire"—keep in mind that while all of this is happening they are firing and returning fire—"but were forced to retreat. The Bosnians were taking advantage of the imminent withdrawal of U.N. forces to make way for NATO troops"—which gives you an indication as to what would happen even if we were able to stop this obsession that the President of the United States has in sending troops into Bosnia and were able to try to get them withdrawn.

Also, a Reuters publication on the same day, on Friday, the 24th, says, "Also on Friday the 24th, U.N. officials reported that Croat forces burned and looted houses"—these are Croat forces—"in areas located in central and northwest Bosnia. Houses were burned and looted in the city of Gornji Vakuf"—which is this area right in here—"in central Bosnia and also in the cities of Mrkonjic Grad, and Sipovo"—which is this area right in here.

If you look, the major part of the activity is taking place in this section right of Bosnia. This is the section in which the United States would have forces.

I have often wondered, and have not been able to get an answer from anyone, as to who drew these lots for us; why we have the French over here and the British over here, but we would be right here—virtually everything north of Sarajevo up to and including Tuzla, and a corridor that would go through here, which is one of the most contentious areas.

This comes from the New York Times article of the 27th: "On Sunday, November 26, angry groups of men stoned and flipped over U.N. vehicles passing through Serbian sections of Sarajevo."

Sarajevo is an area that is divided up between Croats, Serbs, and Moslem forces, each with their own checkpoints.

Also according to the New York Times: "As of November 26, a total of 210 peacekeepers have been killed in the 4 years of conflict in the former Yugoslavia."

Mr. President, these are identified as peacekeepers. If you will remember, one of the major concerns that we have is that the President is putting our forces into a situation that is ideal for what we call "mission creep." That is, you go in with one idea. Say you are going to go in, as we are going in, to keep the peace. Obviously, there is no peace to keep. But still they call them "peacekeepers."

When the President made his speech he was very careful to use the word "implementation."

So it has already crept from peacekeeping to peace "implementation."

The Times article goes on: "In Bosnia itself, 107 have been killed, most by the former Serbs but some by the Muslims. Serbs have repeatedly used peacekeepers as hostages to secure their aims."

Further, in the same article: "In the past NATO has been able to respond to attacks on peacekeepers with air strikes on Serbian artillery and other positions. Now this is less of an option because the multinational troops will be mingled with the civilian population especially in places like Sarajevo, where about 10,000 troops are to be deployed."

"The NATO operation is billed as one where superior Western firepower will obliterate any obstacles. But the NATO led force will not be threatened mainly by organized resistance, but by angry women and children, lone snipers and renegade bands of armed men determined to thwart a plan that would drive them from their homes and negate all they have fought to achieve."

We are talking about people who have fought each other for nearly 4 years. And I stood on the streets of Sarajevo and saw those areas where they have pounded the residential areas and have obliterated them. Many of the people who are there now are not the people who lived in Sarajevo before. They were not there back during the Winter Olympics that we remember so fondly in such a beautiful thriving city as Sarajevo then was. They are people who came in there as refugees. Once the people were driven from their homes, they were no longer livable for individuals who had those homes, and now refugees have come in.

So we are dealing now with two groups of people that are going to be problems—assuming that we are successful in going in there to achieve some type of peace.

Col. Thierry Cambournac of NATO, deputy sector commander of Sarajevo, said he feared that the soldiers could get drawn into conflicts in urban areas

they will patrol. A quote from the colonel: "Our biggest concern is the population in these areas will revolt."

Their concern is not whether one of the organized factions, whether it is Croats or Serbs or the Moslems, are going to be a problem. It is instead the people who have been driven from their homes. In fact, the mayor of this suburb said, and this is a direct quote, "We will still fight, and if the multinational force tries to drive us from our homes, or take away our right to defend ourselves, there will be no authority on Earth"—no authority on Earth—"including the Serbian authorities, that can stop us. We will not leave, we will not withdraw, and we will not live under Muslim rule."

Now, we get back to the two groups of people, the groups of people that have fought for homes. And what does that mean when they have a peace? They assume they can continue to live in their homes. But, no, that is not the way this works because if they happen to be a Serbian family in a home that is now designated by this group that met in Ohio as a Croatian area, then they will be driven from their homes.

I used to be the mayor of a major city in America, Tulsa, OK. You do not make statements like this unless you mean it. He says we will not leave. So we now have a new faction, rogue faction if you will, that will develop from people who are living in homes, fought for homes they feel are theirs now, and now we come along and say, "You have to move."

What is the other group? We hear about 2 million refugees that are scattered all throughout this region. I think it is closer to 3 million. When I was over there, they were identifying close to 3 million refugees, but let us be conservative and say 2 million refugees. These are people who have been driven from their homes—a second group of people. These people were driven from their homes. When they hear there is a peace accord, what does that mean to a refugee? It means he can go home.

So what happens to those people? Are they Serbs? Are they Bosnian Serbs? Are they Moslems? Are they Croats? We do not know. And it does not really matter what they are because they are going to become rogue elements. Our intelligence community has already identified nine rogue elements. We have the Iranians; the mujaheddin; we know they are in there right now; we have the Black Swans which are mostly Moslems; we have the Arkan Tigers; we have special forces.

So, Mr. President, we are not dealing with three people sitting around a table in Dayton, OH, agreeing about what they are going to do. I seriously doubt that the star of that show, the one who was supposed to be the most difficult to swing into a peace posture, Milosevic, is really speaking on behalf of those Serbs in Bosnia because those people are considered Bosnian Serbs, and they consider themselves to be independent.

When I was in Sarajevo, there is a little town located right here called Pale. This is the town where they supposedly had the Christian Science Monitor journalist who had been held hostage for a period of time, and we were getting ready to go over there to help bring him back when we found out in fact he was not there. But one thing we did learn is that when you close those checkpoints, you are in another world, and those people do not have their allegiance to Milosevic. They do not have their allegiance to Tudjman or in many cases even Karadzic because they are people who are now holding themselves out to be independent.

So I would just repeat to the President, who in his speech said the words "the war isn't over," I have yet to find—there are only two Members of Congress, to my knowledge, who have been up into this northeast sector, the sector where the President is proposing to send—and as we are speaking today is sending—American troops on the ground. They are Senator Hank BROWN from Colorado and myself.

Yesterday, we had a chance to address the Senate about what has really happened up there. It is not very pretty. In fact, we went via British helicopter, at very low attitude, never getting over 1000 feet, in a blizzard, all the way from Sarajevo up to the Tuzla area, going back and forth, and really being able to look very carefully at all of this land.

Everything between Sarajevo and Tuzla is not like the Rocky Mountains, not like we think of mountainous regions. It is straight up and down. There is no way you could have even any kind of a light armored vehicle penetrate and travel through those roads, leave alone 120 M1 tanks they are talking about bringing from Hungary, down across the Posavina corridor and into the Tuzla area. Once they go into the Tuzla area, the terrain will not allow them to go any further.

We have seen articles, many of which I have here, published recently about the mines, about the roads. They talk about the roads coming down from Hungary into the Tuzla area where 120 M1 tanks—there is only one bridge in the entire area that is going to be able to hold up an M1 tank. Up in Tuzla, General Haukland, a Norwegian general who was in charge up there, said that another element that you are going to have hostile are the very people we are supposedly trying to protect and trying to achieve peace for. Those are the individuals who will be mad because we have torn the roads up, the same roads they need for commerce and freedom of movement.

I have never seen a proposed mission as doomed for failure as this one. We do not know who the enemy is. We are dealing with the mentality of people who fire on their own troops, murder their own people so they can blame somebody else. I do not know why anyone would not come to the conclusion that, if you are going to fire on your

own troops so you can blame some other faction, you would certainly fire on American troops trying to remove you from your home.

It is my understanding—from the sketchy information we get from the agreement that has been initialed—that there are two conditions under which we will withdraw our troops. One is at the end of 12 months.

Now, since I have not heard anything to the contrary since the Senate Armed Services Committee met, when we had Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all said that in 12 months we will be out of there. And I asked the question, you mean we are going to be out of there regardless? If we are in the middle of a huge war, if we have entrenched ourselves within the civil war that has been going on for 500 years, we are about to win it, and that 12 months is over, we withdraw? Absolutely, they said, we are going to withdraw in 12 months, and it is over.

I do not think there is anyone who has studied military history who can point to a time when we have had a time deadline as to when a withdrawal will take place. It is supposed to be event-oriented: After this happens and this happens and we are successful, then we will withdraw. That is not what we are saying. We are saying we will withdraw in 12 months.

The other condition is withdrawal in the event of "systemic violations."

Mr. President, I have asked for many times a definition of "systemic violation." What is a systemic violation? The administration speaks in vague terms about this. They say if you take the Croats or take the Serbs or take the Moslems as the three major factions, and if it is obvious that one faction is going to break the peace accord that we assume is going to be signed and is going to be acknowledged, then that would constitute a systemic violation.

Well, we already know that there are nine or perhaps more rogue elements out there. How is our soldier, who has been trained over in Germany to fight in this type of terrain, how is this soldier who is fired upon going to know whether that firepower is coming from the Croats, the Serbs, the Moslems or is coming from some irate families who do not want to leave their homes or from some refugees who want to go home or the Black Swans or the Arkan Tigers or the mujaheddin?

This is the problem we have here. Nobody can answer these questions. And yet systemic violation means we pick up our toys and go home. And what is going to happen on the road home? The same thing that you are seeing over here as we are making a transformation from a U.N. peacekeeping operation to a NATO operation that has not been well-defined. They are firing on so-called "peacekeeping" troops. And we are not really sure who will be firing on our troops. Now, if it

could happen now during a cease-fire, it certainly can happen later. I have been disturbed for 2 years about this because 2 years ago—and I do not think it served any useful purpose—when I was serving in the other body, serving on the House Armed Services Committee, one of the top individuals came in and said that one of the first things that President Clinton said when he came into office was that he wanted to do airdrops into Bosnia. And I asked the question, in this closed meeting at that time—it is all right to talk about it now—I said, “Well, let me ask you a question. They have been fighting over there with all these rogue elements, with all these factions. How do you know, if we are dropping our stuff in there, if it will be in the hands of the good guys instead of the bad guys?” The answer of this official was, “Well, we don’t know.” Then he hesitated and looked over and said, “You know, I’m not sure we know who the good guys and the bad guys are.”

We have clearly taken sides. We are now saying that we are in a peace implementation posture where we are supposed to be neutral. We are going in with a NATO force that is declared to be neutral, yet we have taken sides clearly against the Serbs. That is where our air attacks have gone. I think it would be very difficult for us to go in and say we are truly neutral in this case.

I guess the reason that I am going to continue talking about this for as long as we are in session is that each hour that goes by, Mr. President, we become more in peril. More of our American lives are endangered because, as we are speaking today, they are taking the troops—the troops that have been trained and the advanced troops who are going in for logistics purposes—and they have already been deployed from Germany up to Hungary, down south toward the Tuzla area that has been assigned to us, having to go through such hostile areas as this part of Croatia, this part of Serbia and, of course, the Posavina corridor which we already talked about.

That means that if it is an hour after this or a day after this, there are going to be several more—how many are there right now? I am embarrassed to tell you, Mr. President, I do not know. I am a Member of the U.S. Senate. I am a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and yet I do not know. And it is a highly guarded secret.

We read different articles in the newspapers about how many are over there. We hear calls from people at home that say that they have heard from their son or daughter who is being deployed or was deployed 2 or 3 days ago. And there is no way of knowing.

But we do know this: That the clear strategy of the President of the United States is to get as many American troops over there as possible before there is any vote that takes place in

this Senate so that he will put us in a position of voting against our troops that are on the ground, which he knows we do not want to do. And so he is holding us hostage in Congress.

One thing we have not talked about is the cost of all of this. Talk about being held hostage. We have gone through these humanitarian gestures in Sarajevo and Haiti and all the rest of the things that are part of President Clinton’s foreign policy. And while we do not authorize them, they come around later and say now we have to have an emergency supplemental appropriation. We passed one out of this body a few weeks ago for \$1.4 billion. And that was for the things that were taking place in Haiti and Somalia. And those were exercises that we opposed in a bipartisan way in both the House and the Senate.

So I anticipate that if the President is successful, as it appears he is going to be—it may be a *fait accompli*. Maybe it has already happened. Maybe we cannot stop it. So our troops are going to be sent out over there, not 20,000, not 25,000; we know it will be closer to 40,000 or 50,000, at least. Then we will be faced one of these days with a supplemental appropriation request for not \$1.5 billion but for, according to the Heritage Foundation and some other groups, somewhere between \$3 billion and \$6 billion.

It means if we do not then appropriate that in an emergency supplemental appropriation, it is going to come out of the military budget. And we are already operating our military on a budget that is of the level of 1980, when we could not afford spare parts.

So, Mr. President, I want to impress upon this body that the war is not over over there, that they are killing people today as we speak, that all this hostility is taking place in these areas, along with all we know about in the sector referred to as the northeast U.N. sector where we will have our troops.

I have been up there. I do not think there is one person so far who has been north of Sarajevo and up through Tuzla who says that we should send young American lives into that area. I have never personally seen any more hostile area in my life. I have never seen anything that looks like that.

There is no way we can use the armored vehicles. And it is very easy to understand now, in studying our history of World War II, how the former Yugoslavia was able to, at a ratio of 1 to 8, hold off the very finest that Hitler had because of this very unique area of cliffs and caves, this hostile environment, where the President of the United States is sending our young soldiers.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3073

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment for immediate consideration on behalf of Senators THOMAS and SIMPSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], for Mr. THOMAS, for himself, and Mr. SIMPSON, proposes an amendment numbered 3073.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 7, line 23 after “(the State).”, add the following: “*Provided further*, in nonprimacy States, the Governor shall determine which State agency will have the authority to establish assistance priorities for financial assistance provided with amounts deposited into the State loan fund.”

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, this amendment simply clarifies that for a State that does not have primacy to manage its drinking water program, the Governor, rather than a State agency, will have authority to establish priorities for the use of the State revolving loan fund. This is applicable to Wyoming, which does not have primacy.

This amendment has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, and I ask for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

So the amendment (No. 3073) was agreed to.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3074

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of Senator BOND and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], for Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 3074.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows: