

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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