

only redistributes it—mostly from the poor to the rich, and often the rich are not even local people. A good study would provide the details.

But the signs are obvious. In the subway, and advertisement for the lottery portrays a pastel rainbow with a pot of gold at the end. Right next to it is a public service announcement describing how to apply for food stamps. The striking thing is that the two messages are addressed to the same audience: People who can't even afford to buy their own food without government help are encouraged by the government to throw what little they do have at a mirage.

Lotteries may turn out to be the most regressive form of state gambling. One of the few arguments for them other than the revenue they raise is that they closely mimic the illegal numbers games that have thrived in many communities, therefore drawing money away from organized crime.

Casinos raise additional concerns. Successful ones do provide jobs, and some older cities have looked to casinos as potential saviors. New Bedford is as good an example as any. With textiles and other industries gone and fishing on the wane, people in New Bedford are desperate for help. They voted nearly 3-1 for a casino this month. And they argue that half the cars in the Foxwoods lot are from Massachusetts anyway, so the state is exporting the gambling dollar needlessly.

Yet other casino towns have found not only that crime and vice rise rapidly with gambling but that the net effect on the economy is not salutary. Local restaurants and other retail businesses suffer; the problem of addiction to gambling, including among young people, grows; and in many places population drops. Also, the casino sometimes drives out better options. In Bridgeport, for instance, city officials said last week they would dust off a waterfront development plan—one that might provide stronger economic stimulation in the long run than gambling. The plan had been sidetracked by the casino proposal.

A solid study would give substance to all these questions.

Those selling New Bedford on a casino may be no different from the hucksters touting the pot of gold at the end of the pastel rainbow. What provides the spice, as with all gambling, is the fact that someone, sometime, actually wins the gold. But many cities and states have found the odds are no better for them than for the gamblers whose pockets they empty. •

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1438

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1438, introduced today by Senator DOLE, is at the desk, and I would ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

A bill (S. 1438) to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading, and I would object to my own request on behalf of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1833

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m. on Monday, December 4, the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 249, H.R. 1833, the partial-birth abortions ban, for debate only.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. And for the information of all Senators, debate will begin on the partial-birth abortion ban at 4 p.m. on Monday. However, no votes will occur during Monday's session of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1995

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 3 o'clock p.m. on Monday, December 4; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there be a period of morning business until the hour of 4 o'clock p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the information of all Senators, at 4 p.m. on Monday, the Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 1833 regarding partial-birth abortions. There will be no roll-call votes during Monday's session of the Senate.

Also, as a reminder to all Senators, under a previous consent agreement, at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, the Senate will begin debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1058, the securities litigation bill. Senators can therefore expect rollcall votes during Tuesday's session.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 3 P.M. MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1995

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following my remarks.

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

SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I wish to say briefly that I have just heard the majority leader, Senator

DOLE, and Senator McCain state that they would be introducing a resolution—I am sure a bipartisan resolution—to support the President's efforts to send troops to Bosnia.

Madam President, there are no two people I know in the Senate that I respect more, and certainly no two people in the Senate who have given more in the military service of our country than Senator McCain and Senator DOLE. I respect them, and I know that they are coming to this decision in a way that is very thoughtful and statesmanlike.

I am very sad that this is going to happen because I disagree totally with the conclusions they have reached. I think every Member is going to have to really search his or her conscience to decide what is the responsibility of a Senator or a Member of Congress in this type of action. I know all of us are going to vote our conscience. I do not think anyone will come to their conclusion based on anything except what they think is right.

I am sure debate will be heated, but I think it is very important that we have an alternative to the resolution introduced by the majority leader because many of us feel that this is the wrong decision and that for us to exercise our responsibility as Members of the Senate, we must speak out against deploying troops to Bosnia. So there will be an alternative and I hope we will be able to vote on a clear alternative, and that is a resolution to disapprove this deployment of our troops.

We will go into debate more in the next week, and I do appreciate the fact that we are going to have the opportunity next week, rather than some later time after it is too late to try to have an impact on the President's decision.

I have read the Constitution. It is very clear to me that the Founders of our country were specific in not giving the war powers to the President alone.

In fact, in The Federalist Papers, both Mr. Madison and Mr. Hamilton specifically said this is not a monarchy, therefore, the President alone should not be able to wage war. So the question becomes, what is a war? Are we sending our troops into a hostile situation in which they will be in harm's way? And does that mean that they are in a war?

I believe sending troops into a situation in which we believe there is a good chance for fatalities must be done by the President and Congress together, not by the President alone. I think it is most important, and I think it was part of the balance of powers, that the founders of our country were very careful to put in our Constitution that this kind of decision not be made by one person.

I am very concerned that we are also setting a precedent for our troops to be deployed on the ground in border conflicts, in ethnic conflicts, in civil wars that were never contemplated when we signed on to in the NATO Treaty. Nowhere in the NATO Treaty does it say

that we should be required to go into a country that is not a NATO country, a country which has not been invaded by a hostile force, a country which is, in fact, in a civil war.

So, Madam President, the debate will come. And people will be very emotional about it. I am very emotional about it. I want to take my responsibility as a Member of the U.S. Senate, as a person given that responsibility by the voters of my State with obligations that are constitutional, to try to make sure that not only do our young men and women in the armed services have everything that we can give them when they chose to give their lives to protect our freedom, but that they also have the leadership that has the judgment to know that only when it is a U.S. security interest at stake is it worth the risk of their lives. And, Madam President, I hope we can make the case that that is not the situation in Bosnia.

I want to help the Bosnian people. We have done our part. We have shouldered about 60 or 70 percent of the cost of this effort so far. We have been there for the parties to come together. We have been a catalyst for the peace agreement. And I give the President credit for that. He deserves credit for bringing the people to the peace table and for hammering out this peace agreement.

But I think it is most important that we have many options to help the people of Bosnia. I do not think United States troops on the ground are among the best things that we can do for the Bosnian people, not for NATO, and not for America. It is not in our best interest to send ground troops to Bosnia. The President of the United States has unfortunately allowed our allies and others in the world to somehow argue that the only way we can show our commitment to peace is to have ground troops.

I think there are many other ways we can support this peace agreement. We can continue to provide air support. We can continue to play a strategic role. We are giving money now, and we will continue to give money. We can provide intelligence support for them, which we have been doing, and which we can do. We can arm and train the Moslems without being part of this peacekeeping force. In fact, I think that would be a far better policy. So, many options are there for us to help the Bosnian people. But placing American troops in harm's way is not an option that I think is right, not for America, not for NATO, and not for the people of Bosnia.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak in morning business.

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

BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think what has happened today, in my own view, as tragic as it might be, is refreshing to some of the American people, the people who feel this is a partisan place up here, where there is nothing but partisan politics, that the Republicans stand for something and the Democrats stand for something. But what we witnessed a short while ago should defuse that because we now have the majority leader of the United States Senate supporting the President in his effort in sending American troops into Bosnia on the ground.

I listened briefly to the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, and I concur in her remarks. There certainly are no two people I have higher regard for, in terms of their war record and patriotism, than the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, and the Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, Senator DOLE. However, I think there is an honest difference of opinion here.

I think what the President has been attempting to do seems to be working. But what the President has been doing is staying out of the fray until troops can be deployed long enough and far enough into Bosnia that it puts us in the position of where we are going to have to support the effort because we are supporting the troops. I do not buy that.

I think you can support the troops—and I will always support the American troops, wherever they are, anywhere in the world. But if we have the option right now of stopping the deployment of troops into Bosnia, it is our moral responsibility to do that. And I believe that option is still there.

I said this morning on this floor that there are not going to be any free rides on this one. We are going to have a vote, not a vote on a soft resolution saying, well, we oppose the effort but we support the troops, we are going to have a vote on whether or not we send our troops into Bosnia.

The environment in Bosnia is not one the likes of which we have seen in any of the wars that we have been involved in because we have always been able to identify the enemy. You cannot identify the enemy. Sure, we have chosen sides. We have been supplying the Croats and the Bosnian Moslems against the Serbs now for quite some time. I think perhaps that was not the right thing to do, but nonetheless we have taken sides. We have taken sides through our air attacks.

Now it looks as if we are going to deploy troops over there to take sides. But who are the good guys and who are the bad guys? In this case we do not know. You might say, well, this year—any snapshot in history would give you a different answer to that question. There was a time when clearly the Croats would have been the bad guys and a time when clearly the Serbs would have been the bad guys. But here we have more than just three major factions. We have many, many ele-

ments. We have rogue elements. And some of these elements are Serb elements, some are Moslem elements, such as the Black Swans. That is a rogue element. Nonetheless, they are there.

We are sending troops into an environment where only in this morning's newspaper we see a quote from the guy who is working directly for the general with whom I have spoken in the very sector where we are proposing to send our troops, General Haukland from Norway, where they say that there are literally millions of mines all throughout that area—millions. Not 10, not 100, not 1,000—millions of mines of all sizes, all shapes. And we do not know where they are. They are now in a position where, even though they have been going centimeter by centimeter trying to defuse these mines, we are now in a position where the winter is setting in, the ground is frozen, the snows are coming, and there is not any way in the world that we are going to be able to protect our troops that are going over there from stepping on these mines.

Remember, just a short while ago we were faced with a similar situation down in Nicaragua. And what were most of the losses? They were from mines. And the amputees were the result of what was happening.

Now, that is what we are faced with again. Only in today's newspaper, this is happening right now. We have already sent troops over there. I know that the President is hiding out in Europe. He is going to stay there until we have more troops. Then he will come back and say, "Now you have to go with me because we have to protect our troops that are over there."

Madam President, our troops are not there yet. We only have a few there. But a lot are on their way. I went to the training area in Germany of the 1st Armored Division. I know they are training them to go. They are going to go up through Hungary and then come down south through the Posavina corridor and into the Tuzla area.

When you look at that area, there has never been an area anywhere in the world that is so conducive to guerrilla warfare. There has never been an area in the world that has more guerrillas in it that are not identifiable. We have identified nine rogue elements that are there that are not even related in any way to anyone who was around the table in Dayton, OH.

So, Madam President, I just wanted to be sure that it is crystal clear that I do not stand alone. There are many others who feel just as strongly as I do that we are going to do everything we can to stop this mass deployment of troops into Bosnia. It was a bad idea 2½ years ago when the President first started talking about it, when he took sides and started airdrops. It was a bad idea 1½ years ago when the President decided he was going to have airstrikes. And it is a bad idea today. And I will continue to do anything within