being the architect of democracy in Mongolia.

Senator HATFIELD and I, and a number of other United States Senators, had the great pleasure and honor of going to Mongolia in August of this year, and frankly we were overwhelmed not only with the friendship extended to us but with the importance of this country, its strategic location in Asia and its friendship toward America.

So we welcome the President of Mongolia and the First Lady, and look forward to many years of friendship with the President and his great country.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask consent that morning business be extended for another 20 minutes and I be recognized for that period.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

TREATMENT OF THE DEFICIT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I want to touch on an article in the morning news relative to how we have historically dealt with the problem of budget deficits. But first, let me touch on the point raised by my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire relative to the Congressional Budget Office's scoring of the Republican budget as balanced. I hope everyone within the sound of my ears and the view of this particular C–SPAN coverage will look at the RECORD. Yes, on the day before yesterday, on October 18—and you will find it in your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 15263—a letter was included in the RECORD from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office doing exactly as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire claimed. CBO said that not only was the GOP budget in balance but that by the year 2002, there would be a $10 billion surplus.

That was day before yesterday. On yesterday, October 19, if you please, Mr. President, another letter was sent from CBO to Senators CONRAD and DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent at this particular point that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to Section 205(a) of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 (H. Con. Res. 67), the Congressional Budget Office yesterday provided the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee with a projection of the budget deficits or surpluses that would result from enactment of the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee. As specified in section 205(a), CBO provided projections (using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution and assuming the level of discretionary spending specified in that resolution) of the deficit or surplus of the total budget—that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the federal government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts that are designated as off-budget transactions. As stated in the letter to Chairman Domenici, CBO projected that there will be a total-budget surplus of $10 billion in 2002. Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of $108 billion in 2002 from the calculation, CBO would project an on-budget deficit of $98 billion in 2002.

If you wish further details on this projection, we will be pleased to provide them. The staff contact is Jim Horney, who can be reached at 226–2880.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair. Let me just highlight the pertinent part:

As specified in section 205(a), CBO provided projections on spending specified in that resolution of the deficit or surplus of the total budget, that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts that are designated as off-budget transactions.

As stated in the letter to Chairman Domenici, CBO projected that there will be a total budget surplus of $10 billion in 2002. Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of $108 billion in 2002 from the calculation, CBO would project an on-budget deficit of $98 billion.

So, unlike 2 days ago, when the CBO scored the GOP budget as having a $10 billion surplus in the seventh year, yesterday CBO scored it as leaving us with a $98 billion deficit. It piqued my interest because the CBO used the expression in the letter to Senator CONRAD ''including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts.''

What bothers me about that clause is that, this Senator, along with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the former Senator John Heinz, cosponsored an amendment that passed the Congress and was enacted by the President—namely, section 13301 of the Congressional Budget Act, which orders that Social Security funds shall not be used in citing in deficits or surpluses of the Government. That particular section puts Social Security off budget and in trust.

But today we learn that a mistake was made over at CBO. In considering the size of the Social Security surplus in the year 2002, they did not catch the fact that the Finance Committee had banked on a small change in the CPI, otherwise known as the Consumer Price Index. In turn, a reduction in the CPI reduces the amount of cost-of-living adjustments paid to Social Security recipients.

Under the law, this change in Social Security payments does not divert money to lower the deficit or to fund the general budget. Instead, if you save money in Social Security, the money merely adds to the surpluses in the Social Security trust fund.

Right now, Mr. President, we have a surplus of $481 billion in Social Security. We have a surplus in Medicare of $147 billion. And instead of recognizing that fact, we run around knocking over desks to get on TV and carry on about things that will happen 7 years from now for Medicare, 30 years from now with Social Security. What we don't do is to pay attention to the crisis that is happening right this minute.

And that brings me to the morning editorial by our friend, Mr. J. W. Anderson of the editorial staff of the Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in its entirety, entitled ''This Is Leadership?'' be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1995]

THIS IS LEADERSHIP?—SINCE 1973, THE DEFICIT HAS BEEN CENTRAL TO AMERICAN POLITICS

(By J.W. Anderson)

President Clinton's repudiation of his 1993 tax increase, followed by his ungainly scramble to repudiate the repudiation, has inflicted a severe injury on himself and his party. It becomes increasingly difficult to know exactly what he stands for.

His first budget with its tax increase and its attack on the deficit is arguably the bravest, and certainly the most useful, of his accomplishments as president. Now, alas, he's running after the Republicans' tax-cut bandwagon and throwing the best of his own record into doubt. But it's not unprecedented. President Bush, running for reelection in 1992, repudiated the tax increase that he had accepted in the very constructive budget compromise of 1990.

This country seems to be going through a series of presidencies eroded and diminished by the savage politics of intractable budget quarrels. How long will it continue? It's hard to say. The process has been going on for more than 20 years, and progress has been slow.

The origins of today's budget fights lie in the pivotal year 1973—the year that the great postwar boom ended.

For a quarter of a century, from the late 1940s into the early 1970s, standards of living improved faster than ever before in history. It happened throughout the world, but most spectacularly in the developed industrial democracies. As the long boom continued, governments began to think that they had at last solved the mysteries of economic growth and that they now knew how to keep their economies expanding steadily and rapidly.

The only question was the pleasant one of how best to spend the flood of wealth, private and public, that this boom was generating. Most of the democracies decided to put much of the new revenues into new and expanded social benefits—mainly pensions for the elderly and health care. In those years here in the United States, Medicare and Medicaid were enacted, and Social Security was greatly increased. In Western Europe, where the war years had created a hunger for security beyond anything in the American tradition, this expansion of benefits went much farther.

Then, in 1973, the boom suddenly ended. Economic historians still aren't quite sure

why it happened. The oil crisis had something to do with it and perhaps the American decision to take the dollar off the gold standard. But whatever the reasons, throughout the rich democracies—here in North America, in Western Europe and in Japan alike—the economic growth rates dropped to half the level of the previous 25 years.

The consequences have been huge. One of them was that high growth no longer produced the immense increases in tax revenues on which all those governments had been counting to finance the new social entitlements. But, having put those pensions and health insurance laws in place, they couldn't retreat from them. The result was the era—which still continues—of big budget deficits.

The United States is struggling with a deficit that now, counting all levels of government including states and municipalities, comes to about 2.2 percent of gross domestic product. All of the other big industrial democracies have bigger deficits—some of them much, much bigger.

The budget deficit has become central to American politics. It's the same in Europe, and more so because all of the European Union countries have agreed to get their deficits down as a condition of joining the common currency at the end of the decade. Most of them clearly won't make it, and they fear being shut out of continental prosperity. Just as deficit politics is weakening the American president, it's having the same effect in Europe. The most notable example at the moment is France's new president, Jacques Chirac, who is caught between economic reality and a series of unwise campaign promises.

The strongest political leader in Europe is Helmut Kohl, Germany's chancellor, who has responded forcefully to deficit dangers by slamming a heavy surtax on top of a tax burden that was already high. It's to pay the costs of modernizing formerly communist eastern Germany. Other presidents and prime ministers don't have the advantage of a widely accepted public need like that one.

Here in the United States, the past 22 years' record suggests that the country will coast along, weakened and distracted by its budget troubles until they produce a real financial crisis. Americans, and particularly American politicians, are good at meeting crises. Nothing short of a genuine crisis, it seems, can generate enough public attention and concern to make a real solution possible and return the federal budget to the small deficits of the years before 1973.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

Summarizing, if you please, Mr. President, Mr. Anderson states that ''from the late 1940's into the early 1970's, standards of living have improved faster than ever before'' in the history of this Nation. We had surplus moneys, and the only question was ''how best to spend the flood of wealth, private and public. . .'' And, as a result, we greatly increased Social Security, health care, Medicare, Medicaid and all these particular programs.

Then Mr. Anderson goes on and says, now wait.

Then, in 1973, the boom suddenly ended. . . (T)he oil crisis had something to do with it, taking the dollar off the gold standard had something to do with it. . . . The budget deficit has become central to American politics.

He cites how Europe has confronted this particular problem whereby the European countries have agreed that their deficits must be reduced as a condition of joining the common currency and, emphasizing, I quote,

The strongest political leader in Europe is Helmet Kohl, Germany's Chancellor, who has responded forcefully to deficit dangers by slamming a heavy surtax on top of a tax burden that was already high.

Now, that is historic, having the media praise somebody for increasing taxes. Let me go to the concluding sentence here of the Anderson article that I included in the RECORD.

And I quote:

Nothing short of a genuine crisis, it seems, can generate enough public attention and concern to make a real solution possible and return the Federal budget to the small deficits of the years before 1973.

Now, my point here, Mr. President, is, we have a crisis right here and now. The gentleman says, ''Nothing short of a genuine crisis * * * can generate enough public attention.'' The only hope we have is to use the free media to reveal that crisis. The press corps absolutely refuse to do it. They continue to report deficits in the terms of what they call a unified deficit, which, contrary to the law, includes the borrowing from the trust funds.

I can show you what I mean in article after article where $161.4 billion is cited as last year's deficit. The true deficit was $283.3 billion—because that is what you get if you subtract out your Social Security moneys, your civil service and military retirement, your Medicare and all the rest of the trust funds that you are going to have to pay back. And as of this minute, we owe the trust funds $1.255 trillion.

Now, under the Republican 7-year budget, we are going to use another $636 billion of Social Security moneys. So instead of owing Social Security $481 billion today, in 2002 we are going to owe over $1 trillion all the while beating our breast and saying that we are balancing the budget.

We have got to cut out the gamesmanship and get down to truth in budgeting. Mr. President, it is a heck of a note to have to write the Congressional Budget Office and ask, ''In accordance with the law, would you please cite the deficit?''

On one day, they cite a surplus of $10 billion. Then when we asked them to comply with the law, they said, ''Excuse us, there is a deficit of $98 billion.'' Now they have corrected that little mistake and got it up to $115 billion.

Just the other Sunday, I was listening to Mr. Russert on ''Meet the Press'' asking Mr. Panetta: ''Will you withstand those political charges and go along with this reduction in cost-of-living increases in order to balance the budget?''

Going along, with lowering cost-of-living increases in Social Security, does not balance the budget. It enhances the Social Security surplus. He said time and again on that particular program to Mr. MOYNIHAN.

My point is that historically we have gotten into the hands of the Philistines. I saw this start back in West Virginia with our friend, President John F. Kennedy, when he was Candidate Kennedy. They never expected in West Virginia that upbeat Harvard graduate was going to best the populous Hubert Humphrey. But Jack Kennedy had Lou Harris and played all the hot-button issues like a Stradivarius.

He came out on top, and then the rule of thumb came for all national elections, ''Get yourself a pollster.''

Our trouble is that the media act in complicity with the politicians. They get irritated or annoyed if you try to explain an issue. They want a quick, pithy, confrontational answer to any particular item. They do not care about an issue, they do not understand it, and they continue to report what is not the fact, namely, that you are balancing your budget when they know otherwise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET TABLES

[Outlays in billions]

Year	Government budget	Trust funds	Unified deficit	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt	Gross interest
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	−0.3	+3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7

BUDGET TABLES—Continued

[Outlays in billions]

Year	Government budget	Trust funds	Unified deficit	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt	Gross interest
1984	851.8	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.6	−212.3	−252.9	1,817.6	178.9
1986	990.3	81.8	−221.2	−303.0	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.2	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,868.0	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.2	−221.4	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.7	−269.2	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,408.2	94.2	−255.1	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.1	−203.2	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,530.0	121.9	−161.4	−283.3	4,927.0	336.0
1996 estimate	1,583.0	121.8	−189.3	−311.1	5,238.0	348.0

Source: CBO's January, April, and August 1995 Reports.

	Year 2002 (billion)
1996 Budget: Kasich Conf. Report, p. 3 (deficit)	−$108
1996 Budget Outlays (CBO est.)	1,583
1995 Budget Outlays	1,530
Increased spending	+53
CBO Baseline Assuming Budget Resolution:	
Outlays	1,874
Revenues	1,884
This Assumes:	
(1) Discretionary Freeze Plus Discretionary Cuts (in 2002)	−121
(2) Entitlement Cuts and Interest Savings (in 2002)	−226
(3) Using SS Trust Fund (in 2002)	−115
Total reduction (in 2002)	−462

Mr. HOLLINGS. You can see how the spending has gone up. For example, from 1995 to 1996, spending goes from $1,530,000,000,000 in spending to $1,583,000,000,000 in spending. In other words, while we say that we are cutting spending, in fact we have increased spending 53 billion bucks.

Under the GOP plan we are supposed to cut $45 billion in spending this year. If you see in the last year of their plan you have to have a freeze of $96 billion, additional cuts of $25 billion—cuts in entitlements of $159 billion and interest savings of $67 billion, for a total of $226 billion—plus the Social Security trust fund of $115 billion.

Now those are a lot of facts and figures, but what I am saying is you have to have total reductions in 2002 of $462 billion. Let's get real. If you cannot, with a new group of freshmen spurring us to cut, get $45 billion, how are you going to get $462 billion?

That is why I told my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, if this particular plan balanced in the year 2002, I would jump off the Capitol dome. There is no chance of that. They know it and I know it.

In the Commerce Committee, for example, we have presumed to save $15 billion. The truth is—and we all know it in the Commerce Committee—that $4.5 billion of the $15 billion is already expended in the telecom bill.

That has occurred in a lot of these other committees. In the Finance Committee yesterday, they have a mechanism for Medicare called BELT. You find out that the poor, the sick, and taxpayers in America are the ones that are going to be belted. That little phrase requires that if Congress comes in say $40 billion shy, they push off the heavy lifting on to the next Congress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a chart which I compiled earlier this year with respect to ''The Realities on Truth in Budgeting,'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLINGS RELEASES REALITIES ON TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Reality No. 1: $1.2 trillion in spending cuts is necessary.

Reality No. 2: There aren't enough savings in entitlements. Have welfare reform, but a jobs program will cost; savings are questionable. Health reform can and should save some, but slowing growth from 10 to 5 percent doesn't offer enough savings. Social Security won't be cut and will be off-budget again.

Reality No. 3: We should hold the line on the budget on Defense; that would be no savings.

Reality No. 4: Savings must come from freezes and cuts in domestic discretionary spending but that's not enough to stop hemorrhaging interest costs.

Reality No. 5: Taxes are necessary to stop hemorrhage in interest costs.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Deficit CBO Jan. 1995 (using trust funds)	207	224	225	253	284	297	322
Freeze discretionary outlays after 1998	0	0	0	−19	−38	−58	−78
Spending cuts	−37	−74	−111	−128	−146	−163	−180
Interest savings	−1	−5	−11	−20	−32	−46	−64
Total savings ($1.2 trillion)	−38	−79	−122	−167	−216	−267	−322
Remaining deficit using trust funds	169	145	103	86	68	30	0
Remaining deficit excluding trust funds	287	264	222	202	185	149	121
5 percent VAT	96	155	172	184	190	196	200
Net deficit excluding trust funds	187	97	27	(17)	(54)	(111)	(159)
Gross debt	5,142	5,257	5,300	5,305	5,272	5,200	5,091
Average interest rate on debt (percent)	7.0	7.1	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7
Interest cost on the debt	367	370	368	368	366	360	354

Note.—Figures are in billions. Figures don't include the billions necessary for a middle-class tax cut.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I showed the cuts necessary at that time and showed that if you wanted to balance the budget without using the trust funds you had to increase revenues as well as cut spending.

Governors pay their bills, mayors pay their bills, but not us in Congress and the President. We have no idea of paying the bills. We blissfully continue this one grand political charade, this one grand fraud.

The only way I know to expose it is through the free press. Thomas Jefferson once commented that between a free government and a free press, he would choose the latter. You can have a free government, but you cannot hold it long unless you get a free press. But unfortunately, the free press here is a pollster press. In today's paper it says that the best of the best reporters were out eating supper instead of listening to the President's speech in Houston. They do not care. They get little snippets and stories, and you cannot get the truth. The truth is, Mr. Anderson, there is no crisis we are going to have to reach. We are in crisis now.

We have spending on automatic pilot. Next year we will have to pay $348 billion in interest costs on the national debt. That is a billion dollars a day. If that is not a crisis, I don't know what is. We can straighten out Medicare, but we do not have to devastate the Government in doing so. Neither side, including the President, has a balanced budget. The Democrats do not have a balanced budget, and the Republicans do not have a balanced budget. So we should not act like there is a choice at the present time.

The truth of the matter is that next year we will pay $348 billion in interest. They say you cannot avoid death and you cannot avoid taxes. Well, you cannot avoid interest costs. As such,

you have tax increases on automatic pilot of $1 billion a day. That is the hemorrhage we have to stop. That is the real problem confronting us. And we are not doing it. We are arguing whether it is for the middle class or rich, and who is going to get the political credit. We ought to stop these shenanigans and get down to the business at hand.

I thank the Chair.

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

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

POTENTIAL DEPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this week the Senate and the House began conducting hearings on the potential deployment of American ground forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the event a peace agreement is reached. This is the beginning of a very important process of congressional review and debate. I am pleased that the administration sent the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to testify on behalf of the administration's proposal.

Any decision to send American Forces into harms' way requires the utmost consideration. American interests may justify sending Americans into Bosnia, but the goals must be clear and the risks must be understood and weighed carefully.

Unfortunately, the administration has not yet made the case for its proposed operation. Many questions remain unanswered and many answers remain ambiguous.

The first task must be to persuade the Congress that this is the best option of the options available. And let me be clear, there are other options.

For over 3 years now, I have called for American leadership. For over 3 years now, I have called for NATO involvement. But, I am not convinced that exercising United States leadership and deploying NATO ground forces in support of a peace agreement that partitions Bosnia is the best or only option. We need to know: will American Forces be the guarantors of ethnic cleansing? Will they be used to prevent Moslem refugees from returning to their homes in what becomes the Bosnian Serb Republic?

With respect to the peace settlement, the administration must be able to ensure that any peace reached is a stable and sustainable peace—that there are defensible borders; that the Bosnian Government structure is viable; that this is not just the first step toward a greater Serbia.

If there is a genuine peace, there is a real question why tens of thousands of peacekeepers, including Americans, are needed? Moreover, how did the administration come up with the number 25,000 for the American ground force contribution? Is this solely the result of President Clinton's speech 2 years ago or is there a military rationale for it?

There is a lot of confusion as to what NATO's role will be. Will NATO ensure the territorial integrity of Bosnia? Who will accomplish the tasks that NATO does not wish to be involved in, such as facilitating the return of refugees, the conduct of free and fair elections, humanitarian operations?

What will this operation cost? What factors are current cost estimates based on? How does the administration plan to pay for such an operation? Was Secretary Perry serious when he said that the administration would take funds from missile defense programs—intended to protect Americans from the growing threat of missile defenses—for peacekeeping?

What are the criteria for success of this operation? What is the exit strategy? How do we ensure that the Bosnians can defend themselves once peacekeepers leave? Who will arm and or train the Bosnians?

It seems to me that developments in recent months have vindicated the overwhelming majority in Congress who argued that the Bosnians and the Croats were capable of defending themselves if armed. It has also demonstrated that NATO air power can be used effectively and that Bosnian Serb Forces are not invincible. The military balance began shifting in Bosnia, but I am not sure that it has stabilized. In my view, lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia is as relevant in a post-settlement situation as it is now. This matter cannot be avoided and must be resolved as part of any peace settlement.

The bottom line is that Congress is not yet in possession of the facts. Indeed, the administration is not in possession of the facts. There is no settlement yet. But, with that in mind, we must make sure that we do not deploy any forces without clear answers to these critical questions. I am deeply concerned that since current NATO plans call for initial deployments within a few days of a settlement being signed that we may not have all the answers—and that the administration will go ahead and deploy forces and try to figure out what they will be doing after they are already on the ground.

In view of these many unanswered questions—and those I have raised are by no means all-inclusive—I would strongly urge the administration to cooperate with the Congress and provide us with the information we need to make an informed judgment.

Furthermore, I strongly urge the administration to seek congressional authorization for any deployment of United States ground forces to Bosnia. This was my view prior to the gulf war, and it is now. It is essential that the American people are behind any undertaking that places thousands of our soldiers in a dangerous environment for a prolonged period of time.

Mr. President, let me also express my deep concern about other aspects of the diplomatic process and the talks that are due to begin on August 31 in Dayton, OH. The agenda does not include Kosova which has been under martial law for over 6 years now. This is not just a matter of human rights, but a question of Kosova's status. Even in the former Yugoslavia, Kosova had autonomous status—the people and their assembly could make their own decisions. Today, there are 2 million Albanians there under an apartheid-like system—A large majority terrorized and oppressed by a small minority.

We cannot let Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic off the hook for Kosova, or for his continued support of paramilitary forces which are reported today to have slaughtered hundreds of Moslem men and boys in northern Bosnia. Milosevic is no peacemaker, rather the mastermind behind ethnic cleansing, oppression, and aggression in the former Yugoslavia. As early as 1992, senior U.S. Government officials accused him of war crimes. But today, he has been invited by this administration to the United States to participate in peace talks. I believe that this was a serious error in judgment which calls into question the administration's commitment to the prosecution of war criminals in the former Yugoslavia. Sure, Milosevic has not yet been indicted by the war crimes tribunal, but, there is no doubt that he has given support and safe haven to some of the most notorious war criminals. Slobodan Milosevic should not be issued a visa. If the administration insists on this, at the very least, it should ensure that any visa issued to Milosevic confines him to Wright Patterson Air Force Base. He does not deserve to be treated like other foreign dignitaries.

Finally, there should be no comprehensive sanctions relief on Serbia until there is a satisfactory resolution of the situation in Kosova. Unless there is a comprehensive settlement including Kosova, there will be no stability in the region—one of the key objectives presently being cited by the administration. The sanctions on Serbia are the only leverage the United States and the international community have been willing to use on the Belgrade regime.

Mr. President, I hope that the administration will address my concerns and those of my colleagues, and cooperate with the Congress so that together we can determine what is in the best interest of the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended.