

7.23 pesos to the dollar, almost matching its low point of 7.5 pesos to the dollar in early March. The Mexican Central Bank frantically intervened to support the peso but despite these efforts, the peso closed at 6.925 to the dollar yesterday. Banks in Mexico may have to raise short-term interest rates even higher to help the peso recover its value.

These high interest rates are already crippling Mexican families and small businesses. And, Mr. President, do you know who they hold responsible for this? The United States of America. The Clinton and Zedillo administrations' assertions that the Mexican economy is recovering simply does not hold water. It is not true. The American people and the United States Congress deserve all the facts on the Mexican economic situation.

This summer, I released a report on the Mexican economic crisis that detailed a disturbing pattern of deception and misrepresentation of the true state of the Mexican economy. News reports indicate an internal study commissioned by the International Monetary Fund [IMF], sheds new light on the subject and confirms this disturbing pattern. Now the Clinton administration has classified the report—the Whittome report—and is resisting efforts to make it available to the public. The public has a right to know the whole truth. Why is the Treasury Department hiding this information from the American public?

I have written to the Director of the IMF and copied the Secretary of the Treasury to request that this report be made public. We have sent \$12.5 billion worth of taxpayer money directly from the United States and \$9.8 billion from the IMF. Another \$1.6 billion will be sent from the IMF to Mexico next month. And do you know who is the single largest contributor to the IMF—the United States. According to news reports, the Whittome report provides valuable insight into the handling of the Mexican economic crisis by the administration and the IMF. Yet neither of them wants to share this report with the American public.

On October 18, I wrote to the Director of the IMF asking him to make it available. The public has a right to know the whole truth but so far the Treasury Department and the IMF have not responded to my request.

We were told several weeks ago that Mexico was recovering wonderfully, that it was repaying its debt of \$700 million earlier than required, but the administration knew 2 weeks ago that Mexico would be unable to pay the full debt, which was \$2 billion. So they put up \$700 million, when they still owe us \$1.3 billion and call it a success. It is disingenuous to say the least.

Mr. President, let me make a prediction before I close. I predict that there will be a time in the not-too-distant future when we will see Mexico come quietly to the Treasury, the United States Treasury, and make a deal for more money, and this administration will once again go along with

it. The American people will be the losers. We should be prepared the next time they come to say no.

There is an old saying, "You don't put good money after bad." But I guess we have an administration that figures if it is not their money, that it only belongs to the American taxpayers, that wise old saying is not valid.

I believe this Congress has a responsibility to demand that report, and I intend to submit a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that report be made available so that the American people can see that we have a Government that operates in accordance with the rules and they can judge the situation for themselves. They can decide whether or not they are ever going to get that \$12.5 billion back. The American public can decide whether or not the administration has dealt with them fairly and candidly.

Mr. President, I thank you for your courtesies and I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes in morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity and many other opportunities between now and the next few weeks, to strongly urge the President to come to Congress for authorization before he makes a decision to send American troops into Bosnia. We have discussed this in our committee meetings, our Senate Armed Services Committee, and I am very much concerned about the fact that if you look at the history of Bosnia, all the way back to the Ottoman empire, you see that you have these three warring factions that have always warred with each other.

We know that the Archduke who was assassinated was what precipitated World War I right there in Sarajevo. We know that in World War II, Marshal Tito, when he was putting together his alliance to go against the Germans, he had most of them except for Croatia. At that time Croatia was on the other side. We were on the side of the Bosnian Moslems and the Serbs. So it has been a moving target throughout the years.

The only thing that is consistent is that they have been murdering each other. And we have evidence in the last 6 months, all three factions have fired on their own troops and tried to blame the other side. So we have a long and agonizing history of what has been happening over there. There is no more hostile area any place in the world to send our troops on the ground than there.

Back in World War II, any of us who have studied history at all remember how the former Yugoslavians were able to hold off the best that Hitler had on the ratio of 1 to 8. This, in other words, is not the Persian Gulf. These are

mountains with caves, Mr. President. This is an area where historically a small number of people have been able to murder a much larger force and take many, many casualties. This is the environment into which we are talking about sending our troops.

I draw an analogy between that and Lebanon in 1983. In 1983, we sent our troops over to Lebanon. We had a very modest mission at that time, and it was not until the months rolled by when the bomb went off and 241 of our troops were killed, and, of course, then there was a public cry, and we brought our troops home.

Or Somalia. I cannot hang that on the Democrats because George Bush, in December, after he lost the election, before the new President, President Clinton, was sworn in, he sent troops to Somalia really just for 7 weeks. And then he went out of office and Clinton came in. At that time I was serving in the other body. Almost every month we sent a resolution to the President, "Bring our troops home. There is no mission that is relative to our Nation's security in Somalia." And it was not until 18 of our Rangers were murdered in cold blood and they dragged their corpses through the streets of Mogadishu that there was enough public outcry to bring the troops back home, and we did with our tail between our legs. Nothing was accomplished. You see, we have adopted a foreign policy in this country where we are sending our troops out on humanitarian missions, as opposed to missions where we have our Nation's security at risk.

Well, now, this came to a head when we had our Senate Armed Services Committee meeting—it was a public meeting—just the other day. We had Secretary Christopher, Secretary Perry, and General Shalikashvili. When we came to the part where we were talking about the mission, the strongest mission they could state that we have in Bosnia is twofold: First to contain a civil war, which has been going on for hundreds of years; second, to protect the integrity of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

So I asked a question—and this was after there was a quote from General Rose, who was the U.N. commander in Bosnia. He said, "If America sends troops over there, they would lose more American lives than they lost in the Persian Gulf." There we lost 390 lives. So I said, "So we can reasonably assume we are going to lose hundreds of American lives if we send troops over on the ground in Bosnia? That being the case, Secretary Perry, is our mission, as you have described it, to contain a civil war and to protect the integrity of NATO worth the cost of many hundreds of American lives?" He said, "Yes," without flinching. I said, "Secretary Christopher?" He said, "Yes." And General Shalikashvili said, "Yes."

So here we have the people who are in the top ranks, the President's three top men, reflecting the wishes of the President—that is, to send troops into Bosnia on the ground.

There is something else that is very curious about this, which came up in this meeting. They stated in the meeting that no matter what the condition was 12 months from now, those troops would be back in the United States.

I ask you, Mr. President, in all of your well-read days on military science, if you have ever found a time when a country sent its troops into a warring area with a time certain to come back, regardless of the circumstances, whether we were in the middle of a very hostile situation or whether it was a peace accord, we are going to bring them home in 12 months?

They all said, "Yes." They had it written down that, "The troops will return in 12 months." As much as I hate to see it, the only thing I could think of with any degree of certainty that is going to happen in 12 months is that it will be election time, November 1996. I hope that does not have anything to do with this decision.

So I plan, in a couple of days, to go over to Bosnia. I am going to go, and I am going to stand in the same places where all of our troops are going to be standing if the President is successful in not coming to Congress for authorization to send troops. I am going to look at the hostility around me, and I am going to listen to the gunfire, and I am going to bring that message back to the American people.

This is something that has to rise above politics. We went through this same thing when President Bush wanted to send troops to the Persian Gulf. Yes, we had a real mission there relative to our Nation's security. That mission was whether or not we could have the energy necessary to be viable in fighting a war—a real mission relative to our Nation's security. At that time, he said we are going to send the troops there, and we said: Mr. President, we do not think it is wise to send the troops over, those soldiers, not knowing they have the support of the American people as well as the support of Congress behind them. He did not have to. Just like President Clinton does not have to come for authority to the Congress, President Bush did not have to, but he did it. It was a very wise move for the sake of those individuals who were going over there to lay their lives on the line, where 390 Americans died valiantly. The President, at that time, came to the Congress, asked for authority, and we had a united America in fighting the Persian Gulf war.

This war over there is not our war, Mr. President. This is a civil war. Sure, it is a problem for people in Western Europe, and I hope that Western Europe gets busy. Let them do what is necessary to protect their security interests. Perhaps they have security interests in Bosnia. We do not.

I do not want to wake up and find out that the American public did not know

about this, did not care about this enough that they did not know whether they have an outcry to bring our troops back until our American corpses are dragged through the streets of Sarajevo. We can stop it right now, Mr. President. I plan to go to Bosnia and spend several days there at the end of this week and bring a story back for the American people.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, if I understand it correctly, we are in morning business at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask that I may be permitted to speak for as much time as I may consume.

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

EXTENSION OF THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the need for an extension to the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, which expires tonight, and the majority leader's announcement a short time ago that there will be an objection to passing that bill today.

This is very surprising to me. I was sitting in the Judiciary Committee hearings on Waco when I was told about it. I speak today as the ranking member on the pertinent subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee and one who was very concerned about what the repercussions would be in the peace process from the resolution we passed last week on Jerusalem. And now we are confronted this week with a situation that I think, again, has a ripple effect throughout the Middle East if we do not take action.

Mr. President, I think we ought to ask, what will one say, what will the Israelis say, what will Prime Minister Rabin say, when they are asked the question about why the Congress has refused to continue funding Palestinian economic development in support of the peace process? Prime Minister Rabin has explicitly asked for this legislation on each of his visits to the United States. Not passing the extension today, it is my understanding, stops not only the funding but the operation of the necessary offices to carry out that funding, including one here in Washington.

What is disturbing is that no one here is even arguing for letting the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act lapse. This dispute before us, in fact, has nothing to do with the Middle East. It has to do with conflicting views about whether or not or to what extent to consolidate the foreign af-

fairs agencies of the United States Government.

This is a legitimate issue. There are strong opinions on both sides.

It seemed to me we had a process for negotiating this issue to reach some agreement. Senator KERRY on our side, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the chairman of our committee, Senator HELMS, had been negotiating. While agreement has not yet been reached, I believe it can with continued good faith at the negotiating table.

Wherever one stands on the question of consolidation one thing should be clear: The Middle East peace process is too important to be held hostage to disagreements over unconnected issues or to partisan disputes.

I wonder if anyone in this body differs with that view? Do any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle believe that the Middle East peace process just does not matter that much? Or that it is expendable enough to be turned into a political football?

One of the truly wonderful things about American foreign policy in the Middle East is that it has always been bipartisan. Strong support for Israel and active pursuit of Middle East peace have never been the province of just one party.

Indeed, this peace process is the outgrowth of the tireless efforts of President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker. It has been carried forward with skill and dedication by the current administration.

The bipartisan nature of United States support for the Middle East peace process was never more evident than on July 21 when I joined a group of my colleagues in cosponsoring Senate bill 1064, a long-term extension of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act.

I was proud to stand with Senators HELMS, PELL, DOLE, DASCHLE, MACK, LIEBERMAN, MCCONNELL, LEAHY, and LAUTENBERG in expressing strong support for continuing America's leading role in the peace process.

I know, too, that the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve as ranking member, Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Senator BROWN, also supported the sentiments in S. 1064.

I ask my colleagues who joined me that day, what has changed? If the Middle East peace process was deserving of strong bipartisan support on July 21, why is it being held hostage to unrelated legislative disputes on October 31?

I simply do not understand how we can fail to extend this legislation. It is so important to ensuring Israel's ability to live in peace and security with its neighbors in the future. It is so important to protecting a Israel as a Jewish State, to seeing that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are