

Mr. INHOFE. That is exactly what they thought 10 days prior to that time. I have these horrible visions of what happened with Somalia. I can remember when we were trying to bring our troops back from Somalia, and we sent resolutions to President Clinton month after month to bring our troops back from there.

It was not until 18 of our Rangers were murdered and the mutilated corpses were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu that the American people finally woke up and said, "We want them back. We don't have strategic interests there that are worth this kind of a sacrifice." I see similar things like this are happening over there.

When you talk about the morality of the issue and the fact that we are, in a sense, rewarding those individuals who are guilty of the most serious war crimes, because we are now saying we are on their side and we are doing this, this is something that I think we need to talk about before a decision is made that we are going to go along with this, because I see that happening.

I see discussions taking place in this Chamber and outside the Chamber, "Well, let's wait until we have some hearings. Let's wait until this," and as this is happening, our troops are being deployed over there.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say to the Senator, if I can, in response, I think it is very analogous to what happened in Somalia in this respect: There is not a clear military plan. There is not a clear plan as to what we are going to do once we are there.

For example, one of the things you could do is put up a fence and man a border. That is not what they plan to do. One of the things you can do is you can stop people from moving from one side of a border to another, stemming terrorism, guns, ammunition. That is not what they plan to do. When I asked what they do plan to do with the troops there, there was no clear answer by anyone.

The reality is, the President is committing troops to that area for show. There is no clear military plan, and there is no clear, effective way to defend or protect those troops.

I might say, it is cold as can be right now in Bosnia. There is no structure there for our troops to stay in. There is no structure there for our troops to stay in. There is no supply of clean, healthful water. There are no normal sanitary conditions. There is no established supply line at this point. I suspect there will be at some point in the future. But this is a catastrophe in the making, and I believe it shows a reckless disregard for those who serve our country.

I think we have an obligation to people who put on the uniform of this Nation. You can agree or disagree with the mission, you can agree or disagree with the personalities, but we have an obligation when someone comes and puts on the uniform of the United

States to make sure that we do not endanger their life without a real purpose.

Some will say we should not endanger their life. If you are not willing to put your life on the line, you should not be in the military. I understand how these men and women would risk their lives, and our freedom is important enough to do that. But, Mr. President, and I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, keeping our prestige high or avoiding an embarrassment because someone made a commitment they should not have is not a reason to commit American troops to a situation where they cannot defend themselves or cost American lives.

We have an obligation to people who put on that uniform to stand beside them and do all we can to protect them, and it is very clear—it is very clear—that we are not able to do that in this circumstance, and, moreover, we have not even supplied them with a purpose or a reason for them to sacrifice their lives.

If they were there to defend freedom, I think the Senator from Oklahoma and I would be right there with them to stand behind them and support them and to encourage this action to stand up for freedom. But this is not that effort. This is an effort to save face in the world community, and I think it is much more important to stand behind our troops.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado—

Mr. PRESSLER. If my friends will yield for a split moment, we are trying to get a vote ordered at 5:15, and I have to make a unanimous consent request. If I can do that, then you can go back into your mode, because they are going to hotline this.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield to the Senator.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION SUNSET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on or in relation to the Dorgan amendment at 5:15 this evening and that the time between 5 p.m. and 5:15 be divided: 5 minutes under the control of Senator PRESSLER; 5 minutes under the control of Senator EXON; and 5 minutes under the control of Senator DORGAN.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I would like to add to that that I have an opportunity to lay aside the Dorgan amendment and offer an amendment. I will only need 5 minutes to speak on it, and it, too, can be laid aside. If I have that opportunity, then I will not object.

Mr. PRESSLER. Can the Senator offer her amendment at 5 to 5? Would that be OK? I am trying to get to the first vote here. I want everybody to speak as much as they wish.

Mrs. BOXER. As soon as this consent request is agreed to, can I offer it right then and lay it down?

Mr. PRESSLER. My friends will finish their dialog probably by 5 to 5, I guess.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. PRESSLER. Why do you not offer it at 5 to 5?

Mrs. BOXER. So I will get it before the vote on the Dorgan amendment?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes. I amend that by saying at the hour of 4:55 p.m., the Senator from California will offer her amendment, and then at 5 o'clock we divide up the time.

I want everybody to speak as much as they wish.

Mrs. BOXER. I will not object to that.

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I just observe that the 5 minutes allotted for myself and the 10 minutes allotted for Senator PRESSLER and Senator EXON make it 5 minutes for and 10 minutes opposed. I do not object, but I wish if Senator BOND wishes to come over for support, we could get a minute or two.

Mr. PRESSLER. I will give him half my time.

Mr. DORGAN. I will not object.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Did the Senator from South Dakota have a further unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PRESSLER. I further ask unanimous consent no amendment be in order to the Dorgan amendment and the amendment be laid aside at 5 p.m.

Mrs. BOXER. That is fine.

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

BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just a couple of other things I wanted to ask the Senator from Colorado.

In that there is a 10-day timeframe from the time he came back and the time I was over in that area, a concern was expressed to me at that time—and keeping in mind that the lines we have now seen on the map near Tuzla, which I am sure the Senator has had a chance to discuss, there is a problem that there are approximately 3 million refugees, if you count them from all throughout that area that those lines on the map are going to preclude at that time, they said more than 50 percent of them would not be able to return to their homelands.

Their concern was that this is going to increase the number of rogue elements that were there, that anyone who thinks there is a peace accord, first thing a refugee wants to do is go home. The fact that they would not be able to return home would increase the number of rogue elements that are around or that join other elements.

The second thing is their concern over what we refer to, and the administration refers to, has never really been defined as systematic violations. There are two ways we can get out of this. One is, 12 months goes by; and the other is if there is a systematic violation, meaning one of the major factions

is violating the peace accord or whatever accord it is they have initialed and they are proposing to sign.

The fact that there is no way for the military, the soldier in the field, to know if there is an uprising of some type or a conflict, whether that is a systematic violation or maybe just some rogue element that is firing upon troops—did they express that concern when you were there?

Mr. BROWN. Those concerns were expressed, and added to this is the fact that the border will be free flowing. You will not have an interdiction at the border. It will be very difficult to tell if the people coming across the border are refugees and allowed to go back to an area that has changed hands, or if they are terrorists, or if they are a military element.

They also expressed great concern about a couple of other aspects. One was a conviction on the part of the military personnel that I talked to—U.S. military personnel—that none of the parties would abide. When I asked, they said, "Look, the normal pattern here is people sign agreements and then when spring comes, they go ahead and proceed with their plans afoot." Frankly, our people who are on the ground were very skeptical that you would see any of the three parties follow these agreements.

The problem, of course, is that you have U.S. military personnel in a position that is very difficult to defend in between them at a point they have wholesale violations of the peace agreements.

At this point, it is very difficult for me to see what it is U.S. personnel accomplish in that area, other than being targets.

Mr. INHOFE. Certainly in a 12-month period, if we are, in fact, committed to a timeframe—and I do not know from my reading and, of course, my experience in the military, of any time we have gone into hostile conflict with a time-oriented departure—it is always a function or an action, something that has taken place.

It was General Huptmann, I believe, who used this analogy, and maybe he used it with you. He said, "Twelve months is like putting your hand in water for 12 months and you take it out and look down and nothing has changed." Twelve months in the Balkans does not mean anything. If we are going to be out in 12 months, those individuals that would be warring factions would be in a position to start up again.

Mr. BROWN. One thing I might say, it will mean the expenditure of \$1.5 billion to perhaps \$3 billion. I say to the Senator, I suspect this body will face supplemental appropriation requests from the administration that exceed those numbers.

There simply is no way to put down the 20,000 people they are talking about in that region, or perhaps 25,000 they have talked about—my guess is it may be the higher figure—without the ex-

penditures of huge amounts of money in roads, in clearing areas, in some sort of quarters for the personnel that will be there, and the whole infrastructure they are talking about as a backup.

What will be different 12 months from now is an enormous expenditure of U.S. Treasury in taxpayers' money on an enterprise that does not have a defined function or a defined date of accomplishment.

Mr. INHOFE. I think the Senator from Colorado is being very conservative when he quotes the figures of the administration of \$1.5 to \$2 billion. I have seen figures up to \$4.5 to \$6 billion.

I recall not too many weeks ago the administration came to this body for a \$1.4 billion supplemental appropriation to take care of some of the past humanitarian gestures that were forecast to cost a third or a fourth of that amount. It is hard to talk about dollars when we are talking about human lives.

My concern is if we are concerned, as the President indicated he was last night, about NATO and the integrity of NATO, where is NATO going to be if we go in there and start this thing, the body bags start coming back to America and people start getting concerned as they were as the incidents of Mogadishu? Then we cut and run, which surely we would do at that time. Then, where is NATO and the integrity of NATO?

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator has put his finger on the entire problem. Before we commit U.S. troops to a role where they are in danger, the Weinberger rules of engagement, I think, provide a good basis.

It seems to me for every American, just simple and basic understanding, before you send troops into combat, you ought to have a clearly defined military mission that is accomplishable, and without that, they should not go.

What we are literally seeing is the use of U.S. troops as international social workers. The fact is, U.S. armed services personnel ought to be used as soldiers to accomplish a military mission. That is what they are trained for. That is what they are accomplished at. That is what they are good at.

For U.S. troops to be used in this function without a clear mission, at least in this Senator's view, is an invitation to a tragedy of the first order.

Mr. INHOFE. I am very much concerned about it, and I know we are using up more time than we should.

Let me just conclude and speak only for myself. I have listened to the President. I thought the President would come out with something new that has not already been part of the debate. There was not one new argument or element introduced into the debate in the President's statement last night.

In the absence of that, knowing that each hour that goes by the President is deploying more Americans into that hostile area, I have to get on record

right here in this body, Mr. President, as saying I will fight with every fiber of my being to stop the President from sending troops in on the ground into Bosnia.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE SUNSET ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3065

(Purpose: To provide for the comparable treatment of federal employees and members of Congress and the President during a fiscal hiatus)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 3065.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following section:

SEC. . PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

(a) COMPARABLE PAY TREATMENT.—The pay of members of Congress and the President shall be treated in the same manner and to the same extent as the pay of the most adversely affected federal employees who are not compensated for any period in which appropriations lapse.

(b) This section shall take effect December 15, 1995.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment I have sent to the desk which is sponsored by myself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. FEINGOLD, simply says that Members of Congress and the President should be treated the same way as other Federal employees during a shutdown, a partial shutdown, during any period where there is a lapse in appropriations.

Now, Mr. President, the Senate has passed it a couple of times, but I hope it was not a sham when everyone said, "Yes, we are for it," take it by voice vote. We put it on the D.C. appropriations bill. It seems to be stuck there. The other times we passed it, it has not seen the light of day.

I have been around here long enough to know when I am getting conned. This is not happening. Everyone says they are for it, it passes here, and it has not really gone to the President's desk. He supports it.

The reputation of this Congress is at a very low point. The approval rating of this Congress is in the 20's. I submit that one of the reasons, first of all, was the fact that there was a Government