

Back in 1925, freedom day was February 6. In 1945, it was April 1. And in 1965, it was April 14. On the average, since World War II, the date has moved up nearly a week every decade.

One has to ask oneself, when does it stop? I know we work on averages in this body, and it seems to me that if you had one foot in a bucket of ice and the other in the oven, on the average you should feel pretty good. But we know that does not always work, that there is somebody who falls through the cracks. Basically, that is what is happening to our society today.

We are all very familiar with the 1993 tax increase, and now is the time to give part of it back to America's working families. The Clinton crunch has to come to an end, despite the rhetoric we hear out of the White House. Taxes must come down, spending must be restrained, and government must be put on a budget, and I mean a balanced budget.

Now is the time to do it. With America on my mind, let us not let another day be added next year to the burden of this year. Let us work to move it back a day or two. Let us dedicate ourselves, because there are a lot who think this is the most important debate of this century, and we need the help of the American people because our country has to figure out a way to eliminate this devastating debt that we are passing on to our young.

Let us put our Government back on a balanced budget. Let us make Government work for the people instead of the other way around.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk today about a matter that concerns all Americans: the presence of 35,000 young American men and women supporting the peace implementation force in Bosnia. Those troops were sent as a part of a NATO force to monitor the Bosnian peace agreement reached in Dayton, OH, last year. The Senate voted last December to support those troops, to provide them whatever they needed to do what they have been asked to do. But in the resolution submitted by the distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE, and Senator MCCAIN of Arizona, the Senate also said by a margin of 69 to 30 that it does not endorse the President's decision or the agreement reached in Dayton.

The House of Representatives was even more harsh. The House voted 287 to 141 to condemn the Dayton agreement, while expressing support for the troops that have been sent on this mission.

There is never a doubt that we will support fully American troops any-

where when they are performing a mission for this country. We will always be there for them. But, Mr. President, that does not mean we cannot question the policy, and this Senate and the House of Representatives did just that.

Many wanted a vote to deny the President the ability to dispatch the troops by withholding the funds needed to pay for such a deployment. That was not the right thing to do, and it failed, as it should have. But, Mr. President, there are many good reasons why we disagreed with the decision to send American troops, even while we acknowledged the President's right to do it.

First, we did not feel that the administration had made a compelling case that there was a national security interest in Bosnia to justify the deployment of tens of thousands of Americans, with the potential loss of American life. Mr. President, that is an essential element of any mission upon which we would embark with troops from our country.

There must be a U.S. security interest for American lives to be at risk. But, more importantly, Mr. President, many of us voiced strong concern that the administration lacked a strategy for removing those troops once they had dug in and become part of the troubled landscape in the troubled country of Bosnia.

What made many of us particularly skeptical was the administration's insistence that not only was there an exit strategy, but that the troops would be able to perform their complex mission of creating two nations from one, patrolling rugged mountain terrain, separating hostile belligerents, and ending a 500-year-old civil war in just 1 year.

In fact, Mr. President, the Dole-McCain resolution that expressed support for the troops and acknowledged the President's authority to deploy them specifically noted that the Senate support was conditioned on the return of those troops to the United States within 1 year.

Mr. President, let me remind my colleagues what senior administration officials, including the President, assured us as we wrestled with the question of whether to support sending young Americans to Bosnia:

On October 13, 1995, Robert Hunter, the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, told the Washington Post:

This is going to be a limited-duration operation—12 months max. We're not going to take responsibility beyond that.

On October 18, 1995, Defense Secretary William Perry and Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the House Committee on National Security and the House Committee on International Relations:

The implementation force will complete its mission in a period not to exceed 12 months. We believe this will be more than adequate to accomplish the needed tasks that will allow the peace to become self-sustaining. We anticipate the IFOR will go in

heavy and, if successful, would begin drawing down significantly far in advance of the final exit date.

On October 18, 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher told the House Committee on National Security:

The force would have a limited mission and remain for a limited period of time, approximately 1 year.

On November 28, 1995, President Clinton told the American people in a televised address:

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff have concluded that this mission should—and will—take about 1 year.

Mr. President, none of these knowledgeable officials left any room for doubt that the American mission in Bosnia would be limited in scope and duration. Specifically we were told, with no uncertainty, by everyone from the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, to the President of the United States, that our troops would be home within 1 year.

Mr. President, we now learn this is not so. December 20, 1996, was the date set as the 1-year mark. That is the date that we have been focusing on since the beginning of this mission. We now learn that this administration has said to our allies that it intends to keep American troops in Bosnia at least until early 1997 and, according to the United States Commander of NATO forces, Gen. George Joulwan, maybe longer.

Mr. President, the reason we got into the mission in Bosnia with NATO is because our President told our allies that we would be there with troops on the ground if there was a peace agreement. He told them that a long time ago. Once we make a commitment to our allies, of course, America must stand by the commitment.

But now, Mr. President, we have the dilemma of two commitments. We have the President making a commitment to the American people, to Senator DOLE, and to the troops that are there, that this would be a mission of 1 year. Everyone connected with this mission and with the leadership of this administration has repeatedly said 1 year. Now, Mr. President, we have the President making a different commitment to our allies, saying it is not going to be 1 year, but leaving it rather open-ended, into 1997.

Mr. President, I want to highlight the difference between last year's message from the administration and an April 26, 1996, article in the Washington Post:

"A substantial number of American troops will remain in Bosnia for at least one month after the NATO-led mission ends in December. In a departure from the original plan, NATO commanders have decided to keep a significant force in Bosnia up to the final day of the mission or one year after the peace enforcement began," according to spokesman Kenneth Bacon. Earlier officials had said the pullout would begin at least a few months before the December 20 closing date in order to have nearly everyone out by then. Kenneth Bacon said the change in

plans stemmed from a request by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is assisting preparations for Bosnia's elections, that NATO keep its full force there until after the elections.

And, on April 30, 1996, the London Times reported:

The Clinton administration has scrapped plans to withdraw its forces by the end of this year, and may maintain a substantial American presence in the Balkans for months after the deadline set by Congress. Only weeks ago the White House repeated its promise to Republicans that the troops would be back by December 20, the date agreed at Dayton for the end of the NATO mission in Bosnia. The Pentagon, however, under pressure from allies, international officials and its own Gen. George Joulwan, has admitted that it plans to keep a significant force in the region until the end of January, and maybe longer.

Those are excerpts from quotes from newspapers.

Mr. President, this stunning reversal of a critical policy that affects the lives of thousands of Americans has been made in such a casual way that we must ask if the administration's original commitment to withdraw in 1 year was a serious one. It was so casual, many people were not even aware that all of a sudden this commitment that was made to this Congress to a December 20 deadline by which our troops would be out of Bosnia has now been put off, really indefinitely, into 1997.

The President is breaking his promise to the American people to the United States Congress, and, most importantly, to the troops in Bosnia.

Moreover, Senator DOLE had earlier argued forcefully and persuasively about arming the Bosnian Government and allowing the Bosnians to defend themselves so American troops would not need to be sent in the first place. This would have required lifting the U.N. arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia, for which our leader argued forcefully and persuasively, many times for over a year on this Senate floor. We voted to lift the arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia so that the Bosnians could arm themselves and fight to save their country.

Senator DOLE led the fight to let the Moslems fight for their own freedom with help from legitimate sources so that it would be legal to help the Bosnian people defend themselves. No Member of the Senate has been more outspoken for years about the need for the United States to lead our allies in establishing a policy on Bosnia that would avoid the need for American troops than our leader, BOB DOLE. But each time the Congress voted to urge the lifting of the arms embargo, the administration refused to respond.

Now, Mr. President, in addition to the total abrogation of his word to the American people regarding when the troops would come home from Bosnia, we now learn that, in fact, while President Clinton was stopping us from lifting the arms embargo, he was allowing another country to provide arms in violation of the embargo. Was it a le-

gitimate ally of the United States? No, Mr. President, it was not a legitimate ally of the United States that was allowed to violate the arms embargo that we in this Congress were trying to lift. No, it was an enemy of the United States, a terrorist country: Iran.

Despite widespread rumors that Iranian arms were being shipped to Bosnia in violation of the arms embargo, an embargo this administration said we must support, and despite senior officials' strong denials, we learn we were deceived. Here we have the quotes, Mr. President. On April 15, 1995, a State Department spokesman, Nicholas Burns, told the Los Angeles Times, "We do not endorse violations of U.N. embargo resolutions whatever. We are not violating those resolutions. We don't endorse anyone else who is violating them."

On June 16, 1995, Secretary of State Warren Christopher said, "I think you get some instant gratification from lifting the arms embargo. It is kind of an emotional luxury, but you have to ask yourself, what are the consequences of that?" As late as March of this year, President Clinton himself told Congress that "Iran continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States."

Mr. President, despite all of those statements by senior administration officials and the President himself, we have learned in recent weeks that this was not the case at all. Just 3 weeks after the President's report to Congress on Iran, it has been reported that the administration had given its tacit approval of the shipment by Iran, one of America's most hostile adversaries, of weapons to the Bosnian Muslim government.

We are justified in concluding, Mr. President, that the Clinton administration policy on Bosnia has been cynical. What many of us were advocating for so long—arming the Bosnians and allowing them to defend themselves with legitimate sales of arms by people who cared about the people—was, in fact, being opposed by the administration by day, but by night secret arms shipments from Iran were moving forward with the administration's blessing.

Now, Mr. President, we are faced with similar cynicism regarding the deployment of American troops. Those troops are there precisely because the administration refused the suggestions by Senator DOLE and others in the Senate that arming the Bosnians and letting them fight for themselves was the best way to go. Instead, the administration adopted a half-a-loaf policy of covert arms shipments from Iran, which was too little, too late, from the wrong source.

As with arm sales to Bosnia, the American people have been deceived by the Clinton administration on the question of withdrawing American troops from Bosnia. Very simply, the President made a commitment to the

American people, and he is now saying he will not honor that commitment.

Mr. President, many in the Senate personally have opposed the administration's policy on Bosnia but honored their belief that the President had the authority to deploy troops without permission from Congress. Many people on this floor were torn during that debate because they so violently disagreed with the policy, but they did believe that the President had the right to do it and that the troops needed the support from Congress.

Our Republican leader did so at great political risk. He supported the President's right to deploy troops, even though he thought it was wrong, but he did so only after getting a commitment from the President himself that those troops would have a mission of limited duration, limited scope, and they would be home within 1 year. That was the promise the President made to our leader.

We now learn this will not happen. The administration's disregard of its commitments to Senator DOLE, to the U.S. Congress, and to the American people amount to broken promises. Broken promises—there is no other way you can put it.

Today, Mr. President, I am going to ask the President to look at this policy, which is a policy of broken promises, broken commitments, and contradictory commitments to the American people and to our allies.

I am going to ask the President to do two things. First of all, to honor his commitment to the American people about troop withdrawals from Bosnia and to tell our allies this commitment was made. If, in fact, he decides that he cannot keep his commitment to the American people, I ask him to come back to Congress and talk to us about this, rather than just announcing very quietly that the troops are not going to be out by December 20 as promised. OK, President Clinton, if that is what you believe, come to Congress, talk to us about it, tell us why you think this is necessary, and let us have the option of working with you if you think you can make the case that we should be there beyond the date you promised in your commitment to the American people.

That is what I ask the President to do today. Either keep his commitment to the American people, or come to Congress and discuss it. Mr. President, this is too important. We have a policy now in which the President is going to expand the use of our American troops beyond his commitment to Senator DOLE and the American people and this U.S. Congress. We have the second revelation that arm shipments from Iran were being permitted by this administration at the same time that he was keeping us in Congress from lifting the arms embargo, which we voted repeatedly to do so that the Moslems in Bosnia could have arms from legitimate sources.

Mr. President, I just ask you, what kind of policy is that? What must the

people of the world think when our President would make commitments that he does not keep and when he would keep legitimate arms sources from the Bosnian people while allowing Iran, a hostile nation to our country, a country with a background and history of terrorism against innocent victims, to, in fact, violate the very arms embargo that he would not let us lift? Mr. President, this is not the way our country should be represented.

Mr. President, I yield up to 15 minutes to the Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will not take that much time this morning. I have a few moments before I have to be to another commitment. Let me thank my colleague from Texas for her statement and for taking out this special order.

Let me read two quotes that I think speak volumes about what our President has caught himself in—that is, doublespeak. Mr. President, today you are not telling the American people the truth. For the last several months, you have been caught in a very difficult and very deceptive game of doublespeak.

Your representative, Richard Holbrooke, who immediately repudiated the Dayton peace accord was quoted on May 3 in a Reuters article saying:

I will state flatly for the record that this policy was correct—

He is referring to allowing the Iranians to move arms into the former Yugoslavia.

and that if it hadn't taken place, the Bosnian Muslims would not have survived and we would not have gotten to Dayton.

That is an absolute opposite from what our President has been telling us. Mr. President, that is double speak.

The next quote from Richard Holbrooke:

We knew that the Iranians would try to use the aid to buy political influence. It was a calculated policy based on the feeling that you had to choose between a lot of bad choices, and the choice that was chosen kept the Sarajevo government alive. But it left a problem—were the Iranians excessively influential on the ground?

Mr. President, President Clinton once again was caught in double speak. This Congress gave our President an option, a viable, responsible, well-thought-out option, to allow the arms embargo to be lifted so that parity could be built on both sides. He chose not to do that. He chose to openly and publicly deceive the American people.

Mr. President, part of the debate on the crisis in the former Yugoslavia has been over the arms embargo, first imposed against the Yugoslavian Government in 1991.

I was part of the majority in Congress that supported lifting the arms embargo and felt it was a preferable alternative to the deployment of our troops to Bosnia. Along those same lines, I voted against the President's proposed deployment last year, and voted against funding for that deployment.

Mr. President, some very disconcerting information has been coming to light during the last few months. The importance of these developments has led to the establishment of a select committee in the House or Representatives. Therefore, I would like to take a moment this morning to express some of my concerns and frustrations about the situation in Bosnia.

As I mentioned, a main part of the debate on the crisis in the former Yugoslavia has involved the arms embargo, first imposed against the Yugoslavian Government in 1991.

Information continues to surface, showing that while the Congress was openly debating the lifting of the arms embargo, the administration was giving a green light to Iran, allowing them to circumvent the arms embargo.

Richard Holbrooke, the administration's representative who helped to mediate the Dayton Peace Accord, was quoted in a May 3, 1996, Reuters article saying:

I will state flatly for the record that this policy was correct and that if it hadn't taken place, the Bosnian Muslims would not have survived and we would not have gotten to Dayton.

Mr. President, I would agree with the comment made by Mr. Holbrooke. Allowing Iran to circumvent the arms embargo was not this administration's only choice—it was certainly not a correct choice. The Congress, just last year, provided President Clinton a viable alternative by the passage of S. 21, legislation that would have unilaterally lifted the U.N. arms embargo illegally enforced against Bosnia.

There was ample reason to question the enforcement of the 1991 embargo against Bosnia. The original embargo was not imposed on Bosnia, because it did not exist in 1991. Rather, it was imposed on Yugoslavia.

In addition, enforcement of this embargo could arguably violate Bosnia's right to self-defense under article 51 of the U.N. charter.

The legal, unilateral lifting of the arms embargo that was called for in S. 21, would have allowed rough parity to exist in this conflict.

The President chose to veto S. 21, citing concerns that it would be breaking from an agreement with our allies, and diminish our credibility with Europe.

Mr. President, the only credibility that has been diminished here has been through the administration's efforts to allow one of the strongest supporters of terrorism around the world, Iran, to violate the arms embargo and gain a foothold in Europe.

In addition, Iran only provided light weaponry to the Bosnian's, which was fine for providing a little protection. However, it was not enough to provide the needed shift in the strategic military balance, altering Serbia's enormous advantage in the conflict. Therefore, even after this evasion of the arms embargo had begun, thousands of Bosnians were still being killed, and the Serbian forces continued to capture more territory.

Mr. President, as we continue to see this situation unravel, we now face an extended deployment of our troops. After repeated assertions by administration officials that our troops' deployment in the IFOR mission would be for only 1 year, we now are informed that time will be extended. On May 1, the Clinton administration endorsed a recent NATO recommendation that IFOR remain at full strength to maintain peace until after the Bosnian elections.

Mr. President, these elections will not occur until September at the earliest. It is, therefore, likely that our troops will not be withdrawn until January 1997.

Mr. President, Richard Holbrooke made another assertion about the administration's decision in the May 3 Reuters article, with respect to the risks of dealing with Iran.

We knew that the Iranians would try to use the aid to buy political influence. It was a calculated policy based on the feeling that you had to choose between a lot of bad choices, and the choice that was chosen kept the Sarajevo Government alive. But, it left a problem—were the Iranians excessively influential on the ground?

The article continues with Mr. Holbrooke claiming that this problem was adequately dealt with through the negotiations of the Dayton accord, by including in the agreement that all foreign forces would have to leave the country. This is precisely one of the problems that our troops have had to face: the removal of foreign forces including Iranian forces.

In addition, it is my understanding that this arms transfer operation was allowed to continue until January of this year—after our troops were beginning to be deployed as peacekeepers in Bosnia.

In closing, the Iranian presence that the Clinton administration helped to promote is now actively threatening the Dayton accord, the American and NATO peacekeepers seeking to enforce it, and the military viability and democratic character of Bosnia itself.

Mr. President, this situation needs to be addressed, and our troops need to be brought home.

I thank my colleague from Texas for taking out this special order. I hope the select committee in the House will thoroughly investigate what this President is failing to do in foreign policy.

I yield the remainder of my time.

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.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to Mike

Montelongo, of my staff, during this period of morning business.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk for a minute about the importance of arming and training the Bosnians.

One of the commitments that the President made to Senator DOLE and Senator MCCAIN was to arm and train the Moslems. I want to read from the Dole floor speech of November 30, 1995. He said:

What is needed is a concrete effort, led by the United States, to arm and train the Bosnians. This effort should not be contingent on so-called "build-down provisions" in the Dayton agreement. I understand administration officials said this morning that the U.S. or NATO would not be involved in enabling Bosnia to defend itself.

In my view, it is an abdication of responsibility to rely on unspecified third countries to create the conditions that will allow withdrawal of American forces. The sooner we start to enable Bosnia to defend itself, the sooner U.S. forces can come home. In my view, the definition of a success of this deployment must include a real end to the war. That is only possible with the creation of stable military balance which enables Bosnia to defend itself. Anything less simply exposes American forces to great risk in order to monitor a temporary interlude in the fighting.

That is what Senator DOLE said on the floor on November 30, 1995. Both he and Senator MCCAIN repeatedly talked about the importance of that element. It is absolutely true. I have been to Bosnia twice in the last 8 or 9 months, and I have seen what the three warring factions are doing and what their relative strengths are. There is a strong Croatia; there is a strong Serb force in Bosnia; there is a good, strong force of Moslems, but they are underarmed and undertrained.

To be very practical, Mr. President, any reader of military history or, indeed, history of the world, knows that a lasting peace is best kept with strength. The parity of strength among the three parties will give Bosnia the very best chance for peace that it could possibly have. The reverse is also true. If we do not strengthen the Bosnian Moslems, they could be overrun by either of the other two stronger parties. That could happen because we have not kept our commitment.

Mr. President, if we want to have a lasting impact on this country, with the vast amount of resources, human and monetary, which our country has put forward already, we must take the last step. This administration is not doing it. There is no large-scale effort to arm and train the Moslems, which was a promise that President Clinton made to Senator DOLE and to this Congress. It was a promise made.

Mr. President, that is the key for a lasting cease-fire and the possibility for lasting peace in Bosnia. There must be rough parity among the three parties. Right now, we are almost halfway into the IFOR mission, the NATO mission, of which this country is a part,

and we have yet to see a real effort in arming and training the Moslems.

Now, one of the reasons given, Mr. President, is that the Iranian contingency has not left Bosnia, has not left Sarajevo. Well, Mr. President, why have the Iranians not left Sarajevo?

Could it be because Iran was the one country that violated the arms embargo to help the Bosnian Moslems with arms in their time of need?

This should come as no surprise. This Congress spoke forcefully time and time again: lift the arms embargo. Let arms from legitimate sources go into that country and help those people fight for themselves. But this administration continued to refuse to allow that to happen, and so there was one country that provided the arms. And we now learn that this administration knew and did not object to the Iranians providing those arms, in violation of the U.N. embargo, which the administration refused to let Congress lift.

Mr. President, it is a botched policy, and I would call today on the President of the United States to say just what his policy is. Where is the integrity of the policy of this country when two promises that were very important have been broken: That we would not violate the arms embargo despite repeated attempts by Congress to lift it legitimately, and that our troops would go in with a purpose of separating the warring factions and leave December 20—two commitments that we now see are being broken?

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Georgia has come to the floor, and I am happy to yield up to 10 minutes to my colleague from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the admirable efforts by the Senator from Texas who has come to the floor this morning to raise and bring attention to a subject that needs considerable attention.

Last year, when we were debating the entire question about whether to send United States troops on the ground in Bosnia there was much debate—hearings before the Armed Services Committee, hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member. General Shalikashvili, Secretary Perry, and others tried to sort out what should and should not happen.

For one, I never believed that the United States should bear the amount of responsibility it did in Bosnia. I felt that it was a European theater, that the Europeans should have been the predominant force, and that the U.S. support, which should have been there, should have been just that, in support of a European initiative. I have always been worried about this—why around the world when we have a real problem; it is in the European theater; the Europeans cannot work it out, so we will send in Uncle Sam.

I think it is a bad precedent to set. But the President made that decision,

and from that point forward, of course, all of us have been unanimous in trying to do everything we can to make certain that our soldiers, our men and women, have every support they need.

But again, the idea that the European theater cannot work it out so that the United States has to be the one that leads the way I think sets a bad precedent, not only in terms of who bears the responsibility but it would be a little bit like the United Kingdom working out Haiti. I do not think in anybody's mind the leading force in Haiti would have been the United Kingdom or France. It was in our hemisphere. It was our back door, and we have borne the brunt of that situation. Here we are in the underbelly of Europe, and we are bearing the brunt of it again.

In addition to, I think, setting a political precedent that could lead to problems in the future, let us just look at the financial ramifications of it. The United States, which is now the single world power, in a period of enormous domestic financial pressure cannot be the ultimate financial resource in resolving these world conflicts. And the cost of the operation in Bosnia has been and continues to be enormous. The effect of that is to squeeze training, squeeze logistical support, and squeeze research and development in our own standing military. These vast sums of money going into the peace-keeping operations put enormous pressure on the ultimate mission of our own military, which is to defend the integrity and the shores of the United States.

At the time we were discussing all these questions, Secretary Perry came before our Foreign Relations Committee, and in testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee Secretary Perry indicated that the maximum duration of the U.S. commitment would be 1 year. And I can remember on the lips of virtually every member of the committee was the assertion or the worry, the anxiety that there would be mission creep; that we would get into nation building; that we would begin to assume the responsibility of rebuilding this poor and war-torn country and circumstance. And there was worry because of the ethnic divisions that in 1 year how would all that be quelled. But the assurances from the administration, the assurances from Secretary Perry were that we would not be in a mission of nation building; it was a military mission, as suggested by the Senator from Texas, and that it would be 1 year and that would have to suffice. That was the U.S. commitment.

As the Senator from Texas has suggested this morning and has read some of the quotes of the London Times of April 30:

The Clinton administration has scrapped plans to withdraw its forces by the end of the year.

And we are beginning to hear pleas from the European theater and suggestions that, well, we maybe cannot conclude this at the end of the year, and,

yes, maybe we will be involved in other activities other than the initial military mission of separating the warring parties.

That suggestion leaves the American people once again unclear as to how to respond to a Presidential commitment. You go to the American people and say we are going to send your sons and daughters over there but they are only going to be there a year. You come to the Congress. You say we are only going to go for 1 year. We are going to have a very narrow, very defined mission.

When we began to discuss an exit strategy, it was quelled in a minute because the administration said the exit strategy was we are out of there in a year. And now with the slippage of time, we begin to undermine those commitments. Not only does that leave the American people, not only does it leave their Representatives, the Congress of the United States, unclear as to just where we are and where this all leads, but it is almost a certainty to mean more resources, more dollars.

What that means is more pressure on the principal mission of the military, more pressure on the budget, more pressure on the funds necessary to train American soldiers, more pressure on the budget to enter into research and development to keep us the technological military we displayed in the Persian Gulf—keep it at the edge.

We have spent the last 2 years talking about the financial dilemma in America. We fought for balanced budgets. We have eliminated programs. We have fought through the 1996 budget, and now we will be into the 1997 budget, trying to save billions of dollars in order to keep the country financially healthy, because at the end of the day, without a healthy Nation, we cannot fulfill our obligations at home or abroad.

So those financial questions must be at the core of decisions we make about where we put those resources and how long we can suffer those resources being spent. That was the worry when this debate began, that the peacekeeping missions were putting too much pressure on the fundamental mission of the military. Here we are, already beginning to take those initial promises to the American people, the initial promises to the Congress, and you get this fudging, this fuzzy look here.

I think the Senator from Texas has been absolutely correct in calling on the administration to clarify to the people and to the Congress that it is going to adhere to the promises made when this mission began, that it is going to withdraw at the time it said, that it is not going to engage in mission creep, and we are not going to use the U.S. military components to be engaged in social rebuilding of the war-torn country. I reiterate, it is a good time to reassess the fundamental responsibility of the United States as an ally and in support of NATO, but at the same time acknowledging that the

final responsibility for the European theater rests with the Europeans.

Mr. President, I see my 10 minutes has expired, and I yield back to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Texas is recognized for the remainder of her 60 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, we have been talking for the last 45 minutes about this administration's Bosnia policy. I would just sum it up with "promises made, promises broken."

This administration promised: On December 20, 1996, American troops would be gone from Bosnia. The second promise was that the arms embargo would not be lifted by the President, despite repeated attempts by Congress to do so. He refused to lift the arms embargo so that legitimate sources could provide arms for Bosnians to fight for themselves and their country and their freedom, despite the fact they begged us in this Congress to do so. I will never forget the poignant testimony of then-Vice President Ganic, who said, "Let us die fighting for our freedom. We are dying anyway. Help us die for a cause."

But at the same time the administration was saying we are not going to allow legitimate sources of arms for the Moslems. Instead, according to news reports, this administration did not object to arms sales from another source which was not legitimate, Iran.

What is the result of that? The result is the Iranian mujaheddin is still in Sarajevo. Significant arming and training of the Moslems has yet to begin, and the excuse used is the Iranians are still in Sarajevo, despite the fact that in the Dayton accords they were to have been expelled from Bosnia. And the result is that the December 20 deadline is not going to be met.

So we have an administration that would not come to the American people and state a policy that the American people could count on and that our allies and our enemies would know would stay in place. That is the result. The issue of arming and training the Moslems was a key part of the negotiations between Senator DOLE and the President when we were trying to support the President's right to deploy even as we were disagreeing with the policy of deployment.

I want to quote from Senator DOLE's statement on the floor, again, November 30, 1995:

In my view, the definition of success of this deployment must include a real end to the war that is only possible with the creation of a stable military balance which enables Bosnia to defend itself. Anything less simply exposes American forces to great risks in order to monitor a temporary interlude in the fighting. In other words, I guess if they all came home next year there might be a temporary interlude to get us through the November activities of 1996, and I am not certain it would last very long.

Senator MCCAIN, November 30, 1995, in his statement on the floor:

Further, we must ensure that the goals of their mission are clear and achievable and will justify to some extent the risks we will incur. A clear exit strategy is not time-based but goal-based. We must ensure that the peace we enforce for 12 months has a realistic prospect to endure in the 13th, 14th, 15th month, and hopefully for years beyond that. Essential to that goal is a stable military balance. To achieve that balance, we will have to see to it that the Bosnian Federation has the means and the training to provide for its own defense from aggression after we have withdrawn. Therefore, I believe our authorization of this deployment must be conditioned on the concrete assurances that the United States will do whatever is necessary, although without using our soldiers who are part of the implementation force, to ensure that the Bosnians can defend themselves at the end of our mission.

It was clear from Senator DOLE and Senator MCCAIN that it was a condition of this Senate that the Moslems be armed and trained, to create a stable military balance. The President wrote a letter confirming that. The President said:

In the view of my military advisers, this requires minimizing the involvement of U.S. military personnel. But we expect that some individual military officers, for example, working in OSD, DSAA, or other agencies, will be involved in planning this effort. I agree that maintaining flexibility is important to the success of the effort to achieve a stable military balance within Bosnia. But I will do nothing that I believe will endanger the safety of American troops on the ground in Bosnia. I am sure you will agree this is my primary responsibility.

That is giving the President his due. We agree with that. The President went on to say in his letter to Senator DOLE and Senator MCCAIN:

I have given you my word that we will make certain that the Bosnian Federation will receive the assistance necessary to achieve an adequate military balance when IFOR leaves. I intend to keep it.

That is what the President said in writing, December 12, 1995. He said the Americans would not be leading that effort, but that we would make sure that it would happen. "I intend to keep my word." That is what he said. It was a condition. It was a condition for the approval of the President's right to deploy.

We have a policy. We have a promise that is being broken. Either the President must keep his commitment to the American people that he will withdraw the troops by December 20, as he promised, or the President should come back to Congress and tell us why he is breaking his word.

Why does he feel it is necessary to do this? I think he owes us that much. I think he owes the American people that much, and I think he owes our troops on the ground that much.

Mr. President, I think it is time for this administration to understand the importance of keeping a promise, whether it is to the American people or to our allies or in general to the world, so that everyone knows that if we say we are going to do something, we will do it. But telling the American people we will withdraw troops by December

20 and telling our allies that we will leave troops on the ground into 1997 is not keeping the integrity of the American word, and I think we have the right to expect that from our President who is representing our country.

This is a serious issue, and I hope the President will address it with integrity.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield back the remainder of my time, and 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. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, until 10:30.

#### GAS TAX REDUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have noted the last several days a number of people coming to the floor to talk about tax freedom day. I noted this morning on the television programs that the majority leader, Senator DOLE, was talking about bringing a vote to the floor of the Senate, perhaps today, he said, to repeal the 4.3-cent gas tax or reduce the gas tax by 4.3 cents.

I will make a couple of observations about those issues.

First, tax freedom day. The suggestion, I guess, by those who talk about tax freedom day and the date beyond which they now can spend money on themselves, the suggestion is, I guess, that the money that is spent by them to build their children's schools, to pay for the police force, to pay for the Defense Department to defend our country, to provide for the resources for Social Security and Medicare, which incidentally are the four largest areas of public spending—schools, health care, defense, and local policing functions—the implication is somehow that those are not investments or those are not expenditures that count.

I think a lot of people would say that the payment of money to fund a school system to be able to send your children to good schools does count and does matter. That is an investment in your family. I just observe that some taxes are levied in order to do things we must do together as a country—educate our kids, build roads, defend our country, provide for the general welfare such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and so on. Some of them, I think, deserve a more thoughtful response than the implication somehow that it is just money that goes into some dark hole. Much of that is an investment in our children, an investment in security, an investment in health care.

Having said all that, would we like to see lower taxes in our country? Yes. Would we like to find a way to reduce the tax burden? Sure. We have a circumstance in this country now where we spend more money than we take in; 2 years ago, 2½ years ago, in 1993, we passed a bill on the floor of the Senate by one vote to reduce the Federal deficit. It was not easy to do. We only passed it by one vote on a strictly partisan vote. We did not get even one vote from the other side of the aisle by accident. Normally you think somebody makes a mistake, but we did not get one vote by accident. A group of us passed this piece of legislation, and 2½ years later the deficit is reduced by half. The deficit is half of what it was nearly 3 years ago.

Now I am glad we did that. It was not popular. The popular thing was to vote "no." Certainly it was not popular to vote "yes" to cut spending and increase some taxes, but we did it. I am glad we did it. The deficit is down as a result of it.

Now, what has happened in the last number of weeks is gasoline prices have spiked up by 20 to 25 cents a gallon. Gasoline prices spike up, and then we have people come to the floor of the Senate and say, well, our solution to that is to reduce the gas tax by 4.3 cents. There is really no connection, of course, but that is the solution. It is kind of like a person driving down the road in a vehicle and it overheats and steam starts flooding from under the hood and the driver pulls off the road, gets out, opens the trunk, and changes the tire. There is no relationship between the 20- or 25-cent-per-gallon spike in gas taxes and the 4.3-cent gas tax reduction that is being proposed. It is purely political. In fact, it is trotted out here on tax day, I guess it is called tax freedom day. It is trotted out as a purely political hood ornament. That is fine. You have the right to do it.

My point is this: When we consider the issue of the 4.3-cent-per-gallon reduction in the gas tax, I intend to offer an amendment here in the Senate that asks the question, whose pocket is this money going to go in? If you are going to relieve the oil industry of collecting 4.3 cents a gallon in gasoline taxes, who ends up getting the cash? I said the other day in this country there are a lot of pockets. There are big pockets, there are small pockets, there are high pockets, there are low pockets. The question is, who will pocket the reduction in the gasoline tax? I will offer an amendment that says, if you reduce the gasoline tax, we should make sure it goes into the right pocket, the pocket of the consumer, the driver, the taxpayer. If we do not pass an amendment like that that provides the guarantee, guess who pockets the reduction in the gas tax? The oil industry.

Does anybody here honestly think that if we reduce the gas tax by 4.3 cents a gallon and do not provide an ironclad guarantee that it goes back to the consumer, does anybody believe

that the oil industry will not grab that money? It is cash in their pockets. They are the ones who set the price of gasoline. We can have people boast on the floor of the Senate about reducing the gas tax. It will not mean a thing to drivers and consumers unless they end up paying 4.3 cents less a gallon than they now pay.

I say to the majority leader and others, if you intend to bring a bill to the floor of the Senate to reduce the gas tax and increase the deficit, make sure you provide for the allowance for amendments, because some of us will insist on our right to offer amendments. If you develop procedures that prohibit us from offering amendments to make sure that the reduction in the gas tax goes in the right pockets, then we intend to slow this Senate down until we have an opportunity to offer amendments of that type.

I understand it is a Presidential election. It is an even-numbered year. When the Framers wrote the Constitution of America, they created a miracle. At least old Claude Pepper, the former member of this body and the House of Representatives, used to call it a miracle—a miracle that every even-numbered year the American people are able to grab the American steering wheel and make adjustments to where the country is headed. They have the right to grab the steering wheel and make the adjustments. It is an election year, an even-numbered year in America. There are lots of politics floating back and forth here and there; the only time in our country's history, I believe, where the majority leader of the Senate is running against an incumbent President. I have great respect for both people. But the floor of the Senate is not, of course, a political party convention auditorium. It is the U.S. Senate. Is there an inclination to engage in a great deal of politics here on the floor of the Senate on behalf of both sides? Yes. That has always been the case. Will there be more of an inclination now in the coming weeks to do that? I am sure. Is the gas tax reduction that is being proposed political? Obviously.

Someone wanting to know what caused a 20- or 25-cents-per-gallon runup in gas prices at the pumps might have said, well, try to investigate what happened. Ask the Justice Department to investigate the oil industry to ask what happened to the price of gas. Who did it? Why? The President asked the Justice Department to do that. Some saw it as an opportunity to say, "Well, come to the floor of the Senate and talk about the 4.3-cent gas tax that was added in 1993 as part of the deficit reduction act." That is politics. That is fine. They could have said, how about the other 10-cent-per-gallon gas tax that was added, supported by the majority leader and others here in this body? There has been 10 cents supported previously, so, make it 14.3 cents, as long as it is a political issue. Do the whole thing.