

amendment got only 38 votes. I personally believe that if the American people had the right to vote on paying for the disaster assistance by cutting other programs, they would have voted for that amendment and it would have passed. So I somewhat feel here in the Senate as if my views on this subject are kind of hopelessly out of fashion. But I do believe that when families sit around kitchen tables every night and write their budgets and make tough decisions when they have emergencies, they have to take money away from things they want to do, and I believe they would have been on the side that I took on this issue.

This bill, as now written, with all the good things it will do, will raise the deficit this year by \$760 million. It will raise the deficit, over the next 5 years, by \$6.6 billion. We are going to adopt a budget resolution. We have already adopted it in both Houses of Congress—we are going to work out the differences and adopt it shortly—that is going to set out the claim of balancing the budget. I am not going to drag that dead cat back across the table by pointing out again in great detail that 97 cents out of every dollar of deficit reduction in that budget is simply assumed. It doesn't represent any policy change. But I have to lament, in passing, that before that budget is adopted, we are already busting that budget by \$6.6 billion. The deficit spending in the Senate and the deficit spending in Washington never comes to an end.

I wish we were having a different battle today rather than fighting over continually funding the Government—which I think we should—instead of allowing it to be shut down. But I wish we were having a fight about the fact that this bill doubles the level of funding that was originally requested. I wish we were having a battle about the fact that this bill spends \$8.6 billion—twice as much as originally requested—for flood damage and for replenishment of money for Bosnia. I wish there were greater concerns about the fact that this bill will raise the deficit by \$6.6 billion. But that concern today, while it exists in the Senate, is certainly a minority view. I think it is important on these occasions to simply point out that we have done the right thing in helping our fellow Americans who have had terrible things happen to them that were beyond their control. But we have done the wrong thing by not paying for it, because in helping people that have suffered from a natural disaster, we are contributing once again to not only a man-made, but a Government-made disaster called the deficit. I simply want to predict that this problem is not going to go away and that we are going to be back here some day worrying about the deficit again, and that we might wish that we had not raised it by \$6.6 billion today.

I thank our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for giving me this time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes forty two seconds.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this has been cleared with the Democratic leadership and our leadership. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1469 occur at 6 p.m., as ordered, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not have received the official papers from the House by that time, and that when and if the Senate does receive those papers, the vote at 6 p.m. be considered as a vote on final passage of the conference report, provided that the papers received from the House are identical to the conference report filed in the House last evening.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is here. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes forty eight seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may speak within the balance of our time on a subject other than the bill.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 842 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes and 17 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded.

The vote, pursuant to the previous order, will take place at 6 o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order

to ask for the yeas and nays on the vote at 6 p.m.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

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

#### OUR TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I just wanted to share a few thoughts with you on something that came up this last week.

I was quite distressed when I heard that the President of the United States—the administration—suggesting that maybe our troops in Bosnia are going to be there for a longer period of time than the deadline having been established of June 30, 1998. This bothers me a great deal, for one reason in particular, and that is, I am chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Back when the decision was made in 1995 to send troops to Bosnia, many of us felt this was not a good idea—not that we are not compassionate, but that we were using our very rare, precious resources, after this administration has decimated virtually our defense budget to send troops over to areas and endanger their lives where we have no national security interest at stake.

This is something that bothers quite a few of us. So we introduced back in November 1995 a resolution of disapproval to stop the President from sending troops over to Bosnia. This only lost by four votes, or we could have perhaps kept our troops from being sent over to Bosnia.

I was concerned about this because I went to Bosnia to see what our interests might be over there. When I went up to the northeast sector, the northeastern part of Bosnia, where it would be under the jurisdiction of the support of the United States for our station troops to be stationed, I got up there, and when I told the people up there that it was going to be 12 months, as the President promised, that our troops would be over there—this is November 1995, keep in mind—General Hoagland, in charge of the northeast

sector for the United Nations, made this statement. He started laughing. He said, "You mean 12 years, don't you?" I said, "No, 12 months. The President has promised that this is a 12-month operation, that if we deploy the troops to Bosnia, they would be back in 12 months."

So nobody really believed rationally that would happen. However, because of the President's promise that the troops would be back in 12 months, they were able to get enough votes to defeat our resolution of disapproval. And they sent the troops over to Bosnia.

Now we are in a position where we will do everything in our power to support the troops over in Bosnia. But at the time when he said they would all be back by December 1996, all of a sudden, as soon as the election was over, we find that the troops are going to be extended over there another 18 months, or until June 30 of 1998.

This is kind of a creeping thing that we go through, such as we experienced many years ago with our Marines in Guatemala. We have many other examples where we have gone in for a limited period of time. I can remember when we sent troops over to Somalia and they were going to be over there for a short period of time. And they stayed. It wasn't until 19 of our Rangers were murdered and their bodies dragged through the streets of Mogadishu that finally there was enough pressure to bring our troops back home.

I am very concerned now because, as I suspected would be the case, the President, who, again, has promised the second time that all the troops would be back home now by June 30, 1998, has started to renege on that. We can't let this happen.

The cost they talked about for the Bosnian operation initially was \$2 billion. It has now turned out to be closer to \$8 billion, as I predicted over 18 months ago it would be, and we are at least creeping up to \$6.5 billion.

Where does that money come from? We are going to be asked to vote for an emergency supplemental. That is to pay for the additional cost over there, along with other problems, other flood problems and emergencies that existed, and a few cats and dogs thrown into the bill. However, in this case, we have to spend the money.

Where does it come out of? It comes out of our defense budget, which is already strained to the point where we can't carry out the minimum expectations of the American people, and that is to defend America on two regional fronts.

So we have a second reason. Not only are we endangering the lives of our troops over there, but we are also spending money that should be going into building and rebuilding our Nation's defense system.

So, Mr. President, I want to get on record, as I did in Brussels when I gave the speech to NATO, that I would do

everything, with every fiber in my being, to make sure that the troops come back.

I would suggest this, however. I think the President is in the bully pulpit on this. I think he keeps continuing to want to leave them over there knowing full well that once the troops leave, it will go back to just like it was before. The Croats, Muslims, the Serbs, the Mujaheddin, the Arkan Tigers, the Black Swans—all of the other rogue forces—will be over there fighting as they were before. And then he can say, well, if we had left them their longer, that would not have happened. Recognizing that is going to happen regardless, I still say, Mr. President, we should all resolve to ourselves that our troops should come on the second deadline that we have standing. That is June 30, 1998.

I yield the floor.

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

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

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84), establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of June 4, 1997.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a typographical error contained in the statement of managers to accompany the conference report on the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution. During the course of the conference some language was worked out to include in the statement of managers with respect to the section 8 housing allowance—which is set out in section

203 of the conference report. This language was mistakenly included in the description of section 203 of the Senate amendment rather than in the description of section 203 of the conference agreement. The language at issue reads as follows:

The agreement creates an allowance of \$9.2 billion in budget authority with an associated, but unspecified, amount of outlays to be released by the Budget committees when the Appropriations committees report bills that provide for renewal of Section 8 housing assistance contracts that expire in 1998. The conference agreement assumes that the amount of the allowance to be released (estimated to be \$3.436 billion for outlays) will not be reduced to the extent that the appropriations and authorizing committees produce Section 8 savings that were proposed in the President's 1998 budget.

Mr. President, the conference report on the concurrent budget resolution of the budget for fiscal year 1998 now before the Senate, represents the first major legislative step—in what will be a number of steps—to implement the bipartisan budget agreement announced by President Clinton and the bipartisan congressional leadership almost exactly 1 month ago today.

As those in this Chamber will understand, but maybe not as obvious to those watching this debate, this conference agreement is the blueprint that will guide the building and enforce the adjustments to legislation throughout the summer. When the legislation is finished following this blueprint, and when it is sent to the President and signed, we will have built a house that is fiscally strong for the future.

So today's vote on this conference agreement should be identical to the 78 to 22 vote taken in this Chamber just before the Memorial Day recess. And that is as it should be, because the conference agreement is based on the Senate-passed budget resolution and the House-passed budget resolution which both followed the agreed on budget levels of the announced bipartisan budget agreement. In other words the aggregate numbers in the two Chambers' resolutions were almost identical, resulting in hardly any need for a conference.

In fact, it was initially felt that since both resolutions followed the agreement, there was not even a need or a conference. It was held by our joint leadership that merging the two resolutions—because of the normal differences in House and Senate committees of jurisdiction under the reconciliation instructions—that this could have been done by simply adopting a House amendment to the Senate amendment, a procedure clearly authorized under the Budget Act. However, this procedure would have put us in the posture of possibly having amendments to that House amendment, the leadership concluded we should expedite the process by simply having a conference meeting and avoiding possible amendments.

So on Tuesday afternoon when the House returned from the Memorial Day