Using NATO forces as peacekeepers is a mission for which the defense alliance is not designed and was not created.

The number of U.S. troops—20,000—is too small to effectively police the peace agreement and puts soldiers at risk.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 28, 1995]

THE MACABRE TRIBUTE TO MCNAMARA'S BAND

(By Wesley Pruden)

The man has no shame, but we knew that.

Bill Clinton, who did everything but defect to Hanoi to avoid doing his duty to his country 30 years ago, tried yesterday to make a case for sending young men to do their duty in Bosnia and, being Bill Clinton, naturally cast it as something else—an opportunity to immunize little children against childhood disease.

''This is an extraordinary opportunity,'' the president said, announcing that he would commit $2 million for the needles and the serum.

''We have a very compelling responsibility,'' he said, stopping just short of announcing that Miss Hillary would accompany the troops as a Red Cross doughnut girl.

Anyone who objects to doing for Europe what European boys should be doing naturally despises children almost as much as the Republicans hate old folks, and probably roots for measles and chickenpox.

The bad news is that the commander-in-chief has the authority to send troops anywhere in the world, even to liberate Scotland from Di's daffy in-laws if such a notion pops into his head, and in the end Congress, skeptical or not, will have little choice but to stamp it ''OK.''

Once they're in place, there's not a man or woman among us—well, not many—who won't insist that they get everything they need to protect themselves and to make themselves as comfortable as possible.

Besides, if Mr. Clinton truly ''loathes'' the military, as he said he does, there's no better way to show it than to send upwards of 25,000 of our ''loathsome'' sons to a wintry holiday in the mountainous wilds of Bosnia, where sniping at Americans, or planting land mines under their feet, will be the season's sport.

Mr. Clinton enlists all the bromides and cliches, many well weathered in antiquity, to make his case: ''We must not and we will not turn our backs on peace. The accord [signed in Dayton] offers the people of Bosnia the first real hope of peace in nearly four years. Now we have a responsibility to see this achievement through. That is who we are as a people. That is what we stand for as a nation.''

This is remarkably like the fervent exhortations Lyndon Johnson employed to persuade young Bill Clinton three decades ago, and the mature Bill Clinton can only hope that it sounds better in a mock-sincere Arkansas drawl than in a tinny Texas twang.

From the snug comfort of their campaign headquarters, the president and his men, who were—in Mr. Clinton's youthful words—''too educated to fight,'' can live out the vicarious bang-bang enthusiasms they missed in Vietnam. Just as in Vietnam, the men the president sends to Bosnia will have to deal with the fierce ethnic rivalries and bitter suspicions that fragmented the countryside in the first place. In his speech last night, the president recited the scenes of other American attempts to do good in the face of fighting, in World Wars I and II, in Haiti, Iraq, the Middle East and even Northern Ireland. He studiously dodged paying tribute to the American sacrifice in Vietnam, a sacrifice he has acidly scorned in the past.

Mr. Clinton promises to go through the motions of seeking the support of Congress, and Congress will go through the motions of resisting. But in the end the troops will debark—unless the president changes his mind, and nobody is foolish enough to bet against that—and Congress will go along. How can it not, if we intend to redeem whatever shred of respect the rest of the world has for us three years into the Clinton era.

Bob Dole, who has seen the face of war up close and personal, understands this. ''I want to be in a position to support the president,'' he says. ''It seems to me, when it comes to foreign policy, if we speak with one voice, we're better off.'' He makes the point that the president ''never thought foreign policy was important until now.''

Congress has an obligation to the men and women it puts in harm's way to make it clear, since the president and his men won't, exactly who it is who's sending them there, and why. Defense Secretary William Perry, echoing Robert McNamara from the summer of '65, says the American role will be completed within a year. Warren Christopher, echoing Dean Rusk, dusts off the infamous domino theory (''the fighting could spread to Europe unless we act now'').

Nicholas Burns, a State Department spokesman who will get no closer to Bosnia than Constitution Avenue, recites the ''iron-clad'' assurances of the Serbians that they intend to be nice when the Americans arrive, and he scoffs at Radovan Karadzic's grim promise to make Bosnia ''bleed for decades'' as being meaningless because ''his best days are behind him.''

Perhaps. And perhaps Bill Clinton's, too, as his chickens from Saigon come home to roost on Pennsylvania Avenue.

RAIDING SOCIAL SECURITY TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to begin a series of, I do not know if they can be called lectures, tonight; this is by way of introduction; but certainly a series of observations on what is ostensibly taking place tonight, which is presumably the first meeting with respect to balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the floor here previously indicating to you and to my colleagues and to the American people that the budget that has been presented to us is not going to be a balanced budget, certainly not a balanced budget in the sense that most Americans understand it to be. This is because we are going to have a category called off-budget spending.

Now the average person and the average household who has to deal with their budget does not begin to accept this kind of terminology, and the fact is that Speaker GINGRICH has indicated over and over again that he wants to have a balanced budget in 7 years, and he wants honest numbers. Well, I am perfectly willing to deal with that situation. I would like to approach it from a different perspective, and I will be discussing that in the days to come as well as to what that might be as an alternative.

But what is before us now very frankly is not honest numbers, not honest numbers as people understand them. I hope that we will be able to get a much broader discussion under way throughout the Nation as to what constitutes this balanced budget. If the Speaker wants to have honest numbers, then I think he needs to come down here on the floor and indicate that he is going to take money from the Social Security Trust Fund in order to do this balancing. That is where it is going to come from.

I will use the figures of the Congressional Budget Office. This is not something that I am going to be making up because it suits me. There has been an insistence that the Congressional Budget Office figures be used.

Now, I will indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Congressional Budget Office will confirm that in order for the budget, as presented by the majority, to be balanced that it must take from the Social Security Trust Fund upward of $636 billion plus interest, so that in the year 2002, 7 years from now, when the majority is saying that the budget will be balanced, those of you who expect to be able to draw on Social Security will find that there will be a gigantic IOU for almost $1 trillion.

Now I am only one person so far, but I believe, if you have the truth on your side, that it will out. Dozens and dozens and dozens of Members can come down on this floor and say they are going to balance the budget in 7 years, and I will maintain that unless they can explain how they are going to pay the almost $1 trillion that they have taken from Social Security to pay for it, they cannot do it.

You need only look at the budget document itself and it will show every year a deficit. The budget document of the House indicates that starting this year there will be a deficit, and each year that deficit has to be accounted for.

No. 4; this is from the conference report of the 104th Congress, first session, concurrent resolution in the budget proposal for that year, 1996, presented in June of this year. The fourth sequence, deficits. For the purpose of the enforcement of this resolution the amount of the deficits are as follows: Fiscal year 1996, $245 billion, listing on up to the year 2002, $108 billion.

How is it possible for the Speaker or anyone else presenting the budget formula for the press, for the American people, to say that the budget is going to be balanced if by the conference report itself there is a $108 billion deficit? Very simple. You take $115 billion from Social Security, from the trust fund, and wonder of wonders, you come up with a $10 billion surplus.

In the days to come, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be examining what this is all about and what it means.

Now the average family, when they are being told that the budget is going to be balanced in 7 years and told that that is a good thing for the United States, has no idea that Social Security is being attacked, and as I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate

this opportunity to make this introduction, in the days to come I will detail for you and for my colleagues and the American public how there is no balanced budget, how we are raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the deficit that will actually exist in 2002.

IS BOSNIA WORTH DYING FOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, President Kennedy said:

> We must face the fact that the U.S. is neither omnipotent nor omniscient—that we are only 6% of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94%—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.

President Kennedy was right then, and his words are good advice today.

We should follow this advice in regard to the situation in Bosnia.

Last week, the cover of Time magazine showed an American soldier and asked the question: ''Is Bosnia worth dying for?''

I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people would answer with an emphatic ''no.''

It should be for Bosnians because that is their homeland, but not for young Americans.

This is a limited ethnic conflict that has been going on for hundreds of years, and will continue unless we pour many billions in to stop it. And as soon as we stop pouring in billions, the situation will go right back like it was.

We should not send young American soldiers onto foreign battlefields unless there is a serious threat to our national security or unless there is a very real and very vital U.S. interest at stake.

Neither of these is present in Bosnia. Yet now, the President, regardless of how the American people feel, regardless of how the Congress votes, is going to send 20,000 troops into Bosnia.

We will then have another 20,000 in immediate nearby support in Croatia, the Adriatic Sea, and other places.

I had one veteran who called me last night who said that he was always told in Vietnam that it took seven troops in the rear to support one in the field.

We are making a tremendous commitment here. The worst thing is putting so many American lives at risk.

Then there is the huge money involved. We are told right off the bat that this effort will cost a minimum of $1.6 billion for the troops in the field.

We have promised another $600 million in direct foreign aid. That is an initial $2.2 billion and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

I now am told that the Bosnian leadership says they will need $35 billion in loans or aid from the World Bank or other sources to rebuild their country.

Most of this will end up coming from the United States.

B.J. Cutler, the foreign affairs columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, wrote several months ago:

> If guarding people from the savagery of their rulers is America's duty, it would be fighting all over the world, squandering lives and bankrupting itself.

He was not writing about Bosnia, but his words are certainly applicable here.

There are at least 15 or 16 small wars going on around the world at any time. Some people say many more than that.

Why then are we trying to solve this insolvable problem.

Well, I think in part it is because our national media focused on this one.

But, I think the larger reason is that some people in high positions in this country are never satisfied with just running the United States.

They want to make a place for themselves in history. They want to be described as, or thought of as, world leaders.

That is why I believe there is such a class division on this.

Many upper-crust liberal elitist types—many NPR devotees, are all for this—because they want to prove to everyone that they care about foreign policy and are concerned about world affairs.

Horror of horrors, they certainly don't want to be associated with low-class, unintellectual isolationists. That would not be fashionable, that would not be politically correct.

But, Mr. Speaker, even one American life is too many and all these billions it will cost is to high a price to pay just so a few people in our Government can display world leadership and show their superiority to their unenlightened fellow citizens.

We should not get involved in this Bosnian quagmire.

The potential dangers and costs are simply too high.

The United States leads the world in humanitarian and charitable aid for those in other countries.

No other nation is even a close second.

Most Americans want to help out in international tragedies. We are already doing far more than our share. France, Germany, Sweden, Japan, and others are not even coming close.

We have no reason to feel guilty.

And, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I said at the beginning. We do not need to get involved militarily in Bosnia or anywhere else unless there is a real threat to our national security or a vital U.S. interest at stake.

Neither of these is present in Bosnia.

□ 2015

THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF SENDING IN AMERICAN TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHRYSLER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are about to be subjected to a situation where 20,000 American troops will be sent into very difficult territory in the area that we know as Bosnia-Herzegovina. Let us take a look at the circumstances under which they will have to do that. I am holding the Proximity Peace Talks, which is an outline of the circumstances giving rise to the exact language of the peace talks. Listen to the country created by these peace talks.

''The country will be known as the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but the country will be split in two because it will also have two entities comprised of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Serb Republic. The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina will control 51 percent of the country.''

I ask you, is that type of a situation tenable? Let me also throw something out here. There will not be one President on the new Constitution, there will not be two Presidents, it will be a troika, three Presidents, if that is correct. There will be three Presidents to run this country we know as the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. That will be one Moslem, one Croat, and one Serb.

Do you really think that a troika comprised of these three who have been fighting essentially for the past 1,500 years can get along? But, Mr. Speaker, more important is the fact that American troops will be sent to Bosnia-Herzegovina for the purpose of killing, if necessary, to protect the peace. That is correct. The language in this report says that the troops should use ''necessary force to ensure compliance.''

What does that mean? That means they can use the gig guns to clear out the 2½-mile-wide demilitarized zone, but it means something else. American troops actually under the NATO command will try to do one of two things. They will try to keep the big guns away from the Serbs, and if that does not work, then they will try to arm the Bosnians to try to bring about military parity.

Mr. Speaker, this does not make sense. This is a peace agreement? A peace agreement means people shake hands, repent, reconcile, and say, ''Let's go on with our lives, and put the war behind us.'' But what has happened here is the fact our President is going to put American troops in the position of fighting the war that the Bosnians have not been allowed to fight themselves. That is right. The United Nations, with the approval of the President, has steadfastly refused to allow the Bosnians to have the weapons with which to defend themselves. That has cased the tremendous amount of carnage in that country.

Now we have this great peace plan, the peace plan where Americans will be authorized to kill in order to enforce the peace. True peace in that area can only be brought about if the Americans