unacceptable. Protecting New York State's and New York City's hospitals, health care providers and medical educators helps to safeguard the health of our Nation while preserving the health and economic well-being of one of our country's most densely populated cities and States.

□ 2245

As the budget negotiations continue, I ask my colleagues to join me in fighting to reduce these cuts. I am proud to have voted against the reconciliation bill and I will oppose any future budget that cuts with the injustice and scope of the Republican proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUSTIFICATION FOR SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss an issue that is going to confront us for the next several weeks in regard to the President's intention to send 20,000 to 25,000 of America's sons and daughters to the Balkans to participate in living up to the terms of the agreement just recently initialed in Dayton, OH.

Mr. Speaker, like many Americans across the country, I sat before my television set last evening and listened intently as President Clinton gave his justification to the American people for sending ground troops into Bosnia. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks from tomorrow I was invited to the Pentagon, where I had breakfast with Secretary Perry and the leadership of the Joint Chiefs, including General Shalikashvili, where they made a personal case to me and other Members of the Committee on National Security as to why we should commit our troops to Bosnia in light of the pending peace agreement, which had not yet been initialed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to respond, first of all, to President Clinton's speech, because parts of it bothered me greatly, and to lay the foundation for a hearing which our committee will hold on Thursday when again Secretary Perry, General Shalikashvili, and Secretary Christopher will come before the House Committee on National Security and again make the case to us to support the President's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has been on the Committee on National Security for 9 years and who chairs the Research and Development Subcommittee, I am vitally interested in any place or any time that we send our troops into harm's way, whether it be the time that we sent them to Desert Storm, or Haiti, or other operations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was taken aback by some of the comments President Clinton made in the speech yesterday evening and I have to respond to them, and this is the only opportunity where I can deal with them in a lengthy and involved format. I want to respond to three specific points that the President made to the American people and to Members of this body.

I want to, first of all, respond to his assertion that those who disagree with him are isolationists and want us to come back into our own borders and not be a part of the world community. The second issue I want to take exception to is the way that he characterized the moral argument involved in getting involved in Bosnia. And the third is the President's comparison of Bosnia and our potential involvement there to Haiti and Somalia as well as Desert Storm. Then I want to get into my own specific concerns relative to a potential vote that we may take in this body a week or two from now.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the contention made by President Clinton that those who may oppose his policy here are isolationists. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that for the past 3 years, a strong bipartisan voice in this body and the other body have voted repeatedly, have signed letters, have sent messages to the White House and the administration that we want to be a part of the process of helping achieve peace in the Balkans. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues in this body today, would support the presence of the United States in a somewhat limited way in the Balkans, as we have done repeatedly over the last 3 years.

After all, Mr. Speaker, there were many Members of both the majority and minority parties that supported the President's use of our Air Force in terms of the air strikes. Many of us have supported logistical support to provide food and clothing and humanitarian support and relief to the people of the Balkans. So time and again over the past 3 years Members of this body and the other body have made it clear that we want to be involved.

And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, as I said to the Secretary of Defense 2-weeks ago, I am prepared to support American troops in Bosnia tomorrow, but not on the ground. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the key issue that President Clinton completely ignored last evening. He made it appear as if we are in disagreement with him on his policy; that, therefore, we must not want the United States to be involved at all, and that is absolutely totally wrong. I think it was really shortsighted of the President to make that statement to the American people.

In fact, what I proposed to Secretary Perry, I think, would be supported by many of our colleagues in this body; and that is, why should America have to put 20,000 to 25,000 ground troops in between three warring factions that have been at war not for 4 years and not for one decade but for decades and decades and centuries and centuries? Why should the European countries, who are the bordering nations to Bosnia, not step up with that ground support force and let the United States involvement be what we do very well; airlift, sealift, air strikes, command and control, intelligence gathering and monitoring, and all the other ancillary support to make this mission a success?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when the President talks about a U.S. commitment of 20,000 to 25,000 troops, he is not being realistic with the American people nor is he being realistic with our colleagues in this body. As a matter of fact, right now, Mr. Speaker, we have an estimated 15,000 troops who are providing support services in the theater around Bosnia.

These services range from airlift and sealift to intelligence gathering, to all kinds of functions that they have been assigned by the Pentagon, just to name a few of the assignments that our military is currently involved in in the European theater, and this is, by the way, not complete. We have Operation Able Sentry going on right now. We have Operation Deny Flight. We have Operation Provide Province, Operation Sharp Guard, and Operation Provide Comfort. All of those operations are, today, involving American troops in the theater that the President is talking about sending ground troops in.

In fact, along with the ground troops that President Clinton is proposing, we are going to have a carrier, the America, off the coast. We are going to have Navy pilots and Navy personnel available. So our total support forces, besides the 20,000 to 25,000 ground troops, is going to be somewhere between 13,000 and 17,000.

When I met with the Secretary 2 weeks ago, I tried to pin he and General Shalikashvili to a specific number, and I will do that again this Thursday. I asked them, how many other U.S. troops will be involved in this effort? They would not give me a specific answer. To the best of my ability, I have determined that number will be somewhere above 15,000. So when the President goes before the American people as he did last night and says, I want to send 20,000 troops in, that is our commitment, what he should have said is, I want to have 35,000 or perhaps 40,000 U.S. troops involved in the theater of operation that includes, as our overall mission, Bosnia and the maintaining of the peace agreement that was initiated in Dayton.

Now, many of us in this body feel that what the President should have done is said we will provide that support in the form of airlift and sealift and use of our aircraft for attacks, if necessary, on selected sites, and command and control and intelligence gathering, but should not have had American troops placed in harm's way in an area of the world so far away from our shore and which many of us feel that we do not have a direct national interest. Many of us feel that it

is unconscionable that those countries that directly surround the Balkans are only putting in small tokens of troops.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to get exact counts. These numbers have varied. But I went through the foreign media, through our FBIS reports we get, that we can request in our offices, to try to get a feel for what other countries are committing in the way of troops to this operation. I think it is important for our colleagues and for the American public to understand exactly what those commitments are and what, if any, strings are being attached, so that, when the President speaks about 25 nations being involved, we know really what he means and what these countries are actually saying.

Great Britain, the United Kingdom, always our staunch ally, is in fact going to put up the largest complement of troops besides the United States. The Most recent number we have is about 13,000 troops compared to our 20,000. Now, Great Britain is very close to the Balkans, certainly much closer than the United States, and is obviously a part of the European theater. So you would expect them to put in place a large presence of military forces.

Let us go to Germany. Here I have a problem, Mr. Speaker. The United States and the President are committing 20,000 ground troops and the ancillary support troops that I have just talked about numbering at least 15,000. The Germans have said that, and get this, Mr. Speaker, subject to the Bundestag's approval. In other words, we do not have to approve what the President wants to do in our Congress. He can send the troops on his own, which he said he would do with or without our vote of approval. But in Germany their commitment to send their troops will be predicated upon the support of the Bundestag.

And how many troops are the Germans going to send in? Not 13,000, not 10,000, not 5,000, but 4,000. So Germany, right next to the Balkans, is going to send a total of 4,000 troops to the Balkans as their part of this operation.

Now, quoting the minister in a German publication, the defense minister, who spoke on November 22, he went on to say that these 4,000 troops would be involved, and I quote, in terms of being logistical units, engineers, medical orderlies, transport units, helicopters, and aircraft to secure the airspace. Where is the commitment for the ground troops in the middle of the hostile parties? This is Germany's commitment.

Then we go on to France. I remind our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that France has a very real threat from the spread of the Bosnian operation, and France is very near and close to the proximity of the Balkan conflict and you would expect would be willing to put up a sizable amount of soldiers for this operation. France's commitment is currently listed in a most recent French publication of November 22 as 7,500 soldiers. This would be a part of the overall NATO deployment, but 7,500 soldiers. This is the same France that is only putting up 7,500 soldiers to our 20,000 that denied the United States the ability to fly our planes over France when we were going after Mu'ammar Qadhafi when Ronald Reagan was the President, in response to attacks he had made on American citizens. So France's commitment right now is listed at 7,500.

Let us go to Spain, another European country. Let us see what Spain is talking about committing. This is from a radio network in Spanish in Madrid. Mr. Suarez Pertierra said it would be a tactical group of some 1,250 soldiers. So, while America is putting in 20,000 to 25,000 ground troops, Spain in talking about sending 1,250 soldiers to this operation.

Let us look at Sweden. Sweden, another European country that obviously has an interest in seeing peace in that part of the world, has said that it will be part of a Nordic brigade that would have 900 Swedes. Now, Sweden also has a condition placed on its commitment.

□ 2300

And that condition is that the United Nations shall be financially responsible for this operation. So, Sweden is saying, ''Yes, we will go, but you pay our bill.'' I did not hear that said on the part of our commitment. We are going to pay the entire bill.

Mr. Speaker, my guess is that this will end up much like Haiti. We not only paid for our expenses, but we will end up paying for the housing costs, the feeding, and logistical support for a number of other countries, all of which will be borne by the American taxpayers. But Sweden's troop commitment is right now 900.

Then we go to Austria, and I will quote a news source from Vienna Television Network, November 21, where there is a quotation from the leadership of Austria about their commitment. Their consideration is for sending a force of 200 to 250 men. It goes on to say, quote, ''Volunteers, of course. No one is going to be forced to go into this.'' Mr. Speaker, 200 to 250 are going to be volunteers and they will not serve as combat troops. They will be there as a transport unit.

Let us go on and talk about Italy, another European country that is expected to be a part of this operation. Look at what Italy's contribution will be. Initially, Italy balked when the press said that they heard rumors that 2,100 men would be sent, but now there is confirmation that the form will be 2,100. But Italian news media sources also go on to say that actually, and I quote, ''Parliament still has to give its approval to send out Italian troops.''

So, the United States Congress will not have the ability to approve the President's sending of not 20,000, but perhaps 35,000 troops into that theater; we will have the German Bundestag approve the German troops going in, and the Italian Parliament approve the Italian troops going in, but we will not have that ability in this country. The total commitment of Italy will be 2,100 men.

The Netherlands, another European country. The Netherlands, according to its population, is perhaps contributing a larger element that we would expect. The Netherlands Cabinet wants to make a decision about sending 2,000 troops to help with the peace accord.

Then we have Denmark. A Danish battalion is set to leave on January 8 as part of the NATO operation and they are talking about 807 men going from Denmark.

Mr. Speaker, these are not my reports. These are all sources that I will provide to anyone in this body in terms of what our European allies in NATO are going to commit to this operation.

Our point, Mr. Speaker, is not one of isolation. We want to be the leader of NATO, and we know we are. We continue to help our NATO allies every day. We have a strong presence in the European countries I have just mentioned. We have military bases there and Navy units deployed in the vicinity of those countries. We will be there for them.

But, Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is largely a European problem and many of us in this body feel that while the United States must play a role, and that role can be air strikes, air support, sea life support, command and control, intelligence gatherings, and all the other logistical help that we should not have to go beyond that and put 20,000 young American sons and daughters in the middle of what could be a very hostile environment; what certainly has been a very hostile environment.

So when the President talks, as he did last night, about isolationism, the President is totally, absolutely wrong. It is a slap in the face to every Member of this body that he would say his opponents are isolationists. In fact, many of us have said all along that we want us to be involved; we just do not want the United States to go it alone. That is what we think this President has gotten us into.

My opinion is the President, to some extent, put his foot in his mouth earlier their year when he said to the NATO allied leaders, ''I will put ground troops in Bosnia if we get a peace agreement.'' What he should have said is, ''I will make a commitment,'' and left that up to the final negotiations in Dayton. He did not do that.

Mr. Speaker, while the negotiations were going on, all of us in this body knew what was going to come out of those negotiations, and that was going to be taking the President up on his word, and that is to send 20,000 ground troops into Bosnia. That should never have been the negotiating position of this country in terms of our NATO involvement.

It certainly is not the position of this Member, and I know many of my colleagues, that we should not be involved, nor should we be isolationists.

The second issue I want to take up with the President is the way he characterized the morality argument here. He somehow tries to make the case that the Members of Congress who perhaps question what he wants to do here are not concerned about babies being killed, about ethnic cleaning, and about women being raped.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. As a member of the Human Rights Caucus since I have been in this body, I have tirelessly, again and again, spoken out on behalf of human rights abuses. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in at least three votes in this body over the past 2 years, we have overwhelmingly told the President to lift the arms embargo so that the Bosnian people could defend themselves, so that they, in fact, could have a level playing field, so that we could stop the abuses and stop the ethnic cleaning and stop the rape and torturing.

Every time this Congress, in a strong bipartisan manner, told the President to lift the embargo, the President said, ''no.'' Yet last night on national TV, the President tells the American people that he is really that one concerned about these kids being killed and these women being raped and the ethic cleaning.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what were we doing the past 2 or 3 years with all of these votes and these letters and these issues where we came forward and said, ''You have got to do something, Mr. President, about what is happening in the Balkans,'' and he did nothing. Now, all of a sudden the solution to all of these problems is to spend 20,000 of our kids into the Balkans on the ground in the middle of this controversy.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification for the President to make the statement that he made last night that he is the only one concerned with the moral issue of why we should be involved. There are steps that we could have and should have taken over the last 2 years to help even the playing field in the Balkans and we did not do it. Not because the Congress would not act, but because the President would not listen.

These were not just Republicans speaking. These were Republicans and Democrats. Some of the most eloquent leaders on lifting the arms sanctions and the arms embargo were on the minority side of the aisle; not just on the Republican side.

What really bothered me about the speech that the President made last night, at the end, Mr. Speaker, was when he alluded to a conversation that he had with the Pope. I really though it was grasping for straws when President Clinton basically said, The Pope told me to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the Vatican and for the Holy Father and for the leadership he provides for the world's Catholics. But, Mr. Speaker, to use a comment that supposedly have been attributed to the Pope as the political justification boggles my mind.

As one of our colleagues on the House floor said today, perhaps the President will tell us that he is going to change his stand on abortion, because I am sure the Holy Father talked to him about the sanctity of life, but I do not see President Clinton following the advice of the Pope on that issue, yet quoting the Pope in terms of taking this action in the Balkans.

The third issue I want to take exception with the President last night, Mr. Speaker, deals with his trying to compare the Balkans to what happened in Desert Storm and what happened in Haiti and Somalia.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, similarities. In Desert Storm we have a figure who was destined to take over a major part of the world and threaten the security of not just one country but a freedom-loving people in the Middle East, including the State of Israel, and threatening to create anarchy in that part of the world.

President Bush went to great lengths to line up allied support. Mr. Speaker, remember, that the cost of Desert Storm was not just in American lives and dollars, because as every Member, every one of our colleagues knows, the entire cost of Desert Storm, over $52 billion, was borne by those nations that benefited from our involvement. It was not a case where the United States went over and paid the bill and enticed people to come in by saying, ''We will pay your soldiers and provide them food and give them shelter, just be a part of the team.''

Mr. Speaker, in Desert Storm the parties who benefited most provided the dollars. And, yes, we did have an interest and, yes, we responded. And, yes, President Bush came to this Congress and asked for us to have an up-or-down vote in both bodies.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, not one Member of the Democratic leadership at that time stood up and spoke for nor voted for the effort to send our troops into Desert Storm. Not one. Yet I am sure when we have a debate on this floor, every one of those Members will get up and support President Clinton's actions. There is irony in that statement.

The President compared it to Haiti. Mr. Speaker, Haiti is not turning out to be the success that he promised. What has happened is we have spent about $2 billion of the U.S. taxpayers' dollars, and while the President has boasted about the other countries being involved, when he fails to tell the American people is that we paid for the bulk of their housing, their food, and their allowance support, subsistence support, to come to Haiti to be a part of that operation.

□ 2310

So basically they were brought in because America agreed to foot the bill. The U.S. taxpayers agreed to foot the bill. And whether or not we have been successful in Haiti is still undetermined. There have been killings and assassinations down there on a regular basis. And many of us predict Haiti will go right back to the way it was once we have our presence totally removed from that country.

Let us talk about Somalia, because perhaps here is what scares me the most, Mr. Speaker. Somalia is probably that area where we have been involved militarily that I think causes certainly me and many of our colleagues to feel most uncertain and concerned about what President Clinton wants to do in Bosnia. I remember well, Mr. Speaker, a meeting in mid-September, held in one of the largest meeting rooms in the basement of this building, when Secretary of Defense Aspin and Secretary Warren Christopher came into a meeting room filled with Members of Congress only. There were about 300 House and Senate Members there, after we had lost 18 young Americans who had been shot down over Mogadishu and had their bodies dragged through the streets because we did not have the backup troop support to go in and rescue them. When Les Aspin was asked why this happened, he eventually acknowledged that the commanding officer of the Somalian operation had in August requested additional backup support for our troops in that theater but that he and the administration denied that support. When asked why, Secretary Aspin said it was because of the hostile political environment inside the beltway, the first time since Vietnam that a political armchair decision in Washington affected military action in another part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee you this, as a member of the Committee on National Security, President Clinton is not going to repeat what he did in Somalia. If he, in fact, is successful in sending 20,000 ground troops into Bosnia, which I am certain he will be, whether or not we have a vote, he has already said he is sending the troops in, we are going to be very careful and we are going to be strident that this President is not going to call the political shots of what our military officers do in that theater. Because if our troops are committed by this Commander in Chief, then those calls have to be made by the commanding officer in charge of the theater of operation in Europe.

Commander Joulwon who has the highest respect of most every Member of this body who knows him and the military leadership who serves under him should and will be making those calls. And the one thing that we will be focusing on, since we will probably not be able to stop the President from asserting troops in Bosnia, will be to make sure that General Joulwon gets

every bit of support that he needs to maintain the safety of our troops. We want to make sure that there is no second guessing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, as there was in Somalia, saying, General Joulwon, we cannot send in more troops, we cannot send you more equipment because it is not the right political climate in Washington. If this President follows through on his commitment to send 20,000 ground troops into Bosnia, then this President better be prepared to let General Joulwon call the shots in terms of what support he needs to protect our troops, even though many of us in this body, including myself, have great hesitation with any ground troops going into Bosnia whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, most of us have resigned ourselves to the fact that we cannot stop the troops from being sent over there. The President is in fact the Commander in chief of our military. I acknowledge that. He has that function. He has the ability to commit our troops to any part of the world, even though twice in my lifetime, it has been this Congress, under Democrats, who have cut off funding for our military as a way to bring our troops back home from Vietnam and from Somalia. So this President will in fact send our troops. Whether we have a vote or not here will not matter. He has already ignored the will of the Congress in terms of lifting the arms embargo over the past 2 years, and he has already ignored the will of the Congress three times in the last 2 months. Because three times since August, Mr. Speaker, this body and the other body have taken specific votes to say to the President, do not commit ground troops. Aerial support, logistical support, other types of aerial attacks and other types of support that we can provide, okay, but do not commit ground troops.

And those votes were overwhelmingly bipartisan. They were not Republicans. There were Democrats and Republicans together. What did President Clinton do? For the past 3 months he has ignored those votes. Even last week, the week before, before the agreement was initialed in Dayton, OH, this body again went on record saying, Mr. President, do not commit ground troops. He is going to send ground troops whether we have another vote or not. But what we will do in this body is, we will make sure that we do not have a repeat of the Clinton Somalia debacle where American kids who were sent to a foreign country are allowed to be put at risk and, in the case of Somalia, 18 of them coming home in body bags after their bodies were dragged through the streets of downtown Mogadishu.

With every ounce of energy in my body, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen this time. The President may have his way in sending the troops in, but we who are on the Committee on National Security and those of us in the bipartisan manner in this Congress will work to make sure that our troops are given every possible means of support that they need with no second-guessing coming from the bureaucracy inside the Beltway here, letting our military leadership that has been assigned to this operation, in this case General Joulwon, make those decisions and have the full support he needs.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other articles that I want to put in the RECORD and will do so either tonight or in special orders I will be taking out this week from news sources around the world where those people inside of the Balkans are questioning this agreement. We have to be aware of what the leadership in those countries are saying, not just what the three signatories to that agreement out in Dayton said, because they are three individuals. The question is, do they in fact represent the majority of the people in the Balkans? Are the people going to adhere? Are they going to cooperate with this peacekeeping force? If you read some of the FBIS articles that have come out over the past several days, I have grave concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask to enter into the RECORD an article that was printed in the Belgrade Nasa Borba in Serbo-Croatian, its November 22 edition, relative to the political parties and the peace accord and statements specifically that Serbian Radical Party President Vojislav Seselj exclaimed, and I quote, ''The biggest betrayal of the Serbian nation has just been committed.''

In stark opposition to the prevailing positive reactions to the agreement, Serbian Radical Party President Vojislav Seselj, according to BETA, exclaimed that ''the biggest betrayal of the Serbian nation has just been committed.''

I ask to include in the RECORD articles, again from FBIS reports, quoting a leading Bosnian Serb official Momcilo Krajisnik in terms of his refusal to sign on to the accord and explaining his opposition and how this agreement is a sellout of the Serbs.

[FBIS Transcribed Text, Nov. 21, 1995]

PLAN ''NOT ACCEPTED'' BY SERBS

SARAJEVO (AFP).—A senior Bosnian Serb official warned late Tuesday [21 November] that the peace accord agreed in Dayton, Ohio does not satisfy ''even a minimum'' of their demands.

Quoted by the Bosnian Serb official media, ''parliamentary speaker'' Momcilo Krajisnik said: ''The agreement that has been reached does not satisfy even a minimum of our interests. Our delegation has not accepted the plan and we were unanimous on that.''

I also ask to include articles, again from the FBIS reports, from the Banja Luka Srpska Televizija, a TV station in Banja Luka, relative to the explanation of the accord and saying that, ''The people, the Serbs are not intimidated by the Dayton agreement, they are not intimidated by the Dayton agreement in terms of what it is going to do to their nation.''

Further go on to quote in the same article, we will never give up Sarajevo, dead or alive, let everyone know that. If I were able to talk to both Clinton and Christopher like our delegation that went to negotiate, I would tell them not to play with the Serbs.

It goes on to further say, there is no Serb who would leave this and leave the Serb land behind. And it further goes on to say, they will not be frightened of the signatures from Dayton, speaking of the Serbs in Bosnia.

[FBIS Translated Text, Nov. 23, 1995]

SERBS IN SARAJEVO AWAIT ''EXPLANATION'' OF ACCORD

(Report by Draga Grubic)

The signing of the Dayton peace agreement has recently engrossed the citizens of Serb Sarajevo as the event on which they pinned their hope and survival. Now that the results of the talks have been revealed, the people of Sarajevo expect official explanation of the agreement that is to determine their destiny as well as the future of the second largest Serb town in former Yugoslavia. Neither the joint Croat-Muslim enemy, NATO jets, nor rapid reaction mortars managed to send the locals into exile and they are not intimidated by the Dayton agreement either.

[FBIS Translated Text, Nov. 23, 1995]

EXCERPT FROM ''SARAJEVO SERBS OPPOSE DAYTON PEACE PLAN''

[Unidentified woman] What, to give them Sarajevo? It is Serb, and no one else's. We will never give up Sarajevo, dead or alive, let everyone know that. If I were able to talk to both Clinton and Christopher, like our delegation that went to negotiate, I would tell them not to play with the Serbs.

* * * * *

[Unidentified man] There is no Serb who would leave this, and leave the Serb land behind. I have buried 11 of my dearest here over the last year, and now I am expected to leave them behind. No way, God forbid.

[Correspondent] The population of the second largest Serb town in former Yugoslavia has not been driven away by the combined Muslim-Croat enemy, by NATO aircraft, or Rapid Reaction Force shells. And they will not be frightened of the signatures from Dayton. [end recording]

Then going on to an article that appeared in the November 27 FBIS report dealing with NATO, warning Karadzic about his bloodbath threat and NATO having to threaten him if in fact Karadzic was arrested for war crimes.

(Report by Angus MacKinnon)

BRUSSELS, Nov. 27 (AFP).—NATO on Monday [27 November] warned Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic that any attempt to intimidate the peace force the alliance plans to send to Bosnia would be greeted with an ''extremely robust'' response.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, another editorial, written by Bela Jodal, ''Compulsory Hope,'' in a Budapest publication. This is a very important question he asks.

''Will it be the U.S. troops who left Somalia due to difficulties which were smaller than what can be expected in the Balkans?''

[FBIS Translated Text, Nov. 23, 1995]

EDITORIAL DOUBTS FUTURE OF BOSNIAN PEACE ACCORD

* * * * *

Will it be the U.S. troops who left Somalia due to difficulties which were much smaller than what can be expected in the Balkans?

Mr. Speaker, the key question we have to ask is, is what we are about to

do and what this President is about to do in America's best interest? More importantly, Mr. Speaker, we, as elected Representatives of approximately 600,000 people each across this country, have to be able to ask ourselves the ultimate question: Can we go into that family's home when their son or daughter or mother or father or brother or sister are sent home as a casualty of this conflict and be able to justify the job and the mission that they did?

□ 2320

I am a strong supporter of our military, Mr. Speaker, and proudly so, and I will be a strong supporter if the President deploys them there. But I do not support the President's policy, and I do not believe he has made the case.

Let me say in closing, Mr. Speaker, in coming to my conclusions 2 weeks ago I had to rely on a friend of mine who has been in Sarajevo for 3 years. His name is John Jordan. He is a Rhode Island volunteer firefighter. He went over to Sarajevo because he heard that the fire and emergency services personnel were being abused by the military even though they were trying to serve the Croats, Serbs, Muslems, all factions. He went over to volunteer to help them. He ended up staying 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, he was featured by ABC–TV as their person of the week for the work that he did as a volunteer. He brought 50 other Americans over with him to help the Serbian fire brigade with Keenan Slimmick, who was the fire chief before he was assassinated.

John Jordan was shot twice while he was in Sarajevo. He was beaten in the chest with the blunt end of a rifle. He had concussions, shrapnel wounds, but stayed there helping all of the various people in Sarajevo get decent medical protection and protection from fires and disasters.

We sent an airlift of supplies over to him a year and a half ago., We sent three or four fire trucks, rescue equipment that had been donated from around the country, to help him perform this mission in Sarajevo of humanitarian aid to these people during the time this President did nothing to satisfy those concerns he spoke of last night.

I asked John Jordan to come down to Washington to tell me what he thought we should do. John Jordan, American citizen, after 3 years in Sarajevo, gave me the following quote, Mr. Speaker, which appeared in an AP wire story on October 22 in regard to what we are going to face in Bosnia. Every one of us in this body have to understand in a context of the quotes I have given what John Jordan said will occur there:

''We're going to face some very, very ugly, heavily armed, prone-to-violence people who are totally unafraid of the United States,'' he said. ''I've had more than one Serb commander say to me, 'I really wish the U.S. instead of the French were running the airport. If we can just get enough of you in one place at one time, we can kill 200 or 300 of you, you'll be out of this war forever, and you won't be a problem anymore. You'll leave just like you left Beirut.'''

Mr. Speaker, that is a question we have to wrestle with. Are our kids heading for another Beirut? I hope not, Mr. Speaker, and while I would like to think that this Congress would have the same ability that the Bundestag is going to have, that the other parliaments, like Italy, are going to have in approving of sending in of their troops, we are not going to have that because our President said our troops are going with or without the support of this Congress and with or without the support of the American people.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you of one thing. He may send the troops, but we will make sure that we do not have a repeat of the debacle that occurred in Somalia because our kids are not going to be shortchanged, there is not going to be some political decision determining what we will or will not send once they are over there. If the commitment is made and the troops are sent, then they are going to get every bit of support that this body and our committees in Congress can muster to make sure that our troops are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask our colleagues to consider what is about to confront us both this week and next week if, in fact, we have a vote. I am considering legislation right now that I may offer as an amendment if, in fact, we have an up-or-down vote on Bosnia, but again I would close by saying the vote is not really going to matter, Mr. Speaker, because the dice have already been rolled, and the President has already made up his mind, the troops have already been committed, and those of us who have concerns are not isolationists, we are not people who are immoral, and we are not people who think that there is not a proper role for America to help provide security throughout the world. We just question the way that we got to where we are and the decision of this President to put 20,000 kids in harm's way between these warring factions that have been at each other's throats not for 4 years, and not for one decade, but decade after decade and century after century.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEFNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, today, and on November 29 and 30, and December 1.
Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(Mr. TRAFICANT, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,472.)

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYNN.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. KILDEE in two instances.
Ms. NORTON.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida in two instances.
Mr. BERMAN in two instances.
Mr. WILSON.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. POSHARD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. BASS.
Mr. BRYANT of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAKER of California.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.
Mr. KIM.
Ms. MCCARTHY.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that