

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BUNNING. Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLINTON SENDING AMERICAN SOLDIERS TO KOSOVO

Mr. BUNNING. In 1995, when I served in the House of Representatives, I and a large bipartisan majority supported a resolution which called for President Clinton to obtain congressional authorization before deploying troops to Bosnia. That resolution passed by a vote of 315 yeas to 103 nays.

Yet, despite that vote, President Clinton went ahead with a large-scale and long-term deployment of tens of thousands of troops to Bosnia without congressional authorization or any meaningful debate.

Back then, President Clinton spoke to us and promised us all that we would have a well-defined mission with a clear exit strategy. But even today there are no details on getting our troops out of Bosnia. We are still there and President Clinton has spent approximately \$12 billion on that mission without ever including Bosnia funds in his budget.

As a result, he is draining crucial defense resources from other critical areas and further putting our soldiers in harm's way. We still have almost 7,000 troops in Bosnia and we are all unsure of what their exact mission really is and when, if ever, they can come home to their families. So much for a clearly defined mission and exit strategy.

But now, all I can say is, "deja vu" and "here we go again."

Right now, American troops are deployed all over the globe in over 30 nations on missions of questionable value and unclear rules of engagement. And now, President Clinton is about to scatter roughly 4,000 more troops to intervene in Kosovo under a NATO mission to enforce a peace agreement. But there is no peace agreement to enforce because one does not exist.

The Serbs and the Albanians have been fighting in this southern region of Serbia for centuries. So is it any surprise that earlier this week in France, the Serbs would not accept the Kosovo peace plan that their rival ethnic Albanians have agreed to sign?

I do not believe that any amount of American involvement is going to end these ethnic conflicts that have raged for centuries. We have tried to resolve this problem for three years and have gotten nowhere. I do not understand why we think we can end this civil war by sending 4,000 additional troops.

President Clinton has not given us any answers as to why sending these

troops to Kosovo is so vital. President Clinton can tell us any time. But where is he? He has the bully pulpit.

I do not believe it is in our national security interest to get involved once again in another so-called peace-keeping mission in this region. In a few years, Kosovo will take its place in history books, along with Bosnia, Haiti and Somalia, as an example of a foreign policy that has no principled framework.

I want to hear from President Clinton as to why this region is of a national security interest to the United States and why he should risk the lives of our young troops by sending them to Kosovo.

And where is the European community in all of this? It seems as though we are risking the lives of our soldiers to clean up Europe's backyard. If anyone should take the lead on this intervention, it should definitely be from a European nation. This is Europe's problem, if anyone's, and not ours. Kosovo is not in our backyard.

An American soldier's job is to protect America's interests by destroying America's enemies on the battlefield. It is an insult to ask an American soldier to serve as a policeman under the umbrella of some international organization instead of the American flag.

There are many questions that President Clinton and his administration need to answer, and we are being left in the dark once again.

President Clinton, take these questions seriously.

When and how many troops are we deploying and how long will they be there?

What is their mission?

Will there be more troops deployed if our goals and missions are not met?

Will foreign commanders be commanding our troops under this NATO force?

What are the rules of engagement?

How will this mission be paid for, and will valuable dollars be pulled away from military readiness accounts to pay for this deployment?

What, if any, is our exit strategy?

As you have heard, President Clinton, I have many questions and I am not alone. You gave us no details and answers with regard to the Bosnia mission, and I fear we, as well, will be given very little, if any, details regarding our involvement in Kosovo.

But quite frankly, not getting answers from President Clinton does not surprise me.

I do not believe we have a compelling national interest to send troops to Kosovo. If they are sent, we all deserve answers from President Clinton before our troops are sent into another mess for years to come.

Our men and women in uniform are ready and willing to defend the interests of this great Nation, but not the interests of other nations. We cannot

undermine the oaths they take when they are sworn into the military to serve this great Nation.

President Clinton, do your job, and let us know what is happening with Kosovo.

God bless our troops.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 11:45, under the same terms as previously granted.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGETS

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to take an opportunity in morning business, Mr. President, to comment just a little bit on this whole business of budgeting; I guess more specifically, supplemental budgets and the problems that are there.

First of all, with respect to the budget that is before the Senate, I congratulate the leadership and the Appropriations Committee for the good work that they have done. I know that it is difficult. I think they have done a good job in seeking to offset the costs.

But I really believe that one of the things we need to change in the Senate is our method of budgeting, our method of supplemental budgeting particularly. First of all, in the broader sense, I am hopeful that we will consider this year the idea of a biennial budget, that we will come in at the beginning of the 2-year period, put down a budget, and have 2 years under which to operate so that in the second year we can do more of what we should be doing, and that is oversight of the expenditures of that budget.

I understand that under that circumstance there would be supplemental budgets, that you would probably be more likely to have one if you had the 2-year budget, but I think that is the thing we ought to be doing. Now we spend such a high percentage of our total time doing budgetary things and quite often bringing in things that are nonbudgetary on to budget bills. I think that is a mistake.

We are set up to have a Budget Committee. We are set up to have an Appropriations Committee that deals