and to protect the people of Bosnia from the aggression of the Serbs.

And I think the—first of all, I think in the adoption of the amendment by Senator Nunn and in several other ways the resolution is better than it was. Secondly, I noted from the comments that there are many people who voted in the majority who are still willing to work with us.

I do not believe the strong course for the United States and the strong course for the people of Bosnia is to unilaterally lift the arms embargo, collapse the U.N. mission, and increase the chances of injecting American troops there. I don't believe that. I think the strong course is to have a powerful use of air power and to support the rapid reaction force that the French and the British are putting on the ground that they have proved will attack back if they're attacked.

I have worked for 10 days to get NATO the ability to act through the United Nations to really use that air power to raise the price of aggression for the Bosnian Serbs. That is the only thing that has worked in the last 2½ years, and it has worked when we have done it.

And I will say that in London over the weekend and then yesterday at NATO we have made substantial progress. We have a commitment now to a much tougher air posture. That is the only thing that we know based on our own experience that has a chance of working and pushing this whole process back to the conference table and stopping the aggression.

So I think the Congress wants something done. I do, too. I do not believe a unilateral lift of the embargo is the right way to go. I believe that there is clear evidence from the speeches that were made, the amendments that were adopted, the votes that were cast, that we're going to be able to work together and continue to push for a strong position. But I don't favor a unilateral lift. I think what we're doing with the use of air power is by far the better course, as long as the allies will do what they say they're going to do. And I believe now, after 10 days of hard work, we have got that done.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Boutros Boutros-Ghali will that make it easier for you to coordinate Washington policy?

The President. Because he has delegated the authority? Absolutely. And I applaud that. That was the right decision for him to take, and it shows that he, too, is concerned that the United Nations cannot express a commitment to protect the security of people and then walk away from it. I applaud the statement that he made and the action he took today.

Q. Do you wish maybe he had said it a little sooner than just the exact time of the vote?

The President. Well, of course, but you know, the whole world can't calibrate their activities based on what we're doing here at a given moment. I think that the United Nations is working their way through this. And keep in mind, they've had people on the ground. They haven't wanted to have their hostages taken and then been made vulnerable to being killed or tortured or imprisoned for long periods of time. But if the United Nations guarantees the security of certain areas and certain standards of conduct, then we have to stand behind the guarantees.

I think President Chirac and Prime Minister Major, in putting together this rapid reaction force, and then the work that I was able to do to get them to come back to a clear line of authority to use aggressive air—that is the strong approach. That is the approach that we know from experience has a chance to work, to raise the price of aggression.

The other course has a lot of downsides, and we don't know if it will work. We know this will work if we do it. And I am determined to see that we follow through.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to actor Tom Hanks; United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali; President Jacques Chirac of France; and Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom.

Statement on the "Foreign Relations Revitalization Act of 1995"

July 26, 1995

Congress is now considering legislation—S. 908, "The Foreign Relations Revitalization

Act of 1995"—that would undermine the President's authority to conduct our Nation's foreign policy and deny us the resources we need to lead in the world. If this legislation comes to my desk in its present form, I will veto it.

S. 908 attacks the President's constitutional authority to conduct America's foreign policy. No President, Democrat or Republican, could accept these restrictions because they threaten the President's ability to protect and promote American interests around the world.

The legislation would ban or severely restrict diplomatic relations with key countries. Indeed, had it been in effect a few months ago, it would have prevented us from concluding the agreement with North Korea to dismantle its nuclear program. The legislation would handcuff our ability to take part in and lead United Nations operations, limiting our choice each time a crisis arose to acting alone or not at all. The legislation would abolish three important agencies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency. Each is already making serious and successful efforts to streamline its operations, as part of my administration's reinventing Government program. Eliminating them entirely would undermine our effectiveness, not enhance it.

In short, the legislation would put Congress in the business of micromanaging our Nation's foreign policy, a business it should not be in.

This legislation combined with S. 961, "The Foreign Aid Reduction Act of 1995," would also slash our international affairs budget, which already is only a little over 1.3 percent of our total Federal budget. We use these funds to fight the spread of nuclear weapons and technology; to combat terrorists, drug traffickers, and international criminals; to create American jobs by opening new markets for our exports; and to support the forces of peace, democracy, and human rights around the world who look to America for leadership.

The proposed cuts in the international affairs budget are dangerous and shortsighted. We know from experience that it is a lot less costly, in terms of money spent and lives lost, to rely on development aid and diplomacy now than it is to send in our troops later. There is a price to be paid for American leadership. But the return on our investment, in terms of increased security and greater prosperity for the American people, more than makes up for the cost. What America cannot afford are the foreign affairs budget cuts proposed in these bills.

As I have made clear before, I want to work with Congress to get an international affairs bill I can sign, a bill that protects the President's authority to conduct foreign policy, maintains vital resources, and reflects a bipartisan spirit that serves America's interests. The legislation Congress is considering fails each of those tests. If it is sent to me as it now stands, I will veto it.

Statement on Senate Action on Appropriations Legislation

July 26, 1995

Yesterday's action by a Senate appropriations subcommittee removing funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy would seriously undermine the Nation's battle against drug abuse and drug-related crime.

Removal of all funding for this office would severely curtail my ability to sustain a coordinated strategy among some 50 Federal agencies involved in drug control, including supply and demand, enforcement, interdiction, eradication, education, treatment, and prevention. Just when this coordinated effort is showing sustained success, the subcommittee is proposing we go back to the days when the Nation did not have a coordinated drug control strategy.

The Republican majority is already proposing severe cuts in antidrug programs—a 60 percent cut in Safe and Drug Free Schools, which teaches 39 million children about the dangers of drugs, a 26 percent cut in prevention and treatment services aimed at reducing the number of potential criminals, and a 50 percent cut in international antidrug cooperation programs, a cut that could prevent the continued arrests of the world's top drug kingpins.