

register and bag a customer's groceries himself. This is a lesson from which every American should learn.

But Izzy Cohen was more than just a businessman. He was a good friend. He never hesitated to share his feelings and insights with me, to help me get a better perspective on whatever issue was foremost on my mind.

There is a lesson for all of us in Izzy Cohen's life: The most successful businesses are the ones in which workers and management act as a team. He proved that when management takes care of its workers, the workers will take care of management.

Mr. President, the two groups are inextricably linked. Each relies on the other to succeed. And when the workers feel that they are getting a fair shake, that the boss is looking out for them, they will do everything they can to ensure the vitality of the business.

It is my hope and belief that those who take over for Izzy Cohen will continue his work. I would also like to see workers and managers all across America learn from Izzy's example so that both groups, working together, achieve the success he and his employees have realized over the past 60 years.●

THE AFTERMATH OF THE ASSASSINATION OF YITZHAK RABIN. ● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to comment briefly on the aftermath of the assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Following this tragedy, there was a great hue and cry as to who was responsible for the assassination. I would like to state that this is not a time for finger pointing, it is a time for investigating all those responsible for this murder and then, and only then can we accurately ascribe blame. At any rate, we must concur on one point: reasonable people can disagree, but murder is not a recourse or solution to a problem.

In light of this, I would ask that the text of a message of thanks from the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations to all those who offered their condolences be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The text of the message follows:

[From the New York Times Nov. 21, 1995]
THANK YOU TO ALL WHO JOINED IN SAYING
"SHALOM CHAVER"

(By the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Leon Levy, Chairman, Malcolm Hoenien, Exec. Vice Chairman)

We deeply appreciate the outpouring of condolences and solidarity from the bipartisan leadership of our country led by the President and our fellow Americans of all faiths, races and walks of life following the tragic assassination of Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

This was a remarkable demonstration of the American spirit and the bonds of humanity that link us all. It also reflects the special relationship with the state and people of Israel and support for the peace process.

The countless expressions of concern and caring will be a lasting remembrance and an inspiration for the future.

This ad made possible by a grateful Jewish American.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1995

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, November 28; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DORGAN or designee, 45 minutes; Senator THOMAS or designee, 45 minutes.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the week of November 27 through December 4, 1995. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, at 2:15 on Tuesday, it will be the leader's intention to begin consideration of S. 1396, the ICC sunset bill. Rollcall votes can therefore be expected during tomorrow's session.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. THURMOND. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator GLENN.

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

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I followed with great interest the comments made on the floor today, and on previous days, regarding the President's speech this evening on the situation in Bosnia and our potential participation in that effort.

I have said all along that I thought the odds were stacked against a peace agreement that we could work on and that had sufficient detail to enhance the likelihood of doing some good in that troubled area of the world.

We do, however, have an agreement that has been hammered out in Day-

ton. We should look at several things with regard to the agreement and what happens after the agreement. I said all along—and I say again today—the agreement must be specific in its detail. You cannot draw a line that is not exact. We cannot go over there and put our people in harm's way and find out later that something was not agreed to or that a line was not agreed to, or was not marked out closely enough. We must know precisely what we are protecting and who we are keeping apart. That kind of detail appears to have been worked out in Dayton.

Today we got a copy of the Proximity Peace Talks. In this, they specify that we will use 1,000 to 50,000 scale maps and charts. This will define the lines down to within 50 meters. Local commanders enforcing the truce within those areas will get together with the local people to define it even down below that 155 or 160 feet that would be the 50 meters. That is a pretty good definition of road intersections and road routes, and all are listed here; they are well defined. We want to see this carried out. It appears that we are well along the way toward defining the agreement in its initial phases.

The final agreement that will be signed in Paris—not just initialed—will even go into more detail, as I understand it. So the first requirement of a peace over there, and for our participation in it, or even considering American participation in it, is to see that we do have that agreement signed with as much detail as possible.

Now, a second requirement is a tough one. That is, a cease-fire has to have taken place and be in effect. That sounds great. Some may think that the military commander puts out word and the cease-fire occurs and that is it. That is not the way it works in that Balkan area. We were briefed on our trip there several weeks ago. One of the big problems over there is that 20 to 50 percent of the people in combat over there are not the regular troops that receive commands down the military chain of command. They are what are called the "irregulars," those who have a village they have been used to defending. They may have a rifle, and one man may be mowing hay one day and he decides it is his turn to protect whatever they are protecting. He then relieves another fellow and maybe takes the same rifle. That other man then goes back and cuts hay for a while. They take turns.

Those irregulars that have interests in particular local areas have been the primary reason why the more than 30 cease-fire agreements have failed in the last couple of years. Over 30 agreements have failed because the irregulars are not really taking their orders from anyone. Once they start firing, other firing starts, and the whole thing breaks down again.

So these two things must be in place before we can even consider sending Americans in there. One, the agreement must be worked out defining

very, very specifically the borders of what belongs in one jurisdiction and what belongs in another. The second is that the cease-fire has to have actually occurred, and that includes the irregulars.

The Proximity Peace Talk agreement document says: "The parties also commit themselves to disarm and disband all armed civilian groups, except for authorized police forces, within 30 days after the Transfer of Authority."

The definition of the lines is in another section. It says the lines will be "accurate to within approximately 50 meters. During the period in which the IFOR is deployed, the IFOR commander shall have the right to determine, after consultation with the parties, the exact delineation of such lines and zones, provided that with respect to Sarajevo the IFOR commander shall have the right to adjust the Zone of Separation as necessary."

They were able to hammer this out and get all parties to initial this agreement, and we hope to have the signing in Paris before too long.

Why is it necessary that we go in at all? If they are willing to go to this length and say we agree we are all tired of war and that is the reason they have come as far as they have—we are tired of war and do not want to fight anymore. We are tired of the killing, tired of seeing people killed, and over 250,000 people have been killed. We are tired of seeing 2 million refugees floating from one place to another. They want peace.

You may ask if they want peace that badly, why can they not just stop fighting? Well, they have a long history, going back several hundred years, of not trusting each other and not fully trusting the people in Europe either. But they trust the United States. To our credit, they trust us, and so we can be a party for good in that part of the world, if we want to be. And if the agreement is signed and if a cease-fire has taken place, then we can keep these irregulars, which I defined a moment ago, from breaking the peace within the 2- to 4-kilometer-wide area between the previously warring parties.

They want peace. If we can help implement it, it seems to me that we can do a great service by doing that.

Secretary Perry described yesterday, once again, the fact that we would not fight our way in. I heard comments on the floor today about whether we are to create peace or not. We are not there to create peace. We are not there to take one side or the other or carry anybody's battle for them. We are there to maintain a peace that will have been established before we move in, with the agreement signed by all parties and with a cease-fire actually having occurred—or we do not go in.

We can help them achieve this peace because the parties trust us as long as we are involved. We did not fight our way in. We establish our separation zones, and we move into those separation zones.

Local violations of the agreement will be met with a preponderance, an overpreponderance of force, as we were briefed by our military commanders in Europe while on our trip just weeks ago.

This is not the U.N. rules of engagement. This is not debating and asking for permission to retaliate if fired upon. As it was described to us, if anyone fires on the forces in there, the implementation forces, they will be met with return fire of overwhelming support.

Now, say someone changes their mind about this, which has been in the paper the last couple of days. Say any of the participants that initialed the agreement change their mind and say they now believe it is a bum deal, and "we will not go on with what we initialed in Dayton." In that case, our participation is not going to occur.

It is that simple. We are not there to go in and fight somebody's war for them. We are there only to help implement a peace that they have said they, themselves, want and that they have initialed in Dayton, and we would only go in after the final signing in Paris.

Any general attempt at breaking the agreement would mean that we would not stay. We are not there to fight anybody's battle or establish peace throughout the Balkans by military action. We are there only to help separate the combatants for this 1-year period while they can see the benefits of peace more than the war that has gone on there for far too long.

Let me put our involvement in a little bit different light. I believe a little risk now—and there is a little risk—may enhance our long-term leadership toward freedom and peace around the world, and in the long run, perhaps, even save lives.

I think those who question American participation could well ask, why did we keep our troops in Korea at the end of the Korean war? Because we have been able to maintain peace in that area. How about the Middle East? We are very much involved in the Mideast. I know we have a good percentage of our population of Jewish heritage, and they are particularly interested in that part of the world, but I think our interest goes well beyond that and we have tried to get a Mideast peace because we care.

We are a nation that wants to see peace. We do not like to see one nation fighting another. We are interested in the Mideast and the peace process there. We have pursued it for years and years and years. We accept that as part of the American way of doing good around the world, of putting into real terms our Christian-Judeo heritage of which we are so proud.

Mr. President, Americans want to alleviate suffering. We never want to see people being killed or hurt or one nation pitted against another. Granted, we cannot take on all the world's problems, nor should we try. Any time we move outside the confines of our own

country, whatever the purpose is, we do take some risk.

There would be some risk in this situation, of course. I do not want to minimize this, but we take a little risk when we get up in the morning and get out of bed, I guess every time we take an airplane out of a hangar and fly it. Yet, we are willing to take that risk for the good that may come from it.

Have we taken any risks in the past? I imagine if we had a vote here in the Senate today as to whether we would want to keep the Peace Corps in operation, we would find that the Peace Corps would be rather popular. There would probably be no votes against ending the Peace Corps because it has done a lot of good around the world. But how many lives have been lost in the Peace Corps by people overseas killed in accidents or shot or catching some disease? They were put at risk because they went overseas. Do you know how many there are? We have lost 224 people that have died overseas in the Peace Corps. Yet we do not say, pull the Peace Corps out because we have lost people overseas. We would not do that.

Another issue that has repeatedly been raised is the fact that our leadership in NATO is very important. It is. As important as that is, I personally do not think we would go into Bosnia-Herzegovina just because our NATO allies say we should go in. "So, America, you lead our way into that area."

If they were going in some other area we thought was not right, I doubt we would want to rush in and be their leader just to show we are part of NATO. Too many American people, I think, do not have appreciation of NATO, though. Too many people in our country see NATO as a remnant of the cold war and not of the good things that NATO has done. It has been the most successful peacekeeping operation in the history of this world.

At the present time, it is adapting under their own impetus with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, cooperating with the European Union, with the Partnership for Peace, which is in its fledgling status right now, and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, which came into being in 1991. NATO has taken part in all of these things and is a tremendous benefit for peace in the world.

We could even say that we have had economic benefits. Europe is an economic entity and is now one of three major economic centers in the world: Europe, Japan, and our own country.

The main point here is the tragedy and suffering in Bosnia. All parties are war weary. There is now a framework for peace with a detailed agreement. If a cease-fire can come into place, we can move in and help stop what has been a tinderbox over the years and that helped trigger World War I. We do not want to see that ever happen again.

Old enmities die hard. It is very complicated. There are ethnic, religious, patriotic feelings in that area where

they do not trust each other. They trust us to come in and try and help implement peace in that area.

This is one of the first times in history I think we have ever seen a superpower—and we are the world's superpower—that had no ulterior motive, that had no territorial designs, and would help to spread the benefits of democracy and freedom around the world. This is a place where, with perhaps little risk, we may enhance the long-term benefits toward freedom and peace that will literally save lives.

I do not think we can withdraw from the world. We cannot withdraw to our own shores and take an isolationist stance. We can work for peace in that part of the world. I am thankful that we have not withdrawn from the rest of the world. We can be involved for good.

To those who say we are off on another do-gooder mission around the world, I think we should take pride that we have a heritage of trying to do good, of trying to alleviate suffering, of trying to stop conflicts such as this one. We are a powerful nation that cares—truly cares about other people

and what happens around the world. We care when 250,000 people have been killed. We care on a personal basis. We have empathy for the people there who have lost children, husbands, fathers, mothers, wives. Two million refugees. So we care.

If we are to have leadership for the future, this is an opportunity for us to do what we have done historically, to care for other people. Obviously, we cannot take on everything in the world. But, here we can help to maintain the peace.

We stayed active around the world after World War I. We stayed active after World War II and helped form the United Nations. We stayed active in Europe in partnership in NATO. Because of that alignment of the United States along with other nations, we have a world, now, which looks much more peaceful into the future than it did just a few years ago.

I would say thank God we have a nation like the United States, a superpower, that truly does care about the suffering and about the tragedy of what is going on in a place like the

Balkans. Thank God we have a nation like the United States, that wants the benefits of peace and cooperation for everyone. And thank God, if the conditions are right, if the agreement holds, and if the fighting has stopped, we are willing to take the risk that will have to be taken if we are to do much good in that part of the world.

I look forward to President Clinton's speech this evening and his assessment of the situation. I believe that we want true, long-term peace in the world. I think we are a force for peace and freedom and taking the small amount of risk to enforce the peace will be worth it.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m., Tuesday morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:53 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 28, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.