that the U.S. Forces can return to their families.

I am very happy to yield the floor. I know my colleague from Arizona wanted to make a statement.

## OUR MISSION IN BOSNIA

Mr. MCCAIN. I congratulate the distinguished majority leader on a statesmanlike and nonpartisan statement. I will briefly add to it. Again, I hope his statement is paid attention to by colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to restate in my opening remark what the distinguished majority leader has just stated, what we must understand, and what should be a framework for whatever debate ensues next week on the floor.

The American people and my colleagues should understand one salient fact. The President will be sending 20,000 Americans to Bosnia for 1 year, whether we approve or disapprove.

We can argue about whether the President should have made the commitment almost 3 years ago to participate in the peace implementation force in Bosnia. As Senator DOLE just stated, there are many other options I would have preferred to have employed besides this one. I would not have made that commitment. But the reality is the President did so commit and those troops are going to Bosnia.

The President has the authority under the Constitution to do so, and he intends to exercise that authority with or without our approval. We can cut off funding, but the President will veto, and his veto will, without any doubt, be sustained. Even if we should force the President to renege on his commitment, we should understand that there would be very negative consequences to such an action. The credibility of the word of the U.S. President is an enormous strategic value of the American people and essential to our security. I urge my Republican colleagues to consider, in their deliberations on this question, how high a premium they would place on the credibility of a Republican President and place that same premium on this President's credibility. Our friends and enemies do not discriminate between Republican and Democratic Presidents when the word of an American President is given. When the President's word is no longer credible abroad, all Americans are less safe.

Another consequence would be the severe damage to the stability of NATO, the most successful defensive alliance in history.

And, finally, all signatories to the peace agreement have stated that, absent United States participation in the implementation force, the war in Bosnia will reignite. I repeat, the war in Bosnia will reignite and the atrocities we have all come to abhor will continue.

Therefore, I intend to do everything in my power to ensure that our mission in Bosnia is, as the President said it would be, clear, limited and achievable, that it has the greatest chance for success with the least risk to the lives of our young men and women. That is our responsibility as much as the President's, and I intend to take that responsibility very seriously.

We can best achieve this by ensuring that our Armed Forces do not engage in any nonmilitary activities such as refugee resettlement or other nation-building activities for which they are not trained. Therefore, we should condition our authorization of this deployment on the prohibition against our forces enforcing any other aspect of this agreement, other than the military provisions of the military annex to the general framework agreement.

Further, we must ensure that the goals of their mission are clear and achievable and will justify, to some extent, the risk we will incur. A clear exit strategy is not time based but goal based. We must ensure that the peace we enforce for 12 months has a realistic prospect to endure in the 13th, 14th, 15th month and, hopefully, for years beyond that.

Essential to that goal is a stable military balance. To achieve that balance, we will have to see to it that the Bosnian federation has the means and the training to provide for its own defense from aggression after we have withdrawn. Therefore, I believe our authorization of this deployment must be conditioned on the concrete assurance that the United States will do whatever is necessary, although without using our soldiers who are part of the implementation force, to ensure that the Bosnians can defend themselves at the end of our mission.

Some will want to pursue military equilibrium through the arms builddown envisioned in the agreement, but to assume in a few months we can persuade all parties to build down to rough military equilibrium is incredibly naive. We should rightly have little faith in the prospects of arms control negotiations in such a short period. Therefore, we must insist that before we leave in a year there is a stable military balance which will have been achieved by helping the Bosnians to acquire the arms and the training to defend themselves that we have denied them for 4 years.

In closing, let me again urge my Republican colleagues to consider very carefully the institution of the Presidency as they deliberate on this very difficult question. I spent much of my life defending the credibility and the honor of the United States. I have no intention of evading that responsibility now.

Therefore, I intend to work on a resolution with Senator DOLE and, hopefully, all of my Senate colleagues, that will maximize the prospects for the success of the mission and minimize American casualties. I am fully aware that in doing so, I will bear some of the responsibility in the event the mission fails. I do so readily, because my first responsibility is to do everything in my power to support and protect the fine young Americans we will send to Bosnia and to ensure that whatever sacrifices they will endure, they will have done so for a cause that was worthy and winnable.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me just take a moment to thank my colleague from Arizona. He knows as well as I do what the public opinion polls are showing; 80 percent, in some cases higher, ''Do not send the troops.'' As we have tried to point out, that is not the option anymore. The option is to have an exit strategy and to make certain that in that exit strategy we train the Bosnians so they can be an independent force to defend themselves so we can come home; second, to take every step we can to ensure the casualties will be as low as possible.

The Senator from Arizona is not unaccustomed to courage and making courageous stands—this is another example—in the face of public opinion. But that is what leadership is all about. I have to believe, once the Americans are there starting next week and once the images on television are of Americans and the children and the families and the security they have, the attitude of Americans will change.

The Senator from Arizona made a point that I think deserves repeating. That is, NATO—NATO has been very important. It has preserved freedom for a half century. We have given our word. In effect, we are NATO, as far as I am concerned, the United States. Without the United States as a partner in NATO, you would not have NATO.

But, in addition, the President of the United States, without consulting Congress, but it was the President of the United States in 1993 who, in effect, gave his word that the United States, if there were peace to keep, would send 20,000 Americans as part of a 60,000-member force. Then we invited all the parties to come to Ohio, to Dayton, OH, where they stayed for about 3 weeks. The implication was clear. The Americans had taken over the negotiations. The peace talks had broken down. I talked with the Prime Minister of Bosnia less than 3 hours ago. They were all packed, ready to go home; then Mr. Milosevic, the President of Serbia, made some concessions. But the implication throughout was that the United States would be the principal player. You cannot have peace, according to him, unless the United States is present. Not that they do not have great respect for the Europeans who have been there and the U.N. Protection Forces for the past several years, who lost about 200 lives total.

So, it seems to me that our responsibility now is not to say we are going to pass some resolution here that says—it is only two lines long: ''The Senate is opposed to deploying U.S. forces.'' Let me repeat. They are going to be there next week, about 3,000.

They are already deployed and the others will follow.

We do have some responsibility, when the President of the United States, whoever that may be, gives his word to the international community that this is what will happen and this is a responsibility we will assume.

So, I hope we have a good debate. We hope to start it next Wednesday, if we can. It is not going to be easy. It is not politically popular. But it is the right thing to do, and sometimes it takes a while for people to understand when you do the right thing.

So I commend my friend from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN. I know he understands, probably better than anyone on this floor, what loss of freedom and loss of liberty might be like—what it was like for him for several years. So this is about America. This is about American forces. This is about our responsibility as Congress—not about Republicans and Democrats. It is about the Congress. As the Senator said, we could cut off funds. That would be vetoed. I do not think anybody wants to cut off funds.

And I do not suggest everybody who has a different view is posturing. But there will be some of that. There always is. So, this is a very important time in American history.

It is a very important commitment that the President has made. We wish he would have listened to us—this Senator, the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Connecticut—about lifting the arms embargo a year ago. We would not be talking about sending American troops now. But that did not happen. So here we are.

I believe the Congress will do the right thing. We will end up supporting U.S. forces. We will attempt to do everything we can to reduce casualties, and we will have an exit strategy in the resolution. We believe it will be bipartisan. We hope that we can have the same spirit of bipartisanship in the House and that we can send a resolution to the President for his signature—if not next week, the first part of the following week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. There is very little I can add to the eloquent words of the majority leader, except that I would also like to note the presence of the Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, who has labored long and hard on this issue in a very bipartisan fashion. He and I, the majority leader and others, will be working on this resolution so we can get it to the floor, get it debated, and get it passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, often bandied about by politicians is reference to the Constitution of the United States. It is very clear to me that the President of the United States, by virtue of his election by a majority of the American people, has the authority to send these troops. I believe that it is up to us to do everything we can to ensure their safety, and if that means that there is some political damage inflicted by that decision I will hearken back to my first responsibility, and that is to minimize the loss of a single American life. I believe we can do no less.

I want to thank the majority leader, and I look forward to hearing the views of my colleagues. I hope that we can work together with as little rancor as possible on this very emotional, divisive issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to offer respectfully a word of thanks to the distinguished majority leader and to the Senator from Arizona.

The Senator from Arizona described the remarks of the majority leader as statesmanlike. I say that the remarks of the majority leader were more than statesmanlike. They were, in fact, patriotic in the sense that, in taking the position that he has, he has put the interest of his country ahead of politics. All that I know about the majority leader says to me that one should not be surprised to see him do that. Nonetheless, the action he has taken today should not pass without being commented on, and should be appreciated.

Senator DOLE and I, Senator MCCAIN and others, Senator BIDEN on this side, have been working in a bipartisan way now for almost 4 years through the administration of President Bush, and now President Clinton, trying to create a reaction that was effective to what we have seen all along—acts of aggression against Bosnia, taking advantage of its military weakness, and ultimately becoming not just acts of aggression but acts of genocide.

The four of us, and others on both sides, ultimately becoming a resounding majority, a bipartisan majority, cried out for the raising of the arms embargo, feeling it was immoral, it was unfair, and it was unrelated to reality to continue to impose on the warring parties there an embargo that was adopted in 1991 as an attempt to stop the war from breaking out. But the war did break out.

On one side, the Serbs possessed most of the military war-making capacity of the former Yugoslavia. On the other side, the Bosnians had little or none, and, as a result, they were victimized.

Particularly after the attack by the Serbs on the undefended, so-called ''safe haven'' of Srebrenica and the brutal, inhumane slaughter that occurred there, this brought the United States-led NATO to carry out a series of air attacks that finally convinced the aggressors that the rest of the world would not stand by and watch wars spread in Europe, watch people be slaughtered because of their religion, watch NATO and the United States lose their credibility and the respect that they enjoyed throughout the world. President Clinton led the effort in NATO to carry out those air strikes and then designated Secretary Christopher and Ambassador Holbrooke to bring the stature and force of the United States of America to bear to bring the parties to peace. No other country in the world could have done this. It is remarkable that each of the warring parties trust the United States more than any other country in the world. That is to say, that all three of them trust us. In Bosnia, in the Middle East, and perhaps in Northern Ireland, we have credibility, and we have strength. With that strength comes responsibility. But I would say also that with that strength and credibility comes increased security for each and every citizen of the United States.

I agree with the commitment that President Clinton has made to send these 20,000 troops to be part of an international force of 60,000 because I understand that without that commitment, there never would have been peace, the three warring parties would never have come to the peace table and our allies in NATO would never have joined to keep the peace. So while I strongly support the commitment that was made—and I understand that my friends and colleagues who have just spoken do not—what I particularly respect and appreciate is that the Senate majority leader and the Senator from Arizona understand that the question now is not whether we all agree with the commitment that was made; the question now is whether we will honor that commitment. What is on the line there is the credibility and reliability of America's word in the world, of America's leadership in the world.

Somebody asked in the Armed Services Committee hearing that we held on Tuesday of a panel of witnesses, three people who had served in various administrations, ''Is Bosnia worth dying for?'' And, of course, each and every one of us hopes and prays and believes that there will not be casualties among our forces, that we are taking every precaution, learning from Somalia and Haiti, and how important it is to limit our objectives here with the military objectives easily carried out, to make sure that our troops have robust rules of engagement, which means if their safety is threatened in the slightest they can strike back with overwhelming force. But we understand that there are risks involved in any military operation, any sending of American troops to a zone where there may be combat, even if it is to keep the peace as it is today.

While we understand all of that, what is important here is that my colleagues have to answer the question which the former Under Secretary of Defense answered on Monday when the question was asked, ''Is Bosnia worth dying for?'' He said, ''That is not the right question.'' In the gulf war situation,

after Saddam Hussein moved into Kuwait, the question appropriately would not have been, ''Is Kuwait worth dying for,'' because there was much more on the line there as there is here. What is on the line here is the credibility and the reliability of the word of the President of the United States, who alone has made this commitment and is authorized to execute the foreign policy of the United States.

Five-hundred and thirty-five Members of Congress cannot be at every meeting, every negotiation that the President of the United States is involved in. The Presidency, beyond this President, must have that reliability, that credibility, that strength. In that strength and reliability rests not just some distant esoteric governmental structure or authority point of view; in that reliability rests the security of each and every American.

So I thank my colleagues for understanding that there is more at work here. The reliability and credibility of our word, the controlling of a conflict, hopefully ending a conflict that could have spread and become a wider war and drawn us in later on at a much higher price, the renewed strength of NATO on which we will rely to help us share the burdens of peacekeeping, not just here but around the world.

We called on NATO allies in 1990 and 1991 in the gulf war and said we needed their help, and our allies came to our assistance, fought by our side. Today, in effect, they in Europe are asking our help—not to do it all, but to provide one-third of an international force. Who knows? A year or two from now, we again may find that some strategic interest or moral principle of ours has been challenged around the world and we will turn to our allies in Europe and NATO and ask them for help. If we say no today, then what can we reasonably expect them to say to us tomorrow?

So, Mr. President, I thank again the majority leader and the Senator from Arizona for rising above politics and partisanship, doing what is not popular but doing what they have concluded and I believe is best for our country and best for those 20,000 soldiers who are going into peacekeeping in Bosnia.

The last thing I think we would want to do is to send those 20,000 soldiers into Bosnia wondering whether they have the support of anybody besides the President of the United States. It is up to us in Congress, as representatives of the people of this country, every State and district of this country, to say to those brave soldiers—the finest fighting force that has ever existed in the history of the world, in my opinion—we are with you. We stand behind you. The time for partisan debate is over. You have a mission to do, and now we are focused on doing everything we can to support your mission and to help, as Senator DOLE has said, to make sure that it can be carried out swiftly, successfully, and with good effect.

I agree with my colleagues that part of that is to make sure that the Bosnian military is adequately armed and equipped to deter aggression once the NATO peacekeeping force leaves Bosnia.

Mr. President, there are moments when not only the people of the United States but Members of Congress are disappointed, frustrated, discouraged by what happens here. There are other moments when we are elevated and inspired and encouraged because we see among our distinguished colleagues an extraordinarily able group that has been sent here from around the country. We see really the finest, in a sense I would say the most noble of human behavior, real acts of leadership, and I respectfully suggest that we have seen such an act from the Senate majority leader today and from the Senator from Arizona.

I look forward to working with them and, hopefully, with a strong bipartisan majority of colleagues, to draft and then pass an appropriate resolution of support for those 20,000 troops and for the President and the Presidency that has made this commitment.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 30, 1995, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2519. An act to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2525. An act to modify the operation of the antitrust laws, and of State laws similar to the antitrust laws, with respect to charitable gift annuities.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the enrolled bills were signed on November 30, 1995, during the adjournment of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND.)

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1638. A communication from the Chairperson of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled, ''Funding Federal Civil Rights Enforcement''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1639. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed regulations on disclaimers on campaign communications; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–1640. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Selected Acquisition Reports for the period July 1 to September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance:

Darcy E. Bradbury, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

David A. Lipton, of Massachusetts, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Joseph H. Gale, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office.

David C. Williams, of Illinois, to be Inspector General, Social Security Administration.

Melissa T. Skofield, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1438. A bill to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. GORTON):

S. 1439. A bill to require the consideration of certain criteria in decisions to relocate professional sports teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Social Security to increase the earnings limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 1441. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 1996 through 1999 and to abolish the United States Information Agency, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament