

to push us down that road which we have been traveling for the last several decades of open-ended programs with entitlements to individuals and no ability of Congress to check it.

We have a program now that works. We have substantially improved that program in the private sector. We have imposed costs and fees on the banks, guarantors, and lenders that have helped us in our budget savings without imposing additional restrictions on students.

Frankly, it is a pretty good deal for America, to be able, when you send your children to school, to borrow funds at no interest, use those funds to pay college costs, and then have an extended repayment period after graduation where you are not even paying interest on the use of the funds for the entire time that you are in school, plus in a 6-month period of time after graduation from school.

Now, I do not know if there are many better deals in America. If there are, I would like to know about them.

And so I think we ought to deal with the facts and not the political rhetoric. We ought to recognize that we have in place an extraordinarily generous program to help parents who need the help and students who need the help in providing funds to pay for their college costs.

A program which allows you to borrow at zero interest for your entire time in school and then gives you a generous 10-year or more repayment program where the interest does not even begin to run on the amount that you have borrowed until 6 months after you have graduated, give you time to go out and look for employment so that you can begin to pay back these loans, is a pretty generous program. At a time when we are facing a substantial budget crisis, are attempting to bring fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government, at this historic moment when we hope to finally once and for all balance the budget, this is more than a reasonable proposition.

So I hope that the conferees in deciding what the final composition of the Balanced Budget Act will look like and in negotiating with the President understand what the House and Senate have come up with in terms of the student loan program is more than reasonable, does not impose additional costs on students, does not reduce the amount of loans available to those students, and simply is the way we ought to proceed.

Mr. President, I thank you for the time. Whatever time I have remaining I yield back.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. EXON. An inquiry of the Chair. I assume we are in morning business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

REV. RICHARD HALVERSON

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, passage of a wonderful, gifted and true Christian gentleman, former Senate Chaplain Richard Halverson, has left another void in our society and great sadness to this friend of his. My wonderful wife, Pat and I always felt Dick Halverson was one of God's greatest gifts to us and our spiritual well-being. He never let us down, and he always built us up.

The Christian glow of Chaplain Halverson, like a strobe light in the dark or a beacon in the storm and fog, shone brightly always and will everlastingly. Few have attained or maintained the mission of what obviously was God's wisdom and compassion in creating and sending forth among us poor sinners this giant workman for faith and good.

I knew him well years before he was called upon to be the spiritual leader of the Senate. Way back in the early 1970's, when I first met this man, I correctly sensed, when he came to Nebraska to lead us in a Governors' Christian retreat, his devotion and his unique ability to spread our Maker's message of peace and love and understanding.

While he is gone from us in this life, and we will miss him, the light and glow of Richard Halverson does not even flicker. It is brighter than ever. For this wonderful man, who has been taken from us and from his family, we issue condolences to that great family of Richard Halverson, but we commit to continue his gentle but most effective teachings that he has left all of us for the betterment of mankind. God bless my brother, Richard Halverson.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], is recognized for up to 25 minutes. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended sufficient time to accommodate my remarks.

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

A MAN DEARLY LOVED, REV.
RICHARD HALVERSON

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I first wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Nebraska for his fine comments on Reverend Halverson, a man we all dearly loved. There was a beautiful and wonderful memorial service to him in the Senate caucus room this week where not only Senators but, more importantly, Senate family—policemen, people working in the dining room, doorkeepers—expressed their profound appreciation for the life and example of this wonderful, wonderful disciple of God. I will be making more complete remarks, and I will also, at a later point, insert in the RECORD some of the remarks made at his memorial service so that all Senators can read them.

I certainly join at this juncture with my friend from Nebraska and thank him for his poignant and very appropriate observation about this dear brother who meant so much to this body and the entire Senate family.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, before I speak on my frustrations with the War Powers Act and relate some of the most recent debate on Bosnia and most recent deployment of American military forces, I would like to say there was an article in the Washington Times this morning in effect saying I had declared all-out war in an effort to lobby Senators to defeat the Defense authorization conference report.

Mr. President, just for clarification, I will vote against the conference report. I worked very hard with Senator THURMOND and with other members of the committee to get a bill that would not only be something that I could support but also, more importantly, that the President would sign. I am afraid we do not have that kind of product coming in the conference report. But I have informed the Democratic Cloakroom and the Democratic leadership that I wish to cooperate fully with Senator THURMOND in getting this conference report before the Senate. I certainly will do everything I can to get a time agreement for a reasonable period for debate where people can express their views both ways, for and against this bill. I will do everything I can to persuade other Senators not to have extended debate. I have no intent of trying to keep this bill from going to the President for his final decision, whether he signs it or whether he does not sign it.

This article also said I was busy laying some kind of strategy to defeat the bill and lobbying Republican Senators and that I was trying to get out in front of Chairman THURMOND and defeat this bill.

Mr. President, I have not asked a single Senator to vote against this bill. I do not intend to lobby against the bill. I intend to state my views as to why I cannot support the bill. The conference report speaks for itself. There are some people who will be for it, some opposed to it. This article is right out of the whole cloth. I do not know how reporters are able to make these kinds of reports to the public without any check whatsoever with the people they are purporting to report on, in this case me.

It is true that I said I would vote against the bill. It is true that I laid out some of the reasons in a press release. It is not true that I am trying to impede the bill and its progress. It is not true that I am launching any kind of all-out effort to defeat the bill. It is my view that the bill will pass.

It will have, I think, majority support. It will have support from people, I am sure, from both sides of the aisle. So, I wanted to clarify my view on this.

I will vote against the bill. But if I wanted to defeat this conference report, if I felt that was the appropriate route—and I do not—I would certainly be engaged in extensive debate, thereby requiring 60 votes to pass it rather than 50. I do not intend to do that. If there is any kind of effort for extensive debate, it will not only be without my cooperation but it would be against my own advice and something being done by individual Senators.

So, I hope that whoever is spreading that message or making that report or seeing that article also will take into account the remarks I have made here on the floor, which happen to be factual and true.

WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to discuss the overall concept of war powers and the congressional role in making decisions to deploy United States forces abroad. There was not sufficient time in the debate on Bosnia during which I alluded to my frustration in this regard, but did not go into detail. Today I hope to lay out my views in a more complete fashion.

Mr. President, during Wednesday's debate on the Bosnia resolutions, I noted that when President Clinton publicly committed the United States to participate in implementing a peace agreement by putting U.S. forces on the ground in Bosnia, he did so without consulting with Congress prior to making that commitment, as far as I know. I was not consulted, and I do not know of others who were. I certainly do not know of any kind of formal consultation or any kind of leadership meeting before that commitment to deploy U.S. ground forces was made to the world and to our allies.

It was a very important commitment. At that time, we were not on the verge of a peace agreement, so it was not taken as being important by the news media or by those people in Congress in leadership positions; but it was important. And I think all of us need to understand that when Presidents make these kinds of commitments internationally, and when they do so without consulting Congress, then the cards are already dealt.

Those of us in the Congress who have certain constitutional responsibilities, if we do not do a better job ourselves, then this kind of pattern—it has not only been President Clinton, but it has been the same with other recent Presidents—will continue.

President Reagan made commitments and certainly took action in Panama and Grenada and Congress played almost no role.

President Bush, though he did, to his great credit, come to Congress before actually going to war, deployed hundreds of thousands of troops to Saudi Arabia without any congressional action. Congress did not take any action. I do not blame President Bush for that. Congress did not act. And President

Bush then virtually doubled the number of forces in Saudi Arabia, which prevented a troop rotation, which meant that the clock was ticking. There was no way to rotate those forces. Therefore, they either had to be used in some kind of conflict or it had to be resolved. So, the clock was ticking there. Then President Bush also made it clear that whatever Congress did, even though he sought congressional authority, he was going to go forward.

So, all of this leads me to think that it is time, way past time, probably 10 or 15 years past time, for Congress to rethink its own role. I think this is fundamentally a congressional responsibility. I do not think it is going to be solved by a President, whether it is a Republican President or Democratic President. It is not their job. I would hope that any President would cooperate if Congress takes its own initiative to exercise its own responsibility and authority. But, at this stage, I do not expect the President to solve our own problem.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield for just a moment?

Mr. NUNN. I would be pleased to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to corroborate the fact that in February 1993, when President Clinton made this specific commitment, I did not have any knowledge nor did other members, senior members, of the Armed Services Committee, to my knowledge.

Likewise, I remember the commitment of that large number of troops by President Bush. I recall the Senator from Georgia was quite concerned when he learned about it through other sources than through the consultation process which, in some effect, was taking place during that period in the fall. But I remember the Senator specifically raised a point that at no time in that consultation process—and I was the ranking member then—was there any to the then-chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia. And the Senator called the President to task for failing to do that.

Last, Mr. President, I urge the Senator to look at a very erudite article on this subject written by Lloyd Cutler appearing in the Washington Post, I think about 2 weeks ago. I will put it in the RECORD, the exact date of that article. It lays out with detail the legal chronology of the War Powers Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1995]
OUR PIECE OF THE PEACE—SENDING TROOPS
TO BOSNIA: OUR DUTY, CLINTON'S CALL
(By Lloyd N. Cutler)

After months of sustained effort, the Clinton administration has succeeded in negotiating a peace agreement among the three

warring ethnic factions in Bosnia. The agreements initiated in Dayton would require us and our NATO allies to place peacekeeping units of our armed forces in Bosnia for a year or more. This raises once again the biggest unresolved issue under the U.S. system of separate executive and legislative departments: Is the constitutional authority to place our armed forces in harm's way vested in the president or in Congress, or does it require the joint approval of both?

President Clinton has said he would follow the precedent set by George Bush before the 1991 Desert Storm invasion and seek a congressional expression of support before committing American units to the enforcement of the Bosnian peace agreement. But he has also asserted the constitutional power to act on his own authority, just as Bush did. This time, it is Republican congressional leaders who are challenging a Democratic president's view that the president can lawfully act on his own, but, more typically it has been Democratic Congresses challenging presidents of either party.

During the coming debate, Congress would be wise to bear in mind, as it did five years ago, that the world will be watching how the one and only democratic superpower reaches its decisions, or whether it is so divided that it is incapable of deciding at all. Congress needs to recognize that we cannot have 535 commanders-in-chief in addition to the president and that some deference to presidential judgments on force deployments is in order. That is especially true when, as in Korea, Iraq and Bosnia, the president's proposed deployments are based on United Nations Security Council resolutions that we have sponsored and on joint decisions with our allies pursuant to treaties Congress has previously approved.

In the case of Bosnia, the argument for committing U.S. forces to carry out a peace agreement is a strong one. All of us are revolted by the ethnic cleansing and other human rights abuses that the various factions have committed. These abuses are likely to continue if the peace agreement is not formally signed in mid-December as now scheduled, or if it is signed but not carried out. If the war goes on or soon resumes, it may well spread to other parts of the former Yugoslavia and to the rest of the Balkans, still the most unstable region of Western and Central Europe. Any widening of the Balkan wars could well spread to Eastern Europe and the Middle East and pose a substantial potential threat to U.S. national security.

Some foreign forces are needed to separate the contending armies and to control the standing down of heavy weapons. Under our leadership, and only under our leadership, NATO is ready to supply the necessary forces. The stronger the forces, the better the chance that they will not be attacked and that they will accomplish their mission. All these reasons argue for a significant U.S. military commitment, now that a promising peace agreement has been reached.

In 1991, the Democratic Congress narrowly approved President Bush's decision to reverse the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, thus mooted the issue of whether the president could have acted alone. Today, the Republican congressional leadership, while sounding somewhat more conciliatory than in recent weeks, is challenging President Clinton to make his case for the proposed deployment. This war powers question has come up repeatedly since the 1950 outbreak of the Korean War, when President Truman committed our forces without first seeking congressional approval, but has never been resolved.

In foreign and national security policy, as in domestic policy, neither Congress nor the president can accomplish very much for very long without the cooperation of the other.