

father who shaped my life by their love, their expectations and their example—to my sister Betty Mori and her husband, Jean, and to my entire family and close friends for their sacrifice, their steadfast support, and for their love.

I am grateful to my friends and supporters and to the voters of Georgia for their support in each election—for their encouragement and confidence—for their constructive criticism and for their forgiveness of my errors.

I am grateful to my staff—past and present—who have worked with honesty, skill, and dedication on behalf of the people of Georgia and the Nation.

I am grateful to the Members of the U.S. Senate and House—past and present—of both political parties, who have been my mentors—teachers—and friends, and who have been my partners in many legislative initiatives.

I am grateful to my friends in the Georgia legislature, and to Governor Miller, Governor Harris, Governor Busbee, and Governor Carter, Speaker Murphy and Lt. Gov. Howard as well as our State constitutional officers. They have guided our State with vision, fiscal prudence and integrity while I have served in the Senate. I am grateful to our leaders at the local level who play such an important role in the daily lives of our citizens.

I am grateful to Georgia Democrats for their role in leading our State to a point of unprecedented economic opportunity. Georgia Democrats have made education our top priority and brought together people from every region, every walk of life, and every race to work for common goals.

I am honored to represent a State where the vast majority of our people cast their ballots—not on the basis of one or two issues—but rather on their judgment of a candidate's principles and values, integrity and vision. I can never fully repay the people of Georgia for the trust and faith they have placed in me.

I have tried to return this trust and faith with hard work and effective representation.

I hope that I have played a meaningful role in making Georgia a better place to live and to raise our children.

I hope that I have helped build bridges of understanding and cooperation between people of different races, religions and political beliefs.

I have tried to help make America stronger at home and abroad. I have tried to help build a safer and more peaceful world with freedom and justice.

I have tried to instill in our young people by word and by example—the understanding and belief that it remains possible to be involved in the political process and also retain both intellectual honesty and ethical behavior. In the final analysis, this may be the single most important responsibility of public service.

I look forward to continuing these efforts as a U.S. Senator for the next 15 months, and after that—as a private citizen of Georgia for whatever term God may grant.

#### UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in recent days, the Nation has focused its attention on one of the most serious issues to come before this country since I have been privileged to be in the Senate, and I say that in all sincerity. That is the very difficult decision facing the President of the United States as to whether or not this Nation will make a further—and I underline fur-

ther—commitment of our Armed Forces to the situation in Bosnia.

As I am privileged to address the Senate this morning, there are still pockets of combat in that war-torn nation, a nation which I have visited five times myself, being the first Senator to go to Sarajevo over 2½ years ago.

Since that time, I am pleased that so many of the Members of the Senate have found the opportunity to go to that region so that they can, likewise, gain a clearer and better understanding of this historic and tragic conflict.

I would like to focus my remarks today, Mr. President, on an issue which has captured the attention of the American people over the last week, that is, President Clinton's decision to send up to 25,000 United States ground troops to Bosnia.

Hearings were held this week in the U.S. Senate, both in the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and in the Foreign Relations Committee. Those hearings revealed the depth of congressional concerns, both Republican and Democrat, with this proposed deployment. May I emphasize, Mr. President, I do not view this issue as a political one. I think each Senator that has spoken out or involved himself or herself in this debate has done so very sincerely, as a matter related to their duties to this Nation, not for any political reason.

I myself, in traveling through my State, indeed, not just in the last month or so, but over the period of the nearly 3 years of this conflict, have detected perhaps the deepest, the most sincere concern that I have ever experienced since the closing days of Vietnam about this conflict and America's role in the conflict.

In my view, the American people are entitled to a voice in a decision of this magnitude. The American people have followed this conflict for over 3 years. They are well-informed, they understand the complexities involved, they should have a voice in this decision. Their voice can best be manifested right in this institution, the U.S. Congress, with a very thorough and extensive debate. That is the principal reason I rise today to address the Senate. We, their elected representatives in the Congress, must ensure that the voice of the American people is heard.

I call on the congressional leadership, both Senate and House, to establish a plan for debating and voting on a freestanding resolution regarding the authorization for the use of United States ground troops in Bosnia.

I have consulted with my leader in the Senate, Senator DOLE. And he, at this time, is considering this need for the leadership to establish the procedure and the timing for this debate. In my view, in this special instance, the leadership must exercise control—I say that most respectfully—control over the procedure by which the Senate commences this debate to ensure that it is meaningful, well-informed, and timely.

I would like to emphasize that the timing of this congressional debate is critical. If the Senate considers the issue too soon, that is, before we know the outlines of the peace agreement, before we know all of the details of the proposed NATO operation, there will be too many unanswered questions to enable this debate to reach an informed conclusion. If we wait too long, however, our troops may well be on the their way, that is, our ground troops, and Congress will not have performed the responsible role that I believe the Constitution requires us to perform. Only by daily monitoring of this situation can the leadership best determine that critical hour when this debate should be initiated.

I do not see this debate, I repeat, Mr. President, as a political fight. This is not Republicans versus Democrats or Republicans versus the President. The misgivings regarding this operation cross party lines. At issue in this debate is not who scores the most political points. What is at stake are the lives of the men and the women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the present and future credibility of America's security policy.

The most important question we must answer in this debate is whether or not the United States has a vital national security interest in this conflict in Bosnia, which justifies putting United States combat troops in harm's way in this operation and justifies imposing a very significant cost on the American taxpayer, a cost which cannot be fully calculated at this time but which would easily be in the billions of dollars.

We must keep in mind that past military operations have taken dollars from our modernization and O&M accounts in the Department of Defense, dollars which directly affect the future readiness, preparedness, and capabilities of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Again, Mr. President, I focus on the fact that the use of United States ground troops in Bosnia would be an additional step by our Nation. Our military forces are already there and have been there in a very significant way in those military operations involving airpower, and in those military operations involving the naval embargo. In both the air and the naval operations, for several years we have been the dominant military participant.

I question, is this deployment of United States ground troops the best of the remaining options for resolving the fighting in Bosnia? The President and his negotiators deserve credit for the achievements they have had to date with respect to achieving a peace agreement and lessening the fighting. So that is definitely to their credit.

But should the United States play a role on the ground in Bosnia given that we are already, as I say, playing the major role in the air operations and the naval blockade, or are there other options we should consider which

would not involve such a significant number of upward of 25,000 United States ground troops?

Mr. President, Senator LEVIN and I recently completed a report for the Senate Armed Services Committee involving the United States military involvement in Somalia. That report, I think, if I may say, should accomplish one thing. It should cause the administration and this Senate to consider more carefully the policy decisions that put men and women who serve in our Armed Forces at risk.

As the father of one of the young Rangers killed in Somalia, Col. Larry Joyce, told the Senate Armed Services Committee in an open hearing, and I quote him:

Too frequently, policymakers are insulated from the misery they create. If they could be with the chaplain who rings a doorbell at 6:20 in the morning to tell a 22-year-old woman she's now a widow, they'd develop their policies more carefully.

That is why I emphasize that the American people need a much stronger voice in this critical decision. And that can only be fulfilled, in my judgment, by a very comprehensive debate here in the U.S. Senate. I hope that President Clinton will actively seek such a debate.

I point out that, very wisely, President Bush, when he was faced with the similar situation in the gulf war, received congressional authorization for the use of force prior to the initiation of that conflict. That debate, though difficult and contentious, was, in my view, one of the finest in the contemporary history of this institution.

The final vote taken after, I think, almost 3 days of debate, was by a narrow margin of five to authorize the President to use force. But the debate and vote served to unite the Congress and, indeed, the American people behind our President.

Fortunately, the casualty level in that conflict was far below the predictions. But had the Congress not been on record in support of the President and the war effort, and had that conflict resulted in greater—there were significant losses—but had there been greater losses, I fear the drumbeat could well have started right here in the Congress to bring our troops home. We need only remember the experience of Somalia.

In calling for this vote, I do not seek to question the President's role as Commander in Chief—in particular, his authority to deploy United States troops in emergency situations, such as we saw in Grenada and Panama, when the circumstances did not allow for a protracted, prior debate in the Congress. That was quite appropriate, and it was that type of action that was contemplated by the Founding Fathers when they wrote into the Constitution the specific roles of the President with respect to being Commander in Chief.

But that is not the case with Bosnia. That war has been going on for 3½ years, since April 1992. We are, at best,

weeks away from a peace agreement. There is plenty of time for the Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility for such a deployment by thoroughly debating the issue and voting on a resolution.

Although I have traditionally been a supporter of Presidential prerogative in the deployment of United States troops, I have yet to be convinced that this President's plan, President Clinton's plan, for putting this additional contingent of military forces, namely, up to 25,000 ground forces in Bosnia, is the proper option to follow.

I listened carefully to the administration's testimony during the course of our hearing in the Armed Services Committee, but I still cannot identify a vital United States national security interest in Bosnia that justifies putting United States ground troops at risk in that nation. I do not want to see U.S. troops inserted in the middle of a civil war, a civil war which is based on centuries' old religious and ethnic hatreds.

I would like to recount just a personal note. On my last visit, Senator ROBERT KERREY and I went into the Krajina region which, just days before our visit, had been the battleground for Croatian forces driving Serbian forces out, Croatian Serbs having taken that land several years earlier. There was an enclave of Serbs that had been trapped and prevented, in one way or another, from fleeing into Serb territory. We met extensively with these refugees. In one particular meeting, there was a doctor, there was a schoolteacher and there was another very well-educated individual. As hard as we pressed them for answers as to why this conflict exists and continues to exist, they could give no answers to explain why well-educated people have participated all throughout that region—all sides—in barbaric acts which those of us in this country find incomprehensible.

That is my major concern as to why we should not put our troops in there in harm's way. President Clinton has yet to make a convincing case that we should proceed with this deployment.

In my view, the burden of proof on the administration to turn public opinion around is virtually insurmountable. Therefore, it has to be a joint responsibility of the Congress and the President, no matter how definite the President and others may wish to make this commitment at this time. And another thing that concerns me, how the administration can predict, should we go in, that this situation would be of such a nature that we could pull out all of our forces 1 year from today. I just find that incomprehensible.

So, Mr. President, I shall have more to say on this subject in the coming days. I yield the floor and thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, the

Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

#### BLM LANDS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, October 22, which is just around the corner, is a pretty important day in Montana, and I will tell my colleagues why in just a minute. But I will say it is one of the reasons why I am dead set against S. 1031, a bill to transfer the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the States.

Let me say a word about multiple use. When Congress passed the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976, it defined multiple use as "the management of the public lands so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people."

That is what the statute says.

Let me tell you about what it means to Montanans—citizens of a State with nearly 30 million acres of Federal public lands. To many Montanans, it means jobs, jobs from the timber that we harvest, minerals that we mine, oil and gas that we extract, livestock that we graze and city slickers that pay for a week under the big sky with our outfitters and our guides.

And to all Montanans, folks who earn their living off the land and the majority who live and work in towns, these lands represent what we love most about our State. These lands provide recreation, an escape from work, a reminder that we live in the last best place.

It means teaching your kids to hunt like your dad taught you. It means being able to take your family out for a weekend and hike and camp and explore in the most beautiful, pristine places known to man.

Montanans head to the Pryor Mountains hoping to catch a glimpse of the wild horse herds; they float the historical Whitecliffs of the Missouri River; and they fish the blue-ribbon Madison River.

This weekend in particular reminds Montanans of just how lucky we all are to have so much Federal lands available to us. It is the start of the big game hunting season.

Montanans head to the Missouri Breaks in search of trophy mulies, set up their elk camps in the Centennial Mountains, or take a trip to their favorite spot to go antelope hunting, shoot upland game birds, pheasant, or ducks.

Montanans are lucky because these Federal lands are near our homes. Within an hour's drive from any town in Montana, these lands provide full access and outstanding opportunities for a successful hunt. In fact, there were more than 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

Just think of that, 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

There is, however, a bill pending in the Senate which takes this away from Montanans. It is S. 1031. It directs the