

Pressler
Santorum
Shelby
Simpson

Smith
Snowe
Specter
Stevens

Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Warner

NAYS—44

Akaka
Baucus
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Bradley
Breaux
Brown
Bryan
Bumpers
Cohen
Conrad
Daschle
Dodd
Dorgan

Exon
Feingold
Feinstein
Ford
Glenn
Graham
Harkin
Hollings
Inouye
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin

Lieberman
Mikulski
Moseley-Braun
Murray
Nunn
Pell
Pryor
Reid
Robb
Rockefeller
Roth
Sarbanes
Simon
Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Gramm

So, the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. D'AMATO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate concurs in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 63.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I want to thank those Members who supported us in this very difficult measure. I have already mentioned the absolutely vital assistance and support of the distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI. She has been most helpful.

I would say also that I am most appreciative of her staff, Rusty Mathews and Steve Crane, who have been of great assistance to us in this measure.

On my side, Stephen Kohashi, who is the lead clerk, Carrie Apostolou. We had the help of Steve Isakowitz on NASA matters, and of course Lashawnda Leftwich has worked with us. This was not a bill. This seemed to be more like a multiyear protect.

I express my sincere thanks to all of the people, the staff, who worked so hard on it. I express particular thanks to the people in the administration, particularly Dan Golden, James Lee Witt, and Henry Cisneros, who worked very cooperatively with us to help implement the very difficult decisions we had to make.

As I mentioned earlier, there has been a tremendous amount of misinformation and disinformation put out about this bill. I will be preparing a full explanation of some of the misstatements that were issued in the news conference held earlier today. It is regrettable that we cannot have an honest debate, using figures that are actual figures from last year and actual figures in this bill, but that, unfortunately, does not seem to be the rule.

Mr. President, I believe there is a remaining amendment which we need to dispose of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no further amendment. It has been adopted.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, there seems to be no further comments from my ranking member.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

BOSNIA

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, last night I voted in support of the Bosnia resolution offered by our distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, and President Clinton for putting their principles above politics. We have a great national tradition of bipartisanism in foreign policy. The world must know that, when it comes to America's role in the world, we stand together—Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike—as Americans. In that regard, Senator DOLE and President Clinton have served us very well.

While I have deep concerns about this country's Bosnia policy, I also believe it is our moral and patriotic duty to stand by our troops already on the ground in Bosnia. These brave men and women deserve a strong showing of support for their work and their mission. And that is exactly what an overwhelming and bipartisan majority of the Senate gave them last night. We owed them nothing less.

Yet I remain deeply concerned about the wording of Senator DOLE's resolution and our mission in the former Yugoslavia. First and foremost, our troops are being sent to Bosnia as peacekeepers. They are there to enforce the terms of the peace agreement negotiated in Dayton, OH. And I firmly believe—for their own safety and the success of this mission—they must remain neutral. They must not be perceived as taking sides in the regional and ethnic conflict that has torn the former Yugoslavia apart.

Unfortunately, I fear the resolution we voted on last night sends a message that our troops will not be neutral; that they will be called upon to help train and rearm the Bosnian Moslems; that they will be engaged in enterprise of nation building that failed so badly in Somalia. And if that happens—if our troops are anything more than neutral peacekeepers—this mission is destined to failure. We must not let that happen.

In closing, I urge the President and our military leaders to do everything possible to assure the safety, neutrality, and success of our troops and their mission in Bosnia. And I urge everyone to say a prayer that they make it home soon.

BOSNIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday I did not speak on the pending Bosnia

resolutions in order to permit the Senate to finish its consideration of this important matter prior to the formal signing of the Dayton Agreement in Paris early this morning.

However, I wanted to take this opportunity to express my thoughts on what transpired yesterday.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the Senate went on record as to whether this institution supports the President's decision to participate in the Bosnian peace initiative. In fact, I believe that we went on record on matters much broader and more significant than that. We went on record as to whether we in the United States Senate support peace in Bosnia or war? Whether we support the continuation of American leadership in the world or the abdication of that leadership? Whether we support a post-cold-war international order that is governed by the rule of law or the force of arms?

To some, this may seem a rather simplistic summary of what the debate over the last several days was all about. But, I would say to my colleagues, when you boil it all down, that is what we were really talking about.

The war that has raged in Bosnia for nearly 4 years has been one of unspeakable atrocities; of torture, internment, rape, execution, of ethnic cleansing and genocide. More than a quarter of a million people have lost their lives. Millions more have been made refugees—many within the borders of their own country. Once stable multiethnic towns and villages have become flaming infernos as opposing Moslem, Serb, and Bosnian forces have sought revenge against one other.

Regardless of one's views on the various resolutions we will vote on, I know that our shared hopes and prayers are that the Dayton peace accord—brokered by the United States, and agreed to by all the warring factions—will once and for all bring to a close this bloody chapter of Bosnia's history.

I believe that the Dayton peace agreement contains the essential ingredients to facilitate the writing of a new, hopefully brighter chapter for the people of Bosnia.

These elements include: Bosnia preserved as a single State, within its present internationally recognized borders; the country subdivided into two juridical entities—the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Srpska; an agreed cease-fire line, the separation of opposing forces on either side of this line, and the establishment of a demilitarization zone; the creation of a 60,000-person peace implementation force, under NATO command, to monitor and enforce the military aspects of the agreement; internationally supervised democratic elections for President and Parliament to be conducted within a year; freedom of movement of all Bosnian citizens; independent monitoring of human rights of all Bosnians; the establishment of an internationally trained civilian police force; and a commitment by all parties

to cooperate with the activities of the War Crimes Tribunal.

Clearly the implementation of the military aspects of this agreement are critical to the success or failure of the other elements of the peace plan. And, U.S. participation in the implementation force is pivotal in that regard. But, it is important to keep in mind that while U.S. participation is essential, we will not be alone in the effort to implement the agreement—more than 25 countries have pledged to participate as well and will provide two-thirds of the 60,000-person implementing force.

While the Dayton Agreement has been well crafted, it is by no means 100-percent guaranteed to be successful—no agreement of this kind falls into that category. However, every effort has been made to minimize the chance of failure. Each and every American soldier who goes to Bosnia will be well trained and well armed to face any eventuality. The leaders of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have also pledged to ensure the safety and security of the implementing force.

However, Mr. President, I think it would be unrealistic to promise the American people that there will be no casualties incurred during Operation Joint Endeavor. That is a promise that is not, unfortunately, totally within our power to fulfill.

Ultimately the success or failure of the Bosnian peace agreement will depend upon the willingness of the governments of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia to live up to their commitments to each other and to the international community. Without question, U.S. involvement will heighten the prospects for compliance by all parties and lessen the possibility that the Balkans will once again become engulfed in war. On the other hand, if the United States stands on the sidelines at this crucial moment, the renewal of armed conflict is all but assured.

Many of my colleagues have mentioned in the course of this debate that public opinion polls suggest that the American people do not currently support the deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. To them I would say, there is nothing novel about that. The public was initially quite negative about U.S. participation in the Persian Gulf war and only when Operation Desert Storm was up and running did the public mood shift.

It is no secret that the American people have always cared more about what happens at home than abroad and have sometimes been slow to appreciate the ramifications of international events on their own domestic security and prosperity. It is the responsibility of the President and other political leaders to explain to our citizens why a particular course of action is ultimately in the interest of this country.

President Clinton has endeavored to explain the various United States interests at stake in the Bosnian peace process. I believe he has done a very

credible job of making the case for the difficult decision he has made. On November 27, President Clinton went directly to the American people to explain why he is prepared to participate in the quest for peace in Bosnia.

During that address he put the matter very succinctly:

In Bosnia, a terrible war has challenged our interests and troubled our souls. Our interests are plain. The cause is right. Our mission will be clear, limited and achievable. The people of Bosnia, our NATO allies and people around the world are looking to America for leadership. Let us lead. That is our responsibility as Americans.

I agree with the President that the rest of the world looks to the United States for leadership. We cannot and should not answer every call for U.S. assistance. It is up to us, of course, to decide whether it is in our national interest to assume a leadership role in any particular situation. In the case of Bosnia, the situation is clear—United States leadership is essential.

I commend this body for taking the action that it did yesterday, in voting in support of the Dole/McCain resolution. We did what was critical—we sent a clear signal to the world that we are united as a nation in our resolve to support peace in Bosnia, and that we stand full square behind the men and women of our Armed Forces as they commence their mission of peace in the coming days.

With that affirmative vote we did not simply give peace a chance in Bosnia. We did far more. We reaffirmed our position as a world leader and strengthened the rule of law in the post-cold-war era. I am proud of what the Senate accomplished last night.

HAITI—A MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR FOREIGN POLICY FAILURE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, U.S. policy regarding Haiti is another example of throwing good money after bad. In order to keep a sinking foreign policy ship afloat, the Clinton administration has handed over, in less than a year and a half, more than \$2 billion of the American taxpayers' money in propping up the regime of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

This enormous sum of money has gone to a tiny, corrupt country representing less than 1 percent of this hemisphere's population.

Within the past month, I have received new requests from the administration to send additional millions of dollars to Haiti.

President Clinton's enormous spending spree in Haiti has not produced the stability, security, and democracy promised by the Clinton administration. I possess no crystal ball but it was apparent to me then, and still is, that politically motivated assassinations and increased mob violence would result if Aristide were reinstated as President to be propped up by American soldiers. But, just as was the case early in the 20th century when the

United States Marines occupied Haiti for 19 years and did not bring democracy to Haiti, the present military occupation has not transformed Aristide into a leader who believes in and practices democratic ideals.

Mr. President, whatever Aristide and his cronies are committed to, it certainly isn't democracy. Their primary interest is U.S. dollars.

Aristide has flatly refused to implement free market reforms, and has warned that the first person who "dares sell the state's possessions on behalf of privatization" will be "arrested immediately." In fact, Aristide's hostility toward free market economic reform resulted in a political crisis which led to the resignation of his Prime Minister in October and the suspension of all World Bank programs.

In June's legislative elections, fraud was rampant, and several opposition candidates were threatened and intimidated. Poll workers were largely untrained, voting secrecy was rare, ballots were burned or dumped, and tally sheets were widely doctored.

Even with 6,000 international troops and a new U.S.-trained police force in place, dozens of politically motivated murders have occurred since the Clinton administration restored Aristide to power last October. In March, a woman was gunned down in retaliation for criticizing President Aristide.

Another Port-au-Prince murder is reminiscent of the Old Testament account of King Abel who coveted the property of his subject, Naboth. When Naboth refused to sell, King Abel had him poisoned and took the property.

History is repeating itself in Haiti. Michel Gonzalez and his American wife were Aristide's neighbors in the Port-au-Prince suburbs. When Aristide wanted to add on to his villa, several neighbors accepted his offer to buy their property. However, despite several offers from Aristide, Mr. Gonzalez declined to sell his home. So, on May 22, as Mr. Gonzalez entered his driveway with his teenage daughter, he was gunned down. Sources in Haiti assert that soon after the assassination, the wall dividing the properties was knocked down. Aristide got his way.

On November 11, President Aristide incited mobs to violence at a funeral of a political crony and relative. His bloodthirsty syncophants responded immediately, and across Haiti, buildings were burned, houses were ransacked, and dozens were murdered. Yet violence has not abated. Recently, the bodies of seven men and women were found in a dump near Port-au-Prince, gagged and shot in the head.

Mr. President, not one person has been prosecuted and sentenced for any of at least 22 politically motivated murders committed between January and October of this year. In fact, I am unaware of any serious investigation into these assassinations, much less into the more recent murders last month.

When asked by a Creole newspaper about killings sparked by his speech,