

not stand up in time 50 years ago and too many innocents perished as a result. We must not repeat this mistake.

The United States is the leader of NATO. NATO functioned as an extraordinarily successful defensive military alliance against the Soviet Union throughout the cold war. There are those post-cold war who have asked, what is NATO's purpose? But remember, NATO is the strongest functioning military alliance among nations in the world. The NATO powers gathered at our urging to fight alongside us in the gulf war to bring about that magnificent post-cold-war victory. Clearly, NATO will not be willing to play the role of peacekeeper or keeping the peace that may be achieved in Dayton, OH, unless the United States is part of that peacekeeping force. I think we have to be honest about that. If we are not part of that force, NATO will not go in, there will not be peace in the Balkans, and we have only more aggression, more instability, and perhaps more genocide to look forward to.

Beyond that, Madam President, I would say this. The relationship in NATO works both ways. Our allies in Europe are asking us to be part of this. Our friends in Bosnia are saying they will not trust the peace unless we are part of policing it.

But what is the next crisis going to be in which we will not want to carry the burden alone, in which we are turning to our allies in NATO and saying, "Help us"? What will they say if we say to them in this case, "Sorry, folks, you take care of it"?

So I say to my colleagues in the Senate, there is a lot on the line here. That is why I say that the resolution passed in the House last night was untimely and unhelpful. I support the policy of American forces being part of a NATO force to police a peace treaty that is agreed upon in NATO. Are there questions to ask? Yes, there are. Should the administration consult with Congress? Of course it should. And it has been. But this is a time for questions, not resolutions.

Let me also say I support the second part of the House resolution, which says troops should not be dispatched without congressional authorization. But let us remember this: So does President Clinton. He said to Senator BYRD in his letter he would welcome, encourage, and at the appropriate time request an expression of support by Congress. That is what I anticipate.

President Clinton has already begun the important process of consultations with Congress. Key senior officials—Secretary of State Christopher, Secretary of Defense Perry, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili—have all come to Congress to explain the why and how of this proposed undertaking. Everyone understands that there are many important questions which remain unanswered. Some of these answers will depend on the outcome of the negotiations in Dayton. Some will depend on ongoing NATO military planning. Some will depend on decisions to be

made by the North Atlantic Council. But the President and other administration officials have made clear that the United States will participate in implementing a peace settlement only if several nonnegotiable conditions are met.

The operation must be a NATO operation, with full NATO command and control and no U.N. dual key arrangements.

The mandate for U.S. forces and their missions must be clear.

The forces must be large enough and the rules of engagement sufficiently robust for the NATO force to carry out its mission and to defend itself from any attack.

President Clinton and his Cabinet officials have promised to continue their close consultations with the Congress and to explain their proposals to the American people in order to assure that the President has their support.

This process of consultation should continue in a meaningful, bipartisan way. The President needs the support of Congress and the American people if this mission is to be successful. Just as President Bush recognized the need for congressional support before combat began in the Persian Gulf war, President Clinton realizes the importance of congressional support. Thus, he has said, in words nearly identical to those used by President Bush in January 1991, he "would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached."

So I hope that my colleagues in both Chambers will give the negotiators some room, ask questions, but hold the resolution until a much more appropriate and constructive time.

I welcome the coming debate. The stakes are too high for the people of Bosnia, for our men and women in uniform, for the position of America in the world of the next century and for all Americans for us not to engage in this debate.

Just as in those early days of 1991 when I joined a majority of the Senate in supporting George Bush's use of force in the gulf war, we are at a turning point in our history. When His Holiness Pope John Paul II was recently in the United States, he spent a short period of time with President Clinton. The President reports that the Pope said to him at the end of that conversation, "Mr. President, I am not a young man. I have a long memory. This century began with a war in Sarajevo. We must not let this century end with a war in Sarajevo."

If we believe in the hope expressed by the Pope and in the important role which America must play in the world, we must be involved in implementing peace in Bosnia. Without us there will be no involvement by NATO. Without NATO there will be no peace to implement. Without peace in the Balkans, there will be no peace and no stability in Europe, and there will be a continuation of murder and genocide. I am not prepared to accept this outcome for America or the world.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report on transportation appropriations.

Mr. KERRY. Is there any time limit at this point in time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The previous order was to recess at the hour of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for such time as I might consume. It will not be long. I assume the Senator from Minnesota wants time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes before we close, if that would be all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I thank you very much. I shall not be long.

#### BOSNIAN PEACE POLICY

Mr. KERRY. I listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Connecticut, with whom I worked on this issue, and others. He is correct that certainly the resolution passed by the Senate with respect to the arms embargo sent a message. But the truth is that the policy that has been put in place in Bosnia that has been successful was the opposite of what that resolution called on the Senate to do. People should reflect on that. The resolution that was passed so dramatically by the Senate said, "Let's abandon the place and basically just arm them and let them fight." Many of us argued that that would have been a disastrous event for the world, for the United Nations, for NATO, and that everybody would have been left asking who was responsible for this extraordinary mess if that had, indeed, been the policy of this country.

Courageously, the President pursued a different policy. The different policy that he pursued was to finally elicit from our friends and allies in Europe a willingness to do what the President had been asking them to do for some period of time, which was to be willing to take certain risks, use the power of NATO, and try to force the process to peace talks.

There is less killing in Bosnia today than there would have been if the policy of the United States Senate had been pursued. There is less killing today because the President and NATO and the European leaders undertook a policy, which I will agree was one that