savings for Medicare. Many of us believe that is too much. There needs to be a compromise in that area. The same plan provided for $245 billion in tax cuts.

I offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate that I believe every single Republican voted against. It was very simple. I said, if there is going to be tax cuts—I do not think there should be at this point. I think we ought to balance the budget first. Then we ought to decide after the budget is balanced how to change the tax system, and where to cut taxes. But if there will be tax cuts, I said, let us at least decide this. Let us decide that those tax cuts shall be limited to people whose incomes are below a quarter of a million dollars. Can we not at least agree that we will provide the tax cuts only to those whose incomes are below a quarter of a million dollars a year and use the savings from that, somewhere around $50 billion in 7 years, to reduce the reductions in Medicare, reduce the hit on Medicare especially for low-income elderly?

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I posed the question in an amendment. Should we not, if we are going to do that, at least limit the tax cuts to those whose incomes are a quarter of a million dollars a year or less and use the savings from that limitation to reduce the hurt that is going to be caused to low-income senior citizens on Medicare? The answer was no. They said no. We insist that people above $250,000 get a tax cut. Some will get an enormous tax cut from this legislation.

So those who come here and bust their suit buttons boasting about what they have done, what they have done was unacceptable to a lot of folks. Not that they have balanced the budget. That is not unacceptable. It is the way they have done it that is unacceptable. I want to balance the budget. I want to spend a lot of hours in the room with negotiators and try to balance the budget. I am not going to come out here and question their sincerity. I do not think they ought to come out here and suggest the President is hiding in Europe. It does no service to try to advance an opportunity to reach agreement on these issues.

We are talking, after all, about a 7-year spending plan for this country, a 7-year spending plan created in such a way that put this country's books in balance. That is a worthy goal—put the books in balance in a way that also recognizes the need for investment in certain areas, education; the need for protection in certain areas, health care for low-income elderly, and others. We can do that. I am convinced we can do that. But we cannot do it if we keep shouting across the aisle that we are the only ones that had a plan, that we are the only ones on the right track, and that all the rest of you folks do not believe in it. We question your sincerity. You are hiding.

What kind of nonsense is that? That is not thoughtful. That is thoughtless political pandering. And I think that we will all be better off if we decide—yes, the goal is worthy. The plan that was advanced was not acceptable.

So let us have a rectangular table where we sit down and in good faith decide how we balance the budget and to do it in the right way. I want to do that. It is good for this country. The motives of the other side are, in my judgment, good motives. But some of the language makes no sense. Let us decide to work together in a spirit of cooperation, and fix what is wrong in this country and do it the right way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments. I believe they are right on. They are helpful, and I think they are positive.

It is my belief that the budget debate could be settled in 20 minutes, if both sides really sat down and did it. I think the Senator from North Dakota clearly gave the main kernel of a solution. The tax cuts that are in the bill—no one benefits from those tax cuts more than my own family does. My husband is an investment banker. The capital gains clearly benefits him. He would love to have those benefits. It would be a nice thing to have, and many Americans feel that way. However, to have those benefits by making deeper cuts in Medicare and Medicaid—in my own State the Medicaid Program pays half a million of the poorest Californians' premiums and copayments whose Medicare would be done away with. We do not need to do that in this bill. You do not need to have the depth of the cuts to balance the budget in 7 years.

The issue is not balancing the budget in 7 years. We have all agreed that is now going to be the case. The issue is do we need to have a major tax reduction benefiting largely upper-income people by taking those dollars, by making the cuts deeper in Medicare and Medicaid and social programs that are important to the well-being of this Nation? I think the answer to that, for anyone that looks at this from a moral perspective, clearly has to be no. So my own view is that this thing can be settled very quickly, and that the Senator from North Dakota clearly put forward a kernel of that solution.

BOSNIA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about Bosnia.

Three nights ago the President of the United States went before the American people to make the case for sending 20,000 American soldiers to help implement the peace agreement that was recently drawn up and initialed in Dayton.

I listened, as did millions of other Americans, and I heard the President lay out his reasons for doing something no one really wants to do, not even he. The decision that he made was not an easy one. As we have come to know all too well over the past few years, there are no easy answers to end the bloody conflict in Bosnia that has consumed so many lives.

Over the past 72 hours all of us have weighed this question, and discussed the options before us with the administration, with our constituents, and deep within our own conscience. I submit to you that when push comes to shove this is going to be a vote of conscience, a vote of conscience here in the Senate, and a vote of conscience in the House of Representatives.

While the details of the implementation plan have not yet been finalized, and as the President noted, there are critical questions that still need to be answered about how this mission can be accomplished effectively and with the greatest attention to troop safety, it is now clear to me that the American people and the Congress must and should support the President.

To do otherwise, I believe, is to show a divided nation and send a signal throughout a world where 30 wars are now in progress that the American people forfeit our leadership role as the moral force for freedom and responsibility in the world.

Over the past 4 years, while America and our European allies have quibbled about responsibility, the war has continued unabated. Amid the often self-inflicted charges of hand-wringing and finger-pointing as to whose war is it, who should lead, whose backyard is affected, two inescapable facts come home to me. One is something that the British statesman Edmund Burke said two centuries ago. We should all listen to what he said.

I quote: ''The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.''

And, second, in the words of George Santayana, ''Those who forget history are doomed to repeat it.''

Mr. President, it is time for good men and women to stand up, and America must lead.

To those who know history, this area of the world is no stranger to conflict. In 1878, 117 years ago, Benjamin Disraeli said in the House of Lords in Great Britain:

> No language can describe adequately the condition of that large portion of the Balkan peninsula—Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and other provinces—political intrigues, constant rivalries, a total absence of all public spirit . . . hatred of all races, animosity of rival religions and absence of any controlling power . . . nothing short of an army of 50,000 of the best troops would produce anything like order in these parts.

Disraeli's observation is as astute today as it was in 1878, but over the past 4 years the war in Bosnia has taken an enormous toll: a quarter of a

million people dead; the systematic rape and torture of thousands; ethnic cleansing; concentration camps; over 300 graves with more than 1 body in them; war crimes; thousands still unaccounted for; 2 million homeless; and the fear of a spreading conflict.

Not since Adolf Hitler has the world seen such atrocities.

When our children and grandchildren look back on this day, they should not have to ask, Why did we not act when we had a chance to make a difference? Why did we not learn from the lessons of the Holocaust?

America is the strongest nation in the world. As new nations fight for survival, as ethnic groups fight for their rights, as the leaders of fledgling nations fight for democracy and as people suffer atrocities, we must be careful as to how and when and where we make a difference. But if we can make a difference, and if it is important to our interests, I believe we should.

We have an interest in this peace. Some might say we did not have such an interest before Dayton, but post-Dayton we most certainly have an interest in this peace. We have brokered this peace. We have a chance for peace to succeed. We cannot turn our backs because if we turn our backs on a chance for peace, what we are going to go back to is the systematic torture and rape and ethnic cleansing and atrocities.

When the assault took place on Srebrenica, the moral argument truly hit home. And after all, there are still thousands of men and boys unaccounted for since the Serbs took over Srebrenica.

I have used this picture standing next to me in this Chamber before. Today I use it again. This young Bosnian woman from Srebrenica looks very normal—her skirt, her sweater—with one exception: She has hung herself. She is hanging from a tree. Rather than further endure the atrocities, the rape, the torture, the mayhem, she hung herself.

What we stand for as a nation is not letting things like this happen. What we stand for is doing something about it. And we have done that before. Our men and women have fought two wars in Europe—World War I and World War II. America was not threatened then, but we fought for some of the same reasons that we brokered a peace in Dayton that now has an opportunity to succeed, if we have the will, the unity, and the disposition to see that peace succeeds.

So my argument today is really the moral one. We can have a peace succeed at this time if we have the resolve as a free, strong country to see it through.

Once again, I would recall what Edmund Burke said many years ago and paraphrase it: Bad men flourish when good men refuse to stand up.

It is true, as many have said, and there is no question that there is a price to pay. The question is, Should we pay that price? And what happens if we do not?

Let me begin with what happens if we do not. If we do not, we know that our allies will not go in. Since the arms embargo has just been lifted by the U.N. Security Council, we know that all sides will have greater access to arms. The Bosnian Government most probably will get arms from Moslem nations, and possibly from the United States as well. And the Bosnian Serbs will gain arms from Serbia and quite possibly from Russia.

There is a significant danger that what has been a largely self-contained conflict could spread, drawing in Croatia and Serbia as full participants—and we have seen the might of the Croatian Army—and then to nearby nations, such as Macedonia and Albania. From there our NATO allies, Greece and Turkey, could find themselves drawn in. And the threat of a major European conflict will be drastically increased.

The mission that has been proposed is not without risk and it is not without cost. No military mission ever is. But it is a risk, I think, the leader of the free world must take.

My continued support for the President's plan will be contingent upon the details of the mission. And I want to go into that for a moment.

Our task over the next few weeks is to ensure that this mission is achievable, and that our troops are given everything they need to allow these highly trained forces—and they are very highly trained—to do what we know they are capable of as the strongest, best-equipped, best-trained military force in the world.

There are certain aspects of this plan that are fundamentally necessary to ensure success. First, as I have said, the United States will take the lead, but we will not be alone. We will provide one-third of the troops; our allies will provide two-thirds.

Second, the command will be unified and straightforward. U.S. and all other troops will operate under the command of an American general, General Joulwan, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. This mission—Operation Joint Endeavor—will be an exclusively NATO-led mission. The United Nations will not play a role.

Third, our forces will be operating under robust rules of engagement. They will respond with immediate and overwhelming force to any threat. Anyone who threatens our forces will not receive a proportional response. They will, quite simply, be taken out.

Here I want to commend the President for his clarity and strength. I echo his words that if anyone threatens U.S. troops, ''We will fight fire with fire—and then some.''

Tomorrow, the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, will hold hearings on the plan to implement the peace agreement. The Armed Services Committee will also have an opportunity. Today, the House International Relations Committee is having that opportunity.

We will have an opportunity to examine the terms of the peace agreement in depth, and to discuss the commitment of the parties to the agreement. President Clinton has made it clear that there will be no peace implementation force unless all parties sign the peace agreement.

There are other concerns that also must be thoroughly addressed: the precise definition and limits of the mission; the avoidance of mission creep; a well-thought-out exit strategy, and the President has indicated four areas which will be used as the determining factors of when the mission has been successfully completed; the relocation of an estimated 2 million refugees; how to deal with anonymous sniper fire.

We now know that there will be an international police task force set up, separate from the peace implementation force, to handle policing duties. There will be a body set up to handle the relocation of refugees. And we now know that the parties themselves will participate in efforts to remove the large number of landmines.

All of these questions, though, must have more answers, and I believe they are in the course of being presented.

As many of my colleagues have noted in recent days, the President has the constitutional authority to deploy these troops without congressional approval. The President, however, is seeking the support of the American people and of Congress for this mission. We must work with him to ensure that this mission is successful, but we can do no less than to support him.

Three weeks ago, as Bosnian, Serb, and Croatian leaders hammered out this peace agreement, in another part of the world a great peacemaker and world leader was felled by an assassin's bullet. I was very sobered by the fact that Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin gave his life for peace. More than anything else, I think this shows the risk that making peace in a historically troubled area carries with it. And so his death serves as a reminder that leadership in the search for peace has a price.

I remember something that President Kennedy once said, that ''America would pay any price, bear any burden, and suffer any hardship in the cause of liberty and peace.'' I think that really says it all. We have an historic opportunity to help achieve peace where there has been far too much war. We cannot pass up this chance for peace.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am not quite sure I can speak with the passion of the Senator from California, but I, too, feel a great concern for the situation in which this President has now in a foursquare way placed this country.