

Please remember—and I finish on this and I thank the Senator from South Carolina for letting me speak on the floor right now—that when we talk about 34 million or 35 million people, we are talking about women, we are talking about children, we are talking about the correlation between race and gender and children and poverty in America.

In a budget deficit bill you cannot begin to tackle that agenda head on. But at the very minimum, we must not retreat from what I think is one of the best features of this plan, that is the earned income tax credit, and we certainly cannot retreat from food stamp assistance, and we certainly cannot retreat from childhood immunization, and we certainly cannot retreat on the Medicare part of this equation.

We have already asked people to make the sacrifice. I think there are some aspects of this that are very fair, but I want to just make sure my colleagues keep in mind the concerns and circumstances of those people who are on the bottom and who are struggling the most in the United States of America.

I yield the remainder of my time.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE,
JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY,
AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I understand if I ask for a quorum call, it will be charged against this side under the unanimous-consent agreement. But if I talk, there is no charge.

Before some Senator says that is about what it is worth, I will just continue to comment while my counterpart on the other side here, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, is out fetching two Senators to offer their two amendments. I have three of us out looking for Senators on this side. Once again, publicly I remind everyone, do not come crying around here at 10 or 11 tonight, and say Why can we not stop? Why can we not go over? Why can we not do all of this? They are the crowd that is wasting the time now. We are going to get through this bill this afternoon.

While we are on this particular subject of the budget, I think we ought to understand what is good about it. We had a summit. We have some folks running around now saying what we have to do is to get a summit. They know better. I got led by the gang of 17 10 years ago under the Reagan administration. We met at the White House. We met at Jim Baker's home. We went around the clock for months of meetings, and when we got together we found out, frankly, they did not want to agree.

I think the parties to the agreement; namely, the gang of 17, were genuine. They were sincere. But the Director of OMB at the time, and the President, had no idea we were going to get together. And, we had subsequent summit meetings and they have all been disasters.

I will once again say the summit meeting of 1990 was a fraud. I am not particularly talented on fiscal projections, but I used the one CBO gave and we projected, rather than reducing \$500 billion that instead we were going to increase the deficit some \$400 billion in a year. And, that is where we are right this minute.

I see now we have a Senator ready to present an amendment.

President Clinton comes to town, having balanced budgets for 10 years. This crowd that is riding him over the rails here—and want to run him out of town—they ought to welcome him and sell tickets to look at him. Here is a fellow who has balanced budgets for 10 years. And this crowd has never balanced any budget. This crowd has us on automatic pilot with deficit tax increases of \$1 billion a day. I want to challenge them. They are talking about the largest tax increase in history and talk about \$243 billion over 5 years. I want to talk about the \$310 billion deficit tax increase this year, a billion dollars a day for the interest cost on the national debt added to the debt. It is worse than taxes. We are going to repeal some luxury taxes. We did repeal the catastrophic illness tax. We cannot repeal this one; we have to pay it. There is no way to avoid it. It is the worst tax of all. It cannot be avoided, and you can get nothing for it.

I could go down through it all, how the President came, froze your pay and my pay. That has not been done in the 27 years I have been here. He froze your pay, his pay, my pay, the military pay, everybody's pay, and cut his staff 25 percent. We cut our Commerce Committee staff 10 percent. We put in and got rid of 100,000 federal employees. We cut into the veterans' part of the budget. We cut into the farm support part of the budget.

He put Vice President GORE in charge of going through the different departments to look for waste, and his wife, Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton, in charge of health costs. He is working around the clock. What do we have? A pretty good plan on CBO figures.

I could go into the different disputes about these figures but I am glad to see the distinguished Senator from Colorado and we can get back to the subject of this bill. I am willing to continue the lecture series at a later time.

I thank the Senate for its indulgence. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am really pleased the distinguished chairman and I are on an appropriations bill that does not have very much to do with Senator HOLLINGS' remarks about the budget

deficit or the President balancing the budget for 10 years because we would never get the bill passed, obviously. But we do agree on most of what is before us in the appropriation. I just want to comment on his fine remarks. The reason President Clinton balanced budgets is because he has a constitution that says he has to. He is not singular in that regard. About every Governor in America does that.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Of course.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That was in the South Carolina constitution from 1895 to 1985. When I got elected Governor, it was there yet it had never been obeyed. A provision in a constitution does not give a balanced budget. You have to do it, and the only way to do it is to lead, with your own legislature, which I did. As Governor, I obtained a triple A credit rating, but it was not because it was in a constitution. Because you and I know how you can evade and avoid Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, you can evade and avoid summit meeting requirements, you can evade and avoid a constitutional provision.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Again, I agree only that there are ways to get around constitutional amendments that require States to have balanced budgets. But it is nothing phenomenal, extraordinary. It is rather average that Governors have balanced budgets in the last 15 or 20 years. That is why they are having so much difficulty. We do not have that, and to that extent I agree with my friend, we need that. We need to get some similar kind of discipline built into our law some way. But clearly, so nobody thinks this President is solving the deficit, we can have this argument a little bit later when we get a lull in the bill here.

I yield the floor because I think the Senator is ready to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 725

(Purpose: To eliminate U.S. funding of the International Coffee Organization)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 725.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 87, between lines 20 and 21 insert the following new section:

Sec. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for contributions to the International Coffee Organization.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, the amendment is a straightforward amendment which eliminates the appropriations in this bill for the International Coffee Organization.

The Foreign Relations Committee has considered this question this year in markup on the authorization bill and the authorization for the International Coffee Organization was eliminated. It was a bipartisan effort. It has been considered by the committee in the past, and they decided to eliminate it.

More than a year ago, we debated this issue in the conference on the State Department authorization bill. It was decided to continue the funding. It is my hope that the authorization will be dropped again this year.

Why should we save a little over a million dollars by eliminating funding for the International Coffee Organization? There are some 75 countries that are members. It was founded back in 1962 and had 75 members. Membership has gone up and down since.

The primary purpose of the organization is to fix coffee prices and maintain the highest possible coffee price by using quotas and guidelines. There is some dispute within the organization as to which country should get which quota.

Madam President, it is inappropriate that Americans participate in a cartel-like arrangement or an organization that would like to rebuild a cartel that acts to the detriment of American consumers.

America is primarily a coffee-consuming country, not a coffee-producing country. There is some very small amount of coffee that is produced in the United States, but it is an extremely small amount.

It is not in the interest of the United States to have a coffee cartel or marketing organization that restricts price competition. That fact is amply demonstrated by events since the coffee cartel agreement fell apart in 1989.

In July of 1989, quotas ceased. This graph demonstrates what has happened to the price of coffee in the United States and the amount spent for coffee since 1989. From a high of \$7.5 billion spent on coffee by American consumers in 1989, expenditures dropped to \$7.4 billion the next year, down to \$7 billion the following year, and down to \$6 billion the year following. You can see in red the amount that would have been spent if prices had been maintained under the coffee cartel agreement: almost \$2 billion.

This other chart shows the market reaction to the price of coffee since that agreement fell apart.

Some would indicate that this organization provides some positive functions. I think that is a fair statement. It does help share information with regard to coffee supply and consumption. But I guess we should ask ourselves: Is that worth a million dollars? Does it require maintaining an office overseas? Does it require all those conferences?

And, moreover, and perhaps most importantly, is it advisable for us to say it is OK for producing cartels to exist in coffee while we would abhor a producing cartel in oil?

If our position is that producing countries should not get together to monopolize the market, it is in the United States interest to oppose a coffee cartel just as we would oppose an oil cartel.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Consumers for World Trade be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONSUMERS FOR WORLD TRADE,
Washington, DC, July 28, 1993.

Senator HANK BROWN,

Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: Consumers for World Trade (CWT) would like to express its support for the Brown amendment to the 1994/5 Commerce, State, Justice, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. This proposal would end U.S. funding of the International Coffee Organization (ICO).

CWT firmly believes that international agreements which are designed to stabilize commodity prices are not in the best interest of consumers. By removing these products from market competition, consumers are hit by excess costs—de facto hidden and regressive taxes. The ICO is currently pursuing a new quota agreement since its former system of export quotas was suspended in 1989 (resulting in an estimated two billion dollars for consumers).

In addition, commodity agreements deprive consumers of choice in the market place and ignore consumer preference. Inflexible allocations have failed to enlarge quotas for certain coffees in high demand (e.g., "Mild Arabica") and have therefore resulted in distorted prices.

CWT is a national, non-profit, non-partisan organization concerned with the economic interest of consumers in international trade policy. CWT urges the conferees to adopt the Brown amendment.

Sincerely,

DOREEN L. BROWN,
President.

Mr. BROWN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will note that the time is not controlled.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, in behalf of this side of the aisle, as the floor manager, I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his amendment. We are willing to accept it.

Once again, Senator BROWN shows that he looks at the details, and essentially the devil in the detail regarding our expenditures. He has found one in the detail that ought to be eliminated.

I am sure he is going to succeed today, and let us hope we can keep it out of the bill all the way through, and he can chalk up another victory for his own sense of fiscal responsibility and helping us get there.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator has been cleared, and we are ready for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 725) was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 725

(Purpose: None of the funds appropriated for the National Endowment for Democracy may be disbursed to grant recipients who have not reimbursed NED, from nongovernmental funds, for disallowed expenditures made by such grantees for first-class travel, alcohol, and entertainment)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) proposes an amendment numbered 725.

On page 83, line 16, before the period at the end insert the following: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be disbursed to grantees who have not reimbursed the National Endowment for Democracy, from nongovernmental funds, for disallowed expenditures by such grantees for first-class travel, alcohol, and entertainment, identified in the March 1993 report of the Inspector General of the United States Information Agency".

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, this amendment relates to the National Endowment for Democracy, which was extensively debated yesterday. The Senate made its wishes known, I think, quite clearly on that question. This is a smaller question than the entire Endowment. It is simply an effort to make sure that those who have received funds from the National Endowment for Democracy and have misused those funds by violating their agreements that restrict the use of those funds are required to pay them back from nongovernmental funds. In the case of the Inspector General's report, grantees specifically used them for entertainment, for alcohol, and for first-class air travel that was disallowed. This amendment would require them to pay the money back to the National Endowment out of non-Government funds before they can receive additional grants.

It is only fair and reasonable to expect NED's grantees to live by their agreements for contributions they have received, no matter who they are or how influential they are.

The one portion of the amendment that I think is perhaps significant is that the repayment must be from nongovernmental funds. This would restrict the grantees to nongovernmental money, which at least, in my way of thinking, is an appropriate way of

treating people who have not followed the guidelines for the grants they have received.

Madam President, my understanding is that both sides have reviewed this and have agreed to it. I also ask that this chart relating to yesterday's debate appear at the end of my remarks.

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

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DEMOCRACY
AND GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

| | Fiscal year 1992—actual | Fiscal year 1993—esti- mate |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Africa | 55,330 | 55,719 |
| Asia | 15,739 | 14,589 |
| Europe | 30,068 | 39,530 |
| LAC | 101,257 | 117,542 |
| Near East | 6,965 | 8,163 |
| NIS | 12,049 | 55,643 |
| RAF | 684 | 2,344 |
| FHA | 179 | 145 |
| PRE | 1,680 | 1,290 |
| Policy | 607 | 1,266 |
| Total | 225,058 | 296,151 |

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, the distinguished Senator is right on target when he says they abuse the restrictions on expenditures. We all are concerned, but the Senator from Colorado can do something about it. He said, "Look, you are just not going to qualify for any program moneys until you reimburse for that which was disallowed in the first place." I commend the Senator for it.

It has been cleared on our side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I, too, join in saying to the Senator from Colorado that we are willing to accept the amendment and think it is a very good way to follow up on an audit and a report, to see to it that what you are really trying to do is done. That is what he is busy doing on the floor: making sure that those who have not treated the funds of the National Endowment for Democracy properly and benefited from it do not receive any additional grants until appropriate reimbursement has been made.

I thank the Senator again for his diligence and hope the amendment will become law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 726) was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXCEPTED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON PAGE 83,
LINE 12

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, having completed work on this particular amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the pending committee amendment on page 83 be agreed to.

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

So, the excepted committee amendment on page 83, line 12, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, again I say to Senators on this side of the aisle, I know you are busy in committees or other kind of activities that you might have planned, but we want to finish this bill and finish it soon.

We understand Senator HATCH has been advised that if he has an amendment, we expect him as soon as possible.

I do not know of any other amendments, even though there is a long list of reserved amendments, but we are going to ask our cloakroom to put out a last request so that everybody knows we expect them to get down here. Then at some point we have to decide how much longer we are going to wait.

Everybody should know that I am not disposed, nor is the manager, to be here all night waiting for amendments. We have plenty of time right now, and we hope they will understand we want to move on. But the most appropriate business of the Senate is right here passing the bills, and that is what we ought to get done today.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator for his leadership on this score.

We are putting out from our cloakroom the call also for them to come for the so-called requested amendments. We know a good group of them have fallen from the work being done all morning long with explanations about the particular concerns as evidenced by the amendments. We have cleared those up. There are only a few that I know of on this side, but this is going to be the last call for Senators to come to the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask it be attributed to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as if in morning business.

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

THE LESSONS OF SOMALIA AND BOSNIA: PEACE
KEEPING AND THE LIMITS OF POWER

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the grim news from Somalia and Bosnia is more than a description of current tragedies. It is a warning about the future, and the role the United States can play in peace enforcement and nation building. We have lessons to learn from both crises.

They are not pleasant lessons, but they are ones we must heed if we are to avoid drifting into a morass in Somalia and successfully redefine our strategic role in the post-cold-war era.

THE CRISIS IN SOMALIA

Somalia is a warning that even good beginnings do not lead to good con-

sequences. We began with a humanitarian action that saved tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of lives. We reacted to a tragedy that was visible every day on the world's television screens and within a few weeks, we brought order and an end to famine throughout much of the country.

We then, however, came up against realities that we are certain to encounter in case after case in the future. Humanitarian relief is only enough in countries which have an existing political and economic order, and which are capable of enforcing a rule of law. In the case of nations which are torn apart by civil war, they present the dilemma that successful long-term aid requires a massive exercise in peace enforcement and nation building. The failure to provide such a commitment may wipe out all of the gains of humanitarian success.

Today, we may be involved in a hopeless quest in Somalia. We have been forced to take sides in what is essentially a centuries old tribal conflict. We are hunting down one warlord without any clear picture of what is to happen to the others. We are disarming one faction in one area, but leaving most of the weapons and tensions that divide the country intact.

As a result, we are increasing falling into the trap we fell into in Lebanon. We came as saviors and we gradually became participants. Rightly or wrongly, we are taking sides and being seen as taking sides. We are drifting into a state of continuing conflict and an exercise in nation building where we may eventually have to dictate and enforce the form a future government should take.

Yet, neither the United States nor the United Nations have a clear mandate for such an exercise. We also face a major problem in resources. Even if we capture Aided, we may find that Somalia will need United Nations and United States troops for years.

We may find we have to disarm much of the country, and replace volunteer aid organizations with a U.N. effort secured by military force. We may have to create and enforce new laws and legal institutions, and we may be forced to try to invent some form of government that can bring order to a nation whose borders are an accident of the end of colonialism and that has only known order under the rule of ruthless dictators.

We have no way to estimate the cost of such an effort, although it is likely that the current U.N. peace enforcement effort is too small to succeed in meeting these goals and that U.N. would be forced to provide massive aid to succeed. We can be sure, however, that such an effort will entail the death of more Somali civilians and drag us further into Somali politics. We can be sure that we will increasingly alienate a significant portion of the population, and that we will increase the risk of drifting into open

ended commitments that can still end in failure.

There may be a case for going on in Somalia, but it does not consist of issuing daily bulletins on our search for a single warlord. I believe it is time that the President took account of these risks and told the Congress and the American people what his policy in Somalia is, what our end objective is, and what we are prepared to do to achieve it.

If that objective—and the cost of achieving it are what I think they are—then it is time that the President sought the approval of Congress.

THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA

The current situation in Somalia, however, is only one part of the problem of peace enforcement and nation building. Only a few months ago, we came very, very close to intervening under much worse circumstances in Bosnia. At one point, the President seemed committed to sending both ground and air troops into Bosnia to try to enforce an unenforceable peace.

We faced a tragedy at least as real as that in Somalia. We faced the obscenity that Bosnian Moslems were being killed for their religion or even for their last name, and that Serb and Croat were killing each other for reasons no more sophisticated or valid than the quarrels between stone age tribes.

As a result, some people talked blithely about resolving 100-year-old quarrels with a few air strikes, or with token deployments of forces. They talked about the ease of using force, and the strange reluctance of military professionals to rush in where angels rushed to send them.

The risks in Bosnia look very different today, and the military professionals look a great deal wiser. It is all too clear that limited amounts of force would—at best—have brought only a temporary pause to the violence in the area.

It is clear that the Bosnian civil war has had many victims, but that being weaker does not make one faction right or morally superior. It is clear that the Serbs bear the most guilt, but all sides are partially to blame. It is clear that the fighting was not solely the fault of a few leaders, but an ethnic struggle based on widespread popular hatred.

It is clear that a military beginning would have had no clear ending, and would inevitably have forced us into taking sides in an open-ended commitment to peace enforcement and national building that would be far more costly in every way than the challenge we face in Somalia.

If the lesson in Somalia is that we must not blunder into open ended commitments, the lesson in Bosnia is that force does not simplify political failure, or reduce the risks of such failure. Force complicates political failure, and it often increases risks.

This is a lesson, incidentally, that is as important today as it was several

months ago. There may be a case for using force to provide immediate protection for U.N. peacekeepers, or for protecting a threatened Moslem enclave when the alternative is mass slaughter. This is very different, however, from sliding towards a commitment to an impossible exercise in peace enforcement or nation building.

Force may be able to buy a little time, or shift the balance of political compromise. Time, however, has only cosmetic value if it simply delays the killing or changes its form. Compromise only has meaning if it can survive. The basic problem we face today is exactly the problem we faced when this situation began. The three sides seem determined to fight, limited American intervention will not work, and Europe is not prepared to make the massive peace enforcement and nation building effort required. Tragic as Bosnia may be, it is a self-inflicted wound which the United States cannot heal with either airpower or ground troops.

LIVING WITH THE NEW WORLD DISORDER

More broadly, Bosnia and Somalia are warnings of the fact that we are decades away—at best—from any new world order. The end of the cold war, the break up of the Soviet empire, and our victory in the gulf war have all offered new hopes, but they have also exposed the fact that the developing world is rent by low-and medium-intensity conflicts.

This is not a new trend in international affairs. There have been at least 20 such conflicts raging every day of every year since the end of World War II. Throughout the cold war, we largely ignored these crises—at least in terms of using military forces. Our policy was not one of constant engagement, but selective engagement and crisis neglect.

Even so, we used our military forces more than 240 times between the end of World War II and the end of the cold war to deal with contingencies that did not involve the Soviet Union or Warsaw Pact. Even if we eliminate all use of force involving Communist states, we used force more than 200 times. We also learned again and again that the moment our use of force went beyond demonstrations, humanitarian relief, and the protection of our national security, the situation became complicated and uncertain.

In saying this, I am not arguing for isolationism or against peace enforcement. Such an argument is inherently untenable in an era where our global economy and strategic position force us to consider the impact of every crisis and conflict.

However, that we cannot simultaneously cut defense resources, our overseas presence, and foreign aid and then react to each new crisis with military force. Whether the crisis is a Somalia or a Bosnia, we must carefully weigh the opportunities against the risks, we must set feasible long term objectives, and we must only use mili-

tary forces when we have a high assurance of success.

We must also guard against the belief that somehow a problem is easier to solve with an international committee than it is to solve on our own. The United Nation is a critical hope for dealing with the conflicts of the post-cold-war world. It is also, however, limited in resources and is as vulnerable to the risks of open ended commitments as the United States. We do it no favor if we thrust it into crisis we cannot resolve on our own in the hope that the U.N. flag can somehow compensate for an adequate political structure and adequate force.

We must strive towards a new world order, but we must recognize that a new world order is not some natural result of the forces of history. It will not come quickly. It will not come from substituting hope and good intentions for thought and plans. It will not come from trying to use force to substitute for political behavior. It will not come from reacting to headlines or TV news, as a substitute for strategic priorities or military judgment, and it will never come if we waste our limited resources where we do not have a high assurance of success.

Madam President, it is well known that the President of the United States is contemplating the commitment of American air power under certain situations today in Bosnia. I believe that the majority of the American people and this Congress would be supportive of an effort that saved the lives of U.N. peacekeepers or prevented a massacre from taking place in Sarajevo.

But, Madam President, let me emphasize that if military action is taken, the American people must be informed. That intervention must be incredibly limited. It cannot be an open-ended commitment and one which calls for massive, or even token injection of U.S. troops on the ground.

Madam President, the situation has not changed in the last several months when this administration decided not to send military forces in the region. The Europeans must lead. The United Nations is not the answer. And any injection of U.S. military force should be under U.S. military command and direction, not that of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

I repeat: To prevent a massacre, the American people will act. To begin an open-ended commitment of the risk of young American lives is something which is still not acceptable.

I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues and I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1994

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I am advised by the managers of the bill that they are ready to go to work. We