

hopefully, into the next year. And perhaps as we carry out this effort to balance the budget by the year 2002, we are going to achieve these goals on our route to a balanced budget and securing our future.

Mr. Speaker, people have said why should we balance the budget, and we have told people it is important because of our children, and I think that is true. And the reason I do is because our debt is so significant. I brought another chart just to list the amount of the Federal debt.

As of November 8, our Federal debt, this is November 8, 1995, our Federal debt is \$4,985,913,011,032.65. Now, that is a tremendous amount of money.

To give people a perspective as to how much money that is. If an individual had gone into business the day Christ rose from the dead, and they lost a million dollars that day, and the following day, and every day of the week, and every week of the month, and every year for almost 2,000 years, they would only be one-fifth of the way to losing \$4.9 trillion.

Most of us think a million dollars would be a sufficient amount of money to perhaps retire on. To think of losing that amount of money each day for almost 2,000 years and not even getting one-fifth of the way to losing what we have currently as our Federal debt gives us an idea of how much money that is.

For a child born this year, it would amount to about \$187,000 in the form of taxes just to pay the interest on this debt, if we are unable to balance in 7 years.

□ 1845

Next year, in fiscal year 1997, the interest on the loan, on this debt, the national debt, the interest will exceed every other expenditure except for Social Security. It will be more than we spend on the Army and the Navy and the Marines and the Air Force and the Department of Defense structure, the intelligence-gathering community. The entire Department of Defense budget will be secondary to the amount we pay on interest on the debt, with Social Security being the only one we expend more on.

With all of that going toward interest, we do nothing to meet the needs of the poor; we do nothing to meet the nutrition programs. We do nothing to provide part B Medicare support. Nothing on Medicaid. Only interest on the debt.

It is a tremendous problem that we must deal with and solve, and we do that by balancing the budget. When we establish priorities toward getting to that balanced budget, we are going to have to deal with a lot of disinformation that is flowing. One, we have heard that we are trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, and the earned income tax credit has been drastically cut. But, Mr. Speaker, between 1995, this year, this fiscal year, in which we are spending

\$19.85 billion, by 2002, in the budget that we just passed tonight, we plan on spending \$25.4 billion by that year. That is an increase. From 19.85 to 25.4, an increase, and yet we have heard that it is a cut and that we are trying to cut individuals to balance the budget. Mr. Speaker, only in Washington, DC, is that called a cut.

The school lunch programs, we saw last spring, the President go to an elementary school and state that the budget that was before the Congress was going to take food away from these children, that they would be starving.

Well, I have visited some of the elementary schools in Wichita, KS, in my district, the Dodge-Edison School, and there were no reports of children starving at that institution, nor at any school in Kansas or any school across the Nation. In fact, the budget that we passed tonight allows for \$6.3 billion to go to school lunches this year. It will grow. It will increase to \$7.8 billion by 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close tonight by saying that we must establish priorities, we must balance the budget in 7 years, and I am pleased to be able to work toward that effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IS BOSNIA WORTH DYING FOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we theoretically were supposed to adjourn the first week in October. Theoretically, all 13 major appropriation spending bills finished before that in sequence. Everything would have been authorized in the U.S. House. The Money House, the most important among equals around here in the separation of powers between the Supreme Court, the executive branch, the White House, and the Congress.

We are the first among equals. That is the way it was designed by our Founders, by the Framers of the Constitution. Between this House and the Chamber at the north end of the building, the U.S. Senate, we are the ones who control the power of the purse. The right to tax and the right to spend starts here.

The whole authorization, to appropriations to conference with the Senate process, is completely convoluted and all mixed up. Now, we are going out for 7¼ days, and the talks involving a war criminal from Belgrade at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are breaking down.

Meanwhile, in Germany the 1st Armored Division over there is being

trained to be ready to go in 48 to 72 hours and start sending thousands of men into Bosnia and Herzegovina without the consultation with the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and without Clinton having made his case.

Mr. Speaker, here it is in one sentence on the cover of today's brand-new Time magazine. The face of a typical handsome young soldier and it says, "Is Bosnia Worth Dying For?"

Mr. Speaker, I did not get a chance during the brief debate on Friday to read a letter, which I meant to put in the RECORD and inadvertently forgot, a letter to the editor that I think says it all. It is from the Wall Street Journal of 6 days ago, November 14. It is about somebody who is experienced, Philip Merrill, a former Assistant Secretary General of NATO, and this article about says it all.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: "The Clinton administration is still apparently planning to insert 25,000," now they say 20,000, "American troops into Bosnia with no clear military objective, no definition of victory and no exit strategy," a huge mistake.

Jumping forward to the middle of the article, which I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD in its totality, listen to this: "This is not to say there is no moral issue in Bosnia." I also believe there is a moral issue. There is especially the atrocities, mostly Serb atrocities. "We can best help the Bosnians by making sure their 120,000-man army fight for itself."

"It's very doubtful that the Balkans can sustain a multiethnic society of the kind envisioned by Clinton. The U.S. has no strategic stake in this fight and cannot and should not be the military arbiter."

"Our future policy seems to be," listen, Mr. Speaker, and any American following this Chamber, about 1,300,000 of our fellow Americans, listen to this: We seem to be simultaneously threatening Serbs from the air and killing them. We are in hiatus on that. We are going to act as a peacekeepers on the ground; at the same time train the Croatian Army, which I just came back from witnessing in August; arm the Bosnian military, which is what the leader in the Senate wants to do, and I do not have much argument with that, we voted overwhelmingly in the House to do that; and at the same time indict Bosnian Serb war criminals and a couple of Croatian war criminals. The Croats have been turned over. The Bosnians, including three senior army officers, have all been promoted and are not being turned over. There are now over 54 or 54 war criminals involved in this; almost all of them Bosnian Serbs. No Moslems have been indicted yet.

Any one of those policies is in itself coherent and defensible. Taken together they are incoherent. As flare-ups occur, these inherently conflicting policies will leave us powerless to act effectively.

Look at article 10, and I will put all 10 in the RECORD. Look at my 10th commendment that I have sent to every Member in this House over the last 3 years: Thou shalt not commit U.S. combat forces unless the commander in chief, that is Clinton, and Congress, that is us, can explain to the loved ones of any killed or wounded American soldier, sailor, Marine, pilot, or aircrewman why their family member or friend was sent in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, listen to the close of Mr. Merrill's article, and I will end on one sentence, Mr. Speaker. Should Clinton send American troops into Bosnia without congressional approval, he should be impeached. When the body bags start coming home, it will be a disaster, and that means anybody in this House or Senate that let it happen. I will draw articles of impeachment the minute a man or woman is killed in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

1. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the situation is vital to U.S. or allied national interests.

What vital interests are at stake? We already are preventing the spread of conflict with troops elsewhere in the Balkans such as Macedonia.

2. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless all other options already have been used or considered.

What about lifting the arms embargo? What about tightening trade sanctions? What about further air strikes?

3. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is a clear commitment, including allocated resources, to achieving victory.

Are 25,000 U.S. troops enough? Are there enough European forces?

4. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there are clearly defined political and military objectives.

What are the political objectives—protect small "enclaves" in the middle of a civil war? What are the military objectives—seize and hold specific terrain or stand and become targets for all warring sides?

5. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless our commitment of these forces will change if our objectives change.

Will we realistically be able to withdraw U.S. forces after a year if peace is not achieved, even if these forces are directly engaged in combat?

6. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the American people and Congress support the action.

Neither Congress nor the American people support this operation. A recent CBS/New York Times poll indicated only 37% of Americans support the President's position on Bosnia. Further, 79% believe he should seek approval from Congress before sending any troops.

7. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless under the operational command of American commanders or allied commanders under a ratified treaty.

The command structure for U.S. troops involved in this operation seems confused at best with U.S. ground troops serving under deputy European commanders and a NATO council representatives from member states. Will France and Denmark have to approve U.S. combat requests for M-1 tanks & AC-130 gunships?

8. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless properly equipped, trained and maintained by the Congress.

Why has the President nearly doubled the defense cuts he promised in his campaign and underfunded his own "Bottom Up Review" defense plan by as much as \$150 billion? Shouldn't he restore spending if he plans to use our military as world policemen in Bosnia, Haiti, and elsewhere?

9. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is substantial and reliable intelligence information including human intelligence.

What reliable hunt intelligence sources do we have in Bosnia? Will our sources be compromised through intelligence sharing agreements with non-NATO countries such as Russia?

10. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the commander in chief and Congress can explain to the loved ones of any killed or wounded American soldier, sailor, Marine, pilot or aircrewman why their family member or friend was sent in harm's way.

Can we honestly make this case? What do we now tell the families of those killed in Somalia? American lives are at stake!

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 14, 1995]

BOSNIA: WE SHOULDN'T GO

(By Philip Merrill)

The Clinton administration is still apparently planning to insert 25,000 American troops into Bosnia with no clear military objective, no definition of victory and no exit strategy. That would be a huge mistake.

All the parties have coveted each other's assets for a thousand years. In the unlikely event that there is a real peace settlement, American troops are not necessary. If there is no agreement for peace, or a deal falters, American soldiers, like their British and French counterparts, will be hostages to ethnic hatreds.

Once U.S. troops are deployed, it will be in the Bosnian interest to keep them there. The Bosnians will find ways to ensure that enough Americans are killed and the Serbs and Croats will retaliate in kind. Our soldiers will be caught in a deadly and deceptive cross-fire.

To maintain 25,000 Americans under combat conditions would require a rotation of troops in and out of Bosnia. The U.S. Army has only 10 active divisions. A Bosnian deployment could mean that some 40% of our Army would be coming, going, or on the ground in Bosnia, a diversion of people and money that is wildly disproportionate to our strategic interest in the Balkans.

The disastrous result could mean a retreat from Europe, the collapse of NATO, a failure to deal with longer term but more dangerous threats elsewhere, and immeasurable costs as the law of unintended consequences comes into play.

The root problem, more evident every day, is that the Clinton administration, while well-intentioned, has no concept of how, when, or why to use military force. It is preparing to enter Bosnia only because of essentially offhand promises from a president who has no idea of America's role in a post-Cold War world. Our foreign policy objectives should relate far more to integrating Russia and China into the community of civilized nations than to involving ourselves in the ethnic and religious feuds of Eastern Europe.

This is not to say there is no moral issue in Bosnia. There is—especially the Serb atrocities. We can best help the Bosnians by making sure their 120,000 man army can fight for itself.

It's very doubtful that the Balkans can sustain a multiethnic society of the kind envisioned by President Clinton. The U.S. has no strategic stake in this fight and cannot and should not be the military arbiter.

Our future policy seems to be to simultaneously threaten Serbs from the air, act as peacekeepers on the ground, train the Croatian army, arm the Bosnia military, conduct peace negotiations and indict Bosnian Serb war criminals. Any one of those policies is defensible; taken together they're incoherent. As flare-ups occur, these inherently conflicting policies will leave us powerless to act effectively.

The European attitude toward the Balkans—which essentially is a willingness to fight to the last American—is not encouraging. The Germans, for example, are willing to put up 5,000 troops—but only for Croatia, not Bosnia. They know they cannot do what the Romans, Frederick the Great and nine Nazi divisions could not do—pacify the Balkans.

To endorse the president's policy comes close to an act of murder of young Americans who have sworn allegiance to our country but who will serve and die under circumstances that will neither advance U.S. interests nor the cause of freedom.

When the American body bags start coming home, it will be a political disaster for those who did not oppose sending troops to Bosnia. Should President Clinton send Americans into Bosnia without congressional approval, he should be impeached.

The time to face the choice is now, before we enter this war and before American blood is shed.

Mr. Speaker, here is the Dornan-Doolittle language from H.R. 1530.

SUBTITLE A—PEACEKEEPING PROVISIONS

SECTION 1201—LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES FORCES PLACED UNDER UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OR CONTROL

Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25) signed by President Clinton in May of 1994 contains a number of policy initiatives intended to promote peacekeeping as an important instrument of the Administration's national security policy. Summary documents and extensive public and private briefings on this policy initiative, make clear to the committee that the Administration has adopted a policy of allowing the placement of U.S. armed forces under the operational control of foreign commanders when engaged in peacekeeping operations.

The Administration continues to stress that the President will retain "command" of U.S. forces at all times. However, the usage of the term "command" in this context refers to the administrative control of military forces which has never been an issue of debate or contention. On the other hand, the practice of ceding "operational control" of U.S. military forces to non-U.S. commanders remains a highly controversial and troubling policy. While certain U.S. military units have operated under the operational control of other nations, these instances have been rare and usually as part of larger coalition military operations where the U.S. retains overall operational command of the theater of operation. Further, these instances occurred during traditional military operations that allowed a high degree of planning and coordination to minimize the inherent complications resulting from mixed command chains.

By contrast, the concept of ceding operational control of U.S. forces to a United Nations peacekeeping command is a relatively recent practice that has thus far yielded decidedly mixed results. As demonstrated during the UNOSOM II operation in Somalia, peacekeeping operations place a high premium on the ability to rapidly employ effective military force in response to unplanned circumstances. The tactical demands of such

operations tend to stress and exacerbate the limitations of mixed-nationality operations resulting from the usually significant cultural, language, doctrine, and training differences among the participating national contingents. While only U.S. logistics forces were placed under UN operational control during UNOSOM II, the unanimous view of U.S. commanders interviewed by the committee during its review of the Somalia operation was that UN mixed-nationality command chains are inappropriate for demanding UN operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1201) that would regulate the circumstances under which the President could commit U.S. forces under UN command or control. This provision would require that before U.S. forces may be deployed under the command or operational control of the UN, the President must first certify to the Congress that (1) such a command arrangement is necessary to protect U.S. national security interests, (2) the commander of the U.S. force involved will retain the right to report independently to U.S. military authorities and to decline to comply with orders judged to be illegal, militarily imprudent or beyond the mandate of the U.S. mission, (3) the U.S. force involved will remain under U.S. administrative command, and (4) the U.S. will retain the authority to withdraw the U.S. force involved and take action it considers necessary to protect this force if it is engaged.

While this provision seeks to ensure that any deployment of U.S. forces under UN command or control is made with a clear and unambiguous understanding of the right of the United States to withdraw those forces at any time and to take any action considered necessary to protect such forces, the committee recognizes that any such decision to withdraw deployed U.S. forces should be made with due regard and consideration for the safety of U.S. and other national contingents deployed in any such given operation.

The provision would further require the President to submit a report along with the aforementioned certification providing: (1) a description of the national security interests that require such a command arrangement, (2) the mission of the U.S. forces involved, (3) the expected size and composition of the U.S. forces involved, (4) the incremental cost to the U.S. of participation in the operation, (5) the precise command and control relationship between the U.S. forces and the United Nations command structure, (6) the precise command and control relationship between the U.S. forces involved and the U.S. unified commander for the region in which the forces will be operating, (7) the extent to which the U.S. forces involved will be relying on non-U.S. forces for self protection, and (8) the timetable for the complete withdrawal of the U.S. forces involved.

Mr. Speaker consider this Time magazine title "Is Bosnia Worth Dying For?" and these few excerpts from this cover story, of November 27, 1995.

Is the soldier on the cover SP4 Andrew F. Hawley; just another faceless U.S. soldier—No.

1 of 25,000 or 20,000 "American" troops to be sent to Bosnia under "Bill Clinton" foreign policy

He could easily be another Randy Shugart or Gary Gordon, soldiers who gave their lives in Somalia

He could be another "Specialist" Michael New who refuses to serve under U.N. command or U.N. uniform

He could be your husband, or your brother, or your son, going to a place far away to risk

his life, not in "peacekeeping" but combat, where we have no vital national security interests, no specific military objectives, and no clear exit strategy.

What are we going to do about it?

The House has passed binding legislation, cosponsored by myself and JOEL HEFLEY of Colorado to prevent any funds from being spent on such a troop deployment until authorized by Congress.

Our national Security Committee has also passed binding legislation by myself and JOHN DOOLITTLE of California that would strictly limit U.N. command of United States troops, which resulted in the death of 19 United States soldiers in Somalia.

But where's the Senate? No binding Bosnia deployment bill. No binding language on U.N. command. We need your help America. Let the Senate know that we do not want troops deployed to Bosnia, at least until the President has made his case to Congress, and we certainly do not want our troops under U.N. command at any time.

#### COALITION BUDGET IS THE PLACE TO BEGIN NEGOTIATING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, about 17 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, we passed through this body a continuing resolution that will fund Government, reopen Government, and fund it until December 15. It was very important to pass this because the American people, I think, have spoken very, very loudly through the last year and the last several years for Congress to work together; to not engage in gridlock, in posturing and political partisanship and blame games and ultimately deadlock. For us to pass, in a bipartisan way with an overwhelming vote, legislation that not only reopens Government, but establishes some parameters for us to move forward and negotiate a balanced budget agreement for the next 7 years; to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, worked together over the course of the last few weeks, particularly late last week, to try to forge a consensus, a common-sense middle ground restart to these negotiations that seem to be stalled for a host of reasons.

Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that the parties came to an agreement over the weekend. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], a Republican, who I worked very closely with in circulating a letter that was signed by 50 Republicans, and we were able to achieve 50 Democratic signatures.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] and the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] also worked on very similar language to try to get the House to help the leadership to move forward on this bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would salute the President and Mr. Panetta at the White House for their hard work, and I would also salute the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH and Senator DOMENICI for their very hard work in carefully negotiating this pact over the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, the hard work is ahead of us. The hard work, once we have established these parameters to try to balance this budget in the next 7 years, is just starting. I would recommend that the starting place, Mr. Speaker, be the coalition budget, the only budget that has received bipartisan votes on this floor, where over 300 people have voted for a balanced budget plan over the last 2 months.

This plan achieves a balanced budget by the year 2002. It does it in a fair way with equitable outcomes. It says to the American people we all have to participate in the sacrifice of balancing the budget. But it also says to the politicians and the people in Washington, we are not going to pander for votes. We are not going to provide tax cuts 30 days out from an election, or to the tune of \$245 billion, that we must then cut education and farm programs to pay for. We are going to do this by balancing the budget first and then providing tax cuts later.

I think this is a reasonable, prudent, fair budget agreement, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage this body to start with the coalition budget, which is a bipartisan budget, to move us forward in the next few weeks toward December 15, to a goal that I think 85 percent of the American people want us to achieve, and that is balancing this budget.

It is going to be a very difficult task. It is going to be a very arduous task, but if we continue to work in a bipartisan way for fairness and not devastating Medicare programs, and for opportunity where we provide for education, for student loans, and in terms of providing a father to our children, by not cutting too deeply into programs so that farm can be passed on to the next generation of young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that coalition budget achieves that. I think that coalition budget is the place to start, and I think that coalition budget has the best opportunity to bring America together to make sure that we balance this budget in the next 7 years and to have fair, equitable outcomes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. UPTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]