

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.]