

damaging impact on the environment. That is taken out in a legislative rider that is still in the bill, even though the House voted twice to take it out. It also has the provision which I mentioned before, which says the EPA cannot add new Superfund sites to the national priority list without some additional approval. So again, that is in the bill, even though we voted twice to take it out.

In fact, if you look at the VA-HUD appropriations conference report, which will come again to the floor tomorrow, it actually cuts the EPA by 21 percent. It cuts funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 21 percent and it cuts enforcement of our environmental laws by the Environmental Protection Agency by 25 percent.

□ 2015

So not only are they cutting the overall agency's budget, but they are also cutting enforcement even more severely. Why? Because essentially, in many cases, they want the laws to not be enforced. They would rather that the polluters get away with not having to pay the fine, not getting caught.

The EPA and environmental protection are cut more than other agency in this whole Federal budget, in this whole appropriations process, more than any other agency in the Government, and that shows again the Republican leadership and the bias against environmental protection in an effort to try to undercut all efforts, or most major efforts, to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to give a few more examples, if I could, of how efforts were made in this budget process to put antienvironmental provisions in. One example, again, that we voted on, on the House floor, was H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act, which after being defeated on the floor of this House under suspension of the rules, mysteriously appeared in the budget reconciliation bill.

This is a bill that would set up a commission, and as one of its purposes, choose national parks and recreation areas that would possibly be closed. I took it to heart because within my own district at Sandy Hook, Sandy Hook is a unit of Gateway National Recreation Area, the sponsor of the legislation actually mentioned Sandy Hook as one of the national park units that he thought possibly should be closed or suggested should be closed by this commission.

However, even though we worked hard to defeat that bill on the floor of the House so that this commission to close the parks would not be set up, all of a sudden it came up in the budget reconciliation bill that was about to come to the floor of this House. We managed again, through a coalition of Democrats and some Republicans who were concerned about the environment, to make sure that that provision was ultimately not in the conference re-

port; and it fortunately was not in the conference report, but there were a lot of other things that were.

Another item that the President mentioned in his veto message was the transfer of Federal land for a low-level radioactive waste site in California without public safeguards. This is an interesting provision that was put into the conference bill. In fact, what happened is that in the State of California, there was an effort to set up a low-level radioactive waste site to take waste not only from California, but from a number of other States.

The Secretary of the Interior said about a year ago that he would agree to this transfer subject to certain conditions being met to protect the environment. In other words, Secretary Babbitt wanted to go through a process whereby there were hearings, there was an opportunity for the public to be heard, and certain limitations would be put on the types of radioactive waste or the amount of radioactive waste that could be put into this site before the land transfer would be approved. This is Federal land in California, not very far from Los Angeles, that essentially now is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

This budget bill would transfer the land for the purpose of setting up a low-level radioactive waste site for the State of California and other States without any safeguards. In other words, the conditions that Secretary Babbitt had articulated were simply eliminated and not mentioned in the budget bill. Instead, the budget bill said that it was not necessary to meet environmental safeguards; it was not necessary to do the public process with the hearings, and we would just transfer the land, and the State of California and the other States could do whatever they want and use it for a low-level radioactive waste site.

Again, a bill was introduced by a California Member to do this; it was put into my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power which had jurisdiction over it. We never had a hearing, the bill never came up, we never reviewed the bill. All of a sudden it is in the budget bill. But thankfully, now the President has indicated that this is another one of the antienvironmental measures, if you will, that is in the budget bill that he is not going to accept, and that he is going to insist be taken out in whatever negotiations are going to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these items not because I think that there are not a lot of areas where we need to improve environmental protection, not because I think that we need to spend money endlessly on environmental protection, but because I believe very strongly that the normal process is being evaded and that the American public is really not being made aware of what is happening with regard to this budget, this Republican budget, and the appropriations process and environmental protection.

I want to stress before I conclude this evening that we, myself and the other Democrats who feel strongly about environmental protection, will not allow the Republican leadership to try to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people with regard to cuts in environmental protection so that the essential interests can get away with environmental delinquency. The budget and appropriations bills are not to be used as a vehicle for environmental destruction. The President has promised to veto several of these bills, as he did this evening, based on the hateful environmental provisions that are contained therein. I and my colleagues on the Democratic side, along with some Republicans, fully support him and commend him for his strong environmental stance.

As this budget negotiation continues over the next few weeks, and we hopefully come to an agreement on the budget bill that balances the budget and at the same time protects the environment, I think we need to be very vigilant to make sure that whatever is finally negotiated does not give away the store, if you will, to the polluters and strengthens environmental laws and strengthens enforcement, rather than weakening it and turning the clock back over the last 10 or 20 years on what this House and what the Senate have done to try to protect the environment in this country.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET AND TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to first yield to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania, the Keystone State [Mr. FOX]. We want to talk a little bit tonight about the budget, and then perhaps about the other big issue that I think Americans are concerned with, the issue of Bosnia.

So I welcome Representative FOX, and maybe we can talk a little bit about how we got to where we are now and a little bit about the Balanced Budget Act.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership the gentleman has taken here in the 104th Congress in focusing our attention on balancing the budget. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important issue we have before us, to make sure that we can reduce the cost of government, eliminate the waste, the fraud, and the abuse, and get down to the services that the Federal Government should be taking care of.

The fact that we have not balanced the budget since 1969 has given us approximately a \$5 trillion debt, and we are paying for that every day, every man, woman, and child in the United States. It has been told to us by no less

than Alan Greenspan, Congressman GUTKNECHT, that if we in fact come to a balanced budget within 7 years, we will not only increase the number of jobs in the United States by about 200,000 or 300,000, but we will as well reduce the cost of home mortgage payments, we will reduce car payments and, as well, reduce the cost of college loans. I think that is a pretty significant way to helping everyone in America, whether it be seniors, working families and children, making sure they can realize the American dream.

I yield back.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think we should talk a little bit about how we got to where we are. You and I were both elected last November as members of this freshman class, and I think it is important sometimes to reflect back on what the American people were saying a little over 12 months ago. I think what they were really saying is that they understand that the Federal Government has grown too big, it spends too much, it wastes too much of their tax dollars, and they want the Federal Government to be put on a diet.

I think they fundamentally believe, and that is what my constituents still are telling me, that it is time to make the Federal Government do what every family has to do, what every business has had to do. In fact, if you look at every major corporation, every minor corporation, every small corporation, every small business, every single day they have to figure out ways to be more efficient. But that is not true of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the first chart I want to show, and I am sure you are familiar with it as well, Representative FOX, is what the President originally proposed in terms of his, quote, "balanced budget plan." Now, this is what the 10-year balanced budget plan would have produced in terms of deficits for as far as the eye could see.

This is scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and I think that is the source that the President recommended a few years ago that we use, and the reason is, the CBO has historically been more accurate, more conservative, than any of the other sources which score some of our budget proposals.

As you can see, in the year 1996, his proposal would have produced a \$196 billion deficit; in 1997, \$212 billion; in 1998, \$199 billion; in the year 1999, \$213 billion; 2000, \$220 billion; 2001, \$211 billion; 2002, \$210 billion, and on out to the year 2005, over \$209 billion, over \$200 billion deficits literally for as far as the eye could see.

That is not what I think the American people wanted when they asked us to balance the budget. I do not think they meant a 10-year plan which creates almost an additional \$2 trillion worth of debt. Perhaps you want to talk a little bit about what the American people have said and what this plan said.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think the American public made it very clear,

Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike, that in fact what they want is a balanced budget. They have to balance their budget, the schools do, the States do, as you said earlier.

Congressman GUTKNECHT, I know when you were in Minnesota, you had to balance the budget in the State government when you served there in the State legislature.

The fact is, on Monday, November 20, Congressman GUTKNECHT, the President finally agreed to balance the budget in 7 years with honest numbers from the Congressional Budget Office. The President said at that time that he agreed with the Congress to do as follows: The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than the year 2002, as estimated by CBO, and the President and the Congress agreed that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment.

Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

Yet despite all of that on November 20, today, just 2 weeks later, or less than 2 weeks, the President vetoed a balanced budget bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Now, Representative FOX, it seemed to me like you were reading something there. Was that an actual agreement that was signed?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes, it was.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. More importantly, I think, as I understand that, that was actually signed into law. So that is not a campaign promise, that is actually a Federal law. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes, you are correct in that, Congressman GUTKNECHT. What he said, his commitment was detailed in a continuing resolution to fund the Federal Government to December 15.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. So now we have a law, a Federal law, which is a commitment by the President and this Congress to work together to produce a 7-year balanced budget plan, scored by CBO. What were some of the other things that you mentioned, some language that provides adequate funding for what?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. For Medicare and for welfare, for adequate funding for Medicaid, for education, agriculture, veterans programs, and the environment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, we all support that, and I think we can do that with the budget we proposed that the President vetoed today that calls for spending almost \$12.1 trillion over the next 7 years.

Let me point out something else, Representative FOX, and I think you are probably aware of this. But right at the bottom of this chart it also points

out that the President's plan was offered for a vote in the Senate, and it got zero votes. As a matter of fact, it was defeated 96 to zero.

To their credit, some of our colleagues here in the House offered their own budget alternative, and I do give them credit for that. They went to an awful lot of work to put together a budget alternative to ours. Unfortunately, it only got 73 votes. As you and I both know, one of the critical ingredients in terms of actually structuring a budget and putting it together is, you have to get at least 218 votes in the House and 51 votes in the Senate; otherwise, you are really just sort of whistling in the wind. It really does not make any difference. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the coalition in the House only got 73 votes for theirs.

What we have put together, and I think it is important that we understand this, is not only have we put together a balanced budget plan which meets the CBO test, which actually balances the budget in 7 years or less, but we were able to get 218 votes in the House and 51 votes in the Senate. So we passed the two most important hurdles.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that you have been working and struggling and hoping that we can get this bipartisan support, and I think we will eventually, because I think the American people are now saying, they want a balanced budget. They want the Federal services that the Government can provide where the States cannot take care of them better. What is surprising under that Republican plan that was sent to the President, Medicare spending would total \$1.6 trillion, \$724 billion more than was spent during the previous 7 years, a 63-percent increase.

□ 2030

When it comes to welfare, the Republican plan would have welfare spending total \$878 billion during the next 7 years, \$386 billion more than was spent during the last 7 years, a 78 percent increase.

Under Medicaid, the Republican plan gives States \$791 billion in grant assistance over the next 7 years. That is \$358 billion more than was spent during the previous 7 years, a 79 percent increase.

On education, under our plan the amount of money available for student loans increases nearly 50 percent during the next 7 years, rising from \$24 billion in 1995 to \$36 billion in 2002, and the number of student loans will increase from 6.6 million in 1995 to 7.1 million in 1996, the most ever made available.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] and I to come back to those numbers, but before we do, I want to go back to this basic point, the commitment to a 7-year balanced budget plan.

I want to read this quote again for the Members who are watching in their offices and perhaps Americans who are

watching at home: "The President and the Congress shall." It does not say "ought to," or "it would be a good idea" or "may." It says, "The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session," that means before we start next year, "of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office."

That is a direct quote. That is what the agreement was. That is what the President signed and, most important, that is currently Federal law. I guess it is good news and bad news.

The bad news is the President vetoed our attempt today at that plan. We had a plan that we felt very good about, that we felt we could defend. It met the CBO test and it met the vote test and we were able to get the votes to pass it here in the House. That is the bad news, that he vetoed our plan today.

The good news, though, is I think the President now is serious. I think the reason he is serious, as the late Senator from Illinois used to say, the late Everett Dirksen, "The more I feel the heat, the more I see the light." I think the President is beginning to feel the heat and I think the administration understands that the American people want us to balance the budget in 7 years.

There is another important point that I think the American people want. The more I hear from the American people, the more I hear them saying they also want that tax relief, because they understand very, very well what it could mean to them and their families if the \$500-per-child tax credit passes.

To many families, the average family with almost three children, let us say the average family with three kids in my district or your district, that is an extra \$1,500 in their pockets every year, cash that they can spend to do some home improvements, to buy a new automobile, to take the kids on a vacation, a fishing vacation of some kind, or just to invest and save for the future for the kids' education. So that \$500 per child tax credit, people understand very, very clearly.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Let me add to that, I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT]. Beyond that, the tax reform that we have adopted in the House, and hopefully will be adopted by the President as well and signed into law, a joint bill from the Senate and the House, will in fact also give us some other items that are important.

It will give us the opportunity for the first time to have a new IRA for \$2,000 for individuals, \$4,000 for couples, an elder care tax credit, a capital gains tax reduction for individuals of 19 percent, for businesses 28 percent, which will give the infusion of more savings, new jobs, expansion of businesses.

It will help our seniors by rolling back the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits, together with the op-

portunity for seniors to earn more. Right now seniors under 70 are capped at \$11,280, that they will have deductions from Social Security. But with the new law we just adopted here in the House, seniors will be able to earn up to \$30,000 a year without those deductions from their Social Security.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think seniors can understand that. In fact, I met with one the other day working at a Wal-Mart store in Mankato. Her name is Muriel.

If you stop and think about it, in effect Muriel is paying among the highest tax rates of anybody in the United States. As a matter of fact, there is a very good chance that Muriel is paying a higher tax rate than Ross Perot and some of the wealthiest Americans.

The American people are not completely confident that we are going to be able to follow through on our promise to balance this budget in 7 years. They hope we do, they think we should, but the one thing they can understand is if next year they actually get this \$500 per child tax credit.

Let us talk a little bit, and perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] wants to talk about this chart as well, where the benefits really go, because some of our colleagues on the other side have attempted to sort of distort this issue and to explain that, well, this is a tax cut for the rich. I wonder if we could talk a little bit about this chart and where the benefits really go. Perhaps you want to share some of those ideas.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The fact is there are so many families who will benefit if this does get adopted. I wish you would explain to our colleagues on the floor tonight and those in their offices just what the percentages are, because the poster is closer to you.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just explain what this chart says. This is according to the Heritage Foundation, and they got the information from us.

The truth of the matter is that 89 percent of the benefit will go to families earning less than \$75,000 a year. Let me repeat that. Eighty-nine percent of the benefit, of the \$500-per-child tax credit, will go to families with incomes of less than \$75,000 a year. If you look at it, only 4 percent will go to families earning more than \$100,000 a year, and only 7 percent will to families earning between \$75,000 and \$100,000.

The truth of the matter is when you talk about this per-child family tax credit of \$500, the overwhelming bulk of the benefit goes to average middle-class families, and that is the people we believe deserve the relief. As a matter of fact, you may have heard us talk about it before, that in 1950 the average family was sending about 3 percent of their gross income to the Federal Government. Today that number is up to 24.5 percent of their gross revenues are going to the Federal Government.

Families are the ones who need the tax relief the most. So what we are

proposing is saying we believe, and I think the American people understand this better than the people here in Washington do, but we happen to believe that families can spend that money much more efficiently than the Federal Government. Let us allow them to keep more of their revenue, let them keep more of their income and spend it themselves, because they are the ones who know how to spend it the most efficiently.

As this chart underscores, even more important than anything I have seen is that the overwhelming amount of the benefit is going to go to middle and lower middle income families. We believe that is a good thing and, more importantly, the American people can understand this chart even better than the experts here in Washington.

I would like to welcome the gentleman from Las Vegas, NV [Mr. ENSIGN], the former Speaker of the House, to join us in this debate.

Mr. ENSIGN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

I serve on the Committee on Ways and Means. We had a lot of debate this year about tax cuts. I am sure, as many of my colleagues in the freshman class, when we were out on the campaign trail last year there were a lot of us that were told by the American people that they feel this weight and this tremendous burden of the Federal Government, and this debt that they feel on them. They feel that more and more the working middle class is bearing this tremendous debt load, that career politicians that have been unable and unwilling to say no to the special interest groups have continued to put on them.

If we think back to the 1950's, and especially seniors remember this, the average family of four back in the 1950's paid about \$1 out of \$50 to the Federal Government. Today the average, just the average income family of four, pays about \$1 out of \$4 to the Federal Government.

The reason is, it has to do with what is happening with your chart, and that is that the personal exemption did not keep pace with inflation. If you look at virtually everything across the board, whether you are talking about a carton of milk or a loaf of bread or cars or houses, if you adjust for inflation, they all cost pretty much the same. Their earning dollars pretty much buy them the same thing they bought back in the 1950's.

The difference between the 1950's and today is the tax burden. That is the reason in a two-parent family that when one of the parents, especially when the children are young—and I just had a little girl that was born on Saturday.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Have you named her yet?

Mr. ENSIGN. Yes, her name is Sienna.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Sienna. Did you tell her about the debt she inherited when she was born?

Mr. ENSIGN. It is \$187,000 this year. I try not to politicize my daughter's birth this year.

Fortunately, I am in an income category where my wife has chosen to stay home with the kids for the first 4 or 5 years of their life. We are fortunate to be in an income category to be able to afford that.

It used to be in the 1950's that the average income family could afford, in a two-parent family, if either the husband or the wife wanted to stay home and stay with the kids and nurture those kids, especially during those formative years, they could afford to do that. But today they cannot afford to do it, and it is not that they do not earn enough money. It is that the tax burden is too high, and that is one of the things that this \$500 per child tax credit will do.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is basically what has happened in the last 30 or 40 years, is the Federal Government has grown in its influence over our daily lives and the family has actually diminished. What we are trying to do is reinforce families, because we know that the cornerstone of the western civilization is strong families.

So this is something that I feel—and you hate to always speak for the freshman class, I know you are a member of the class and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is a member of the freshman class—but I think this is something we feel very, very strongly about. We are willing to negotiate in good faith with the President and the administration.

But in terms of ever giving up on the \$500-per-child tax credit, I think it is one thing that I hope that our class and members of this side of the aisle will fight to the bitter end, because I think this is something the American people can understand. It is going to mean cash in their pockets. It is going to mean money that they get to spend rather than sending it to Washington, and I think that is really what the American people want.

I think they want us to downsize the Federal Government. They know it is inefficient, and frankly they are correct. The more I have been here, the more I have realized just how incredibly inefficient this Federal Government is, and the most efficient spender of resources in this country is the American family. Why should we not allow them to keep more of their money and spend it themselves?

Mr. ENSIGN. If the gentleman will yield, one of the things, this \$245 billion number has been just demagogued to death because they talk about this huge tax cut.

Over the next 7 years, under the Republican proposal, we are going to spend about \$12.2 trillion. If you think about \$1 trillion, to get to \$1 trillion, if you had a business that lost \$1 million a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, you would have to have that business start at the time of Christ, till now, plus another almost 700 years to get to \$1 trillion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. So if you spent \$1 million a day 365 days a year from the time of Christ until now.

Mr. ENSIGN. Plus 700 years. To get to \$1 trillion.

In the last 7 years, the Federal Government spent a little over \$9 trillion. Under the Republican proposal that you hear about all these cuts, we are going to spend a little over \$12 trillion. President Clinton wants to spend almost \$13 trillion. So the difference is not in whether we are cutting anything. The difference is whether we are going to increase Federal spending by \$3 trillion or \$4 trillion.

The reason I bring up those numbers, because they are so staggering and they are so hard to think about, is the dollars. These are tax, that is all that is, that is money raised from taxes. The \$245 billion is less than 2 percent of the \$12.2 trillion. That is what we are talking about. We are only talking about cutting taxes by 2 percent.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. So all of these tax cuts that we are hearing demagogued every day on the House floor represents only 2 percent of all the Federal spending over the next 7 years?

Mr. ENSIGN. Staggering numbers. That is why if we could just be honest with the American people, and I am sure you heard during your campaign, why can they not be honest with what they are telling us from Washington. Forget about this political spin, just be honest. If we can go to Medicare and tell people, and when you do this, the light bulb just goes off, they say, "Why are they saying that?"

In Medicare, the total spending in Medicare over the last 7 years was a little over \$900 billion, almost \$1 trillion. The next 7 years under the Republican proposal, we will spend a little over \$1.6 trillion. It is over \$700 billion more. Not less. More. I know the educational system is not what it once was, but still, when you spend \$700 billion more we still call that addition, and I still think they call that addition today. This is what certain people in this Congress are calling a cut, is \$700 billion more spending.

I think the chart you have up there talks about some of the premiums, the part B premiums. That is the part that does to doctors. Part A trust fund is the part that goes to hospitals. Part B premiums and part B of the Medicare part is the part that goes to doctors. Why do you not explain a little bit about the differences between the Republican proposal and the Clinton proposal.

□ 2045

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think it is important and instructive, and one of my favorite quotes is from John Adams, one of the Founders of this great country, and he said that facts are stubborn things, and that sort of is what we have been talking about is let us get the facts out there.

Interestingly enough, we just got back a rather in-depth poll. I do not

think you should make public policy based upon polls. I think it does confirm instinctively what all of us believe; that is, if the American people are given facts, they overwhelmingly support what we are doing. As a matter of fact, the interesting thing is there was a separate poll we did a couple of weeks ago when they asked the American people essentially some of the questions that are being posed by some of the other national polling media outlets; for example, do you think the Republicans are cutting Medicare too much? Not surprising, a majority of Americans said "yes." But when we explain to them in our poll what the numbers really were and that we were actually increasing total Medicare spending from something like \$189 billion a year to \$278 billion a year over only 7 years per year and—

Mr. ENSIGN. And per person.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. On a per capita basis, per recipient spending actually increases from \$4,800 a year this year to \$7,000 a year.

The interesting thing is when you tell the American people that, in one poll we did a few weeks ago, 63 percent, after they learned that information, after they heard the facts, they said you are increasing spending too much on Medicare.

So I think once we get our side of the story told, what this chart basically demonstrates is, while the administration has been demagoging to a certain degree, our Medicare part B premiums plan, the truth of the matter is, if you extend it out to the seventh year, we are really only talking about a difference between our plan and the President's plan of \$4.80 a year. Now, that is almost nothing.

Mr. ENSIGN. The difference between the President's plan and our plan, how many years does that save Medicare? We save Medicare to what year versus what?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. With this chart, we are only talking about part B. When you are talking about the part A trust funds, when you start talking about the trust funds, we are talking about saving the Medicare system from imminent bankruptcy, which the trustees of the Medicare trust fund came out earlier in April and told us that there is a drastic—

Mr. ENSIGN. The Medicare trustees, who are they appointed by?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Appointed by the President; I think three members of his own Cabinet.

Mr. ENSIGN. He appoints every single member of the trustees, as I recall?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I believe that is correct. The point is they have no interest in telling us anything than the truth. What they said was, unless the Congress gets serious about reforming the Medicare system, it is going to go bankrupt in 7 years. It will not be able to make the payments.

I think everyone now acknowledges there is a serious problem. Again, we have advanced a plan which uses market-based reforms, which I think the American people can understand.

Essentially, one of the reasons they did not like the Clinton health care reform plans that came out a year and a half ago was they did not really believe the Federal Government could do a much more efficient job of running the health delivery system than the private sector. What we did was sort of change the whole notion. Let us see if we can use the things working so well in the private sector to help control costs in Medicare. I am absolutely confident our reform plans are going to work.

More important than that, I am convinced seniors who decide to participate in some of these new Medicare-plus programs that we are putting together and allowing to operate, I think, in the end of just a few years, many of them are going to say, "Yes, I like this plan much better than what we had before," because they are going to have options, they are going to have choices, they are going to be treated like human beings, just like everybody else out there.

Mr. ENSIGN. You received just recently, like I did, like virtually every other Member of Congress and every Federal employee did during this enrollment period now, where we decide by January which plan we are going to have; I am holding up a card here and this card is a Blue Cross/Blue Shield card. You have the same card. Over 90 percent of the Members of the House of Representatives have this card. The Speaker of the House has this very same card.

What we are talking about here is something called a PPO. Seniors in the United States today do not have the same option to choose the health insurance that you and I have to choose, the same as the Speaker of the House has to choose. What we are doing, and, by the way, a PPO is managed care. The vast majority of Americans do not understand that a PPO is actually managed care. It is a very good managed care.

We are going to give the seniors options to be able to choose a PPO, just like you and I have the option each year to choose a PPO, and HMO, fee-for-service, medical savings accounts or these new things called provider sponsor organizations. Can you imagine, imagine this scenario, let us say we had all of those options currently in Medicare, can you imagine what would happen, what AARP would say to Members of Congress if we took a whole list of options that seniors had and now tried to reverse it and say no, no, no, we have got a better system for you; instead of having all of those options and all of those things, you can choose from each year, we are going to give you fee-for-service; in a couple of areas of the country we will give you HMOs. That is all you get. Can you imagine the uproar?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. They would not stand for it.

Mr. ENSIGN. We would have 34 million seniors marching on Washington

tomorrow. That is exactly, I mean, if people think about it in that context, we are giving them more choices, more freedoms.

The chart you hold up is only people that stay in fee-for-service, and the people that choose PPOs, many of them will actually have less out-of-pocket expenses because they will not have, or these companies will be able to pay their Medicare part B premiums. They may get prescription drug coverage.

I have three grandmothers on Medicare. It is absolutely heartbreaking. Luckily, I am able to help some of my grandmothers, with different members of our family help, and sometimes if it was not for that, they would have to choose between what they ate that month and getting prescription drugs. Many seniors are in this same boat.

What we want to do is be able to offer seniors in all parts of the country so many choices they will have that option so they do not have to make the choice between what they eat that month and between getting prescription drugs.

So I think we just have to put the politics aside. Who cares whether it is Democrats, whether it is Republicans? We have to put the politics aside and do what is right for this country.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The American people, I think, understand this. In fact, when you talk about health care reform, if you look at what has happened in the private sector over the last number of years, we have literally seen the reforms with the various kinds of managed care and much more sophisticated kinds of managed care which are doing an incredibly good job of controlling the growth in health care costs. As a matter of fact, in the State of Minnesota, where we have probably more managed care than virtually any other State in the Union, we have seen health care costs over the last 18 months increasing at only about 1.1 percent.

If you look at the private or at the public sector side, if you look at Medicare or Medicaid, we have had health care inflation at a rate of 10.5 percent. So the truth of the matter is we absolutely know that managed care will work. It will help control costs.

But more important than that, in the State of Minnesota, we had a study that was done where they interviewed over 17,000 recipients of health care and asked them about how satisfied they were with their health care, and the interesting thing was among seniors who were already in some kind of managed care, their satisfaction with the plan that they have is 3 times greater than those who were in the standard Medicare fee-for-service plan.

So it is not just about saving costs. It is not just about squeezing out some of the waste and mismanagement which we know is there.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] has done more to study the whole issue of waste, fraud

and abuse in the health care system than anybody. I think if you create these managed care systems and create competition out there, we are going to attack that waste, fraud and abuse so we have more health care for fewer dollars.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate your leadership as well as the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

We can achieve savings we want by making sure we attack for the first time that health care fraud. Medicare fraud is \$30 billion a year. By getting that savings, by offering choice, reducing paperwork costs and making sure we have an efficient system, health care will be preserved for our seniors under Medicare, and we can balance the budget, and I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] from his own experience can tell us about parts of the balanced budget amendment and the Balanced Budget Act that relates to his district, if he could join us in this discussion for that purpose.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. He is not a freshman, but we will allow him in on this debate, the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If you remember, it was our freshman class when I went aboard 5 years ago that had the gang of 7 that closed down the House bank, that found out they were selling cocaine downstairs here, and brought the check scandal to fruition. I think it was the first radical group to come in to make change, and the sophomore class followed, and the 75 young Turks that came in after that have done a bang-up job.

I thank you for yielding, and one of the things I would like to talk to is that, you know, some of the more radical Members on the other side of the aisle say that, well, we are cutting education, we are cutting the environment, we are cutting, hurting senior citizens.

Unfortunately, this place is about power. It is about the power to be reelected. The power to be reelected over the last 40 years means the power to disburse money from the Federal Government down to the lower ranks so they are going to vote for you so you can get reelected so that you have got the power, and to support that you need the big bureaucracy to support the flow of the money so you can get reelected so you have got the power.

What we are doing, and I think the American people would have a legitimate complaint if this Congress and the Republicans were trying to shift that power to the Republican Party, but the whole agenda and a balanced budget amendment and the agenda that we are trying to do is take that power not to Republicans but to the American people, to the States, where it can be more effectively used. We believe that government works closest to the people and it works best there.

You will hear over and over and over again by more liberal Members from Congress here that this is the only place that those decisions can be made. The States cannot make those decisions because in the past they have failed and that they are the only ones that can tell the American people how to do their business. That is a good issue.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is so important because I think there is sort of this argument that if we do not do the spending, if we do not do the regulating, if we do not do not the controlling, it will not get done. This is not a debate about how much money is going to be spent on education, how much money is going to be spent on nutrition or how much is going to be spent on health care. This is really a fundamental debate about who going to do the spending and who can do it more efficiently.

What we are really talking about, as you say, you said it so well, is returning more of that decisionmaking back to the States and, more importantly, wherever possible and with the \$500 per child tax credit, giving it back to the families because families are much more efficient than local governments, and local governments are much more efficient than State governments, and State governments are far more efficient than Federal Governments. That is why we are talking about welfare reform. We need to talk a little more about that because, again, I think the American people are so far out in front of us it is not even funny. I think they know the welfare system that has been created, controlled, directed, and regulated by the Federal Government has been an abysmal failure. They do not have to go very far in any direction, particularly if they come to this city, to see the results of 30 years of the social welfare state.

As a matter of fact, here in Washington, DC, if we go 10 blocks literally in any direction from this Capitol, you will see the results of 30 years of the social welfare state, and the results are devastating and not just in terms of the total costs. We all know we have spent over \$5 trillion over the last 30 years, but the real cost is in the human cost because we have replaced self-reliance and families with debt, dependency and despair, and that is what the American people want changed. They know the real way is to send it back to the States through block grants to allow local communities and local individuals to help those who need the help.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me be very specific. I would like, Mr. Speaker, for you to listen to these figures because they are accurate and they are important in this debate. The Federal Government only supports 7 percent of education funding, 7 percent. 93 percent of all education is paid for out of State tax dollars.

Now, of that 7 percent that we send to States, it occupies over 50 percent of

the rules and regulations and burden on the State itself. It represents 75 percent of the paperwork that the State and the schools have to go through that tie up portions of the 93 cents that comes out of the State tax dollars.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Say that again. I think that needs to be repeated. That it is a powerful set of statistics.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is. It is very accurate. It is accurate for any State you go into. We happen to have one in eight Americans lives in the State of California. It is the same for any one of the States. The Federal Government only provides 7 percent of the funding for education. 93 percent, or 93 cents out of every dollar, comes out of the State. But yet of that 7 cents, 50 percent of the rules and regulations that tie up the State comes out of that 7 percent of funding from the Federal Government, 75 percent of the paperwork, and by getting back, and for example, my colleague says, well, you look, you cut out Goals 2000, you cut out all the funds for Goals 2000, what a great program. Well, if I send the money directly to the State and the State likes Goal 2000, the Governors have told us they can do a Goals 2000 program much more efficiently. They do not have the Federal rules and regulations, and they will argue, well, it is all voluntary. In the Goals 2000 bill there are 48 instances that say "States will," and requires reporting, requires paperwork, and guess what, on the other end it takes Federal bureaucrats to take in that information, to record it and so on.

My wife is a principal. She has to write grants for Goals 2000, and they receive some of the dollars. Many of the schools set up and hire people to write grants. They do not get the dollars, in most cases. Even in the cases they do, quite often, if it is not a larger school, the amount of dollars they get is not as much as it costs to pay the grant writer and to perform the rules and the regulations and the paperwork that comes back to Washington, DC.

□ 2100

So when they say we are cutting, we are actually providing more dollars and more efficiency to the States. And those savings; guess what? Those savings go to balance the budget, and in the case of the education bill, Mr. Speaker, some of those savings went up to NIH for medical research on AIDS, and heart disease, and some of the things that I believe most people in America believe are of national interest and that the Federal Government is the one that can host. So I get kind of upset when they say that we are cutting education, and they say I think the gentleman covered the student finances and the student loans. We are providing more money for student loans than ever in the history. But guess where the savings come from? The President's bill on direct lending, and I would like to give you, Mr. Speaker, some accurate figures as well,

if I can find them here, that what the costs of the President's direct lending costs us.

The President asks, or the President's costs, cost \$1 billion over the next 7 years more than private student loans, \$1 billion for the direct loan period, and guess what? CBO and OMB have not even calculated what it costs to collect those loans. That is just the distribution of it. So when we say—

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is just the overhead.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Just the overhead, \$1 billion more than sending it to the private enterprises, but yet our colleagues say, well, that is only for the rich, that is for your loan guys, and that is for your banks. Well, I can do something cheaper and better and provide more loans to the students that really need them, and the Pell grants which have been increased higher than any other level in the time of history, then I think that is better, instead again of having the Federal Government up here being able to dole out the money, and guess what? That direct student loan program, the President wanted billions more dollars to increase it by fourscore, and that would make the Department of Education the biggest lending entity in the world, I mean other than the World Bank, and that is what they want. They want that power of the Federal dollars to come down so that they can say, well, look at the grant that I gave you here.

But they forget one thing, Mr. Speaker. They forget where the money came from in the first place. It is not their money. They take it from the very people, send it up here, and let me give you another accurate figure, Mr. Speaker, and this is one for my colleague to remember also. Only 23 cents out of every dollar that comes to Washington gets back into the classroom, 23 cents on every dollar.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is a pretty poor return on the investment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Only 30 cents in welfare gets down to the recipients that really need the welfare check because of all the bureaucracy.

Now my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or this side of the aisle, or the American public, you cannot run a business like that, and what the Governors have come to us and said is let us have the dollars, you do not want children to go hungry, you want the needy to be taken care of, you want the help. But you have got 144-some welfare programs, you have got 250 education programs. Let us set our own State standards, give us the money, do away with the Federal requirements and the bureaucracy, and we can make it more efficient. And guess what? We can apply those savings to the deficit and reduce, and what you have been talking about, what Alan Greenspan said, is that interest rates have already come down 2 percent.

Why? Because the lending institutions for the first time in over 40 years believe that Congress is serious about

balancing the budget, and if that expectation goes away, those interest rates would not only go back to where they were, they will spiral upward and upward, and then look what it costs for a student loan in the increased interest. Look what it costs for a home with increased interest.

I do not know about you, but most Americans, when interest rates came down, they refinanced their home, and I would encourage you, Mr. Speaker, if you have not done it already, take a serious look because it is going to be cheaper on your payments, and what does that mean? It means more dollars in the pockets of the American people.

And these are some of the things on education, and I have a special order later tonight that I want to go through in depth some of these same issues on education and go through grant by grant, loan by loan, education bill and education program by education program and show what we have really done. If you say cut at a Federal level, yes, I will zero out any program I can at a Federal level and pass it on down to the State because I think and believe from the bottom of my heart it is much more efficient, it is closer to the people, and they can decide better where those dollars will be used, and I think that is what we are trying to do here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The examples you have given, Congressman CUNNINGHAM, are so good, and frankly I think the American people instinctively understand just what you have talked about tonight. They understand that what we really need to do is localize, and privatize, and downsize this Federal Government, and that is what we are trying to do, and when they talk about cuts in education, we are talking about moving more of that educational decisionmaking back to the States, local units, and to families where they can make their own decisions about what they are going to do with their kids and the schools that they have, and frankly I think every American family understands this. They care much more about their kids' education than some bureaucrat in Washington.

You know we can all talk about caring, and everybody talks about compassion, but real caring and real compassion happens around the kitchen table. It is families that care most about their kids' education, and that is what we want to get back to, and the waste and mismanagement here in this city, as I say, is just awesome, and I know you are going to talk a little bit about Bosnia, and I want to hear a little more, and I see Congressman DORNAN is here tonight as well to talk a little bit about military affairs, and I believe in a strong defense, but just look at the Defense Department and the amount of waste, and duplication, and mismanagement that we see, and I know that your other colleague from San Diego once told me, Congressman HUNTER, about how many buyers they have at the Pentagon.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Congressman who?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. HUNTER.  
Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Congressman who?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Congressman who?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. DUNCAN HUNTER.  
Mr. CUNNINGHAM. He told me to mention his name three times.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Why? The duck comes down and you win 50 bucks?

But he talked about how many buyers, and it is like 106,000 buyers in the Department of Defense. We have 1,646 buyers for every F-16 we buy, and we buy 1 or 2 a week, something like that, and it is replete throughout the Federal Government. We all know that, the people that we serve know that, and the interesting thing, and we talked a little bit earlier about the megapoll that we did; it just confirms, I think, the common sense we all have, and that is once the American people understand what we are doing, once they see how much we are actually going to be spending, if anything the criticism is that we are still spending too much. Our budget calls for almost \$12.1 trillion worth of spending over the next 7 years, and if you divide that up, it works out to over \$46,500 in Federal spending for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Let me say that again. Over the next 7 years, Mr. Speaker, our budget plan, which the President vetoed today as cutting too much, will spend \$46,500 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Now what we are saying, I think in very simple language, we believe the \$12.2 trillion is more than enough to fund the legitimate needs of this Federal Government and to take care of those people who depend on the Federal Government for various services; \$12.1 trillion is more than enough. \$13 trillion will bust the bank, and it will bust the taxpayers. In fact I think, if we can get the American people to look more at the facts of our budget, I think they will come to the same conclusion that we have come to, and that is that our budget is fair, it is reasonable, it is responsible, and it is long overdue.

And so I think the budget that we are talking about is one that is good for the American people. As you said, long term it is going to bring interest rates down even more so Americans will have more of their own money to spend. They will not have to spend so much in interest. It will make student loans more available and more affordable. In fact the average family, according to Alan Greenspan, if we can stay on this balanced-budget plan over the next 7 years, the average family with a \$100,000 mortgage—in fact the average mortgage in the State of Minnesota is \$93,600—they will save almost \$3,000 a year in interest as opposed to what they would have spent or will spend if we do not really get serious about—

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They can use it for their child's education, for medical bills, first-time home buyers, or they can even put it away for an IRA to save for when they become chronologically gifted folks.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is about the difference between government responsibility and Federal responsibility and getting back more personal responsibility. Let the people make their own decisions, let them spend their own money, because we think they can spend it more efficiently than this Federal Government.

As I say, I think the American people, once they know the facts, will again conclude that our budget spends more than enough to meet the legitimate needs of this Federal Government and that the target numbers we are working with, they are fair, they are reasonable, they are responsible, and, as I say, they are long overdue.

I want to yield some time to you and talk about the other major issue that is confronting this Congress, and this Government, this country, and this world, and that is about Bosnia, and it has been particularly frustrating for me as a freshman Member because things happen pretty fast around here, but I would suspect that most of America, I know all of our colleagues know, that you were one of the most decorated Navy pilots in the Vietnam war, and I think when you talk about military issues and particularly about brushfire wars, and political wars, of civil wars around the world, you speak with a special degree of expertise, and so I want to yield some time to you, and so I welcome one of the other world experts on foreign policy and military affairs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do we have to give time to that Air Force guy?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman from the Air Force, flew F-100's at one time and perhaps maybe he still does, but I would yield first to Congressman CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and like I said, I have got an hour special order after this, and I will take up afterward. But what I would like to go through, Mr. Speaker, is what I found is many of the Members on the other side of the aisle, as well as Members on this side of the aisle, are concerned about the other issues that we have talked about, budget debate and across the board. They do not serve on National Security. They are not directly involved with the Bosnia issue, but it is of great concern to them, and they do not have the time to really go out and find out the information.

What I would like to do first is kind of set the stage, if my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] would allow me, to just kind of go through and name the players. Later on in the evening I would like to go through the history of the portions of the world that we are talking about going into in Bosnia, from over 600

years ago on the Field of Flowers and the time of Hugo through the revolution where Nazis invaded Yugoslavia, the former Yugoslavia, back in the 1940's. First of all I would like to go through the players, Mr. Speaker, because, as I said, many people do not associate names, places, religions, with individual groups.

For example, Alija Izetbegovic; he is a Bosnian Muslim, but when someone talks about talking about Sarajevo or Bosnia and Herzegovina, they do not necessarily tie the two together. So Izetbegovic is a Bosnian Muslim that is primarily responsible in the Bosnia and Herzegovina area, and primarily Sarajevo, which is where there are headquarters. Now Izetbegovic, like Tudjman, who is a Croatian, is of Roman Catholic descent, and you talk about Zagreb when you talk about that particular portion of their Croatian nationalism. They also during World War II, if you take a look at the two groups, their Croatians fought alongside with Nazi Germany, and they were called the Ustase. They formed the only Nazi concentration camp outside of Germany where they executed and ethnically cleansed over a million and a half Serbs, Jews, and gypsies at one time, and if you take a look also at Franjo Tudjman, Croatian, Roman Catholic, Zagreb, the World War II association was with the Ustase in Nazi Germany. If you look at Slobodan Milosevic, we talk about he is the head of Serbia, not Bosnian Serb, but Serbia, greater Serbia itself. That is a group of Orthodox Catholics. The difference between the two groups; one is Orthodox Catholic, the other is Roman Catholic in the religious affiliations, and of course Milosevic is in Belgrade, and if you look at that portion of the world during World War II, there were three basic groups: the Chetniks which fought under Mihailovic, the Ustase, which were associated with the Nazi Germans, and then you had a well-known man named Tito. He was with the partisans, which was a group of people that fought with the greater Russian Communists. Mihailovic fought for greater Yugoslavia, Tito fought for communism and a greater Russia, so that there is a big conflict, not a conflict but a misunderstanding, of the players and where they really came from.

□ 2115

Let me go into also the number of troops under this agreement that will be placed into Bosnia. Great Britain has come up with 13,000 troops, France 7,500 troops, Spain 4,000, Italy 2,000, Germany 4,000, other NATO countries 2,500, Russia 2,000 troops; and the United States, where they say 20,000 troops, the actual number of troops there, and that will be deployed, will be 32,000 troops, not 20,300 troops.

Let me go through, and then I would yield back over to my friend, if he likes, let me go over some of the history perspectives of the area, Mr. Speaker. As I said, many people that are not historians, that have not

looked at the issues, have not read the books, they have not gone through the list of that portion of the world.

As early as 1389, and let me repeat that so there is no confusion, 1389 on the Field of Blackbirds, some call it the Field of Flowers, saw the Serbian Empire defeated by the Turks. By the end of June, the time of Yugo, former Yugoslavia was dominated by the Turkish Moslems. June 28 today is celebrated much like our Fourth of July in Bosnia, as Independence Day, because it was 600 years of domination of the Ottoman Turks. That is how the same basic ethnic group changed from Serbian to Croatian to Moslem, and the Moslem came from the Turkish Moslem, the Suni Moslem.

Mr. DORNAN. If the gentleman will yield for a 1-minute elaboration, DUKE, I found out that no matter how good I am or you are, some of our supporters out there have said sometimes a dialog is good. It gets the juices going. We cannot tell the colonel in the chair there, our good Marine Speaker pro tem, to get a cup of coffee or tea, but I am telling people if they want to continue to listen to you, they are going to learn something from you and from me tonight, as they just learned a lot from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

I want to flesh this out. This is not a movie, they must listen to us. Let me flesh out why Serbians treat as though it were 2 years ago the battle in the Field of Blackbirds at Kosovo Pojje. Here is what happened. Prince Lazar, a tall, handsome Serbian knight, sets up to do battle with the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. He had 400 concubines in Topkapi; interesting place when people go to Istanbul to visit the blue mosque, hundreds of years old, and Hagia Sofia, built by, oh, my gosh, Justinian up here in the corner in 532.

The Sultan had reigned for 29 years. Roosevelt got a fourth term, and about 82 days into a 13th year. Thirty-nine years, Sultan Murad, sounds like something for the eyes, Murad I ruled for 29 years. The Serbs were winning, and a Serbian noble, Miloc, that is why so many children are named Milo or Milan or Miloc, Miloc Kobolic pretends to be a deserter—what you guys in Vietnam called the chu hoi program, come over to our side—in all his knightly armor and garb, a swash-buckling figure, for the mind to conjure this up and know that it is better than anything they do in Hollywood with their fake violence and untrue stories, just a will to fiction.

He works his way into the tent of a 29-year ruling Sultan and stabs him to death with a poison dagger. He dies a violent death of torture, and for a while it was pandemonium. It looked like the Serbs had won the day, yet again to save Christendom from the Islamic forces that had gone all the way across North Africa, across the Strait of Gibraltar and conquered most of Spain, driving out, if they would not convert, and killing the Christians and ending the Christendom of St. Augustine in all of North Africa. His son,

Sultan Murad's son Bayezid, rallies his forces and inflicts a crushing defeat on the Serbs. They capture and torture to death the leader, Prince Lazar.

The Serbs are then forced to pay tribute for decades, turn over many of their women, and promise to do military service in now young Sultan Bayezid's forces for decades.

Then the second Battle of Kosovo is fought 59 years later, and the Serbs again almost win. The old date is 15 June, like Waterloo, but you are right, 28 June. And where have we heard that date on this floor before? 28 June 1914 caused George M. Cohen to write "Over There," "And we won't be back till it's over over there," and my dad gets three Purple Hearts, then wound chevrons, poison gas, 11 million of the flower of European youth killed.

That started not too far from Kosovo, to the west a little bit, in the city of Sarajevo where a 19-year-old knowing that if he was going to be hit man, he had to move fast, because if he turned 20 he would have gotten capital punishment. And Gavrilo Princip at 19, in Sarajevo, on a street much narrower than the distance between the gentleman and me, he shoots to death the Archduke Ferdinand of the Austral-Hungarian Empire, the heir-apparent, his beautiful wife Sofia, nicks the driver of this big car. And the killing is on, and it has not stopped for this whole bloody era.

That is why, when you speak for the Serbs, and you jumped on me a little bit yesterday because in the abbreviated time I'm trying to be fair to Serbs, Croatians, and Moslems here, but the Serbs saved Christendom, as did the Hungarians, as did the Austrians, as did a whole area of southern Europe, held the line, saved Vienna, saved Malta, won the Battle of Lepanto in 1571, that is almost two centuries later. This went on for half of this millenium we are ending in 4 years. Just wanted to know, fact is better than fiction.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, my hour is going to expire quickly and then you guys are going to have it for another hour. But I just want to say that I think this is important.

I said earlier that facts are stubborn things. And I think it was Patrick Henry who said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The American people need to get plugged into this discussion, whether we are talking about Bosnia or the budget, because I think the American people in many respects are going to be the final arbiters of this debate. I thank you so much for sharing with us the history, because the more you learn about that region, the more you learn about this agreement, the more you learn about what is going on over there, the more troubling this whole story becomes.

The real trouble is they are going to be our kids, and they are just kids for

the most part. You see them out here exercising with the various honor guards and color guards and so forth, and you cannot help but feel proud of them. But many of those kids are going to get hurt, they are going to get killed, they are going to get wounded. The American people need to tune into this debate because facts are stubborn things, and the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The American people, I hope, will be tuned into your discussion as you go on for the next hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### HISTORY OF THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. I do not think there is anybody on the floor who knows history, accurately, as my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, why is it so important, the time of the Field of Blackbirds, the time the Turks took over the Serbian Empire? What significance does that have for us, today, Mr. Speaker? From 1389, June 28 to June 28 in 1989, kind of the start of the problems we have in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in former Yugoslavia, because on June 28, 1989, Slobodan Milosevic, remember he is the Serbian out of Belgrade, spoke to national Yugoslavia and spoke about a former and a greater Yugoslavia.

At the same time and even prior to this, in 1980, prior to the 600th anniversary of the time of Yugo and the Field of Blackbirds, the Croatians, Franjo Tudjman spoke of the same Croatian national goals for Yugoslavia, which included the eviction of Serbs occupying the greater Croatia. The problem with that, we do not believe that either Milosevic or Tudman wanted an all-out war. It would cost too much and too much bloodshed. What they did want is as much of the Croatian and Serbian Empire for themselves under a greater Yugoslavia than they had. The problem was that at the same time, it kind of got out of hand. The Bosnian Moslems that we associate, again, primarily with Sarajevo, were kind of caught in the middle of this thing. They were the minority. They were forced, I believe, into a shotgun wedding with the Croatians, but quite often, the Moslems, the Bosnian Moslems, found themselves at odds with both the Croatians and with the Serbians, and both groups were killing the other.

At a time when the Moslems thought that they had no one to turn to, the United States did not support them, the Croatians were beating up on them, the Serbians were beating up on them, they accepted with open arms the Middle East Mujaheddin groups, and there are over 4,000 of them there today.

This is one of the groups we are very concerned about. This is not the Bosnian Moslems, the more moderate. This is the Islamic terrorists and fundamentalists that come out of Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Egypt, and some of the other Middle East countries. They are sworn to a national Jihad.

Germany sees its economic future in the hands of the Balkans. Greece is also concerned about further expansionism into Greece by the Turks and the Turkish Moslems, so it is a problem. The Germans, Croats, and Slavs are Roman Catholic. The Turks, the Bosnians, the Macedonians and Montenegrans are primarily Moslems. The Russians and Serbs are Orthodox Catholics.

Now let me back up just a little bit in time, Mr. Speaker, from going from 1389 to 1989 in the history when this was significant to both the Croatians and the Serbians, when Serbia was taken over by the Ottoman Turks. During World War II, and this is prior to Pearl Harbor in 1941, Germans attacked and invaded Yugoslavia itself. The Serbians united with Russia and the United States. Let me repeat that. The Serbians united with Russia and the United States.

There were two primary groups that fought with the United States and with Russia. They were the Chetniks, led by Micholevic, that were interested in a greater Yugoslavia; and then there was Tito, who was a Russian Communist, who was there to promote primarily Russian communism; two factions, but all fighting against the Nazis.

The Croatians and most of the Moslems fought with the Ustase in support of Nazi Germany. Germany built a concentration camp at Janocovic and killed 1.5 million Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies. During the 1980's Croatian nationalism movement under Tudjman, and the Croatians adopted, and this is now back at 1980, you can imagine the concern of most of the Serbians and some of the Moslems when the Croatians donned the old uniforms of Nazi Germany in the nationalistic movement which Tudjman was pushing on the other side of the Serb nationalistic movement, and the fears came to fruition.

I recently attended, last year, a banquet in which over 400 allied U.S. pilots were giving homage to the Serbs. Why? I remember the old Humphrey Bogart movies when the underground got our allied pilots and French pilots and the British pilots and United States pilots, most of them were with the Army Air Corps at that time, but they got out through the underground, our allied pilots. In 1990, France and Great Britain allied themselves with Croatia against

their cold war enemy, because after the war, Russia in the cold war also became the warring enemy with the United States.

As early as 1991 Tudjman, again, Tudjman with the Croatians, and Milosevic with the Serbians, hoping to actually avoid a war in 1991, sat down and sought out a reconciliation at Kraziavo. They split Bosnia-Herzegovina between Serbia and Croatia, much like the Ohio agreement had done over the last month. The West insisted, however, on a Bosnia-Herzegovina Moslem state, which suited the goals of Izetbegovic, again, the head of the Bosnian Moslems. It also suited the radical Islamic movement.

The Dayton agreement also splits the area, but guess who is in disconcert with that agreement the most? Izetbegovic, because again, it splits up Bosnia-Herzegovina, primarily between the Serbs and the Croatians, and gives the Moslems not the Moslem state that they originally wanted.

□ 2130

General Lewis MacKenzie, former head and commander of the United Nations, and I quote, "Izetbegovic wants the entire country back." Now, this is General Lewis MacKenzie, the Canadian and head of the U.N. forces. In testimony before the Committee on National Security, when asked if he would commit United States troops in Bosnia, he added, "I would not touch it with a 10-foot pole." At the same time the media reports from Bosnia and Sarajevo supported President Clinton against the Serbs.

In 1994 and 1995, Bosnian Muslims established the Mujahideen Third Corps. Today there are over 4,000 radical Islamic fighters in organizations in Bosnia, and many of those, Mr. Speaker, have integrated into the regular forces. So when they talk about, in the agreement, they are going to eliminate those forces, those are the forces that are sworn to fight against the United States.

Brigadier General Bastimas, commander of the U.N. military observes in Bosnia, and General MacKenzie have said that it was a Muslim who provoked the Serbian attack on Garazde. Brigadier General Bastimas criticized the United States media campaign and President Clinton's failings to recognize the Muslim trap set in Sarajevo.

Another thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that the press jumps out, and we say we are going to treat all sides equal, but yet we have the biggest dog in town. If there is an incident and the press jumps on it and the President reacts, let me give you a couple of examples.

The press reported that the 40 Muslims killed in Sarajevo was through a Serbian Shell, mortar. The French, the Russian and the British bomb experts have stated, and I can publish and show you the articles and submit them for the RECORD, that it was a Muslim preplanted bomb, that they just so happened to have photographers there,