things—just two—but when Republicans wrote the bill, they managed to forget half of that short list.

What is the effect of this oversight? The American Heart Association is restricted. The American Red Cross is restricted. The Girl Scouts are restricted. They are restricted because they get grants. But the Speaker's network of think tanks and pet projects—such as the Progress and Freedom Foundation, Earning by Learning, National Empowerment Television and the like—can take tax-deductible donations and keep their money tax-free. And do they take money? Yes, millions from the Speaker's political supporters. And what do they do with it? They videotape Mr. GINGRICH's speeches and sell them. They use the money to produce a weekly television show starring the Speaker. In short, the Speaker uses their activities to promote his political agenda—and it is all done on the taxpayer dollar. All tax-exempt.

What did the Supreme Court say about that? Mr. ISTOOK has told us that they said tax-exemptions were the same as cash grants. If so, then why is there no mention of tax-exemptions in this amendment? The Progress and Freedom Foundation gets no grants, so this amendment will not stop them from sending every Member a so-called ''briefing'' on why the telecommunications industry needs reform, and coincidentally that it should be reformed in precisely the way Speaker GINGRICH suggests. But the Supreme Court, and more importantly Mr. ISTOOK, said their money is just as much ''welfare for lobbyists'' as a grant is.

All of you have received numerous briefings from the National Center for Policy Analysis supporting Medical Savings Accounts, an idea which actually wormed its way into the bill which cut Medicare by $270 billion. Has anyone figured out why? The Republicans said they were impressed by the savings these accounts could achieve. But the CBO says these accounts will actually cost the Government $3.5 billion. Of course, the savings were based on numbers produced by the think tank itself, and were then used to lobby Members. This think tank, by the way, is a tax-exempt organization. Distribution of their briefings was essentially lobbying. That means that the National Center for Policy Analysis lobbied Members with taxpayer dollars.

But what does this amendment do about it? Nothing. Why? Does it have anything to do with the fact that the National Center for Policy Analysis is heavily funded by a major backer of the Speaker's Progress and Freedom Foundation, the shadowy GOPAC organization, and others of the Speaker's funds?

Consider also that this big-time financial backer is also the CEO of the Golden Rule Insurance Co., the country's biggest marketer of medical savings accounts. In other words, a big financial backer of the Speaker's has used his tax-deductible contributions to fund a tax-exempt lobbying campaign designed to result in legislation that would bring huge profits to his company. Later this week, they will try to rake in still more by including medical savings accounts in the Federal employee health benefits plan. Ironically, the hearing on the subject will be before the Government Reform and Oversight Committee—the very committee which has written and promoted the Istook language. Does this bother anyone?

It bothers me, but it apparently does not bother the supporters of the Istook amendment. They do not protest while big money buys out American politics, piece by piece. In fact, they now offer legislation designed to facilitate the process.

This Istook amendment is a sham. It deserves defeat. Let us not stop the Association for Retarded Citizens, the YMCA, and other voices of the little guy from advocating with their Government while we let fat cat special interests lobby to maintain huge profits, and then write off the expenses as tax deductions.

NO UNITED STATES TROOPS DEPLOYMENT TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress will within a very short period of time take up the very delicate issue as to whether or not American fighting troops should be positioned in the country that we know as Bosnia and Herzegovina. For the past 3 years, our President has, without consulting Congress, made a commitment that somehow he is going to send 20,000 to 25,000 American troops to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

□ 1315

Now we find ourselves at this point in American history where this body has to make a reasoned decision as to whether or not we should put these young men and women in harm's way. We have to take a look at the historical background of this country as we know it.

One can go back 1,000 or even 1,500 years to see continuous fighting on either side of the Balkans as the various tribes from the areas that we know as the former provinces of Yugoslavia, now independent nations, have risen up, engaged each other in mortal combat, then been quiet for a period of time only to have these types of prejudices flare up again and result in killing.

The question is this: Does America have such a strategic interest in Bosnia and Herzegovina so as to commit our young men and women into combat? And that other question is this: If there is, indeed, a peace treaty, then why should our young men and women, as part of a NATO force, be sent in heavily armed for the purpose of killing to keep the peace?

As I examined last night the very thick document that sets forth the memorandum of understanding among the parties to this horrible conflict, several points stood out, and I think the American people have a right to know the terms upon which American troops would be sent into this country.

Let us take a look at the nature of the country that will be set up. There will be an elected house. There will not be a president; there will not be two presidents; there will be three presidents. Can you imagine a constitution that has a troika for a presidency and is able to rule? And, incidentally, each of these presidents have to come from each of the three warring factions, the Moslems, the Croats, and the Serbs. So now you take one of each, put them into a government and say, ''You rule.''

What is even more ironic is that in the constitution that will be set up is called the country of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and yet it is legally split, one country that is already split, and this is supposed to be a peace agreement.

How is this peace agreement formed? Well, a demilitarized zone is set up. American troops have to pour in, and the language of the agreement says that the troops will use whatever force is reasonably necessary in order to carry out the peace plan. So that if the warring factions do not clear out of the DMZ, then after some type of a warning, presumably NATO forces will be called upon to shoot in order to secure a peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the question: What type of peace is this? And that is not all. The agreement says that within a year the troops are to be withdrawn.

So everybody gets together for a year, possibly acquiesces in a DMZ zone, and then knowing at the end of the year they can pull out only to have the fighting resume.

But there is more to it than this.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to examine very closely the agreement before they vote in favor of this type of peace plan.

MOVE RESPONSIBLY AND PASS THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. FRAZER] is recognized during morning business for 1 minute.

Mr. FRAZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together. The time is now for us to represent our constituents in a responsible manner.

We all agree that a balanced budget is possible. The manner in which we get there is our dilemma. We need a balanced budget that is fair and equitable. This equality is based on a set of

principles wherein all areas of Government are affected proportionally.

Our children are the future. Our Government must continue to provide a safety net for mothers and children who are least able to provide for themselves. Programs such as child nutrition and Head Start are essential to our national interest. We must also invest in education and job training so that our Nation will be able to effectively compete in the global marketplace.

We must also honor our commitment to the elderly. They have the right to live in this country and enjoy the security and comfort of retirement without the fear of Government reducing their benefits to the point they must sell all of their assets to qualify for governmental assistance.

We can achieve a balanced budget without devastating cuts in Medicaid, Medicare, education, and without raising taxes on working families.

Therefore I urge my colleagues to move responsibly and pass the budget.

EPA APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week, we will be addressing the remaining appropriations conference reports, including the VA–HUD appropriations conference report which provides funding for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Unfortunately, our environmental laws have taken blow after blow in the 104th Congress as bills spiked with antienvironmental measures pass the House floor, both out in the open as in the Clean Water Act reauthorization or through more mischievous measures, as through appropriation and budget bills like the VA–HUD conference report that we will be voting on this week, most likely tomorrow.

No other Government agency is facing the kind of cuts that are included in this bill for the EPA.

The bill cuts funding for the EPA to set and enforce environmental and public health standards for air pollution, pesticides, and clean and safe water by 17 percent from what the President proposed.

Hazardous waste site cleanup is being cut by 25 percent, slowing efforts to make the Superfund Program faster, fairer, and more efficient.

And EPA's enforcement funding is being hit even harder, with a 27-percent cut in enforcement of all environmental programs.

On top of all the direct cuts to EPA's budget, this bill cuts by 30 percent funds that go straight to the States to help keep raw sewage off beaches and out of waterways.

And State loan funds for use in protecting community drinking water nationwide are reduced by 45 percent in this bill.

Restricting the EPA's ability to implement environmental protection programs and reducing funding to the States, in my opinion, is nothing less than an unfunded mandate on the States to maintain environmental quality.

In the majority of cases where adequate Federal funds are not made available, State funding just is not there.

This means that a virtual environmental protection vacuum will be created by this bill, where polluters get off scot free at the expense of environmental quality, and human safety and health.

One must ask why funding for environmental protection is being targeted or why after three votes to remove restrictive riders from the VA–HUD appropriations bill, the majority of the riders were simply moved to report language and several riders still remain as actual legislative language in the bill.

For example, incorporated in this bill is a rider that prevents EPA from stopping dumping of potentially harmful fill into wetlands.

EPA is by no means overly zealous in its use of this authority over wetlands, and only 11 times in the history of the wetlands program has it stepped in to veto this type of dumping.

Even in New Jersey, a State with one of the most stringent wetlands programs in the country, 94 percent of all wetlands permit applications are approved. So why is it necessary to put a rider in this bill prohibiting the EPA from protecting wetlands?

Another measure that does not belong in this bill is the prohibition of EPA's authority to add hazardous waste sites to the national priority list under Superfund.

The Superfund listing process is strictly scientific now.

There are those in this Congress, however, who seem determined to politicize the process by placing all sorts of restrictions on listing Superfund sites.

My committee, the Committee on Commerce, is now reviewing the Superfund Program, and I maintain the legislative process should simply be allowed to run its course.

If this conference report is passed in its current form, the EPA's hands will be tied and the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink will suffer dramatically.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and send it back to conference in order to restore the EPA's ability to effectively protect the health and safety of our environment and our constituents.

Essentially, if we send the bill back to conference again, those who represent the House and the Senate can get together and come up with a better bill that does not cut enforcement for environmental protection as much, that provides sufficient funding to the States so that they can continue to maintain a quality environment. This is what we should be doing in this Congress instead of passing this bill.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we gain more knowledge about the workings of our world, we pray, gracious God, that we will sense more fully the wonder and the awe and the marvel that are about us and which have been provided by Your creative hand. May we live each day with a reverence for the miracles that are before us, with an appreciation of the mysteries of the universe and with a greater awareness of the ambiguities of the road ahead. Give us pause to reflect on Your majesty, the power of Your love, and the marvelous occasions we have to serve You and the people of the land. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WELLER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives: