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