

while you raise the level of income taxes paid by corporations? Would not your common sense tell you that ought to be one of the answers to increase the amount of money paid by corporations into the Federal coffers? Corporations are making all the money. Let them pay more in revenue as a part of the way to solve the problem.

Using your common sense, would you not say that even though there has been an agreement to do all of this in 7 years, that there is no magic to 7 years? If you have to, in order to do it in a more humane way and lessen the suffering, if you have to do it in 10 years or 9 years, why not do it in 9 or 10 years? Your common sense would tell you that.

Yes, your common sense has told you over the years that something is wrong in Washington. You wanted to eliminate the high price toilet seats that the military was putting in their planes. You want to eliminate the \$600 coffee pots.

Common sense has always been against waste. Medicaid waste, Medicare waste, food stamp waste, Embassies abroad wasting money, all of that waste, your common sense tells you to eliminate. So let us bring our common sense into this debate, keep it focused.

Look at the CIA. The CIA has blundered and is now a danger to our foreign policy, a danger to America. It makes so many blunders, until we would be better off if we did not have a CIA. Yet the CIA goes on.

Recently the CIA was exposed as having a petty cash slush fund that nobody knew about, the Director of the CIA did not know about it, the President did not know about it. It was at least \$1.5 billion.

We have proposed on this floor several times that you cut the CIA budget by just 10 percent a year. If you cut it by 10 percent a year over a 7-year period, take out your pencil and paper, and you will see that the CIA cut by 10 percent a year, and the admitted amount is at least \$28 billion, 10 percent is \$2.8 billion a year, times 7 years, you will end up with \$19 billion in 7 years. The CIA would still exist, but it would only be cut 10-percent a year over that seven-year period.

If you take that \$19 billion that you get from the CIA cut of 10 percent over a 7-year period, and you add to that the \$1.5 billion slush fund that the CIA discovered that it had and nobody knew about, you would have \$21 billion, and \$21 billion is more than you need to make up for the education cut. Education is being cut by \$4 billion next year.

\$21 billion is not quite enough. Take the B-2 bomber and add that. The B-2 bomber over the period of its life will cost about \$33 billion. One-third of that is \$11 billion. You add the \$11 billion of the B-2 bomber to the \$21 billion of the CIA, you have \$32 billion. Education cuts are going to be \$4 billion left over, if you take out your pencil and paper and use common sense and get rid of

real waste. But nobody is discussing a cut of the CIA. The CIA goes on blundering and nobody cuts it.

We must raise our voices, maintain a steady focus on the critical life and death target here in Washington. It is the budget. The Republican remaking of America is an appropriation and expenditure revolution. This is a war without blood, but there will be casualties. The common sense of the American people is necessary to minimize the casualties and to save America. We must raise our voices. We must maintain a steady focus. Do not let anybody tell you to lower your voice. Scream and scream loud.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the viewing audience.

NEW YORK TO BE DISPROPORTIONATELY HURT BY CUTS IN MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have the greatest health care system in the world and New York City has many of the Nation's best hospitals to support that great system, hospitals that have the enormous responsibility of caring for the citizens of America's largest city, that train a disproportionate number of our next generation of health professionals, that conduct the cutting edge research to save and improve our lives. Yet many of these hospitals will be decimated by Republican Medicare and Medicaid cuts that will cost these great New York City hospitals billions in reduced payments.

Where will these institutions be forced to make up these cuts? Conservative estimates put the New York City job loss at 107,000 health care positions, more than 2.3 percent of the city's total employment.

Doctors will be cut, nurses will be cut, janitors who keep our hospitals clean and sanitary will be cut. New York medical technology will not be purchased. Yes, this will hurt seniors; yes, this will hurt the poor; yes, this will hurt the health care of every New Yorker and every American.

The House of Representatives voted to cut Medicare spending by \$270 billion over 7 years and to cut \$170 billion to the Medicaid Program. There are several unique features of the New York City health care system which make it especially vulnerable to the type of targeted cuts in the spending contained in the Republican legislation.

The New York City metropolitan area trains 15 percent of the medical residents for the entire Nation. The New York biomedical system is a rec-

ognized world center of advanced science, medicine and education. New York hospitals reach these heights while simultaneously serving a high percentage of patients with special needs far exceeding the national average. These patients include the elderly, the disabled, the chronically ill, and the poor, and it is not only the health care we all receive that will be affected by the proposed cuts. New York's economy will also be hard hit due to the State and city's dependence on its large and complex health care system.

Cuts in the formulas for Medicare, graduate medical education, and disproportionate share payments, would create unacceptably severe reductions in payments for New York's hospitals. This is because indirect medical education and disproportionate share payments are based on percentages of overall medical payment rates. As the overall Medicare payment rates are reduced as a result of smaller inflation adjustments, payments for graduate medical education and disproportionate share are automatically reduced and their rates of growth are slowed. Thus, further reductions in graduate medical education and disproportionate share would amount to double cuts, which our hospitals, most of which are operating below the break-even point, simply cannot withstand.

Changes in Medicaid will also have a drastic impact on New York's health care providers, especially those providing long-term care. New York has received one of the lowest rates of Medicaid payment increases among the States. New York's nursing homes could lose 25 percent of the money necessary for their survival by 2002.

According to the Health Care Association of New York, New York State, with 7 percent of the Nation's population, would take 11 percent of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. New York City, with 2.9 percent of the Nation's population, would absorb 6.5 percent of these cuts, more than double its fair share. Over 7 years, cuts in Medicare and Medicaid payments to hospitals would cost New York State \$20 billion and New York City \$12 billion. Funding for long-term care and personal health services would decline by \$11 billion in New York State and \$7 billion in New York City.

The proposed cuts will dangerously damage health care services, but that is not all. The cuts would wreak havoc with New York's many health care workers, their employment and their income. New York City will lose 107,000 jobs, and New York State may stand to lose well over 200,000 jobs. Any budget plan must include everyone having to do their part to balance the budget, but I argue that any budget plan must treat all States equally.

I think the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid and the impact on hospitals and health care systems across the country is deeply disturbing. The disproportionate impact of these cuts on New York State and New York City is

unacceptable. Protecting New York State's and New York City's hospitals, health care providers and medical educators helps to safeguard the health of our Nation while preserving the health and economic well-being of one of our country's most densely populated cities and States.

□ 2245

As the budget negotiations continue, I ask my colleagues to join me in fighting to reduce these cuts. I am proud to have voted against the reconciliation bill and I will oppose any future budget that cuts with the injustice and scope of the Republican proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUSTIFICATION FOR SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss an issue that is going to confront us for the next several weeks in regard to the President's intention to send 20,000 to 25,000 of America's sons and daughters to the Balkans to participate in living up to the terms of the agreement just recently initialed in Dayton, OH.

Mr. Speaker, like many Americans across the country, I sat before my television set last evening and listened intently as President Clinton gave his justification to the American people for sending ground troops into Bosnia. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks from tomorrow I was invited to the Pentagon, where I had breakfast with Secretary Perry and the leadership of the Joint Chiefs, including General Shalikashvili, where they made a personal case to me and other Members of the Committee on National Security as to why we should commit our troops to Bosnia in light of the pending peace agreement, which had not yet been initialed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to respond, first of all, to President Clinton's speech, because parts of it bothered me greatly, and to lay the foundation for a hearing which our committee will hold on Thursday when again Secretary Perry, General Shalikashvili, and Secretary Christopher will come before the House Committee on National Security and again make the case to us to support the President's efforts.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has been on the Committee on National Security for 9 years and who chairs the Research and Development Subcommittee, I am vitally interested in any place or any time that we send our troops into harm's way, whether it be the time that we sent them to Desert Storm, or Haiti, or other operations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was taken aback by some of the comments President Clin-

ton made in the speech yesterday evening and I have to respond to them, and this is the only opportunity where I can deal with them in a lengthy and involved format. I want to respond to three specific points that the President made to the American people and to Members of this body.

I want to, first of all, respond to his assertion that those who disagree with him are isolationists and want us to come back into our own borders and not be a part of the world community. The second issue I want to take exception to is the way that he characterized the moral argument involved in getting involved in Bosnia. And the third is the President's comparison of Bosnia and our potential involvement there to Haiti and Somalia as well as Desert Storm. Then I want to get into my own specific concerns relative to a potential vote that we may take in this body a week or two from now.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the contention made by President Clinton that those who may oppose his policy here are isolationists. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that for the past 3 years, a strong bipartisan voice in this body and the other body have voted repeatedly, have signed letters, have sent messages to the White House and the administration that we want to be a part of the process of helping achieve peace in the Balkans. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues in this body today, would support the presence of the United States in a somewhat limited way in the Balkans, as we have done repeatedly over the last 3 years.

After all, Mr. Speaker, there were many Members of both the majority and minority parties that supported the President's use of our Air Force in terms of the air strikes. Many of us have supported logistical support to provide food and clothing and humanitarian support and relief to the people of the Balkans. So time and again over the past 3 years Members of this body and the other body have made it clear that we want to be involved.

And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, as I said to the Secretary of Defense 2-weeks ago, I am prepared to support American troops in Bosnia tomorrow, but not on the ground. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the key issue that President Clinton completely ignored last evening. He made it appear as if we are in disagreement with him on his policy; that, therefore, we must not want the United States to be involved at all, and that is absolutely totally wrong. I think it was really shortsighted of the President to make that statement to the American people.

In fact, what I proposed to Secretary Perry, I think, would be supported by many of our colleagues in this body; and that is, why should America have to put 20,000 to 25,000 ground troops in between three warring factions that have been at war not for 4 years and not for one decade but for decades and decades and centuries and centuries?

Why should the European countries, who are the bordering nations to Bosnia, not step up with that ground support force and let the United States involvement be what we do very well; airlift, sealift, air strikes, command and control, intelligence gathering and monitoring, and all the other ancillary support to make this mission a success?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when the President talks about a U.S. commitment of 20,000 to 25,000 troops, he is not being realistic with the American people nor is he being realistic with our colleagues in this body. As a matter of fact, right now, Mr. Speaker, we have an estimated 15,000 troops who are providing support services in the theater around Bosnia.

These services range from airlift and sealift to intelligence gathering, to all kinds of functions that they have been assigned by the Pentagon, just to name a few of the assignments that our military is currently involved in in the European theater, and this is, by the way, not complete. We have Operation Able Sentry going on right now. We have Operation Deny Flight. We have Operation Provide Province, Operation Sharp Guard, and Operation Provide Comfort. All of those operations are, today, involving American troops in the theater that the President is talking about sending ground troops in.

In fact, along with the ground troops that President Clinton is proposing, we are going to have a carrier, the America, off the coast. We are going to have Navy pilots and Navy personnel available. So our total support forces, besides the 20,000 to 25,000 ground troops, is going to be somewhere between 13,000 and 17,000.

When I met with the Secretary 2 weeks ago, I tried to pin he and General Shalikashvili to a specific number, and I will do that again this Thursday. I asked them, how many other U.S. troops will be involved in this effort? They would not give me a specific answer. To the best of my ability, I have determined that number will be somewhere above 15,000. So when the President goes before the American people as he did last night and says, I want to send 20,000 troops in, that is our commitment, what he should have said is, I want to have 35,000 or perhaps 40,000 U.S. troops involved in the theater of operation that includes, as our overall mission, Bosnia and the maintaining of the peace agreement that was initiated in Dayton.

Now, many of us in this body feel that what the President should have done is said we will provide that support in the form of airlift and sealift and use of our aircraft for attacks, if necessary, on selected sites, and command and control and intelligence gathering, but should not have had American troops placed in harm's way in an area of the world so far away from our shore and which many of us feel that we do not have a direct national interest. Many of us feel that it