

Steve Kroft: President Clinton said this is a gonna be one-year commitment.

General Louis McKenzie: Everyone—everyone agrees that that's for domestic consumption. It's just no way you're gonna be out of there in one year.

Steve Kroft: So, you're saying that you believe that there will be United States troops in Bosnia taking casualties, during a Presidential Election?

General Louis McKenzie: I—I hope there are no casualties. But I believe there will—if you go in, in the near future, there will be United States troops in Bosnia during the— the Presidential Election, and another Presidential Election, and another Presidential Election.

Steve Kroft: Do you agree?

Lt. Colonel Bob Stewart: Absolutely.

Steve Kroft: Is it a mistake to say that you're gonna be out in a year?

Lt. Colonel Bob Stewart: Well, I don't think it's a mistake, but I don't think any—I think it's rather foolish statement to—to say, that—there is a time limit. Because I don't think you can actually necessarily put a time limit on something, when we don't even understand—we don't even know what's going to happen there tomorrow.

Steve Kroft: President Clinton and his State department have heard these dire assessments before. Some have even come from American military officers. But the President and his Administration are taking their cues from history; and their belief that an abdication of responsibility in Europe, could destroy the NATO alliance, and weaken America's position in the world. And even former military commanders, who have spent time on the ground in Bosnia, believe that argument has some merit.

General Louis McKenzie: With all due respect to NATO—and I served nine years in NATO—I mean, it is looking for a mission. And if it passes this one up, it might be a long time before another one comes along. So this is a defining moment for NATO, overworked phrase, but I think it is.

Steve Kroft: Is this a situation where the Europeans said, "This is too tough a problem for us to solve. Let's let the Americans do it?"

I think, Colonel Stewart, a lot of people probably are thinking that.

Lt. Colonel Bob Stewart: Yeah. I think it's possibly true. I mean, quite frankly, I don't care. Really, I don't care who leads. But pray to God, someone does, and we get something done. I don't care.

Lt. Colonel Bob Stewart: All I want—I personally, and I know General Lewis is the same, want peace restored to this area. We actually feel quite strongly about the place. We know that the vast majority of the people are crying out for the fighting to stop.

Steve Kroft: And finally, there is the moral argument; 200,000 people killed, 1.8 million driven from their homes. Does the world's last superpower have a moral duty to end the suffering? Is there a chance that the Serbs, the Croats and Muslims really are finally tired of the bloodshed.

General Louis McKenzie: There's a whole bunch of things involved here, just in addition to doing the right thing. I mean, there's the American political process which is unique. There is NATO looking for a role. There's a country that self-destructed over the last three years, and is looking for some help. There's a whole bunch of very brave non-governmental organization working their butts off in the former Yugoslavia, delivering medicine and food, et cetera, et cetera, and all that comes together in Dayton, with three people that we agree we don't trust.

BOSNIA: QUESTIONING THE CLINTON

PLAN . . . BUT SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS!

Republicans don't question the President's authority, as Commander-and-Chief, to send U.S. troops to Bosnia. We do question his judgment. For an operation that will place American lives at risk, the "Clinton Plan" for Bosnia is fraught with difficult-to-swallow Administration "assurances" and too many unanswered questions. However, as much as we may disagree with the President's decision, there should be no mistake that Republicans will strongly support our troops once they are on the ground.

The Process—The President's promise to send 25,000 U.S. ground forces to Bosnia was made in an ill-conceived and off-hand remark more than two years ago. It became a commitment in search of a mission. Clinton made this promise without gaining the support of the American people and before consulting Congress. As a result, both Congress and the American people have been shut out of the process that now involves sending American men and women to Bosnia. This problem is highlighted by the numerous polls indicating close to 60 percent of Americans continue to disapprove of the Clinton plan to send U.S. troops to Bosnia.

U.S. Troops As Targets—There are inherent problems with using American soldiers as "peacekeepers." As Washington Post Columnist Charles Krauthammer has written, "If you are unhappy with the imposed peace, there is nothing like blowing up 241 Marines or killing 18 U.S. Army Rangers to make your point." The lessons of Beirut and Somalia are simple—when the United States, the world's only remaining superpower, sends troops to unstable regions of the world, they immediately become targets for those seeking either attention for their cause or retribution for past events, such as NATO-led bombings.

Can U.S. Peacekeepers Remain Neutral?—The Clinton Plan calls for U.S. forces to act as neutral enforcers of the peace while the U.S. also helps arm and train the Bosnian Muslims so they will be able to defend themselves once American troops leave. This scenario, however, ignores the role America played prior to this peace accord. It was American planes that bombed the Bosnian Serbs into submission in order to force them to the bargaining table.

As for arming the Bosnian Muslims, the Clinton Administration contends that the Bosnians need arms to defend themselves once American forces leave. But if peace has broken out, and the American "enforcers" are no longer needed, exactly who will the Bosnians be defending themselves from? The fact that the Clinton plan recognizes that the Bosnian people will need to defend themselves from the Serbs once the American forces are gone illustrates just how illusory this peace really is.

Is There Really a Peace?—While peace may exist on paper, it is unclear as to whether it exists in the hearts of the Balkan people. Recent news reports indicate that the peace plan is not receiving a very enthusiastic endorsement from the Bosnian Serbs, especially those living near Sarajevo. And it is still unclear to most Americans why 60,000 heavily-armed, combat-ready soldiers are needed to "enforce" a "peace" agreement.

The Clinton Plan Is Poorly Defined—Before our troops are fully deployed, Republicans will continue to insist that the President outline a clear and achievable objective and define what encompasses a successful mission. Finally, the President needs to develop an exit strategy that is more comprehensive than the simple goal of having our troops home in one-year.

Republicans Support Our Troops—While Republicans continue to question the wis-

dom of the President's decision to send U.S. forces to Bosnia, we understand that it is a foregone conclusion that they will go. Indeed, close to 1,500 troops have already begun to arrive in the former Yugoslavia. There should be no doubt that Republicans will unconditionally support our troops once they are in Bosnia. We will make sure our troops have every resource available and as much leeway as they feel they need to defend themselves should they be attacked. Again, there should be no mistake: Republicans will support our troops in Bosnia and we will continue to work to ensure their safety throughout this mission.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE: WE SHOULD NOT SURRENDER THE DREAM

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have 10 days left on our countdown until the budget deal is made. Ten days left, and it appears certain that there will be some great disappointments among a majority of the American people. The majority will be swindled by this budget deal, but I am here tonight to send a message that we should not be discouraged.

The budget deal that is going to be made is not a surrender, it is a retreat. It is temporary. The dream and the vision of the American people to have a better society, a society which makes use of all of the resources of our tremendously rich industrialized economy should not be surrendered. It still can be realized.

Last year we drove for a while, for the first two years of the Clinton administration, toward a national health care plan. The national health care plan's dream was to realize universal health coverage for the first time in the United States of America. Most of the industrialized nations of the world do have universal health care coverage, or something close to it.

Because of the fact that the legislation which is before us now, the legislation which is likely to be agreed upon, the negotiations dealing with the legislation and the appropriation when it is all finished, we will be a long ways away from that universal health care dream.

We should not surrender the dream though. We should only understand that it is a temporary stalemate. It is a retreat which we continue to insist that this country is rich enough, this country has the resources, and the people of this country deserve a national health care plan which guarantees health care for all who need it.

□ 1945

That is a next step in our civilization that we should not ever turn our backs on. The fact that the deal is going to be made and we are going to be far short of that should not deter us. The deal will be made and no matter what it is,

it certainly will leave us without universal health care coverage.

I only hope that we are not so far away that it may take us another 10 years to regain the territory that we lose. I only hope that we do not lose the Medicaid entitlement. The Medicaid entitlement is the first step that was taken 30 years ago toward health care coverage for all who need it. If we lose the Medicaid entitlement, if we no longer are willing to say to every poor American that if you are in need of health care and you are poor, you qualify by a means test, which tests whether or not you really are eligible, if you qualify, you get the health care coverage, you get taken care of. You are not left to die. You are not left without a nursing home, if you cannot afford it. Medicaid pays for health care for poor families, but Medicare also pays for most, two-thirds of Medicare goes for nursing homes and the care of the people with disabilities. So people with disabilities and the elderly who need nursing homes are as much beneficiaries as poor families of Medicaid. So we should not forget that. The Medicaid brings us closer to the realization of universal health care than any other Government program in health care. If Medicaid entitlements are lost, we will experience a great setback. So step one is to hope that in the negotiations which grow more questionable each day, there is less to negotiate with as the days go by. We had the defense appropriation as part of the negotiation at one time and as long as the President did not sign the bill, we were waiting for him to veto the bill, then you had the possibility of a \$7 billion process there, \$7 billion that the President clearly felt was not needed. It was not in his budget, \$7 billion which represented things like the B-2 bomber that everybody agreed we did not need.

We had the flexibility of at least starting negotiations with \$7 billion on the table that could be transferred from wasteful defense expenditures to expenditures that were more meaningful in education or health care, et cetera. That is gone. The defense bill has become a part of law. The defense appropriation now has been, sort of by default, since the President did not veto it, the time period lapsed and now that is off the table. So without a doubt, we are in a little weaker position than we were before the defense bill was allowed to pass through.

That is why I say that as we move toward the deadline of December 15, every day of the countdown brings us a little closer to a situation where we are weaker than we should be. And, therefore, the outcome is inevitably going to be a dissatisfactory one. It is going to be a disappointing one. It is only a matter of how much are we going to give up, how much are we going to hold on to.

Whatever the outcome is, we should insist that it is only a temporary setback. It is only a retreat. It is not a total defeat. We will not surrender. We

will insist that we come back and, when the Democrats regain the House of Representatives in 1996, health care will be back on the table. We will move again toward universal health care coverage. It cannot be surrendered. We cannot envisage an America which does not care about the sick, an America which does not care about the elderly and what kind of nursing homes they have. We have to insist on maintaining that standard for our civilization. We have to get back to the fight, and we have to get back to it with gusto.

The majority have made it clear that they do not want to retreat on health care. The majority have made it clear that they do not want the Medicare and the Medicaid cuts. More than 70 percent of the people have said that they do not want the health care cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. The majority have said they do not want cuts in education. The majority have said they want the President to veto many of the bills that he has already signed, but certainly those that are left, basically the health, education, and human services budget, certainly the one they most of all want him to veto.

The majority has made it pretty clear that they think that the movement of the Republican majority to dismantle the programs that were created by Franklin Roosevelt in the New Deal and by Lyndon Johnson in the Great Society, the rapid movement of the Republican majority to dismantle and to wreck these programs, the majority has indicated they do not agree with. They do not think that this kind of extremism is necessary. They do not accept the artificial crisis that has been created.

The majority have made it clear that they are not on board and they are very much against this. Yet it sort of creeps forward because that is the way our Republic works. The people who have been elected can ignore the majority for a while. They can get away with it.

So I want to just reaffirm the fact that we need health care for every American. We can have health care for every American. The country can afford it, and we should not accept whatever happens when the deal is finally completed as being final.

Health care in many cities and many areas of the country right now is already undergoing some drastic changes for the worse. Even while the debate is taking place and no final decision has been made about what funds will be available and what new rules will be in place, health care systems are being dismantled in rural areas. Health care systems are being drastically changed in urban areas. And in New York City, there is a great dramatic change taking place now. Health care administrators in large numbers are leaving. Restructuring of hospitals is taking place. Super HMO's are being developed to swallow up small HMO's.

All of it represents a great deal of energy, a great deal of change, which has

very little to do with the improvement of health care. The restructuring is all about how the funding will take place. The restructuring is about who will make profits. The restructuring is about how will you save money by giving the patients minimum service and maximizing the profits for the providers.

It is a very unfortunate situation. There was an article that appeared in the New York Times on Friday, November 3, which I think sort of sums it up, "Can Someone Save My Hospital," is the op-ed article's title. The dismantling of New York City's health care system has already begun.

The mayor has a plan to privatize and drastically change the hospitals. They are going to be closing city hospitals. Many of the city hospitals are getting ready to sell themselves or to be sold. HMO's are being developed that will compete with each other for patient dollars.

I will just quote from this article, "Can Someone Save My Hospital," by Gary Calcutt who is a physician. He is medical director of a special care AIDS clinic at North Central Bronx Hospital. And one paragraph in his article reads as follows:

This plan will no doubt take some time to carry out, but in fact the dismantling of the city hospital system is now underway. Because of State Medicaid cuts and a reduction in city subsidies, the Health and Hospitals Corp. has had a budget shortfall of \$950 million over the last 2 years, forcing it to slash services and to cut personnel. Twice in the past year nearly all the agency's employees have been offered a severance package. The second buyout offer in May was accompanied by a letter from Dr. Bruce Segal, who was then president of the Health and Hospitals Corp., strongly urging employees to take the severance package in order to avoid layoffs. The agency's managers must approve each layoff but in North Central Bronx Hospital, I don't know of any employee who has been denied a severance buyout. This has led to devastating losses in some crucial departments.

He goes on and on. I have had my constituents come to me and say, look, you must come and visit Kings County Hospital. I go there quite often, but they wanted me to make a special visit and walk around in various departments and look around carefully. They said, you can visit, you can see the chaos, you can see why patients are bound to be suffering because the chaos is so great; the overworked personnel are so obviously tired. There is so much, the morale is so low until it is visible. And they were right. You could feel it in the hospital. You could feel that this hospital is no longer the way it once was.

I have been there many times. Kings County Hospital has a history of being one of the finest hospitals in the Nation; 40 years ago people came from all over the country to be treated at Kings County Hospital, a public hospital. But now it is in chaos, and it may be in better shape than many of the city's hospitals.

So the process has begun. The suffering has begun. But I am saying we

should not surrender. I am saying that this too must pass. When the budget deal is made, we should not surrender. We should not give up on health care.

We should not give up on education. We know already that the Federal Government only pays a small percentage of the total educational bill. The total funding for education, over \$360 billion the last year, is borne by State governments and local governments. The Federal Government is responsible for only about 7 percent of the bill. So when you look at the cuts in education and you say that there is \$4 billion cut in 1 year, it is a large amount to cut from the Federal budget. I think it is a 16-percent cut. But it does not represent a 16-percent cut across the Nation in education expenditures by itself.

But what has happened is the Federal Government's cut, its statement that education is of less importance, the Republican majority's indication that education is of less importance, that we pay lip service to the fact that education is an investment in the future of the country, education guarantees that young people will be able to survive in a very complex society, they will be able to qualify for the high technology jobs created, we have all of the rhetoric on both sides, Republicans, Democrats say the same thing. But the Republican majority has indicated they really do not believe it.

If you can make cuts of that magnitude at the Federal level, you send a message down to the State levels and the local levels. So they have begun to cut, too. In New York City, the school system has been cut by almost \$2 billion over the last 2 years. New York City has almost a million students, and the budget at one time was up to \$8 billion for the million students. But those drastic cuts have taken place so you have obvious hardships.

When the school term started last September, 8,000 youngsters in the New York City high schools had no place to sit. Right now there are classes of 40 and 45 students. And there are still problems with just getting places for children to sit. An editorial recently in the New York Times talked about the fact that every time it rains, the New York City schools literally wash away. You have the rains going through the crevices of the old buildings and the sand and the cement is drained away. The bricks start to fall. So after every rain you have large numbers of bricks falling from these old buildings. So the New York City schools are literally falling down. There is no hope in sight in terms of new construction because the budget cuts in construction preceded the other cuts.

All of this is taking place in education. But I say, we should not surrender. We should not accept the fact that the Federal Government is retreating in this one budget. Which is under the control of the Republican majority. We should hold onto the dream that the Federal Government, although it never will play a major role in funding of education, it has a role to play. It never will play the predominant role but it has a major role to play.

The Federal Government still is the only place where you are going to have

any long-term research and development to improve schools. The Federal Government is still the only place where you are going to have the kinds of financing for higher education that you need, infrastructure of colleges and universities are in deep trouble, updating of equipment of colleges and universities. There are a number of things that need to be done on a scale that will require help from the Federal Government. Otherwise, the help will not be coming. Private industry and private donations will not be able to do it, and certainly States and localities will not be able to do it.

We should not surrender and say that it is never going to be done by the Federal Government. We should not say that we are forever going to have B-2 bombers that are not wanted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense does not want it. The President does not want it. We are going to forever continue to fund B-2 bombers and neglect education.

We should not surrender and believe that that is going to happen. I do not think it is going to happen. The majority want education to be made a priority in the expenditure of Federal funds and Government funds at every level. The majority will ultimately prevail.

□ 2000

We must hold on and understand that the fight has just begun, the public opinion has just begun to manifest itself. They are just waking up here in Washington to the fact that the American public means it when they said that education is a top priority for Government expenditure, they mean it when they say that health care is a top priority. It is not just an idle piece of energy thrown away when people reply to polls. They are replying to polls and telling them the truth, we mean it. Education ought to be a top priority. Right now it is No. 1 in the polls; health care, No. 2. From week to week they rotate, they alternate. Health care and education clearly are No. 1 priorities. If the decisionmakers here in Washington, if the Republican majority, respected the majority of American people, then certainly we would not be in this dilemma.

So the majority should not sit, but the majority should not give up. They should wait, and in the process of waiting we should assert ourselves. The majority should continue to make certain that the public opinion polls register what you believe.

In the process of continuing the fight I think I cannot stress too often that there is a bedrock basic piece of information that we should always fall back on. We should not accept the theory that America is in a state of fiscal crisis. We should not accept the notion that the country is about to go bankrupt, that Medicare and Medicaid cannot be funded. We should not accept the notion that the Federal Government will go bankrupt because it helps poor people. All of this is just not true.

We should understand that there is a problem, there is a problem in terms of taxes being too high for individuals with families, and we should deal with

that problem. There is a problem of waste in Government, and we should deal with waste wherever waste is. The waste is in the B-2 bombers that nobody wants. The waste is in the CIA that continues to spend at the same level it was at during the cold war while it does more and more harm.

Mr. Speaker, the CIA is one example of an agency that ought to be streamlined and downsized before it does more harm. The CIA's latest revelation about the incompetence and the evil of the CIA has been manifest in a "60 Minutes" expose of a fact that the CIA had on its payroll the head of the organization in Haiti called FRAPH.

FRAPH is an organization that demonstrated, and brought guns and terrorized the pier in Haiti when the first ships were sent to Haiti with Canadian and New York City personnel, New York State—I mean United States personnel, some police from Canada and police from the United States, and engineers from the United States Army were supposed to be the first peaceful contingent landing in Haiti, and that was part of a peaceful plan that had been agreed to at Governors Island. But they were greeted on the docks by this demonstration of men with guns who roughed up the Embassy officials from the United States Embassy in Haiti, and they made all kinds of threats, and the *Harlan County* ship decided to turn around and not dock at the port there in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. They did not dock because the intelligence that we received was that that group that was demonstrating on the dock was a very dangerous group. The intelligence that came from the CIA was that great harm would come to American personnel and Canadian personnel if they had landed that day. That was what the CIA said.

Mr. Penizullo, who was then the President's envoy for the Haitian problem, he was dealing with the Haitian problem. He insisted that it was just theater, that this group had no depth, that there was no danger from this group, and that the *Harlan County* should go ahead and dock, we should proceed with the implementation of the Governors Island agreement as we agreed upon it. But the CIA insisted that, no, this group represents a real threat, great harm could come to America forces, and since this incident was following the Somalia debacle where 18 Americans have lost their lives in Somalia, the President accepted the advice of the CIA and ordered the *Harlan County* to turn around. So you had a great American ship being turned around by handful of thugs in the Port-au-Prince harbor because the CIA had said that those thugs represent a large armed threat.

The CIA insisted on this, and it turns out that all along the CIA knew better. The CIA knew because the leader of the group that met the *Harlan County* ship in the port was on the payroll of the CIA. They knew who Emmanuel Constant was because Emmanuel Constant had been recruited by the CIA, and the CIA had its own policies separate from the White House's policies and programs, and the CIA thwarted the first peaceful attempt to restore the legiti-

mate Government of Haiti to power. That peaceful attempt, if it had been allowed to go forward, would have saved the United States at least a billion-and-a-half, maybe \$2 billion, because a year later almost exactly a year later, the liberating forces of the United States went into Haiti, 20,000 strong, armed with equipment, et cetera, because of the fact that the first plan, a peaceful plan which would have cost much less, would not have involved large amounts of troops, and equipment, and et cetera. That plan had been thwarted by a group that the CIA knew was a very small group because they had recruited it and they had the head of the group on the payroll.

Emmanuel Constant is now in prison here in the United States. Emmanuel Constant has confessed and told all as to how he was recruited, how he was urged to run for President of Haiti, and I believe the story 100 percent. The CIA of course has not denied it; they just have no comment. They do admit that they sometimes hire people in foreign countries to get information from them. The implication is that Emmanuel Constant might have been on the payroll of the CIA, but all they wanted from him was information. There was no further plot to undermine the legitimate Government of Haiti.

I cite this one example as just one more of several examples I have cited over the past of blunders of the CIA which are costly and also dangerous. I need not go back and tell the story of Aldrich—and recount the story of Aldrich Ames. Mr. Ames is in prison now.

Mr. Ames even recently, with all of his arrogance, wrote a book review on a spy novel, and the book review was in, I think, the Washington Post, a book review of a spy novel where he chastises the author of the novel as being an amateur, et cetera. I found it sickening that a man who was in prison as a result of serving for 10 years as a Russian spy; you know, he was in charge of CIA spying on the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, and he was in the employ of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. They admit that at least 10 agents lost their lives as a result of Mr. Ames' betrayal of his country. There is nothing lower than a traitor, you know, and I cannot see how this traitor is now being allowed in prison to write book reviews and to parade his ego over the pages of the media showing what a smart guy he is.

But Aldrich Ames was there for 10 years. Aldrich Ames was not detected despite the fact that he was an alcoholic, he used the CIA safe houses for his trysts, his rendezvous with his women. He did all the things wrong that you are not supposed to do, even failed a lie detector test, and still the CIA did not detect that he was spying for the Soviet Union. He had a bank account which allowed him to own very

lavish homes and cars, something he could never afford on the CIA salary, the CIA on his salary of course, but who knows what the CIA has paid. All things which affect CIA are secret, so you really do not know what was paid, but it was agreed that Aldrich Ames really did not earn enough money to have the kind of luxurious lifestyle that he had.

Despite all that, alcoholic, betrayal of CIA codes with respect to sex and safe houses, lavish living, he was only accidentally sort of discovered, and of course there are still revelations about the harm that was done by Aldrich Ames. Not only did at least 10 agents die as a result of his betrayal and his activities, but we now know that he passed on information from some of the agents that were in question that was not correct information, and he led the United States Government to expend large sums of money on various activities, probably like star wars, and counter warfare, submarine warfare, and a number of things that were based on information deliberately fed to our Government to make our Government spend money on activities to counteract Russian achievements in military hardware which did not exist.

So in every way Aldrich Ames is an example of a blundering CIA that not only is costly, but is also dangerous.

The other example I have given of the CIA blundering is the fact that they discovered that the CIA had a slush fund, a petty cash fund, of at least \$1.5 billion. Everything is secret again, but we know they confessed, and the press has pretty much established that it was at least \$1.5 billion in petty cash or in an account that was treated like a petty cash account that nobody knew about in high places. The Director of the CIA did not know about the petty cash account, and the President did not know about the petty cash account. How can you have a fund of \$1.5 billion and it not be known in the circles above you, the supervising circles that are there? Who had it and where are they? Who was put in jail as a result of harboring this \$1.5 billion slush fund? And if they had a \$1.5 billion slush fund that nobody knew about, the likelihood that they were also at the same time had more money and were misusing funds is great, but of course, everything is secret, and we still do not know exactly what happened.

I am only giving this example as an example of a place where there is obvious waste, there is dangerous waste, and, if you want to save money, then downsize the CIA, streamline the CIA, cut the budget of the CIA. It is just one example of many where you can cut the budget appropriately.

So we should not surrender, we should not admit, that it is impossible. We should not accept the big lie that it is impossible for America to ever provide health care for everybody, you

cannot have universal health care in America. You can have it in Germany, you can have it in Japan, you can have it in Italy, you can have it in France, but you cannot have it in America. You can never have education paid for all the way through 4 years in college as they have in France or a few other nations. You cannot have that in America. We are too poor. Do not accept that big lie no matter what happens in the budget negotiations and where we end up on December 15.

I am saying the majority of the American people, the great majority out there, people who I call the caring majority, should never accept this. The dream should not be surrendered. We should just understand it is a temporary setback and we will continue. We will continue the quest for Federal involvement in education at every level, we will continue the quest to guarantee that our society provides maximum opportunity for all and that we also meet the threat of a changing economy which requires job training and readjustment for large numbers of people.

I wanted to talk about continuing the process of forging ahead and not accepting the temporary setback without having to use my chart tonight. I think you probably have grown weary of seeing the chart which reflects a large part of the answer to the problem of both the deficit and the excessive taxation of Americans. I hope you have not grown weary because it needs to be branded into the memory of every policymaker in America. It needs to also be clearly branded into the memory of every American voter. There is a basic story told by this chart, and whereas I wanted to sort of take a recess and not bring it tonight; today I read an article in the New York Times. I was a little late in reading the Sunday Times, and I read an article which really upset me greatly, and I in the process of reading that article determined I have to go back one more time before this session is over and explain this chart.

I have to explain the chart because the writer of the article in the New York Times; it was Sunday, December 3, and the name of the author is Keith Bradsher; it is not a op-ed page article, so I assume he is a journalist, a reporter, or an analyst for the New York Times. He chose to write an article about Democrats and Republicans and how we have created the deficit together over the last three decades.

□ 2015

The title of the article is "Deficit Partnership," and the subtitle is "The Republicans and the Democrats Dug the Budget Hole Over Three Decades."

As I read the article, I could not help but boil with fury because of the fact that here is a very long-winded analysis. They use a large chart here showing over a period from 1965 to 1995, a 30-year period, what happened. A lot of thought has obviously gone into the article. Why a journalist, an analyst of this caliber, maybe he has some economic training, why or how he can discuss this problem of the deficit over a 30-year period and not deal with the whole problem of revenues and the problem with the fact that the American people were swindled in the methods used to collect revenues. He talks only about expenditures.

The Republicans and the Democrats dug the budget hole over decades. He talks about how Republicans and Democrats together have increased the expenditures. He does not talk about what happened with the revenues and how, while expenditures were increasing for various reasons, some of them good, a great drop took place in the revenues; and the revenues did not drop in the area of personal or individual and family income taxes, the revenue went up in the area of individual and family income taxes.

The revenue dropped drastically in the area of corporate income taxes. The story of the great drop in corporate income taxes as a percentage of the revenue collected by the Federal Government is a story that nobody wants to tell. The New York Times reporter, analyst, journalist, whatever he is, does not want to talk about it. You will not find the commentators on television, the talk show hosts, nobody wants to talk about the fact that taxes in 1943, and I did not go back as far as he went and this article went back, actually this article went back to 1965, 30 years; 1943 goes all the way back, World War II was still underway in 1943. The income taxes being paid by corporations were up to 39.8 percent, almost 40 percent, while the income tax being paid by individuals and families was 27.1 percent. I have gone over this many times, but you just have to get the red bar and the blue bar clearly focused in your mind in order to understand the nature of the great swindle that took place.

In 1943 corporations were paying 40 percent of the burden, the income tax burden, but in 1983, 40 years later, the corporations are paying only 6.2 percent of the tax burden. Only 6.2 percent of the income tax burden is being borne by corporations, and the individual's share of the taxes has shot up from 27.1 percent to 48.1 percent. That was the highest point of taxes on families and individuals. This was when Ronald Reagan was in his heyday on his trickle-down economics, the rising tide will lift all boats, and if you will cut the taxes for corporations they will create jobs, and those jobs will fuel an economic revolution, a miracle, and everybody will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, individuals and families did not benefit. They ended up paying

more taxes. They paid 48.1 percent of the taxes in 1983, while corporations dropped to an all-time low of 6.2 percent. Now corporations are up, up from 6.2 percent to 11.2 percent, which is, thank God, a slight increase, but individuals are still up at 43.7 percent.

We have Mr. Bradsher discussing the deficit partnership and how the deficit took place, and at no time does he talk about this dramatic change that took place in the tax structure, in the burden, the percentage of the tax burden that shifted from corporations to individuals. How can a learned journalist, analyst, economist make such a discussion without discussing the obvious? If the physical sciences, physics and chemistry, proceeded in the same way, we would probably be 30 or 40 years behind in our technology. If you take a major factor in a discussion and ignore it completely, then you certainly cannot be said to be participating in any scientific reasoning process. You certainly be said to be proceeding in a logical manner when you just leave out a great portion of the argument.

Mr. Bradsher is intent on blaming both Democrats and Republicans. I would concede that from the beginning. Whatever has happened in America over the last 30 years, 40 years, it certainly has been both Democrats and Republicans. Yes, in 1983 Ronald Reagan was President and that is why you have corporations' share of the income taxes go down to an all-time low of 6.2 percent, but Democrats were in control of the House Committee on Ways and Means, where all tax policies originated, so if we had a scandalous situation where the income taxes for individuals and families went up to 48.1 percent while the taxes for corporations dropped to 6.2 percent, then both the hands of the Democrats who controlled the Committee on Ways and Means and the Democrats in the House who voted for it are dirty in this situation where the American people as a whole, the great majority, were swindled. This is something that I would concede.

Mr. Bradsher, from the very beginning, I would say yes, the Democrats and Republicans were both guilty. My problem is not with that assertion. The problem is why do you go on and on and you do not even mention the fact that there was a great revolution taking place in terms of the shifting of the tax burden.

I am going to read a few paragraphs, excerpts from Mr. Bradsher's article:

Democrats in Congress have repeated for years the mantra that President Reagan pushed the deficit out of control by cutting taxes while raising military spending.

Democrats have said that. That is true.

To continue with Mr. Bradsher, though;

Republicans have recited just as regularly the view that Democrats voted for ever-larger deficits during their 40 years of control in the House.

The deficits did get larger, but when Jimmy Carter left office, it was less

than—it was around \$70 billion per year versus when Ronald Reagan left office, it was almost at \$400 billion per year, the deficit. But he is right, the deficits did get larger:

Among experts who have studied the history of American budget deficits, there is fairly broad agreement that both sides are partly right. Neither party has clean hands, and the slower economic growth over the last 20 years has made the situation worse. The current budget negotiations between the Republican Congress and a Democratic President, stalled in large measure over handling the deficit, are a reminder that the budget policy of the United States is made by compromise.

Yes, that is true. Some of the biggest decisions that continue to feed the budget deficit were made by Republican Presidents with Democratic Congresses, notably during the Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan administrations. He goes on to point out what I have just already conceded, that both Democrats and Republicans were guilty. But all Mr. Bradsher discusses in terms of the creation of the problem is expenditures.

He talks about the fact that—

There was a competition between the Republicans and Democrats at one time on expenditures for the elderly, a rivalry between Richard Nixon and Wilbur Mills. Wilbur Mills was the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means who made a brief bid for the Presidency in 1972. That rivalry between Nixon and Mills contributed to the decision to increase payments to Social Security recipients by 15 percent in 1969, by 10 percent in 1970, and by 20 percent in 1972. In each case the administration advocated a generous increase, and the Congress added a little more.

I am not going to criticize the Congress or Nixon for the increase in Social Security payments. They were far too low. I think that is an example of expenditures going up that was very badly needed. The expenditures were far too low for Social Security recipients who were in very dire straits, and that increase was certainly a noble increase, a reasonable increase, a justifiable increase.

As Medicare and Social Security costs have grown they have squeezed out Federal spending on other programs like transportation and education. Medicare and Medicaid expenditures, however, were raised when the Congress and the Presidents competed in terms of increasing expenditures in the area of expanding Medicaid to include pregnant women, pregnant women who were not necessarily on AFDC, the elderly in nursing homes, and all those expenditures were added to Medicare after it had first been created.

I would not quarrel with the Democrats or the Republicans for adding those uncovered people who were very important to the Medicare Program. Those expenditures I think were justifiable. All of the expenditures that are cited in terms of domestic discretionary expenditures in this article are not necessarily justifiable, but 90 percent of them are. He is talking about

expenditures for people, expenditures as an investment in education, an investment in health care, an investment in programs for the elderly.

If he were talking about expenditures for *Sea Wolf* submarines or for F-22 fighter planes and for star wars, then he would be talking about expenditures that we could have done without. If he was talking about expenditures for the CIA and the intelligence operation on a large scale after the cold war was over, then I would say he was talking about expenditures that we could certainly do without.

The point is that Mr. Bradsher goes on and on about expenditures and never does he once cite the fact that a revolutionary change in revenue collection took place, that we fell in our revenue collection from 39.8 percent for corporations and went up to 48 percent for individuals in 1983. Even now, in 1995, after some adjustment was made by the Clinton administration, corporations are paying only 11.2 percent of the total tax burden and individuals are paying 43.7 percent.

Why is this important? Because this is the bedrock of the dilemma that we face. This is where you end as you go backwards in the discussion to its foundation. The agreement that is going to finally be made by the Democratic President and the Republican-controlled Congress is going to have to do something about the question of tax cuts. Who will get the tax cuts is the question, or should anybody get tax cuts? That is the question that emerges from the editorial pages of more and more newspapers. We are down to a situation now where if you are going to have a balanced budget in 7 years, then you have to surrender the tax cut.

I am a Democrat. I am described as an old-fashioned liberal, but I think the American people ought to get a tax cut. I think you ought to have a tax cut for families and individuals. I think the tax cuts proposed by President Clinton that were related to education are very much appropriate. I think the tax cuts proposed which relate to children are very appropriate, if you were to rewrite them in a way which allows families that do not owe taxes to also benefit.

To rewrite the Republican tax bill would be almost impossible. I think you could build a compromise on President Clinton's tax cut proposals. Those tax cut proposals would give some relief to the American families and individuals who have financed the cold war and gone through quite a bit, and saw their taxes rise from 27 percent in 1943 to 48 percent in 1983, and to 43 percent, almost 44 percent, today. They deserve some relief. Individuals and families should get a tax cut. When all is said and done and the deal is made, individuals and families need some tax cut. It ought to be the individuals and families who are at the lowest levels in the economic strata, the middle-income and lower-income people, who get the tax cut.

At the same time, you cannot balance the budget unless you deal with the fact that everybody insists on ignoring, and that is that corporations have gotten away with a big swindle. If you follow the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, you can raise this 11.2 percent by first ending all subsidies to corporations by the taxpayers. We have a situation where taxpayers' moneys are used to subsidize corporations in certain activities. You can raise this amount by getting rid of those subsidies. You can raise the amount again if you close tax loopholes, starting with the loopholes that deal with foreign corporations.

□ 2030

Foreign corporations have advantages that our own home-based American corporations do not have.

There are a number of loopholes that can be closed which have been developed over the years, with the help of the Committee on Ways and Means and Ronald Reagan, primarily, while he was in office. Those loopholes can be closed now. If we merely raise the corporate share of the revenues from 11.2 percent up to 16 percent, we could lower this 43.7 percent, at the same time we raise the corporate up to just about 16 percent, and thereby give a tax cut.

When we do this, according to the calculations that were accepted using CBO figures, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget shows, we do not have to cut Medicare and we do not have to cut Medicaid. We do not have to cut Medicare and we do not have to cut Medicaid, and we can increase education.

The dream does not have to be surrendered on universal health care. We can keep the entitlement for Medicaid, and we can go further in terms of an additional amount of involvement of the Federal Government in education.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget increased education by 25 percent. The President says that he wants to increase education by even more. Over a 7-year period, he talks about an increase of more than \$40 billion in education. I have not figured the percentage on that, but the President is on course. The President is following the rhetoric of both the Republicans and the Democrats.

We all say that education is an investment in the Nation's security. Education is also an absolute necessity if our economy is to be able to compete, and what the President is doing is following the rhetoric and the philosophy and the ideology instead of ignoring it, although both parties have expounded along the same lines.

Education was deemed a priority by Ronald Reagan. He was the first one who sounded the trumpet and said, we are a nation at risk if we do not act to revamp our entire education system. Ronald Reagan was the one who led the way. George Bush followed by saying he wanted to be the education presi-

dent. He called a conference and set forth six goals. Bill Clinton was at that same conference. He continued what George Bush started.

So why are we on the verge of a \$4 billion cut in education for the next budget year? Why are we on the verge of a tremendous 20 percent or more cut in education over a 7-year period?

We can give that up. We do not have to have those cuts. If we were to take a look at the hard facts of what has happened in America from 1943 to 1995, we would see that we have allowed ourselves to be swindled.

The share of the taxes paid by corporations could go up and nobody would suffer. Wall Street is booming. Everybody has indicated that we are in an unprecedented growth period. The Dow Jones average is above 5,000. A record-setting pace has been established.

So who is making the money? The corporations. The red bar is where the action is. The red bar is where the money is. Why did Slick Willie rob banks? Because that is where the money is. If we want to revitalize the American economy, then the revenue should come from the bustling sector of the corporate world where the money is. That is where we can solve the problem of the deficit: We can give a tax cut, and at the same time we can avoid the draconian cuts in programs.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to destabilize the whole society. We are refusing to recognize that poor people need health care, poor people need education.

We have a problem with the minimum wage, that I talked about last time, which does not contribute to the deficit at all, has very little to do with this chart, except if we were to increase the minimum wage, the profits of corporations would go down a little bit. However, at the same time, we would benefit greatly by having to expend far less on unemployment compensation and various other benefits that are provided to poor people, food stamps, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, in short, I want to conclude by saying, we are 10 days from a final budget deal, and the outcome of that deal is going to be disappointing. We expect our Democratic President to make certain that we do not have a total debacle. We will not have a Dunkirk; we do not expect to surrender the Philippines. There are a lot of terrible things that will not happen, but it is going to be disappointing, it is going to be a temporary setback.

The important thing to remember is that the majority of the American people have already made it clear in the public opinion polls. They do not think that we have a crisis that merits the draconian cuts that are taking place. They do not think that we need to move against the elderly and cut Medicare. They do not think we need to move against the poor who are sick and cut Medicaid so drastically. They do not think we need to throw away our

education policies of the last two decades and desert public education or desert higher education.

All of these draconian moves are being made by people who have a vision of America which is an incorrect vision, a vision that is not the vision of the majority of the people. The caring majority knows that their welfare and their best interests lie in rejecting these cuts.

That is why the polls clearly show that at least 60 percent of the American people want the cuts to be vetoed and rejected. At least 70 percent of the American people do not want Medicare and Medicaid cut.

If we were to follow the common sense of the American people, they would make the budget cuts in the areas where there is real waste instead of insisting that the defense budget be increased by \$7 billion while we are cutting the education budget by \$4 billion. They would insist that we cut the CIA and obviously wasteful agencies instead of making the cuts in the area of Head Start, summer youth employment programs, and Medicaid.

The current majority knows that the Medicaid entitlement means exactly what it says. People are entitled to health care if they are poor; if they pass a means test and they qualify for the service, they are entitled to health care, the legislation that is before the President now. The appropriations bill before the President will take away that entitlement.

We have already almost lost the entitlement for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and now on the chopping block we have the entitlement for Medicare. We should not surrender that entitlement. Everything possible should be done. Everybody should make certain that they register their opinions and that they communicate with their Congressmen and the President and the White House, everybody, to let it be known that one clear indication of a giant step backwards that cannot be accepted by the American people is a surrender of the entitlement for Medicaid. We will not surrender that entitlement.

However, even if there should be a catastrophe happening and we have a loss of that entitlement, I am here to say that it is only a setback, it is only a retreat. The majority will win in the end. We should get our forces and begin to reassemble and march on toward the dream.

America can have universal health care; America can have a budget which is a budget which seeks to take care of the interests of all of the people. This is the richest nation that ever existed in the history of the world. There is no reason why every American cannot have opportunity and decent health care, and we dedicate ourselves to that purpose, no matter what happens on December 15.

BOSNIAN CONFLICT IS CIVIL WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss my opposition to sending our troops to war in Bosnia. As one of the new freshman Members, I do not pretend to have the experience of our earlier speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who has traveled to many of these areas and has much knowledge about our military.

I am a country boy from a small town in Indiana of 700. I come here on behalf of common-sense Hoosiers who are very concerned about what our President has committed us to do. I want to make a couple of general comments first before plunging into some specifics.

The first and core question is, is sending ground troops in our vital national interest? I think not. The primary question regarding the United States role in Bosnia is whether this is a civil war or is an act of aggression between two sovereign nations.

This conflict is a civil war because the Bosnian Serbs are fighting with the Bosnian Moslems and the Bosnian Croats over political control, power and authority. Since the conflict is a civil war, there is no legal obligation for the United States to get involved.

President Clinton even admitted the conflict in Bosnia is a civil war in an interview with Rita Braver of CBS News on April 20, 1994, stating the President of the United States as follows: "I think this is a civil war in the sense that people who live within the confines of the nation we have recognized are fighting each other for territory and power and control. It is clearly a civil war." That is not a Republican stating that; that is the President of the United States.

Although the United States has numerous interests in a peaceful resolution of the Bosnian war, for example, ending the atrocities, preventing further human rights abuses and ending the suppression of minority groups. Much of this, I think, is coming out of a heartfelt concern for those who are hurting in other nations and watching the terrible torture. The conflict does not in fact threaten our national security.

Given the terrible nature of war, I am supportive of sending troops into combat situations only when there is a vital national security interest at stake and when a clear military objective is achievable.

So then the next question is, has the President provided a clear mission or exit strategy, which will place our troops in imminent danger because he has not provided such a mission or strategy. He has promised to commit at least 20,000 troops. We have heard 30,000, but it appears to be 20,000 here at the beginning, before an agreement was reached, instead of designing a

plan that could coordinate troops with this specific goal. In other words, it was a mission looking for a purpose.

Clinton's implementation force has no clear mission. In theory, they are poised to act as buffers between warring sides, and in reality, they are targets for snipers. His is an arbitrary time period for exit and not a national exit strategy, which means anybody who wants to wait out the last months can do that. The potential for United States troops becoming targets for those who have no interest in bringing peace to the area is simply far greater than any national security interest in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell a local story that has ties to northeast Indiana. Marine Lance Corporal Jeff Durham of Fort Wayne, who graduated from Blackhawk High School, was involved in the rescue of Air Force Captain Scott O'Grady. The 20-year-old Durham and other members of the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit were awakened on board a carrier in the Adriatic Sea around 3 a.m., were briefed, and departed for a mission 2 hours later.

Jeff was on board a backup helicopter which was prepared to defend the rescue team against the enemy if things went wrong. Their mission was to get between the rescue chopper and the enemy. Fortunately, O'Grady made a clean escape and the Marines did not have to get out of the chopper.

We may have a voluntary army, but it is wrong to view our troops as missionaries or use them in missions that do not have clear American interests at stake.

I know that the people of Fort Wayne and Jeff's family do not consider him a disposable asset, a mercenary just to be thrown around in the process of pursuing whims by our President. I also believe we have shown that there is strong congressional and public opposition to sending ground troops.

The House has voted on three separate occasions in opposition to United States involvement in Bosnia. In the DOD appropriations bills, the original House-passed bill contained the Neumann amendment by MARK NEUMANN, a fellow freshman from Wisconsin, which will restrict the use of funds for deployment of United States forces in Bosnia without the prior approval of Congress. It passed by a vote of 294 to 125 on January 7, 1995. In conference, this was modified twice to become a nonbinding provision and then was dropped completely.

By the way, many of us who opposed that DOD Conference Report the first time, one of the three main criteria that we opposed it on was the pulling of that Bosnia language.

Part of the agreement that came out of that was H. Resolution 247, which expressed the sense of the House that there should be no presumption by the parties to any peace negotiation that the enforcement of any peace agreement will involve the deployment of U.S. forces and emphasized that no