

House and Senate read this piece, and consider the value and benefit that the B-2 offers our national defense.

[From *Forbes* magazine, Nov. 6, 1995]

KEEP THE B-2 PROGRAM ALIVE

(By Caspar Weinberger)

Whether to continue production of the B-2 stealth bomber, the world's most advanced aircraft, is an issue that creates strange alliances. Many proponents of a strong defense favor terminating the B-2 program, leaving us with only the 20 aircraft already paid for. A second group favor making the required expenditures now (roughly \$500 million) that would enable us to resume production of the B-2 should international conditions require it. This would be far less expensive than closing the production line and having to start it up later. A third group, small in number, believe we need more B-2s and should continue production on a low-level scale.

The second group's approach is the most reasonable, practical and necessary. The B-2—the world's only stealth bomber—is, as even one of its strongest opponents admits, "a technological marvel . . . widely praised by our highest-ranking military leaders." But few people seem to understand just how good, how revolutionary, this stealth bomber is and what it adds to our ability to keep peace and freedom.

Of course, the word "stealth" does not mean the plane is invisible. But when the B-2 is at high altitudes, where it flies when delivering nuclear or conventional bombs, it is virtually impossible for any existing or projected defense system to detect it on radar, and it therefore is invulnerable. Two B-2s with a total crew of four can deliver a bombload which, if dropped from conventional planes, would put the lives of 132 crewmen at risk. In the Gulf war's first hours, 45 sorties by stealth fighter F-117s struck almost as many Iraqi targets as did 850 sorties by conventional aircraft. In the first 24 hours of Desert Storm, we sent 1,263 conventional aircraft to strike 144 major targets. Thirty-two B-2s could have attacked the same number of targets—and more effectively because of precision weaponry—in less time.

The debate turns on whether we need this astonishing capability now that the Cold War is over. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), a skilled and effective advocate of a strong defense, believes that we no longer need a "large fleet of stealthy, long-range, nuclear delivery aircraft." He also views aircraft carriers, submarines and other weapons as better serving our national security needs because they are "visible, forward-deployed forces," enabling us to "put our capability on peaceful display"—a good deterrent in and of itself. McCain makes the point that, although the B-2 can carry conventional weapons, having it do so is not cost-effective at a fixed price of \$556 million per aircraft. Each additional B-2 will use scarce defense budget funds, precluding necessary modernization and replacements for the trucks, tanks, other aircraft, artillery and ships that will be needed shortly. These are understandable, reasonable arguments.

It seems to me, however, that events over the last several years have demonstrated conclusively that we are going to need the B-2's capabilities. The Gulf war exemplifies why we need to be able to project our military power over vast distances quickly and effectively. It would be nice—but scarcely safe—to believe that there will be no more Gulf wars or events that will require such capabilities. But, for example, we are committed to the defense of two other potential hotspots: Taiwan and South Korea. Should the U.S. be called into action, the B-2 would be extremely useful. It serves us well to re-

member that the more strength we have, the less likely it is that we will have to use it.

In any event, the ultimate question of whether we need to buy more than the already-ordered B-2s need not be decided now. What we do need now is the option to acquire more later and the ability to exercise that option without the staggering costs of re-starting production. If we terminate the B-2 production line now, we virtually preclude securing any more of those remarkable aircraft in the future.

We should instead agree to use the funds in the Defense appropriations bill to procure some of the parts necessary from the B-2's nearly 3,400 suppliers, thereby keeping the line open for later low-level production. General John Loh, former commander of our Air Combat Command, sums it up well: "I see the B-2 as the centerpiece of . . . [a] strategy that places increasing importance on projecting immediate, responsive power from the U.S. to a regional crisis anywhere in the world."

INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE WATER SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

HON. MICHAEL D. CRAPO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1995

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to preserve the authority of the States over waters within their boundaries, to delegate the authority of the Congress to the States to regulate water, and for other purposes.

Since 1866, Congress has recognized and deferred to the authority of the States to allocate and administer water within their borders. The Supreme Court has confirmed that this is an appropriate role for the States. Additionally, in 1952 the Congress passed the McCarran amendment which provides for the adjudication of State and Federal water claims in State water courts.

However, despite both judicial and legislative edicts, I am deeply concerned that the administration, Federal agencies and some in Congress are setting the stage for ignoring long established statutory provisions concerning State water rights and State water contracts. The Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Federal Land Management Policy Act, Endangered Species Act Recovery Plans, rangeland reform, and proposed wilderness legislation have been vehicles used to erode State sovereignty over its water.

It is imperative that States maintain sovereignty over management and control of their water and river systems. All rights to water or reservations of rights for any purpose in States should be subject to the substantive and procedural laws of that State, not the Federal Government. To protect State water rights I am introducing the State Water Sovereignty Protection Act.

RECOGNITION OF JUDE HARRINGTON

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, far too often the work of the men and women who are charged with preserving our Nation's natural resources goes unnoticed. These individuals, many of whom dedicate their lives toward maintaining America's treasures are rarely recognized for the importance of the service which they provide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to such an individual from my own congressional district, Mr. Jude Harrington of Huntingdon, PA. A native of Pennsylvania, Mr. Harrington began his career with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1980 as a student intern with the Pittsburgh district. He received a bachelors degree in parks and recreation from Slippery Rock University in 1982. After graduating from Slippery Rock, Jude has served the corps at several different locations and in the process has earned a solid reputation as a man of integrity and conviction.

Since 1992, Jude has served as the supervisory ranger for Raystown Lake. His work at the lake has enabled it to become one of the largest tourist and recreation attractions in my district. In fact, last year 1.3 million people traveled to rural Pennsylvania to visit Raystown Lake. Mr. Harrington's primary responsibilities at Raystown are centered upon the management of the lake's natural resources and recreation programs.

Recently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers selected Jude Harrington as the national resources management employee of the year. The corps handpicked Jude out of a field of a possible 1,200 candidates from across the Nation. They recognized what we in the Ninth District have known for years, that Jude Harrington is the best of the best when it comes to natural resources management. His work on behalf of Raystown Lake is a testament to both his love for the area and his commitment to the preservation of natural resources. I will close by thanking Jude Harrington for his service to Raystown Lake and congratulating him on being recognized for this honor which he richly deserves.

THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995. As the name implies, this package of reforms outlines a clear path to a balanced budget in the year 2002. We promised the American people that

we would bring the budget to balance in 7 years, and today we plan to deliver on that promise.

While balancing the budget in itself is an admirable and worthwhile goal, our bill does much more. These provisions, taken as a whole, mark a clear shift in power from Federal bureaucrats to families, States, and communities, who know what works best for them. I had the opportunity myself to vote in Committee on many of the provisions included in the bill, and I commend my colleagues for their fine work in constructing the other reforms included in this bill.

I would like to outline some of the major items included in our bill.

As many already know, the Medicare trustees reported last April that unless Congress takes "prompt, effective and decisive action," Medicare will go bankrupt in 2002. Consequently, House Republicans have passed the Medicare Preservation Act of 1995, which has been included in this bill. This legislation will bring Medicare back onto solid financial ground by infusing it with the innovation and efficiency found in many private health plans. By giving seniors a wide choice of options, while maintaining traditional Medicare as one option, and by cracking down on waste, fraud, and abuse, we can ensure a strong Medicare Program well into the future.

Another major highlight of this legislation is the \$245 billion tax cut for American families. As included in the Contract With America, our bill includes a \$500 per-child tax credit, a reduction in the capital gains tax, and a repeal of President Clinton's 1993 tax on Social Security benefits. While President Clinton promised tax relief for the middle-class, and subsequently delivered the largest tax increase in American history, our bill delivers on our promise of needed tax cuts.

This package also incorporates the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, as passed by the House earlier this year. Simply stated, welfare has become a way of life for far too many recipients. By making it easier to collect a handout than to work, the current system has destroyed individual initiative and actually perpetuated poverty. A Contract With America priority, this pro-work, pro-family bill will reform our welfare system by providing a helping hand, not a handout, to the millions of Americans caught in this dead-end trap.

As some may know, the cost of Medicaid has been growing at the uncontrollable rate of nearly 10 percent a year, and eating up one-fifth of State budgets. Our bill includes Medicaid reform that will provide more money, fewer bureaucrats, and greater protections against fraud and abuse. With the help of our Nation's Governors, Republicans have developed a plan to block grant Medicaid funds to States in the form of new MediGrants. Given this new flexibility States will be able to design innovative, cost-effective programs targeted toward their specific needs and populations.

In our continuing effort to make Government both smaller and more efficient our bill includes language, which I personally shepherded through the Commerce Committee, to abolish the Department of Commerce. While our bill will maintain the Department's legitimate functions, such as the census and statistical recordkeeping functions, we eliminate the unnecessary and duplicative functions for an estimated \$7 billion in savings.

Another issue that I was personally involved with was the spectrum auction. Our bill will ex-

pand the auction to raise an additional \$15.3 billion over 7 years. Having been an early proponent of the spectrum auction, I am pleased that revenue raised by auctioning radio spectrum, which was previously given away for free, will now be used to balance the budget.

Other meaningful reforms included in our bill include: The creation of tax deductible personal medical savings accounts, the closing of corporate tax loopholes, public housing reforms to eliminate duplicative programs, terminating the overly bureaucratic and costly Direct Student Loan Program, and the adoption of a taxpayers' bill of rights.

I believe that it is time for these reforms, because the American people deserve more than higher taxes and a bigger, more bureaucratic Federal Government. This bill represents much more than your average yearly spending reconciliation plan, it represents a blueprint for the future. Under our plan Americans will have more in the family budget, greater control over the workings of their Government, and the peace of mind that their children and grandchildren will live in a debt-free America full of opportunity.

THE 7 YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2425, and to speak on behalf of our communities, hospitals, and the health of today's and tomorrow's senior citizens. If we are to bring about Medicare reform which will prove to be truly beneficial, we must first reach a consensus that reforms must achieve specified goals without creating new, more difficult problems.

In the Pittsburgh area alone, there are seven hospitals which would face almost certain shut-down as a result of these proposed cuts. This situation is certainly exacerbated by the elimination of disproportionate share payments to these hospitals. It is neither prudent nor logical to make devastating cuts to Medicare in such an arbitrary fashion. The sound thinking, hard-working people of western Pennsylvania and across this country will tell you that putting the cart before the horse will get Medicare nowhere fast.

It has been documented that both proposals we are considering today, H.R. 2425 and the Democratic alternative, will result in the Medicare trust fund being put on sound financial footing through the year 2006. However, the Democratic alternative saves \$90 billion, all of which is put back into the Medicare system, while H.R. 2425 cuts \$270 billion, far more than is necessary, simply to help pay for huge tax cuts we cannot afford.

A recent national poll shows that 72 percent of those polled oppose Medicare cuts being made to pay for tax breaks. One has to question how making major cuts to Medicare in a

quick fix effort to fund tax breaks could be construed by anyone as fiscally conservative.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the ill-conceived and reckless cuts called for in this bill which will not only shake the current foundation, but will cause irreparable damage to the health of American senior citizens in the future.

NO WELCOME MAT FOR
MILOSEVIC

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, instead of rolling out the red carpet this week for Slobodan Milosevic, the Clinton administration should hand over the Serbian President to international investigators for his alleged role in war crimes perpetrated in the former Yugoslavia. Having ignited the firestorm of extreme Serb nationalism which has consumed most of Bosnia and part of Croatia, Milosevic is now being enlisted as a member of the Clinton administration's fire brigade assembled to douse the smoldering ashes in its aftermath.

Milosevic, who has earned the title "Butcher of the Balkans," has reincarnated himself, in the eyes of the Clinton administration, as a peacemaker despite the fact that he was named a suspected war criminal by Secretary of State Eagleberger during the final days of the Bush administration, and that he heads a government being sued for genocide before the International Court of Justice. The Clinton administration views the Serbian leader as the one who can deliver the Bosnian Serbs in support of a United States-brokered peace plan which will effectively divide Bosnian-Herzegovian along ethnic lines.

Is he really a new peacemaker or is he after something else? I fear the latter is true. Reeling under the devastating impact of economic sanctions imposed in 1992 by the U.N. on Serbia for its role in the wars in neighboring Croatia and Bosnia, Milosevic is keen to cut a deal which will pave the way for the sanctions to be lifted. I am not convinced he has given up on his dream of creating a "Greater Serbia."

The Clinton administration has embraced Milosevic as part of its full-court press to conclude a Bosnian peace accord, at almost any cost, as the presidential campaign season nears. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the fact that the President has finally begun to focus on the crisis in Bosnia. At the same time, I have reservations about the conduct of the current negotiations and am vehemently opposed to allowing Mr. Milosevic into the United States.

Despite the hype and new spins, one fact is abundantly clear—Milosevic was the mastermind behind extreme Serb nationalism which spawned mayhem in Bosnia and Croatia and ultimately has led to the murder of tens of thousands of innocent civilians in these countries. Warren Zimmerman, the last United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia has observed "nobody in Belgrade doubts that the war in Bosnia is being masterminded by Milosevic in collusion with his Bosnian Serb henchman, Radovan Karadzic." Zimmerman has characterized the Serbian President as a liar "almost totally dominated by his dark