

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to get their support, before the markup of the National Security Revitalization Act we reached out and made 32 specific changes in the bill. This was not some piece of legislation jammed down the throats of committee members. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we reached out, and over the weekend before the markup, made changes that Democrats offered to us to enhance the bill and to get their support for that particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in total, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman, allowed 32 separate changes to be made in the chairman's mark. Mr. Speaker, this was in fact a bipartisan bill, a bill that reflects our concern with the direction this administration has been going in terms of national security. We are going to have our debate on the floor, but to somehow attempt to mislead the American people, and there were so many distortions and half-truths that were spoken by our colleagues on the House floor, is a gross injustice, both to this institution and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance to get all those issues out on the table on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. I look forward to that debate, and I hope that the American people will also be watching the debate and the final vote on restoring our national security interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to speak to the issue of what the minority talked about as far as the majority not supporting national defense. I can remember being on this floor, Mr. Speaker, when the majority, or the now-minority, turned their backs on our men and women in Desert Storm, would not support them, and yet we had debate on that issue.

I can remember the first event that they brought up was homosexuals in the military, when the majority of military folks do not want homosexuals in the military.

I remember that most of that same leadership, all of the leadership, voting for Clinton's tax bill, which cut defense \$177 billion, and then also put the highest tax that they had ever had on the American people. They had increased the marginal tax rate of the middle-income taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I can look, and when Colin Powell and Dick Cheney and then-candidate Clinton said that anything below \$50 billion would put us into a hollow force, but yet these same Members that are now saying that they are hawks cut defense \$177 billion. Not a single Democrat at the Democratic White House fundraiser put a foot down when military men and women in uniform were serving as waiters. It would have happened at our fundraiser, I guarantee you.

I can remember at the extension of Somalia, we then in the minority voted against it, saying it would cost billions of dollars. Then I also look at how the policy was changed toward General Aided. General Aided is still there, by the way. Then we weakened our strength. Then they denied armor, and then we lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded. Why? Because the Democratic leadership would not support our troops.

Now they say that we are weakening national security. Twenty-two killed and seventy-seven wounded, with the father of one of those killed that received the Medal of Honor chastising the President.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is one of our experts on missile defense.

The gentleman is talking about H.R. 7, the Defense Revitalization Act, part of the Contract with America that is coming up in a day or 2 on the House floor. He is one of the few Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who has had the experience of being shot down by an enemy missile in his illustrious career in serving in Hanoi.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I don't know if it is illustrious, being shot down.

Mr. HUNTER. But he managed to get five MiG's before they got him.

I guess I would ask my friend, he has seen the language that places us square in the middle of the missile age. That is, it mandates that we develop theater defense against missiles, and we develop a national defense against missiles.

I would asked the gentleman, what is your feeling with respect to our timing? Do you think we are coming too early, too late? What is your opinion with respect to missile defense?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California, my first concern is yes, I believe looking at Desert Storm and the other, that we need to support missile defense. However, I want to tell the gentleman from California, which may not be the position that he wants, I look at the Air Force. They want the C-17, they want the B-12, they want the F-22, and they want F-15's, and the Navy wants to upgrade F-14's and the Air Force F-115's.

We need to take a balanced look and see how much money is available without taking from the other services. I support missile defense, but I think we have to be real careful with the funds available, and we are cutting down everything.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

With respect to national missile defense, what is the gentleman's feeling with respect to what the former Soviet States are doing, and with respect to what China and North Korea are doing?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the liberal side of the Democratic leadership would tell us that there is no threat from Russia, but yet the Soviet dropped five nuclear-class *Typhoon* submarines last year, that is five nuclear submarines, when we gave them \$1 billion to dismantle nuclear weapons.

They built a MiG 35, which is superior to the SU-27, which is superior to our F-14's and F-15's. They have an AA-10 missile which is superior to our Amram missile, so they are investing in those kinds of weapon systems, while ours are going down.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at what they are doing in pushing out the joint airplane, they are pushing out beyond the year 2010, when we have no chance of building up even to a Bottom-Up Review level.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

AMERICAN MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and then to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], to ask first the gentleman from Pennsylvania about his feeling with respect to H.R. 7, the Contract With America, regarding missile defense of the Nation and missile defense of our theater forces.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, in response to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] the Russians also, as we know, have been selling their submarines. They recently sold at least two submarines to Iran.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Two *Kilo* class.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And Iran has been doing very well in the training of those submarines, which presents a whole new threat for us, with Iranians having capability in the seas.

The question of our colleague and friend on missile defense is an important one. This President changed our policy from the Reagan and Bush era with absolutely no warning to this Congress, to say that we no longer need to have a defensive system to protect

the American people, in spite of the ABM treaty, which allows the Russians to have the only operational ABM system in the entire world right now, which surrounds Moscow and which is in fact operational.

□ 2250

What we are saying in the contract is we want the Secretary of Defense unlike what we heard from one of our colleagues on the other side today say that we want immediately a space-based system. That is not what the contract provision says. It says that we want the Secretary to come back and tell us what kind of national ballistic missile system we can deploy now.

In conversation with General O'Neill who heads ballistic missile defense last week and a follow-up meeting I am having this week, he says that at the basic we can install a program within 2 years that would cost no more than \$5 billion over 5 years. So the figures we are going to hear on Wednesday and Thursday are going to be way out of line and are going to be more rhetoric than they are substance.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for reminding us that the Secretary of Defense did say he could build a system for the type of attack that he expects in the context of expecting some type of an offense against the United States, what he calls a thin attack. He said he could do it for \$5 billion in a couple in years, and I think that the gentlewoman who propounded that question, our friend Mrs. SCHROEDER from Colorado was a little bit shocked at his low number, because I think she came back and said, "Wait a minute. What's it going to cost total?" And he said, "\$5 billion total."

In the context of the 5-year defense plan, that is roughly .004 of the total defense numbers, .004 of the budget. So that is not a number that is going to crowd out readiness or modernizing our military. The only thing that is going to crowd those things out is the President's budget itself. And the President himself has cut \$9 billion just between FY 1995 and FY 1996 in modernization. So the President is doing the cutting. One slap of the pen by the President cutting \$9 billion in modernization had doubled the impact on the modernization budget of building what Secretary Perry himself described as doable, that is, a missile defense nationally that will defend against the thin attack.

So if we are asked would you rather have a defense that will defend against a thin attack or nothing, but absolutely naked, I think the American people say, give us something, give us some missile defense against that accidental launch or that third-world terrorist attack.

I would be happy to yield to the fine gentleman from San Diego, my seat mate, Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think another important factor, and gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

WELDON] brought it up. When we brought this bill up in the committee, we had 41 Republicans and Democrats vote for it. Only 13 voted against it. I want to tell you, those 13, their politics would go good only in a small island off Florida.

I would also like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that the contract talks about not having U.S. troops under U.N. control. Very, very important. We lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded in Somalia. Because, for example, it took 7 hours for our troops to get to all those Rangers that lost their lives and were wounded because the U.N. control had never used night goggles, it was at night, many of them did not speak English, some of them could not even drive the equipment. We want to eliminate that, and that is another reason for bipartisan support.

The part that I am upset, the liberals that have done everything in their power to cut national security, to cut defense of this country now stand up and object at the majority when it is a bipartisan bill that is coming out of the committee itself, what same minority. We are glad that that leadership exists. Let them talk.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 33 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the Speaker for affording us this opportunity to address a subject which is extremely important and critical.

We have seen this week the opening of the markup in the subcommittee on the House Committee on Ways and Means of the welfare reform bill. We have had a lot of discussion about the issues surrounding welfare reform. Last week we saw the Republican version of their Contract With America with regard to family responsibility, and we saw also the response on the Democratic side with respect to what they would like to see in terms of a reform measure.

We are here tonight because we believe that voices of the women and children who will be primarily affected by what this Congress does in reforming welfare have not been heard and probably will not be heard from during the course of this debate. It is imperative that as we consider this legislation, we think of it in terms of the women and the children.

I am very happy tonight, at this very late hour, to be joined by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who has been a great leader on this subject and whose voice continues to be heard for the women and children of this country. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii for

yielding me the time and thank her for arranging this special order.

I would just like to enter into a discussion with you and raise a couple of concerns that I have and perhaps have you to explain your knowledge of the Personal Responsibility Act.

If the block grant goes, and it appears that we are going to have that structure for a number of programs that are going to be put in a basket called welfare reform that will allow different ways of providing services. I am particularly concerned about the nutritional part.

Let me first say, I support welfare reform. I think our welfare system does not work well. It does not encourage self-sufficiency and we need to make sure the system works well for the recipients as well as for the government itself. So we need welfare reform. But we do not need welfare reform just for change sake itself. We need it for a better system, for a system that is improved, a system that is obviously going to serve people better.

In the areas of nutrition, we are not necessarily perfect but those are areas where we help people. We have food stamps, the school lunch program, we have the WIC program, the commodity program, the senior citizens program, all of those programs which speak to the needs certainly of people who are in need but also speak to needs of people who may be working.

For the food stamp program, 20 percent of the food stamp program is received by persons who are working families. My concern is if we block-grant that program, not only do we drastically reduce the amount of moneys that will be available but also we put the States themselves into the business of setting national nutritional standards. These programs have worked well to make sure children are fed and are prevented from disease.

If now we block-grant it, does that not mean that each State would have the responsibility of setting nutritional and dietary standards for the implementation of those programs.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. Not only will the States be given the responsibility of setting up the criteria and the eligibility standards, but indeed they could move the moneys around within that category and, as I read the legislation, even take out 20 percent from one block grant to put into another program.

Mrs. CLAYTON. So it is possible that all that money would not go to feed the hungry, feed children or seniors, they could do other things with it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Exactly. They could do other things with it. It seems to me that in the area of nutrition in particular, Congress has been very, very careful in looking at the needs of specific groups of individuals in our society, children in the schools for school lunch, senior citizens in their centers, in congregate dining programs and