

they can move into the work force in high-paying jobs.

Every student in that senior high whose goal it was to have a good job came out well-trained with more job opportunities than there were students to fill that. These are not kids that are starting at minimum wage, but far above that. Their opportunities and their benefits are proof of the success that program has.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to talk to the House today about what works and what does not.

□ 1400

NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would start out my discussion today, I want to talk a little bit about national security, but I thought I would start out the discussion today, since MFN, that is most-favored-nation treatment for China, trade treatment for China, is at issue and we will be discussing and debating this issue on the House floor, there is a lot of commentary on it right now, I thought I would start out today with a statement that was made, apparently by the NFIB or one of our other good groups that wants to continue this trade relationship with China, and presumably this \$40 billion annual trade deficit that we suffer at the hands of China, one of their statements was, gee, if we cut off China, we are not going to get any Tickle Me Elmos because apparently Tickle Me Elmo is made in, of course, Red China. It is made in China and presumably some of the slave labor that makes some of the textiles in China also makes Tickle Me Elmos.

I thought that in light of what the Chinese are doing with the \$40 billion trade surplus that they enjoy over the United States, that means they get \$40 billion in hard American dollars for things they sell us in excess of what we sell them, when we do all of our trading at the end of the year, they have got 40 extra billion dollars in their bank accounts that we do not have in our bank account because they enjoy a trade surplus over us. That is largely because the Chinese have a massive tariff for almost every American item.

Of course, they enjoy virtually free access to the American market. But they make Tickle Me Elmo. It is made in China. One of our good trade groups said, gee, we will not have any more Tickle Me Elmos and should we not be upset about that because we want our children to have a nice life and having a Tickle Me Elmo presumably is a real illustration of quality of life now.

But here is the reason why we should not care whether or not we get a lot of Tickle Me Elmos or other toys from

Communist China. They are taking that \$40 billion and they are going to their friends, the Soviet Union, former Soviet Union, now the main player is Russia, and they are buying military hardware. They are buying a lot of this hardware and aiming it at guess who, the people that provided the dollars in the first place, the good old Americans. They are using this 40 billion extra dollars a year to arm.

That means they are not only building these, this is a missile destroyer that they just purchased from Russia, it has one purpose and that is to kill American carriers. That means killing the 5,000 uniformed sailors who are on board an American carrier as well as the attending ships in the battle fleet formation. This was designed by the Russians with their surface-to-surface missiles, their N-22, their SSM, their 44 SAN-17's and their SAM's and their four point defense systems and their 130 millimeter guns and their helicopter. That has one job in mind and one purpose, and that is to destroy American surface ships.

The Chinese are able to buy these now from the Russians with hard dollars. They did not used to pay hard dollars. They would give IOUs and they did not get very much of that, because they were a dollar short. They were cash strapped. We have now given them all kinds of money from these doggone Tickle Me Elmo sales and dozens of other commodities that we now purchase from them. And they are buying weapons and they are aiming them, their nuclear weapons, nuclear missiles are aimed at the guys, the American people who gave them the money in the first place. They are aimed at American cities.

So as we enter into this debate over whether or not we should continue to have these Tickle Me Elmo transfers with China, I would suggest that they are in reality a Torture Me Elmo transaction, because in the end the same young Americans, the people that we are trying to give a good lifestyle to now, our children, may face American technology. And in the least they are going to face military technology that was purchased with American dollars from their own parents on the battlefield, coming back our way, the bullets will be coming back at us. So when we put together this China policy, I think we have to look at a couple of things.

One thing is, by maintaining this beneficial trade relationship with China, when I say that I mean beneficial especially for China, we are making China economically strong. China is becoming very economically powerful. As they become economically powerful, it is our hope, of course, that they will have a benign leadership, a leadership which appreciates human rights, appreciates the rights of other nations on the earth to exist and will not have, not focus in the future on military exploitation and on an aggressive national security stance. We hope that but we do not know.

So the point is, we are making China strong economically and militarily with our dollars and we do not know where China is going. Incidentally, that carries me to a second subpoint.

We passed an amendment in the Committee on National Security. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] was here from Mississippi who was very instrumental in that debate, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO] and a number of other members of the Committee on National Security and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and we passed an amendment that prevents an arm of the Chinese Government, it is called COSCO, COSCO is not where you go to buy your lawn chairs, COSCO is the Chinese Ocean Shipping Corporation. And they have done a pretty smart thing. They have corporatized different arms of their government on the basis that good old Americans, Republicans and Democrats, are a little bit wary of the Communist army and other agencies that are centralized agencies in part of the Beijing Government, but if you call something a corporation, that makes us feel very comfortable because we are a bunch of capitalists and we like corporations.

So they have corporatized a maritime arm of their government. And that maritime arm is buying the U.S. Naval Base at Long Beach or leasing the U.S. Naval Base at Long Beach. Of course, the port reuse facility or entity, that is the Reuse Commission at Long Beach, when the Long Beach Naval Station got closed, were looking around for a beneficial use. When we put that law into place that allowed for some closing of military bases, we envisioned that there would be industrial parks and other types of development that would take the place of military activities on these bases. We never envisioned in our wildest dreams that a foreign nation, especially one that has nuclear weapons aimed at our cities, would want to lease one of our U.S. naval bases. But that is what they are doing with the 135 acre terminal at Long Beach. I think that is bad for a number of reasons.

I am glad to see my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on National Security, joining me.

There are a number of problems with allowing a foreign government to have such a large facility at a fairly strategic location like that. First, you can do a lot more with a 135-acre facility in terms of intelligence gathering than you can if you are just trying to intercept signals coming off a ship with your own ship. You have a permanent location. You are able to have bigger physical facilities to intercept intelligence.

Also presumably you have a pretty large staff of people. We know as a matter of record that the Chinese Government attends its industrial facilities around the world with intelligence

agents. So unless they change course and do something that they have not done before, they will have intelligence agents at this base at Long Beach, and presumably they are going to use them to gather intelligence on U.S. military activity and presumably also on the high tech industry in California.

Anyway, it is clear that China is on the rise, on the ascension in terms of its military buildup, its military apparatus, and it would be very wise for us, I think, to do two things. First, to be very wary about funding the buildup. Why pay for their arms buildup by buying a bunch of doggone Tickle Me Elmos and other things that we purchase from them? And second, let us make sure that our own national security is not on the descent. I want to tell you where we are at with respect to our security because most Americans do not know this.

When we won Desert Storm, here is what we had. We had 18 Army divisions. We had 24 active fighter airwings, that was our air power. We had 546 Navy ships. Since Desert Storm, since we saw those great pictures on television of us taking care of Saddam Hussein in short order, we have gone to this buildup or this force structure because we have actually built down. We have gone from 18 Army divisions in 1991 to 10. We have cut the Army almost in half. We have gone from 24 fighter airwings to 13. So we have cut our air power almost in half. And we have gone from 546 Navy ships to 346 so we have cut the Navy by about 40 percent in terms of structure.

Interestingly, we are down to the level that is just about where we were when on June 25, 1950, the North Koreans invaded South Korea. We had 10 Army divisions in those days. Within 3 days, the North Koreans had taken all of Seoul; that was the capital of South Korea. They were driving southward on the Korean peninsula. The peninsula looks a little bit like Florida. They almost pushed the Americans entirely off the peninsula. Pusan is a little port at the southern tip of South Korea. We were right at the southern tip there. And we formed the perimeter. We flew part of the 25th Infantry Division from Tokyo to try to stop them. They got torn to pieces. We flew in the rest of the division. The division commander got captured. We lost 50,000 people killed in Korea. That is just about as many as the Vietnam War. But we did that because we drew down our military strength so sharply after World War II that we were so weak that a third rate military power pushed us down in the Korean peninsula just a few years later.

So we need to rebuild national security. And we are going to be having the defense bill on the floor here in just a matter of hours. I think tomorrow it will be coming up on the floor. And I want to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] who has done a tremendous job heading the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

Let me say, before yielding to him, that our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has done a great job of taking a few scarce extra dollars that the Republican side of the aisle has put into the budget for defense, not enough of an increase in force structure to what I think it should be, but they have given a few extra dollars. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has allocated that money with only one direction to us. Try to make our national security apparatus stronger, try to get the equipment that the men and women in uniform need and try to see to it that we have the best in terms of quality of life for those men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

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

I cannot stay with him for the entire hour, but I appreciate his leadership, not just for this special order but for the leadership he provides on the committee and as chairman of our acquisition and procurement operations. He has done a fantastic job. I appreciate that. I know that the country does as well.

I want to follow up on his point about the perception of the American people that somehow we have dramatically increased defense spending over the past several years. Unfortunately, I think part of that perception has been created by the White House itself.

Let us go back. The gentleman talked about some of the things that have taken place in terms of cutbacks. Let me highlight a few other facts that our colleagues need to keep in mind tomorrow as we begin the defense bill.

During John Kennedy's era, that was at a time of relative peace, it was after Korea and before Vietnam, we were spending 9 percent of our gross national product as a Nation on the military. We were spending over 50 cents of every Federal tax dollar coming into Washington on the military, nine percent of our GNP over 50 cents of every tax dollar.

In this year's budget, we are spending less than 3 percent of our GNP on defense; 16 cents out of the Federal tax dollar will go toward the military in this next fiscal year, 16 cents and dropping. That does not take into consideration the fact that when John Kennedy was President, we drafted young kids out of high school. They were paid less than the minimum wage. They served the country for peanuts. They were not married. They did not have families.

Today we have an all-volunteer force. Our kids are better educated. Many of them are married. They have spouses. We have housing costs, health care costs, education costs. We pay them a decent wage. So out of that 16 cents that we are spending, a much higher percentage of that goes for quality of life. It does not go for exotic weapons systems. It goes to protect the morale

and the well-being of the members of the military and their families and loved ones.

We take those factors and then add in that we have had an administration over the past 5 years who has increased the level of deploying our troops to the highest level in the last 50 years. This President has committed our troops to more locations and more operations than any President since World War II. So we have increased costs with deployments that we did not budget for.

In fact, as the administration has put our troops in Haiti, which was hotly debated in this Congress, the problem is not just the increased costs that we have to pay for our troops to be there, but as the gentleman full well knows, we are also paying for the cost for the housing and the food of the other countries.

The President talked about how he has a multinational effort. What he does not tell the American people is the reason why Bangladesh sent 1000 troops is we are paying their housing and food costs. It is a great deal for them.

What the President did not tell the American people in the Balkans, when he committed us to get involved in the Balkans over in Bosnia, and I would say that the majority of the Members of this body did not disagree with our being a part of the multinational force, our problem was, why were we committing 36,000 troops to that theater on the ground and in the area when Germany, right next door, was only putting 4000 troops in and when the Japanese were not paying their fair share?

□ 1415

So the point is, as the defense dollar has gone down, as quality of life costs have gone up, we have seen a President who has overseen these cuts increase dramatically where we send these kids around the world, and also increase dramatically the amount of DOD money going for environmental clean-up. So the largest pot of money being used to clean up environmental sites in America is not the energy bill, it is not the commerce bill, it is not the bill to reauthorize EPA, it is the Department of Defense bill. And, as the gentleman full well knows, we are spending hundreds of millions and billions of dollars out of DOD's budget to clean up sites and to pay lawyers, which is the bulk of what we do.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, told me one month ago he was required in this fiscal year to request one-half of the amount of money he is spending on his total buying for all the Marine Corps on environmental costs. So he is spending one-half of his total buy just on environmental costs.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow me to reclaim for a second, that means when our Marines get back from places like Bosnia, places like Somalia, they have very little money to refurbish their equipment and get ready for the war.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Exactly.

Mr. HUNTER. Because if they do not do the environmental cleanups on places like Camp Pendleton, the commander goes to jail if he does not comply.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Right. So all of these factors have caused us to be put into an environment where we cannot meet the needs of our military. That has resulted in a decline of morale. That has resulted in problems in terms of funding.

I have been with base commanders who have not paid their electric bill for 8 months because they have had to shift money over to help the administration pay for deployments that they never budgeted for. All of this we have to deal with.

Now, for the past 2 years, the Republicans, supported by a significant number of Democrats who are our friends, this is a bipartisan debate in the Congress, the battle here is not Republicans versus Democrats. The battle here is this Congress versus a White House that is totally insensitive, in my opinion, to the military needs. We increased funding for defense for the past 2 years.

What did the administration do? They soundly and roundly criticized us. They said this money was going for what they called pork barrel programs, even though 98 percent of what we funded were requests by the services.

But what really offended me was former Secretary Perry coming in before our committee and testifying that they had stopped the cuts in the acquisition accounts. In effect, what he was doing was taking credit for the plus-ups that they had criticized us for putting in the year before.

Even more outrageous, and the gentleman knows full well this issue because he and I cochaired this hearing, we told the administration that in each of the past 3 years they were grossly underfunding our requests for national missile defense. We put extra money in and we were criticized.

What did the administration do the beginning of this year? Secretary Cohen, being an honest broker, came before the Congress and said, "Well, ladies and gentlemen, we made a mistake. We have underfunded national missile defense by \$2.3 billion."

So after the President submitted his budget, we were then given the task to go out and find the money that the President did not ask for, that we told him about for the past 3 years, to fund missile defense. So out of my subcommittee I had to eat a \$474 million plus-up just for national missile defense, to fund the shortcomings and the mismanagement of this administration.

On top of that, because they underfunded the intelligence budget, they asked me to also put up \$207 million of additional funding to fund the shortfall in intelligence.

On top of that, even though the President pounded his fist on the table

and said to the AIPAC members across the country that he was for the Nautilus program, and that he would fight to protect the Israeli people, he never requested funding for that very program. And as the gentleman full well knows, we had to go and find out ourselves by plussing up our own estimate of what the money would be needed to give the Department of Defense enough money next year to actually implement the cooperative program with Israel called tactical high energy laser. Once again, the administration committed to it but never asked for the funding to make it happen. All of these things we have attempted to deal with in this bill.

I say to my friends and my colleagues who will listen to the debate tomorrow that they should be very careful because we are in a very difficult time. We are having to make decisions in an environment where the administration is not giving us the leadership. They are causing us to spend more money than we have, they are causing us to stretch programs out, driving up the costs of those programs, and they are not working with us in a way they should be working with us for the betterment of our people and for our troops.

I would add one more point. The administration talks a good game about jobs and so do the Members on the other side. I heard some of my colleagues down here wailing about the loss of jobs in this country. And as my good friend knows, we do not fund defense because it provides jobs, we fund defense because we want to support our troops and because there has never been a country that has been attacked because it was too strong. We never want to lose that edge.

But over the past 5 years, under this President, something we have never heard the other side talk about when they have railed about NAFTA, when they have railed about this side of the aisle, is the 1 million men and women who belong to unions who have lost their jobs because of this President's cuts in defense spending. He has decimated defense in aerospace.

So the gentleman has had a million workers who belong to the UAW, the IAN, the building trades, all the major metal trades, and all of them have felt the impact of the downsizing. Most of those people are out looking for positions paying not even one-half of what they were making when they worked in the defense industry. Another important point about the impact of the defense downsizing and the impact on our industrial base that has occurred over the past 5 years.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for the dialogue that he has commenced with a lot of working people in this country to let them know how important defense is from an industrial base perspective.

I might mention that about 250,000 of those aerospace workers who lost their jobs, it is real, because 250,000 of them

lost their jobs in California as a result of the downsizing.

But I want to take the gentleman back, because first he has been our leader in missile defense, and his subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, is the place where we put our plans together for missile defense to defend this country and to defend our troops in theater, and we move out with those plans and try to build those systems over the years.

I want to start the gentleman at about 1986 or 1987, when the gentleman and myself put together a letter that we sent to the defense secretary or defense minister of Israel, and we told him that at some point in the near future Israel would be attacked with ballistic missiles, made in Russia, coming from a neighboring nation. In that case I think we suggested in our letter that that might be Syria. Turned out it was another nation, it was Iraq, but in fact that happened.

We urged Israel to commence a program, not of building fighter planes, because everybody builds fighter planes, to drop that Lavi fighter, but to make the centerpiece of the American-Israeli production agreement and cooperation to make that missile defense. Because nobody in the free world made missile defense, and at that time we did not do it.

Partly as a result of what we did, and I think also as a result of what our Secretary of Defense did at that time, and I think some good thinking on the part of Israel's leaders, they embarked on the ARROW program, which is one of their missile defense programs, and they have a certain sense of urgency, because they know life is real, missile attacks happen. They have moved out with some urgency and are having a pretty good program with ARROW.

I would like the gentleman, because he is the expert on missile defense, to walk us through our programs, our Navy programs and our Army programs, and let our folks know, the Members of Congress and the American people, where we stand on those programs. What is happening? And I yield to him.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his lead on missile defense initiatives.

This Congress, again in a bipartisan manner, Democrats and Republicans, have come together for the past 3 years, and the single biggest difference between our position on security and the President's is we have said we have to move aggressively in protecting our troops, our allies and our citizens. Two years ago we plussed up by a billion dollars in this area, last year by a billion. This year our bill calls for about \$800 million of additional spending.

Now, why do we do that? My friend and colleague knows the largest loss of life from a single incident that we have had, at least in the last 5 years, actually a little bit longer than 5 years,

was when we lost those troops that were killed by that incoming Scud missile in Saudi Arabia. It was horrible. These young kids never had a chance. What hit them? A low-class, very rudely constructed missile that Iraq fired into that barracks.

Mr. HUNTER. It was basically the Model T of missiles.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. That is right, the Model T.

We said as a Nation, never again will this happen to our troops. That is why the Congress gave the administration carte blanche. We said we would give them the money they needed, we would give them the resources, but they needed to give us a system that is highly effective, that will protect our kids wherever they are in the world.

What has been the administration's response? They now are projecting that they want to wait until 15 years after those kids were killed to deploy the first battery of that highly effective system that is now called THAAD, theater high altitude area defense system. We say that is unacceptable.

We provide the full funding for THAAD, but we go beyond that. We fund the Navy's lower tier program, because we believe, as the scientists have told us, that the best way to protect our troops and our allies and our people from the threat of missile proliferation, that the best way to do it is to have a layered approach.

The first layer is Navy lower tier, which provides protection against cruise missiles. Cruise missiles are now being built by over 20 nations. Over 75 nations in the world now have cruise missiles. Pakistan, India, Iraq, Iran, every country we can think of has cruise missiles that they can fire.

We are putting the funding in well above what the President asked for, but what the Navy requested to implement Navy lower tier as soon as possible. We have a promising capability, as my colleague and friends know, in Navy upper tier to give us a capability using the Aegis systems to allow us to protect our ships wherever they are and to provide a wider range of coverage against faster, hotter missiles.

We have funded that system to a higher level, again in line with what the Navy says they need to move aggressively, to see whether or not Navy upper tier offers us potential well beyond just protecting a fleet of ships, perhaps even becoming eventually a national missile defense system.

Now, while we have been doing that, funding Navy upper tier, Navy lower tier, THAAD, cruise missile defense, we have also funded a space-based sensing capability so that we can detect the moment that a rocket is launched so that we can activate a response.

Now, some on the liberal side would say we should not do that, that is destabilizing. The Russians have had the world's only operational ABM system in place since the ABM Treaty was signed back in 1972. It protects 80 percent of the Russian people around Mos-

cow and they have modified it three times.

The Russians, as my colleague and friends knows, have some of the most sophisticated missile defense systems they are now selling on the marketplace. In fact, the gentleman and I have had conversations that perhaps we ought to buy that system, because under this President we are never going to be able to deploy a decent, effective system.

General Lyles is on the record, and Under Secretary Kaminski, in charge of technology for DOD, said that we will not have a highly effective system under their plan to protect our troops until 2006.

Now, why is that such a priority for us? As my colleague and friend knows, we were told by the intelligence community that we would not have to worry about a threat to our troops or our homeland. They said we would see evidence of an aggressive testing program by an adversary like North Korea. We were told the No Dong missile of North Korea, with a range of 1,300 kilometers, would never threaten our troops because we would see it developing, so we could take our time.

Up until 1 month ago, when the world community saw North Korea deploy the No Dong missile system now. So that today, June 16, we have all of our troops in Japan, South Korea, and Okinawa at risk from the threat of a No Dong missile being fired at them, for which we have no defensive system that can shoot that missile down.

That is outrageous, and that is what this whole debate is about, giving us a capability that we know is there. It is kind of ironic that the administration now comes back this year and says to the Congress, "Well, we criticized you soundly last year and the year before on missile defense, but we guess you were right. We did underfund national missile defense by \$2.3 billion, and would you please help us find that money?"

But it really irritates me that it has taken us 3 years to convince the administration that they had in fact not had the facts on their side. Only because of the efforts of a bipartisan group in this Congress with the leadership of my good friend and colleague, joined by Members of the other side, have we been able to keep these missile systems in place to protect us.

While we have done that, as the gentleman knows, we are increasing funding above the administration to protect us against the chemical or biological attack. That is the Congress taking the lead, not the White House.

□ 1430

Three years ago we started funding money for chem-bio technology, for training our first responders. The administration followed us. We were the ones in the Congress that funded extra money for technology relative to information warfare above what the White House requested.

This Congress has been the guardian of the defense of this country for the past 6 years under this administration. Once again, we hope that our colleagues tomorrow will begin to understand why this has been so important and why we ask for them to join with us in a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. He has made an excellent statement. He gives us great leadership on the committee, and I look forward to seeing him tomorrow and seeing a lot of other folks who presumably will give us a lot of support also. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on national defense.

One thing that the gentleman said, I think, should be very well taken by the people who have put together national security, and that is that we should have the Boy Scout motto, "Be Prepared." Because we have a number of nations in the world that have nuclear systems right now and have missiles, and right now they may not have the political intent to do us harm, but political intent can change overnight. Political intent can change with one election, one coup, one dramatic change of direction by any of a number of countries, and we will then, right then, have to be prepared to defend ourselves.

The idea that this administration says that is not so, we do not have to start preparing until it is clear that somebody intends to do us harm, is an illustration of the fact that the folks in the administration have not read history books.

We were not prepared for Pearl Harbor. I asked a number of our intelligence agents, intelligence leaders to tell me the other day how many of them predicted the Falklands War between Britain and Argentina. None of them predicted that. Well, I went to something a little easier: How about the fall of the Russian empire, how many of them predicted that? None of them predicted the fall of the Russian empire. Lastly, I said, how many of them predicted the invasion of Kuwait? One said, before or after the tanks started rolling? I said, no, it has got to be after the tanks had started rolling. None of them predicted the invasion of Kuwait.

So we know this: We have had a lot of wars in this century; we lost a lot of Americans killed in action; we are going to have more wars. That is human nature. That is the nature of nations. It is the nature of some of the aggressors around the world that we will have wars.

The only question will be, will we be so prepared and so strong that other countries do not mess with us? We are not that strong at this point, and we need to turn it around.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the way out, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]

struck a note that I had to come back and respond, because he is raising very valid points here. When he talks about intelligence and how we decide how much money to spend on defense, it is supposed to be driven by the threat that we see emerging around the world.

Unfortunately, in many cases it has not been done in that manner. In fact, it has been basically a budget number given to us. But hopefully tomorrow, to my good friend and colleague, the Committee on Rules will allow me to offer one, and I have actually asked two amendments to be put in order, and the gentleman will know the importance of each of these amendments.

The reason why we have such a tough time convincing the American people on the issue, or the American people have been lulled into a sense of complacency, is that we have heard nothing from the bully pulpit except do not worry, everything is OK.

As my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] knows, this President on 135 occasions has made a speech that has the same phrase in it. He has done it 3 times at the podium in this room. He has done it on college campuses. He has done it before women's groups and national associations where he has looked this group squarely in the eye, squarely in the TV camera, and he said, "You can sleep well tonight because, for the first time in 50 years, there are no long-range missiles with nuclear weapons pointed at America's children."

Now, he has made that statement 135-some-times, and most of our constituents, since the President is the Commander in Chief, think that he probably knows what he is talking about. My amendment says one very simple thing: Mr. President, certify to the Congress the facts that bear out your statement. Certify to us that you can document that there are no long-range ICBM's pointed at our children. Certify to us how long it takes to re-target those missiles, which we have been told in hearings takes about 30 seconds, some have said 10 seconds. And certify to us that if a missile is taken off of targeting, that when that missile is activated it reverts back to the original targeting pinpoint, which would mean it would be aimed at an American city.

The President, as my good friend knows, cannot certify that. Because we have heard testimony over and over again that we do not know whether or not Russia has taken its missiles off of activation in terms of targeting our cities. We cannot verify that. But the point is that when the President says that over and over again, that drives the mood in this country that there is no longer a threat.

The second issue is one that is becoming increasingly important. As my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], knows, I work Russian issues aggressively and advocate engaging the Russians. But there has been a project in the Ural Mountains that Russia has been working on

for 18 years. They built a city of 65,000 people right next to it. The site is called Beloretsk 15 and 16. And this site, we just do not know what it is for. They actually have mined out over 18 years a monstrous underground complex.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would hold for a second, that complex is bigger, as I understand it, than the District of Columbia.

Mr. WELDON. That is right, it is exactly bigger.

Mr. HUNTER. All underground.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. All underground. There have been articles in the London Times and the New York Times and there have been over 30 articles in the Russian media about this project.

When I was in Russia, my 10th visit to that country, 3 weeks ago, I met with Minister of Atomic Energy Mikhaylov, I met with Minister of Natural Resources Orlov, I met with Boris Yeltsin's top assistant, Boris Nemtsov, I met with the Deputy Defense Minister Mikoshin and I met with the No. 2 guy in the general staff, General Manlov, and I asked each of them about this project and I said, we need to have some transparency.

The response was, each of them knew about the project but none of them would claim that it was their project. In fact, Mr. Mikoshin said to me in front of five Members of Congress, "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Congressman, I know of that project, and I do not like that project. But to get further information, you have to go directly to Boris Yeltsin."

Now I could tell my friend and colleague, I have had all the briefings that we can get as Members, classified at the highest levels. We do not understand what is going on there. If you read the Russian media, in 1991, General Zyuganov, who was in charge of this project, said that it was an ore mining project. In 1992, General Zyuganov said that it was a facility to store food and clothing. Since that point in time, the Russian security apparatus has identified this project as one that is of strategic importance, that is one of the highest security that exists in Russia today.

My point is, at the same time that we have a President and an administration trying to create a feeling that there is no longer a concern, we ignore the fact that there are things going on in the world, not just in Russia, the transfer of technology from China, the M-11 missiles, the ring magnets, the chemical-biological technology, the Iraqis taking accelerometers and gyroscopes from Russia for long-range missiles. All of these things are happening, and not in a vacuum, and yet we have a President that is telling the American people, do not worry, there is nothing to be concerned about.

In fact, he is even going so far as to basically ignore the enforcement of the arms control agreements that he maintains should be the cornerstone of our

relationship. He has waived the sanctions under the MTCR with China. He has waived the sanctions under the MTCR with Russia time and again. So even though the administration claims arms control agreements are the critical component of our bilateral relationships, there is a pattern here of consistently waiving sanctions that should be imposed under them.

The reason why I mention all these things is because the administration is driving a feeling in this country that creates a false sense of security. As my friend knows, we are not advocating that we resort to the cold war again. In fact, we are doing more with Russia than any Congress has done in the last 50 years proactively. But we want an administration to work with us, to be candid, to be honest and forthright.

We get none of those things in this administration. In fact, we have gotten little or no cooperation on strategic programs that we feel are important, that our Joint Chiefs feel are important to our long-term security.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for yielding on those couple of points I wanted to also add.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], so much for his words. I hope they will be well taken on the floor tomorrow.

Let me go back to what we actually have in terms of a defense apparatus that he spoke so eloquently about. As I have said, we have gone from 18 to 10 Army divisions, 24 to 13 fighter air wings, 546 Navy ships to 346, all since Desert Storm.

Now what does Congress and what does the President owe to the American people in terms of national security? According to the Constitution, the President is the Commander in Chief. The Congress is charged with raising the navies and the armies necessary to defend America. Well, what is that?

Well, over the years, we have come to the conclusion that we have to be prepared to fight two wars almost at the same time. The reason we have to be prepared for that is because if we get in a conflict in Korea or in the Middle East and we get our military tied down in that area, there is a chance that somebody else on the other side of the globe is going to look at that as an opportunity to do something, like invade South Korea, for example, or do something else along that line. So we have to be prepared to fight two wars at about the same time.

Now, we have folks in the Pentagon, great folks, great minds, civilian and military, doing war games all the time and trying to figure out what it is going to take, how many people do we need, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, how many planes, tanks, ships do we need, what type, how much ammo do we need to fight that two-war scenario. They are supposed to put that all together and come up to us with a

bill for it and say, here is what it is going to cost, Mr. Congressman, Mr. Representative, Mr. Senator, Mr. President. Here is what it is going to cost to defend the American people, our number one obligation.

So we have said, well, it has got to be a two-war requirement. We have to have the ability to fight those two fights at the same time. Well, what are those two fights? It is interesting because two of the wars that we think are the most possible, the most probable, are wars we have already fought. We fought on the Korean peninsula starting June 25, 1950. We fought Desert Storm on the sands of Iraq after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. We fought that war.

I want to tell my colleagues what it took to fight both those wars. First, in Korea we used seven Army divisions. That is seven. In Desert Storm, we used eight Army divisions. That is eight. Eight and seven is 15. The Clinton administration has cut our Army divisions from 18 to 10. So we have the prospect of fighting two wars that used a combined 15 Army divisions, and we only have two-thirds of that strength. We can go right down the list with respect to air power and with respect to U.S. Navy requirements and we are short. We are short of fighting the two-war scenario.

I looked at Louis Johnson's testimony. He was then the Secretary of Defense in 1950, just a couple months before North Korea invaded the South. And I see a lot of the same words that we see coming from this President's administration back then. Louis Johnson did not seem very alarmed. He had no idea that a bloody war would start in about 4 months. He said things like, "We are turning fat into muscle. We are getting a lot of people from behind their desks and putting them in the field. We are creative. We are innovative." He had a very pleasant and, I think, a very optimistic view that he presented to the U.S. Congress.

We asked Omar Bradley, then General of the Army, five-star General Omar Bradley, to comment on the state of the defense budget. One thing Bradley was known for, even though he went along with what his President requested, he did give us one warning that we did not heed. He said, "We cannot win a major war with the size of the military we have now." He said that he did go along with the budget because it provided a core around which we could build in times of an emergency. But Omar Bradley knew that we could not fight a major war. And, unfortunately, within a few months we were in a major war.

Now, a lot of folks back then had the same idea that the Clinton administration has today. They said, you know, we are never going to have to fight the Chinese or the Koreans or anybody else because we have, guess what, the atom bomb, and nobody wants to mess with a country that has the atom bomb.

But nonetheless, after the North Koreans pushed us down the peninsula, we

finally got a foothold in the Pusan perimeter, we pushed them back up, we started to win. The Chinese sent in hundreds of thousands of troops, surprising us by getting involved in this war we never thought they would get involved in.

□ 1445

The Secretary of Defense who is a fine gentleman, Secretary Cohen, a man I really like and respect, had somewhat of the same description about Desert Storm. I pointed out that we did not have as many Army divisions as we had then and we used up almost all of them, 8 of them, in Desert Storm. We only have 10 today. And he talked about Saddam Hussein being weaker now than he was in the old days. But remember, we were worried that other nations in that area would come to Saddam Hussein's assistance, would help him, and he was out shopping around trying to get his neighbors to support him against the United States. But every time he got to one of those countries, George Bush had been there in front of him and had lined that country up solidly on our side, countries like Egypt, that Saddam Hussein thought he might be able to bring over. So Saddam Hussein had to fight Desert Storm alone. That might not happen in the future. We cannot make all of our war plans based on Saddam Hussein acting alone the next time. We have to be prepared for him to act with some allies.

Similarly when the Chinese had no problem with getting involved in Korea when we had nuclear weapons and they did not, today they have nuclear weapons aimed at American cities, and they have that leverage and we have nuclear weapons also. They are much stronger in a relative sense than they were in 1950. They had no problem with sending their hordes of people south to kill Americans on the Korean Peninsula in 1951. They will not have any qualms about doing that today. So we are weak.

We have undertaken this drawdown that is a historic cycle in America. After we got involved in World War I, we lost a lot of people, our people came home and wanted to do other things, Americans had no taste for a large defense budget, we cut our budget dramatically. The justification for cutting it was we said, "We have already fought the war to end all wars." For folks that are studying history, that was a well-known phrase in the 1920s because World War I was so bloody and so tough and so rugged on people that we did not contemplate there would ever be another war. Well, a war to end all wars was followed by what, another war to end all wars. That was World War II which once again caught us without the industrial base that we needed and without the defense forces that we needed to deter Japan, that means keep Japan from attacking the United States. So we had a bloody war. We lost a ton of good Americans. Once

again we came home after the war, we had about 9 million people under arms in 1945, we came home after the war, we threw away our weapons, General Marshall was asked how is the demobilization going, he said, "It's not a demobilization." He said, "This is a rout. People are just throwing their weapons away." We need to stay strong but we did not stay strong and we only had 10 Army divisions when Korea started. That is the number of Army divisions we have today. We kidded ourselves about not having to have those people. In fact, in that year in 1950 just before Korea was invaded, the other body, the Senate, tried to pull the defense numbers down by \$100 million. The House of Representatives stood up to them and would not let them make that reduction. We have now won the cold war. But the ambitions of Russia can be reconstituted just as fast as they were dissipated. Russia has turned and within just a few months' time actually changed their intentions with respect to the United States from being an extremely aggressive nation, an extremely ambitious nation that was working hard in Africa, they were working hard in our own hemisphere in running supplies into Central American nations, they had met us on battlefields around the world where they met us with Russian-made equipment in Vietnam, in Korea, and in Afghanistan we met them with American help for the Afghan freedom fighters. We had fought in proxy wars around the world during this cold war. Their intent toward the United States changed so quickly that none of our intelligence people, at least the ones I talked to, the presumably really smart ones, none of them predicted the falling of the Berlin Wall. People laughed at the idea that President Ronald Reagan went to the Berlin Wall and said, "Mr. Gorbachev, bring this wall down," and yet within a few months it happened. Their intent can go from a benign intent toward the United States to an aggressive intent toward the United States just as quickly. They have the apparatus, they have the nuclear weapons still. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] said so eloquently, if they are not aimed at the United States it takes 30 seconds to retarget them. That means that a Soviet missile specialist sitting in a silo can re-aim those nuclear weapons at cities in the United States as quickly as the average rifle shot at the Olympic rifle marksmanship trials can lift his rifle up and aim it at a bull's-eye. That is how fast the Russians can retarget. We have China trying to step into the superpower shoes that were left by the Soviet Union and their military is on the ascendancy. They are adding things like this missile destroyer. This missile destroyer has only one enemy in the entire world. It is designed specifically to destroy American ships and kill American sailors. They are doing that incidentally with the toy money and the other money that we send to

the tune of \$40 billion a year in surplus to Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a very dangerous world. The last thing that I think it is important for my colleagues to know is that while we are short on Marines, we are short on Army, we are short on Air Force, we are short on Navy in terms of force structure, we are also short on ammunition. The Army has certified to myself and to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who is the minority ranking member on the Subcommittee on Procurement, that they are \$1.6 billion short of what it takes in ammo to fight those two wars that we talked about. The Marine Corps has said in their letter that they are \$300 million short in ammo. They are 93 million M-16 bullets short of what it takes to fight those two wars we talked about. The point is we have entered a trough, a time of weakness, it is a historic cycle, a cycle down in this case for America in terms of defense spending. We need to boost it back up. I guess what I would ask all of my colleagues is to stick with us, stick with the few extra dollars that we put into this defense budget to give some modicum of support to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that our motto with respect to national security should be, "Be prepared." We are not prepared now if the intent of other nations around the world changes dramatically and suddenly. We owe it to the American people not to be ready to build a strong defense but to be ready with a strong defense already built in case we should have a war.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT PLAN AND THE BUDGET BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COBLE]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend some time today, and know I have some of my colleagues, including the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], who has been really outspoken on this issue of why the Republican tax cuts which are part of the balanced budget package really are not fair to working families in this country. Of course the Democrats have come up with an alternative primarily targeting the tax cuts to working families. Really for those of us who voted for the balanced budget resolution and who have supported that plan over the last couple of weeks, it has been very disappointing to see the Republican leadership, particularly on the Committee on Ways and Means, come up with a tax bill that essentially does not do the right thing for America's working families. Because we believe, those of us who supported the balanced budget resolution, that in achieving a balanced budget, we have to do what is fair. We have to make sure that what-

ever tax cuts are implemented, primarily are targeted to help America's working families.

I am really concerned that the Republican leadership is doing just the opposite. Their tax bill would essentially phase out the alternative minimum tax for corporations which will cost taxpayers \$22 billion over the next 10 years. This is a tax on corporations that was passed in 1986 to stop many large, wealthy corporations from getting away with paying no taxes at all which is what we are going to go back to if the Republican leadership plan, their tax cut plan, goes through.

□ 1500

And while doling out this corporate welfare essentially, the Republican leadership has also decided to deny tax breaks for working families and also deny, and I want to stress deny, the minimum wage and basic worker protections for men and women they said had to get off welfare and go to work.

I do not know how this got into the bill, but in addition to the problems with the Republican tax cuts not helping working families, they have also put a provision in the reconciliation bill as part of their budget plan that would say that for those who are on workfare, those coming off of welfare as a result of the welfare reform, that they do not get minimum wage, and I think that is totally wrong. The whole idea of the welfare reform was to encourage people to work, to bring these people who are on welfare up to the standards, if you will, of the rest of the working population, and if you simply deny them minimum wage in the context of this overall plan, I think what you are doing is basically saying they are second-class citizens, and making them create competition between those who are already working, who are getting the minimum wage, to essentially bring down their wages as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Republican priorities I think are clear, and they are actually very bad for working people because the tax cuts are not for working people; the minimum wage, the lack of a minimum wage for people coming off welfare, does not encourage them to work, and the tax breaks again go for the wealthiest and most powerful corporations and individuals rather than for the working families of America.

We are going to be talking a lot more about this, but at this point, if she likes, I would yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey, and am glad to join with him this afternoon just to say that I look forward to all the opportunities that we have in the next several weeks to talk about the tax cut plan, because I think you stated it absolutely correctly.

There are two tax cut plans. The Republican majority has a tax cut plan, and the Democrats have a tax cut plan. This is not a question of one or the

other parties having a plan; we both concur like we did on a balanced budget agreement that in fact we ought to be able to provide tax relief, and the tax cut plan is a good opportunity for the public to take a look at who is on their side and who is on the side of working middle-class families in this country.

That is what the discussion is about because, again, there are two tax cut proposals that are on the table.

Just a footnote to what you were saying about the minimum wage, which is really quite extraordinary in that we pride ourselves in this country on rewarding people to work. We also passed a welfare reform bill in order to get people from welfare to work. That was the purpose of the legislation, and I think everyone concurs with that.

Now to say that if you are going to work, you cannot earn the minimum wage; that is astounding and outrageous, quite frankly, when you think about trying to reward people not for something they are not doing, which was the cry in the welfare situation and why we reformed welfare, but to get people from welfare to work, let us pay people the minimum wage, an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. I mean that is what we are all about in this country.

Let me go back to the tax proposal because, as my colleague from New Jersey has pointed out, the Republican tax proposal flat out, plain and simple hurts middle-class families. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle, they are going to stand in the well of this House, and they are going to talk otherwise. Let me just give you two or three facts about the Republican proposal and then two or three facts about the Democratic proposal.

One, the Republican bill hurts working women by slashing the child tax credit for 6 million families. The Republican bill hurts seniors by providing only \$600 million for low-income seniors to pay for rising Medicare premiums. What is necessary, and these are low-income seniors who are assisted with paying their Medicare premiums, what is required in the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. Now understand, people must understand that in a bipartisan way we said we were going to have a balanced budget agreement, and we agreed in that bill, with lots of weeks of turmoil and tribulation and going back and forth, to come to a balanced budget agreement. Within there it is said that we need \$1.5 billion in order to help seniors, low-income seniors.

This is nothing new. This was agreed to. The Republican majority has reneged on that agreement with regard to seniors.

The Republican bill hurts working families by denying the minimum wage to those struggling to make the transition from welfare to work.

The Republican bill hurts students. It provides, their bill provides, \$15 billion; I repeat, \$15 billion less for the