

Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be taking up a very important issue, the B-2 bomber, and I want to read a letter that was just sent to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] from General Brent Scowcroft, who has just done an independent bomber force review:

You requested my colleagues and I provide your committee with an independent look at the adequacy of the Nation's heavy bomber force. This is an important issue as we move into the new security era and we greatly appreciate the opportunity to offer our counsel to you and your committee.

In our review, we first examined the planned future of the bomber force, its role in supporting U.S. national security, and the potential offered by the B-2's. We then examined the sources of Pentagon opposition to additional B-2's production and the recent series of studies the Department of Defense has sent to Congress regarding the bomber force.

We reached two fundamental conclusions. First, long-range air power will be more important than ever in the decades ahead. Consequently, we do not believe that the planned force of 21 B-2's will satisfy foreseeable

U.S. national security requirements. Second, Pentagon opposition to further B-2's production is shortsighted and parochial. It reflects a consensus across the services that long-range air power can be safely abandoned in the long run—a view with which we strongly disagree.

Based on these conclusions, we offer a set of legislative recommendations regarding the bomber force.

The following contains an executive summary and overall report.

And I would like to just read a few paragraphs from this executive summary.

If this decision (on the B-2's) is allowed to stand, the end result will be a shift to a force structure that relies almost entirely on short-range air power.

Yet current plans will perpetuate a bomber force which will not contain enough modern survivable bombers to support our national interests around the globe. The need for the prompt, global reach of heavy bombers was starkly demonstrated in the 1994 and 1996 Iraq crisis, both of which surprised our military planners and exposed the continuing weakness of our bomber-deficient forces to fast-breaking conflicts located great distances away.

Investing in the revolutionary B-2's offers the potential for a radical change in the way in which we think about and employ military power—a change which opens the door to a much more affordable and effective military posture.

We believe that being able to strike the enemy promptly and accurately from a distance is the preferable choice, particularly since it appears the long-range option is cheaper over the long term.

This is not the way to conduct rational national security decisionmaking. By allowing organizational politics and short-term affordability concerns to dominate the B-2's debate, we will turn our backs on the future. Moreover, we will needlessly risk U.S. national security interests and the lives of thousands of young Americans.

Additional B-2's are affordable. The Pentagon plans to increase procurement spending approximately 50 percent by 2001 and those funds should be spent on the most cost-effective systems, such as additional B-2's.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say again today, I think this vote this afternoon is critically important. General Scowcroft is a person who I have enormous respect for, who was national security adviser to President Ford and to President Bush. His group also with General Burpee and others have come forward with a devastating criticism of this administration's long-range bomber policy.

I would say of all the weapons we are buying today, none has more conventional military potential than the B-2's. When combined with smart conventional weapons, like JDAM's at \$13,000 per weapon, it gives us an ability to attack an enemy who is invading, stop the invasion, destroy his army in the field, and also attack his national security leadership, and his operational and tactical targets as well. It gives the opportunity for simultaneous warfare with a plane that can operate autonomously without a huge package of supporting conventional aircraft.

I think this is a crucial issue. I think this administration has made a terrible, tragic mistake in not recommending to the Congress to keep this program going, especially now with the line open out there in Palmdale, CA. We can get these bombers today at the cheapest price possible because the line is still open. I believe that buying an additional nine B-2's over 6 years is the right thing to do for the security of the country. It will give us a force of 30 bombers, three squadrons of 10, and I think it will markedly improve our national defense capability.

TIME LIMIT OF INVOLVEMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA NECESSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last December I came to this floor to oppose the deployment of troops to Bosnia because I felt that the mission had no chance of solving their problems. Stability in that troubled area will not be achieved easily, and only achieved with the solid support of those people in the former Yugoslavia and the neighboring nations in Europe.

In my speech last December, I stated, "We have learned through sad experience that it is easy to rush troops into an area of contention, but it is extremely difficult to solve the problems once we get there, and even more difficult to get out in a timely and honorable way."

I still stand by that statement. It is absolutely true.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this has become indeed the reality in Bosnia.

Unfortunately, the President failed, before sending our troops there, to outline our goals specifically that our military had to achieve before they could safely leave. We went in there

with an ill-defined mission. A well-defined exit strategy based on the achievement of a set of tactical goals has been lacking from the start. Now the President, after breaking his promise to have them out by the end of the year, has extended the deployment at least 18 months from the promised 1-year deadline.

Two amendments that will be debated today are consistent with the policy of previous Congresses.

The Fiscal Year 1994 Department of Defense Appropriation Act, Public Law 103-139, section 8158(a), stated: It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act should be available for the purposes of deploying the United States Armed Forces to participate in the implementation of a peace settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina unless previously authorized by Congress.

Further, Fiscal Year 1994 Department of Defense Appropriation Act, section 8151, cut off funds for the military operation in Somalia after March 31, 1994. This is similar to the proposals presented by the amendments today. Congress is using its constitutional power to not provide for the authorization of funds.

Mr. Speaker, the time for Congress to act is now. We cannot continue to shirk our responsibility. No one can stand on this floor and say that this Congress has not given the President more than enough chance for his plan in Bosnia, whatever it was, to work. It would also be inappropriate for anyone to come to claim that we are on the verge of real progress in this region. Unfortunately, the current situation is a continuation of the same stalemate that has plagued the mission for a majority of its existence. We must bring our troops home at the earliest possible time, be that December 1997 or June 1998.

The troops deserve Congress' support, and the best way to show that support is to bring them home.

LEGISLATION PREVENTING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS NECESSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret by now to most of the Members of the House that for some 8 years I have been introducing legislation on a regular basis, appearing in many different forums, presenting myself and the proposition in front of the Committee on Rules, both when it was controlled by the Democrats and now by the Republicans, to press the point that we need legislation to prevent Government shutdowns.

Now that has, of course, been a phenomenon that we have tested in the

Congress many times. Not just this last time, which received such notoriety in this last session of Congress, but seven times before that since I have been a Member of Congress, eight times since I have come to the Congress. Not only that, but we have been operating on temporary funding resolutions when the government is about to shut down 53 times during the course of the incumbency which I so pleasurably try to serve for the people of my district.

What am I trying to do again? I have reintroduced the legislation for this term. Now, an important thing and a surprising thing happened this time around. The Republican leadership decided that they were going to embrace my prevent-shutdown-legislation, and so very competently, very properly, they added this prevent-shutdown-legislation to the supplemental appropriations bill that comes up every year in one form or another, and this time the supplementals included aid to Bosnia, not to Bosnia, but to our efforts in Bosnia, and disaster relief, long term, for the people who are afflicted by the floods of the Midwest, in the Midwest just very recently.

Here is what galls me, Mr. Speaker, and I must spread this on the RECORD again. The President vetoed the bill, the supplemental appropriations, because it had in his words in the veto message, the extraneous provisions of prevent-shutdown-legislation; while at the same time he said in 1996, in his weekly radio address to the Nation in January of that year, "It is deeply wrong to shut the Government down under the illusion that somehow it will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues. It is wrong to shut the Government down."

This is what President Clinton said. Then when he vetoes the supplemental appropriations, in which there was a prevent-shutdown-provision, he says, "I urge the Congress to remove these extraneous provisions," meaning the shutdown legislation and a census provision, "and to send me," now, get this, Mr. Speaker, this is important; and the President says, "and send me a straightforward disaster relief bill that I can sign promptly."

Straightforward disaster relief bill, in his language, means one that does not contain the prevent-shutdown-legislation which I offered and which was adopted by the House.

Now, here is the rub. In this bill that he finally signed after we, the Republicans, removed the shutdown legislation that had passed the House in order to achieve a compromise and allow the disaster relief bill to be signed, in the final bill that was signed were provisions like this: \$3 million for allocation by the Attorney General to the appropriate unit of Government in Ogden, UT, for necessary expenses for the Winter Olympic Games. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what does that have to do with disaster relief?

Now, the President signed the bill that had Winter Olympics funding in

it, even though, in my judgment, please correct me if I am wrong, that is extraneous to disaster relief, but did not allow through his veto the inclusion of prevent-shutdown-legislation which he says is extraneous to disaster relief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he signed the bill that had marine mammal protection in it. Now, what does this have to do with disaster relief? I say, Mr. Speaker, that mammal protection, although laudable in its own right, just like shutdown legislation, prevent-shutdown-legislation, was extraneous to disaster relief. But the President vetoed a measure because it had prevent-shutdown-legislation which he calls extraneous, and signed the bill that contained mammal protection as part of disaster relief.

Is that an extraneous provision, Mr. Speaker? This is double talk, Mr. Speaker. We need provisions to prevent the shutdown of Government, and I aim to do it time and time again until the Congress and the President come to terms.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PETRI] at 12 noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David FORD, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Enable us, O gracious God, to comprehend the vast reservoir of Your grace and to be fed by the height and depth and width of Your blessings to us and to all people. When we stumble and fall, You are there; when we stand on the mountain with accomplishment and pride, You are there; when we walk through the valley of the shadow of despair, Your spirit is with us. In our prayer this day we offer our thanksgivings and gratitude for Your presence with us in all the moments of our lives. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. GIBBONS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Gibbons led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FOLLOWING THROUGH ON PLEDGE FOR SMALLER GOVERNMENT AND LOWER TAXES

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider a bill that simply says that the Federal Government is too large, too intrusive, and too expensive, and that the hardworking men and women of this country should be able to keep more of their money, the money they earn. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is an easy vote. It is easy to endorse the idea of smaller government. It is easy to say that we pay too much in taxes every year. The real challenge will come later this week and this month when we vote on the reconciliation bill. This is the opportunity to deliver to the American people the truth, the truth about the status of the Federal Government, the truth they so richly deserve.

I urge every Member that pledges his or her desire for smaller government and lower taxes to follow through when the reconciliation bills come to the floor.

AMERICA'S POOR ARE LOOKING FOR WORKFARE WHILE AMERICA'S WORKERS ARE FALLING INTO WELFARE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the White House said the economy is great; they said the stock market is at a record high, spending is at a record high, and there have been 10 million new jobs since 1992. Now, that sounds great, except the stock market is a lot of paper, individual debt is at a record high, the trade deficit is at an all-time record, and most families need three or four of those jobs just to make ends meet. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, America's poor are looking for workfare while America's workers are falling into welfare.

Cite this: Since 1992, there have been 6 million jobs lost. And of those 6 million workers who have tried to reenter the work force, they have. And they earn less than 50 percent on their new job than what they made on their old job.