

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 12, 1990

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Irving Spielman, Fort Lee Jewish Community Center, Fort Lee, NJ, offered the following prayer:

Eternal G-d, Father of All; with grateful hearts, we turn to Thee to bless us with wisdom to understand the true responsibilities of our tasks, to give us the courage to pursue them, and the health and vigor to persist in reaching our goals.

Bless us, the men and women of this House, that we may be granted the peace for which we yearn. May we be endowed with harmony, vision, and strength of purpose, so that we may better fulfill our obligations to You and to our fellow men. In moments of doubt, renew our faith. In days of adversity, gird us with patience and understanding. Above all, imbue us with the wisdom to count our blessings.

May we always uphold the challenge to "proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

All this we ask in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GALLEGLY 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.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI IRVING SPIELMAN

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome Rabbi Irving Spielman, this morning's guest chaplain to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Rabbi Spielman is the spiritual leader of the Fort Lee Jewish Community Center in Fort Lee, NJ. For nearly a decade, he has given inspired leadership in Bergen County on a variety of religious and community issues.

Rabbi Spielman received the rabbinical degree at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. For over 30 years, he has served a number of important congregations in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Rabbi Spielman, among his many community affiliations, is a member of the National Rabbinic Cabinet of the Israel bonds organization, and serves on the boards of the Jewish National Fund of New Jersey, the Bergen County Board of Rabbis, and the Rabbinical Assembly of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues join me in extending warm greetings to Rabbi Spielman, his wife Selma, and members of their family on this happy occasion.

CUTTING INDIRECT COSTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with across-the-board cuts only 18 days away, congressional leaders and the administration want to reach a budget agreement. Budget summit participants are faced with deciding what to cut, whose programs to cut, and what taxes to raise or cut.

I have introduced a proposal that would ask the budget summitters to look not at what or whose programs to cut, but at how the Government can better control its costs.

Total net expenditures of the Federal Government in fiscal year 1991 will be about \$1.3 trillion. Of this figure, \$270 billion will be indirect, or overhead, costs.

My proposal would require every Federal manager to lower these overhead costs, such as travel, printing, and supplies by 10 percent. This works out to only \$2 of every \$100 the Federal Government spends.

Every Federal manager could achieve these savings and the Government would save \$27 billion the first year alone.

URGE SUPPORT OF THE TEXTILE BILL

(Mrs. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Speaker, today textile workers from throughout the United States of America have assembled here in the Capital for a

march down to the White House in support of the textile bill, which will be before the Congress next week. They are here today to protect the jobs of 2 million American taxpayers and workers who work in the textile industry.

The Textile and Apparel Act, which will be before the Congress next week, is not saying, "Hey, roll back your level of imports." We are saying, "Limit the growth of imports to 1 percent annually," as this is the growth in the domestic markets. As my colleagues know, the imports in our country have been growing at about 10 percent a year. It does not take a mathematician to realize that if this trend continues, there will not be a textile industry, as we know it today.

Do we want to be dependent upon foreign countries for our supply of textiles entirely? This is where we will be if the trend continues. We know where we are when we are so dependent on our oil supply. Let Members not let this happen to the textile industry. I urge my colleagues to support the textile bill next week.

HEISMAN TROPHY CANDIDATE AT BYU

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

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Madam Speaker, in 1984, when Brigham Young University captured the national football championship there were questions raised whether or not the Cougars were for real. One sportscaster referred to BYU at that time as "Bo-Diddily Tech." Even though they had beaten Pittsburgh, Texas, Air Force, and Michigan.

Even this year with Miami on the BYU schedule they figured the Hurricanes, with their legendary offense and defense, would cloud up and blow the Cougars all over the field. They figured the only question would be which quarterback would give a Heisman-type performance.

Madam Speaker, it was the Ty Detmer Show last Saturday on national prime time television. Ty and his no-name teammates put on a vintage BYU passing and defensive exhibition for the world to see and I simply want to say that I am proud of them all. Proud of the team, of their coaches, and of the school where I taught for 25 years.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Madam Speaker, the Brigham Young University Cougar football team is for real. Quarterback Ty Detmer is for real and I wholeheartedly endorse his candidacy for the Heisman Trophy this season.

□ 1010

THE BANK ACCOUNT SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS ACT

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, the crisis facing the bank insurance fund protecting deposits at our Nation's banks is rapidly reaching the point of no return.

I have been deeply troubled by the condition of the bank insurance fund. In the last 2 years, the fund suffered \$5.1 billion in losses. Since 1986, the fund's reserves have declined by almost 40 percent. The FDIC could easily lose another \$2 billion this year.

Yesterday, the GAO released a report echoing my concerns that the fund does not have enough money. The GAO warns that a recession "could exhaust the fund and require a taxpayer bailout." With economic indicators weakening, a recession is a very real possibility.

Madam Speaker, we must act to avert this catastrophe. The taxpayer should not be saddled with another bill for financial institution failure.

That's why I am introducing the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act. This bill will require banks to put and maintain 1 percent of their deposits into the bank insurance fund. This bill will pump an immediate \$25 billion into the bank insurance fund, and protect the American taxpayer by placing banks' money between the fund and the taxpayer. The inflow of money will also reduce the deficit by \$25 billion in the process.

Madam Speaker, the time for the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act is now.

DEFENSE SPENDING MUST BE CUT TO GET BUDGET AGREEMENT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, pensions are underfunded, savings and loans are belly-up, and the General Accounting Office has now warned that with one major bank failure, the Federal deposit insurance of this Nation will be wiped out.

I am hearing all this fancy talk, and Madam Speaker, let me say to the Members that the Reagan experiment is over. America is technically bankrupt today, and Congress must cut defense spending.

Let us tell it like it is. Let us not make Hussein into something he is not. Let us let the world protect the world from Hussein, we will help, but let us not let Hussein become another reason for a glut for the Pentagon.

Everybody in this country can see it. It is awfully bad when the economic analysts say that the bookkeeping system at the Pentagon is best described as "multiple choice."

Madam Speaker, let us cut defense spending. That is what it is going to take to get the President that budget agreement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COLA EQUITY ACT

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Madam Speaker, I have been notified by the military coalition that a proposal is circulating in the budget summit that would eliminate any cost-of-living adjustment for military retirees under age 62, while maintaining a COLA for recipients of Social Security.

COLA policy should be equitable, but this discriminatory proposal singles out one group of retirees which is patently unfair. The same basic COLA policy should apply to those who retire under all Government-sponsored retirement programs, whether they are Federal/military retirees or Social Security recipients.

I oppose a COLA freeze that singles out any particular group.

There is no reason why we can't design a budget resolution that will treat all retirees equitably while achieving the Gramm-Rudman deficit target at the same time.

I have introduced legislation that would ensure fair treatment for military and civilian Federal retirees. The COLA Equity Act—H.R. 5403—would provide equitable cost-of-living adjustments across the board for both 1990 and 1991.

SUPPORT URGED FOR FIVE-POINT PLAN ON BASE CLOSING

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

Mr. BROWDER. Madam Speaker, last night, in this Chamber, President George Bush spoke some common sense to the joint session of Congress and the American people. He said:

The world is still dangerous. Surely that is now clear . . . This is no time to risk America's capacity to protect her vital interests.

The President is right. This is no time to risk America's capacity to protect her vital interests by gutting the military bases and defense installa-

tions of this country. And this is no time to risk America's capacity to protect her vital interests for partisan politics.

Today, on this floor, we will see a fight over a section of the 1991 Defense authorization bill, the five-point plan, which outlines a fair base closing and realignment process based on rational defense strategy. There will be an effort to support a partisan plan developed by the Secretary of Defense without any basis in rational defense strategy. That plan targets 95 percent Democratic districts and 99 percent Democratic civilian jobs. That plan would close Fort McClellan, AL, in my district—the home of the Army's chemical school and the only place in the country where our soldiers can train with live chemical agents such as those that Saddam Hussein is aiming at our young men and women in the Middle East.

I would like to point out that nowhere have I called for saving Fort McClellan because of its importance to our community, and at no time have we complained because the budget cuts, which we know are coming, will affect Alabama. What I do maintain is that Fort McClellan and the other bases should get a fair hearing, and that the base-closing process should be based on rational defense strategy.

Many of us have formed what we call "The Fairness Network" to fight for those objectives, and you will be hearing from them this morning and throughout this debate.

Madam Speaker, I ask our colleagues to heed the President's request—"This is no time to risk America's capacity to protect her vital interests." Reject gutting our bases. Reject partisan politics. Vote for a rational defense strategy and fairness. Support the five-point plan in the Defense authorization bill.

THE END DOES NOT JUSTIFY THE MEANS

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, in June President Bush announced plans to defer oil and gas development in certain environmentally sensitive waters off Florida's coast. That decision reflected a reasonable balance between protecting our national security and preserving our national resources.

With the volatile situation continuing to unfold in the Middle East, there has been speculation that the balance has changed—that national security needs dictate that we open up even the most environmentally sensitive waters to look for oil. In this case, they say, the end justifies the means.

But what end will we really be achieving?

Will we end dependency on foreign oil if we drill off the coast of southwest Florida? No. Most likely we end up with only a few days' supply of oil.

Will we be closer to a national strategy for conserving energy and developing alternate energy sources if we expand drilling along the Florida coast of the Gulf of Mexico? No. On the contrary, a search for more oil will most likely just increase our national appetite for it—at a time when President Bush has asked us to conserve.

It seems to me that we can count on only one thing if we change course in Florida waters at this point—and that is the enormous potential for destruction of some of our Nation's most treasured coastal resources.

Madam Speaker, we don't need bad environmental policy—what we need is to develop sound energy policy. It's time we got on with it.

PRISON EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1990

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I am today introducing a measure designed to address problems posed by the rapidly growing Federal prison population. This bill—the Prison Employment Act of 1990—will maximize the number of jobs created for Federal prisoners and thus help to avoid discipline problems that accompany idleness among prison inmates.

This measure will insure that Federal prison industries, which employs Federal inmates and manufactures goods for sale to the Federal Government, only enter to expand production in labor intensive industries, so that it can create the maximum number of new jobs for Federal prisoners. In the past, Congress has mandated that FPI create jobs in labor intensive industries. This measure helps define labor intensive.

My goal is to create guidelines for UNICOR, the Federal Prison Industries Co., which will help that agency create jobs for prisoners without putting workers and companies out of business. Many companies across this country depend on Federal Government contracts to survive. A great many of us in this House are concerned about the possibility of UNICOR cornering the market in some areas and doing damage to companies, both small and large. My bill will direct UNICOR to enter and expand in labor intensive industries and only to a reasonable level.

Madam Speaker, I believe this legislation will go a long way toward ending the conflict between UNICOR and private industry. It is a reasonable approach that will create jobs for prisoners while protecting the jobs of many working Americans. I urge all of

my colleagues to take a look at this measure and join me by cosponsoring this important bill.

□ 1020

IN OPPOSITION TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CRIME BILL

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, do you believe that the death penalty should be an option for a jury when someone kills through the mailing of a bomb intended for some unhesitating recipient? I do. If you do, you cannot support the crime bill that is being brought to the floor by the Judiciary Committee. You can vote for that and not cover that situation.

Do you favor the death penalty for someone who throws a bomb into a mass of people at a railroad depot or an airport? If you do, you cannot vote for the crime bill that purports to provide the death penalty that is shortly coming to the floor. If you believe the death penalty should apply to these heinous crimes, then you must support the substitute that we are going to be offering which will cover the death penalty possibilities in all these very vicious serious cases about which we have been crying all these years.

So I ask you to look very carefully at this. The crime bill, although it says it has the death penalty, covers only such a modicum of circumstances as to be in opposition of the general application of the death penalty.

Support the Bush proposal substitute that we will be offering and then you will be on proper grounds.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET POLICY

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, we all know how important it is to reach a deficit agreement and how devastating sequestration would be. Most everyone in this body hopes that the leadership of Congress and the White House can come to a real agreement on the deficit. That is why the President's speech was troubling.

Despite the muffling effect of conciliatory words, what the President said sets back, not forward, the cause of reaching an agreement. The President seemed to feel the best way to reduce the deficit was to cut taxes on the wealthy, whether they be rich individuals or big oil companies. After all, tax rates on the rich have only gone down from 71 to 28 percent in the last 20 years.

The President seems to feel that despite the fact that the Saudis and

others are paying for most of the costs of Desert Shield that we still need an increase in the defense budget. This is a budget where more than half of the spending, far more than half, goes to the increasingly obsolete notions of nuclear destruction and preventing the Warsaw Pact from invading Western Europe.

Finally, the President seems to feel that most of the cuts should come from such places as Medicare, programs that working and middle income people struggle for. These are the same people who are paying an increasing share of the tax burden.

Madam Speaker, much as many of us want an agreement and are willing to make concessions and compromises to get to it, if the President insists on the proposal he outlined last night, it is hard to see in good conscience how this side of the aisle can support it.

The President's speech, while sincerely issued, sets back the cause of a budget compromise.

INCREASING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVENESS

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEWEN. Madam Speaker, last night the President said that first, the Congress should, this month, enact growth oriented tax measures, to help avoid recession in the short term; and to increase savings, investment, productivity, competitiveness for the longer term. These measures include extending incentives for research and experimentation; expanding the use of individual retirement accounts for new homeowners; establishing tax-deferred family savings accounts; creating incentives for the creation of enterprise zones and initiatives to encourage more domestic drilling, and thus reduce also the tax rate on capital gains.

Madam Speaker, our economic competitors in Germany, in Korea, in free China, in Hong Kong, and in Japan have a zero capital gains tax. We in America as of 1987 have the highest capital gains tax of any industrialized nation in the world.

Now, one should not be surprised when we also have a 100-percent deduction for debt, that America is forced to not increase its competitiveness through capital formation, but must go to debt because of the Tax Code that the President has proposed that we change.

If we are going to be competitive in the next decade, we must have increased savings and increased capital formation to create jobs.

I hope the other side of the aisle will not continue their program of subsidizing Japan by discouraging capital formation in America with the highest

capital gains tax in the industrialized world.

Congressman GINGRICH has introduced legislation to accomplish this. It will reduce it to an historically high level of 20 percent, and we can then move from there.

BURDEN SHARING

(Mr. BRENNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENNAN. Madam Speaker, in a time of huge Federal deficits, citizens all across my home State of Maine are upset and angry about other countries not paying their fair share of the cost of the defense of the free world.

The Dave Bonior amendment that will be offered later today will require Japan to pay all the costs of U.S. troops stationed in that country.

We all know that Americans are carrying more than their fair share of the burden of the defense of the free world. The time has come for our wealthy allies to pay more of these costs.

The Bonior amendment, which would increase the Japanese share of the cost of American troops in that country from about 40 percent to 100 percent, I think would be a giant step by the Congress to get a just contribution from a country that gains much by the freedom of commerce that the United States military personnel and the United States taxpayers do so much to protect.

Americans have a legitimate right to expect more help from our friends. Let us support the Bonior amendment. Let us get that help. Let us make other nations pay their fair share. I think it is the right thing to do.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON RENTAL PROTECTION FOR RESERVISTS

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

Mr. LOWERY of California. Madam Speaker, many marines and sailors from San Diego are now in the Persian Gulf. A number of reservists have been called up to support Operation Desert Shield. This has caused an economic hardship to many of their families.

A bank in my hometown of San Diego recently announced it would suspend loan payments for activated reservists.

That bank is to be commended. But not all lenders and landlords will follow suit and there is a serious possibility that some reservists will not be able to make rental or mortgage payments in full while pulling in a lesser salary.

Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, if you are a homeowner and are called to duty, it is possible for you to maintain your home for your family without fear of foreclosure during your time of duty and 3 months afterward. But if you are a renter you are afforded protection for 3 months under the act and then only if your rent per month is below \$150.

Mr. Speaker, in San Diego a tent would rent for more than \$150.

I have introduced legislation to bring rental protection into parity with the relief afforded the homeowner under the act.

In addition, I have heard from many reservists who wonder why they do not qualify for the variable housing allowance that comes to their active duty counterparts. In San Diego the VHA can add \$200 to \$300 a month to an enlisted persons paycheck due to the high cost of living in the area.

My legislation would allow a reservist to collect a variable housing allowance, if it applies in his area, after 30 days on active duty at the call of the President. Our young men and women should not be penalized for answering the call to defend our Nation.

OPPOSITION URGED TO MARTIN AMENDMENT ON BASE CLOSINGS

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to an amendment to be offered today to provide the Secretary of Defense with expedited procedures for closing and realigning military bases.

I believe that approval of this amendment could have an extremely negative impact on our national defense and urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

It is imperative that the Department of Defense devise a realistic plan for its future force structure before any final decisions are made to close bases.

All recommendations must be based on the projected critical needs of the military.

We must be sure that the process is fair and unbiased.

As our Nation begins to draw down our military forces in light of the changing global threat, we must remember that decisions on base closures have a real and often devastating impact on local communities.

Possibly more importantly, these decisions can have a major impact on the future readiness of our troops.

If bases are closed unwisely, there is always the possibility of actually costing our Government more money in the long run if decisions were made in a vacuum without relationship to our Nation's long-term needs.

The current proposal offered by the House Armed Services Committee ensures that base closures are done in a prudent manner.

Approval of the Martin amendment would take us several steps backward in the process and have a potentially devastating impact on many communities.

I urge you to oppose that amendment later today.

□ 1030

CREATION OF BIPARTISAN COMMISSION NEEDED TO MAKE US ENERGY INDEPENDENT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, President Bush indicated last night that we need a new energy policy coupled with conservation to make us less dependent on foreign oil supplies.

In the late 1970's, we saw long gas lines and high energy costs, and at that time we decided to develop a plan to make us energy independent. We imported about 35 percent of our oil then. Then the oil crisis passed, and so did our plans for energy independence. Now we import over 50 percent of our oil, and we are more dependent than ever on Middle East oil supplies.

Madam Speaker, this must stop. So today I am introducing legislation to make us as energy independent as possible by the year 2000. This bill would create a bipartisan commission of energy experts from all areas of energy to develop a plan. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will cosponsor this legislation.

We did not do it in the late 1970's, and look at the mess we are in today. This must not happen again.

CREATION OF NONPARTISAN COMMISSION TO CLOSE MILITARY BASES NEEDED

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

Mr. ATKINS. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago I supported legislation to create a nonpartisan commission to close obsolete military bases. I did so despite the fact that my district contains two major military installations and despite the fact that one of those installations, Fort Devens, has been targeted for closure on almost every single Pentagon hit list since the early 1970's.

Madam Speaker, I supported this legislation because I have always argued that we could achieve savings by reducing the number of military bases. The base closing decision should

be based on the merits of each individual base and on a sensible force structure strategy rather than on the arbitrary whims on whoever controls the White House. I feel the same way today.

Madam Speaker, that is why I oppose Secretary Cheney's efforts to pick and choose which bases to close himself strictly on political criteria, and that is why I support the Aspin-Schroeder-Browder five point plan to close bases rationally.

There is far too much at stake to allow base closing decisions to be based on factors other than national security and cost effectiveness. Despite the crisis in the Persian Gulf, we can make major cuts in Pentagon spending, and we can continue to close obsolete bases at home and overseas. I am willing to take my chances again with the two bases in my district, but only if base closing decisions are made in a rational and objective manner and in keeping with a coherent defense strategy.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, the President of the United States spoke to Congress and the Nation last night. He defined with clarity his purpose and intentions for the benefit of America and the world. He clearly acknowledged, however, that our foreign policy, and our direction is clearly subservient to the will of the American people, and that any policies that we follow must meet with their approval. Whether or not we prevail in any confrontation is contingent upon the support of the citizens of this Nation. That is our constitutional process, and we must follow it.

The new thinking in the globe has allowed for a new world order in which the United States is a leader, but other nations must bear the burden of responsibility as well. We cannot afford to pay for all of the world's problems. We have enough problems with our domestic budget. Our own domestic economy is in difficulty, and we must come up with a sensible deficit reduction plan. Raising taxes, especially in these times when the economy is weakening, is not a prescription for growth and economic health. Our constituents have spoken, and they want us to take the President's advice and do what is right.

KEEP NEW BASE CLOSURE LANGUAGE IN THE DEFENSE BILL

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, last night, just a few feet from where I am standing, the President of the United States came before us, and the world, and talked about a changing world order, a world order in which we might have prospects for greater peace, prospects for greater coordination and cooperation among the superpowers; and, where there are conflicts, they would be regional and be dealt with conventionally. That is exactly where the Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, KY, comes in. Ironically, Naval Ordnance Station, which supplies many of the systems now being used by the Navy in the Persian Gulf, is on the Pentagon's hit list for possible closure or realignment.

Madam Speaker, this, I think, suggests the fallacy and the unfitness of the current existing law for base closure and realignment. We need a new law: one premised on a careful study of national defense; one carefully studying the force requirement; and, one which is fair and equitable.

That, Madam Speaker, is exactly the program put forth by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] in their base closure amendment.

So, when the House deals with base closure later today, I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, and support the Aspin-Schroeder-Browder amendment. That process will yield a fair and equitable procedure for base closure.

FORGIVING THE EGYPTIAN DEBT: WHAT WILL THE FOLKS AT HOME SAY?

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, there is a proposal floating around the Halls of Congress to forgive the military debts of Egypt. As most of my colleagues know, Egypt's debt estimate ranges from \$6.7 billion to over \$8 billion by the end of fiscal year 1990 depending on applied interest and penalties.

I ask the Members of this Chamber, how will we be able to face the American people if we, the Congress, forgive this debt? The American people who have been asked to bail out the S&L's. The American military and Federal retirees who face a possible COLA freeze. The American people who are Federal workers facing possible furloughs. The working people of America who are having trouble making house payments. The waitress who is being hassled by the IRS over her tips. The list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly recognize the role Egypt has played in the Persian Gulf crisis, but haven't we committed thousands of American lives in the gulf partially to save their bacon. How can we justify forgiving billions of dollars at the expense of United States jobs when we don't offer to forgive debts of the American people. We may find ourselves in a very precarious situation with other countries which owe the United States money. We can't afford this type of generosity. We must get our own house in order financially with prudent fiscal decisions. I ask my colleagues to make the right decision and not support forgiving Egypt's military debts.

SUPPORT FOR THE ASPIN FIVE-POINT PLAN

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Aspin-Schroeder-Browder base closing language in the 1991 defense authorization bill. Later today, an attempt will be made to strike this language from the bill and return us to the unfounded, partisan list of base closures released by Secretary of Defense Cheney in January. I urge my colleagues to vote against this approach.

The five-point plan contained in the defense bill is a sound, tested, and bipartisan approach to base closings. With the decline in the defense budget, there will have to be corresponding cuts in our base infrastructure. This language is the best way to approach these cuts fairly and effectively. The language in the defense authorization bill simply requires the Secretary of Defense to come forth with a long-range, 5-year force structure plan which will be the foundation for base closures. To this point, the Secretary of Defense has put the cart before the horse by suggesting base closings with no corresponding military strategy or force structure requirements.

The Aspin-Schroeder language places the decisionmaking process of base closing into the hands of a bipartisan commission that can examine this issue outside of the limelight and political pressures. In 1988, we saw just how effective this method of base closures and realignment can operate. This expert and rational approach will best serve the Nation's base needs in the years to come. It is the only way bases will be closed in this country and the only way they will be closed in a smart, fair manner.

I urge your support of the five-point plan. Defeat the other proposal.

□ 1040

**AMERICANS ENTITLED TO
KNOW HOW AND WHY OF
IRAQI CRISIS**

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, last night President Bush did a masterful job of tapping the righteous outrage that we all feel toward Saddam Hussein's naked aggression. But over the last several days, facts have emerged that cast doubt on the accepted wisdom about events before and since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

Fact: We were not blindsided by the Iraqi invasion. The CIA knew in early July that units of battle-ready Iraqi forces were amassing along the Kuwaiti border.

Fact: Despite Saddam Hussein's ominous actions before the invasion, the United States continued to take a friendly stance toward Iraq.

On July 25, our Ambassador responded to Saddam Hussein's threat that he would consider anything less than a rise in oil prices by Kuwait as a death threat of Iraq. The United States, knowing that he had amassed over 100,000 troops on the border, said, "We understand your need for new revenues."

It is time, Madam Speaker, that we deal with the facts, that on the same date the United States Ambassador to Iraq told the Iraqi Government that the United States was not interested in becoming enmeshed in an "Arab-Arab conflict."

Fact: In early and mid-July, President Bush and Saddam Hussein exchanged friendly cables, despite our knowledge of Iraqi troop movements along the Kuwaiti border.

Madam Speaker, did we really follow a policy of appeasement up until the invasion, only to have a change of heart immediately thereafter, after miscalculating just how far Hussein wanted to go? Did we set up Saddam Hussein, leading him to believe that we would not oppose his aggression and then pouncing on him? The costs of our involvement in the Persian Gulf are very likely to rise, both in human and economic terms.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the United States to raise the question whether or not we have pursued a diplomatic solution as rigorously as possible. The American people are entitled to know just how and why we are involved in the crisis in the Gulf.

**WORKING PEOPLE POWER
GROWTH ENGINE OF AMERICA**

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, a few moments ago a Member described the proposal to forgive Egypt's debt as if it was a congressional proposal. President Bush wants to forgive Egypt's debt. He said, let us forget it, \$7 billion; let us just give it away.

Look, this country is choking on debt here at home. We cannot be giving away \$7 billion abroad. We need our allies to start paying their fair share of defending the free world.

The President came to this Chamber last night and said, "Yes, we have got a debt problem here at home." And he said "Here is how I propose to solve it." He said, "What I want to do is increase defense spending, and I want to give tax cuts to the rich."

Madam Speaker, that is kind of a curious approach to solving this country's deficit problem. I wonder how one is going to reduce the Federal deficit by increasing the largest area of spending and by cutting tax revenues from those who earn the most in this country?

Mr. President, do you really think tax cuts for the richest of the rich, the millionaires and billionaires, are going to provide some stimulus to the American economy? Is their money now hidden in socks or under mattresses, that they will run and begin investing productively? Nobody believes that.

Mr. President, how about giving the working people in this country a little something to work with? America's economic engine is powered by the effort, the sweat, the daily commitment of the people in this country that work for a living. Growth economics does not rest on the shoulders of the rich. It is made possible by the efforts of the rest.

Mr. President, pay a little attention to the rest. Give us an economic policy that really works, an economic plan that really will reduce the Federal deficit. That is what will put America back on track.

**AMERICAN ALLIES MUST CONTRIBUTE FAIR SHARE TO
DESERT SHIELD**

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Madam Speaker, our major allies are not assuming their share of responsibilities in carrying out Operation Desert Shield.

In a recent ABC news poll, 89 percent of Americans said U.S. allies should help pay at least part of the cost of our military operations in the Middle East. Eighty-nine percent is not just a majority, it is near unanimity.

Today I am introducing legislation to convince our allies that the Congress supports the American people in

demanding more assistance from them. This measure would impose an additional 25 percent duty on imports from countries which the President determines are not contributing sufficiently to Desert Shield.

America has a direct interest in protecting the Middle East oil upon which we depend so greatly. However, our major allies, especially Japan, depend on Middle East oil just as much as we do. It is time for these nations to get off the sidelines and take part in defending their own interests, and this legislation will send this message loudly and clearly.

**DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP
SHOULD PERMIT SERIOUS
DEBATE ON REMOVING
BURDEN OF PAYING FOR DE-
FENSE OF EUROPE AND JAPAN**

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

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, you and your designates are now busy in a budget summit to decide what taxes should be raised on the American people and how much their Medicare should be cut in order to lower the deficit. But the biggest single item in our budget is the \$170 billion we are spending every year to subsidize the defense of Europe and Japan. Forty-five years after World War II, this is ridiculous, and it is unnecessary.

Now we read that the Japanese and the Europeans are not really willing to share the cost of defending their principal source of oil in the Middle East. It is time we woke up and started the budget balancing process by telling the Europeans and Japanese that it is time for them to pay for their own defense, and it is time for us to use the tax dollars of the American people for the benefit of the American people. It is time for the Democrats in this House to ask their own leadership, and I am talking about the Speaker of the House, this question: why will you not permit a serious debate on removing the burden of paying for the defense of Europe and Japan in this House and in this defense authorization bill that is coming up, rather than the 10-minute debate on watered-down substitute versions of burden sharing that we are going to be permitted to consider in the debate today?

**CONGRESS SHOULD NOT COM-
PROMISE BASE CLOSING PRO-
POSALS**

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, as we witness the continued dramatic changes occurring in Eastern Europe and the Middle East and other places around the world, we are also witnessing changes in our United States defense policy, changes that are calling for a rapid response, for more mobility among our troops, and for other changes that were not foreseen by defense planners in years past.

Madam Speaker, I want to applaud the foresight of the Committee on Armed Services in the bill that is going to be brought up to this House today, for its thoughtfulness, reasoned, and fiscally sound approach to the idea of base closings. There will be attempts made today to compromise that plan, I believe to be offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN]. I hope that Members will resist that effort and support the process that has been brought forward by the Committee on Armed Services to address these all-important questions.

THANK GOODNESS FOR LOW BLOOD PRESSURE

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

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, I really liked the President's speech last night, for two main reasons: first, because of its stunning candor; and, second, because it was good for my health.

In speaking about who is going to pay the price of our curious military adventure in the Mideast, the President said, "We shall pay our share, and more."

I admire him for acknowledging that painfully obvious fact.

Second, I was born with low blood pressure. But despite that, I would have had a heart attack last night if the President had not requested one more tax break for the oil industry. He did. So here I am.

VOTE FOR THE COMMITTEE DEFENSE BILL

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

Mr. TALLON. Madam Speaker, in light of what is going on in the Middle East and an obvious need to redirect our policy in Europe, it is ludicrous that we are even here today discussing the possibility of closing Myrtle Beach AFB or any other domestic military base without the slightest indication from the Pentagon of what our force structure needs will be.

Like most Members of Congress, I am concerned that we take a good hard look at what our true defense challenges will be before we dismantle

any bases. Especially in light of the events of the past month.

If anything, these events lend a tremendous amount of credence to what the House of Representatives has proposed to combat the current reckless base closing process.

Our five-point plan, first and foremost calls for a Pentagon assessment of the real threats to American security, such as regional conflicts, and to produce a long-term strategic plan.

Our plan also calls for closing domestic bases according to realistic military necessities.

Perhaps the most important part of the House five-point plan is that it would place a moratorium on the current process.

I believe this is our only option because we are facing an unknown future in our conflict in the gulf.

We all know we need savings from our defense budget.

But now, more than ever, we must step gingerly.

If our threats are not of superpower magnitude, then we must obtain our savings from those weapons systems designed for a superpower conflict.

Now is the time to truly consider putting in perspective strategic weapons such as star wars ASAT's and MX missiles where cuts may be made without sacrificing our national security interest.

I urge Members to vote for the committee bill and reject the Martin amendment.

JAPAN—PAY UP

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, the August recess is over. Momentous events have occurred.

The eyes of the Nation and the world are on us to see how we can resolve the budget crisis, and how we will support the President in his efforts to restore stability to the Middle East.

October 1, we face a \$100 billion sequester, which will adversely affect our military, our Federal workers, and beneficiaries of many critical programs, and yet our continental NATO allies refuse to commit ground troops to Saudi Arabia to protect their oil, and Japan also refuses to bear a sufficient share of this burden.

Japan once again is restraining its support, trying hard to sit this one out.

We defend their oil—they defend their right to Buy America.

Japanese banks buy our T-bills, and we pay interest; Japanese banks loan our cities money, and we pay interest. Japanese private interests buy American assets. In August, the Japanese teed off on the famed Pebble Beach

golf course—paying as much for it as their total offer to relieve the Iraq build up—and now Sunday Silence, the racing horse, is riding into the rising sun.

When we consider the defense budget—and contemplate the budget deficit, we must reorder our priorities. We cannot carry the world alone. It is time Atlas shrugged, and threw off some of the hangers on.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP NECESSARY FOR CONSERVATION

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, we all applauded the President's speech last night. He represented Americas' firm resolve, and determination to stick with and to accomplish the task of riding the Mideast of Saddam Hussein. He mentioned our energy dependence on the gulf, and mentioned the word "conservation" twice. But he failed even to begin to spell out an energy program.

Mr. Speaker, energy conservation does not fall from the skies when the morning mist burns off. It is a creation of government and people, and it demands Presidential leadership.

I have here an article from last Monday's issue of the Wall Street Journal. It answers the question, "How Japan became so energy efficient." It leaned on industry. The Japanese Government made some demands upon their industry. The Wall Street Journal article continues, "One clear lesson to learn from Japan is that forcing core industries to become more energy-efficient is one thing that government can do well." That is a very simple but very important message.

And the government can do great things in encouraging individuals to engage in conservation in those millions of decisions that take place every day. From Her Majesty, the Queen, Department of the Environment, 1974, I have a poster exhorting us to, "Use the amazing 'off' switch. Easy to operate. Dramatic savings in electric bills. Simply switch off when not needed. Switch off unnecessary lights." That is the message that Her Majesty, the Queen, sent her subjects in Britain. That is leadership.

I hope very much that the President of the United States will come to understand that he ought to be in the bully pulpit calling upon Americans to pull in their belts just a hitch to engage in an energy conservation program that will vastly lessen our dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

If oil, that black, viscous fluid, is important enough to spend \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money on, to send

100,000 of our troops abroad to broil in 120-degree desert heat, if it is important enough to the United Nations to put together this incredible consortium of nations to defend the flow of oil, and I give the President full credit for his magnificent leadership in producing that consensus among the civilized nations of the world, surely it is important enough for us to examine our consumption of oil and to do what has to be done to reduce it vastly, and we can.

We can turn off the lights. We can car pool. We can depend on mass transit more. We can ask our industries, our utilities, our manufacturing plants, and our automobile production factories to become fuel efficient. These are all the things that we can do, but it requires Presidential leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the President, please, match Her Majesty, the Queen, in leadership, in bringing great energy consciousness to our people as Her Majesty has done for our British cousins.

READ THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today a Member from the minority party will offer an amendment that will give the Secretary of Defense the power to close any military base.

Before she offers the amendment, I will encourage my colleagues to read article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, the part of the Constitution that gives the Congress the authority to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution very clearly gives the power, the responsibility, and the duty to provide for the common defense to the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the citizens and not to some appointed bureaucrat in Washington.

I urge Members of this Congress to honor the wisdom of our Founding Fathers and to defeat that amendment.

JOSEPH CICIPPIO'S PLIGHT CONTINUES

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I note that today is the fourth anniversary of Joseph Cicippio's captivity in Lebanon. A caring and committed individ-

ual who prior to his kidnapping oversaw the financial affairs of the American University of Beirut—an institution dedicated to the betterment of life for all Lebanese, Moslem or Christian—Joseph Cicippio, a native of the 13th District of Pennsylvania, today languishes, shut off from the world, somewhere in Lebanon.

Throughout the course of his captivity, Mr. Speaker, there have been many ups and downs. It has been most difficult for Joe's family and friends. There have been times when it seemed that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which has sponsored the Lebanese Hezbollah terrorists over the years, has looked beyond the vitriol of the past and has realized its own self-interest in improving relations with the West. There have been times when political moderation and even a sense of morality have taken hold, and Americans have been freed.

Then, there have been occasions when demagogic politicians in Iran have turned to their favorite scapegoat, the United States, to raise nonissues and ruin any chance of improved relations. Though Iran may not control entirely the outcome of hostage affairs in Lebanon, it is clear that Iranian sponsorship of the Hezbollah is a central determinant of Hezbollah policy. Ironically, when Iran's leadership assumes an antagonistic attitude toward the United States—an attitude that can have an important impact on the hostages' situation—it is cutting off its nose to spite its face. Iran's economic problems are huge, but until the hostages in Lebanon are freed, Western aid to help Iran's economic situation will not be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Americans in Kuwait and Iraq now commands much of the Nation's attention, as well it should—Saddam Hussein is a reprehensible dictator. We must not forget, however, that the kidnapers of Joseph Cicippio and six other innocent Americans also continue each day to deprive our fellow countrymen of their freedom and most basic human rights. We must redouble our efforts to obtain the freedom of these Americans.

BASE CLOSING AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider an amendment to strike Armed Services Committee language and give the Secretary of Defense the discretion to close bases such as Naval Air Station Chase Field, which is in my district, without the Defense Department submitting a force structure plan or legislative proposal containing a fair process based on objective criteria.

This is extremely disturbing to me because the Navy's own report to the Secretary of Defense in November 1988 ranks Chase Field No. 1 in strike pilot training and fourth overall in the world for naval air stations. Just this month, the Navy released another report that ranks Chase Field No. 1 again in strike pilot training and No. 1 in efficiency.

Chase Field is an important part of what is becoming the center of naval aviation training worldwide. Chase Field, which is located in a small Texas town, has graduated more strike pilots and recorded more training missions per year than any other naval air station but somehow continues to be on the base closure list without substantial claim.

If we are truly working in a cohesive bipartisan fashion, this type of methodology should not be implemented. I urge the Congress not to give such an enormous task that will ultimately impact the security of our Nation and world alliances to a select few in our Government that have repeatedly ignored the facts.

SOWING THE SEEDS OF THE CURRENT CRISIS IN THE PER- SIAN GULF

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President's goal of working together to build a national policy in the wake of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, but I think it is important for us to look back at where the seeds of our problems were sown.

In 1981 President Reagan appointed his first Secretary of Energy whose goal it was to abolish the Department of Energy.

In 1981 when the Israelis swooped into Iraq to destroy the Osirak nuclear reactor, our Government condemned the Israelis, as did the United Nations, and President Reagan was heard to say that nonproliferation is none of our business.

In addition, for the last decade we sat on our hands with an enormous historic opportunity to meet our article VI objections under the Non-Proliferation Treaty by signing a complete Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union and a strategic agreement. This would allow the United States and U.S.S.R. to put pressure on Third World countries and on the French, and the Italians, and Germans, and Brazilians and others who have cynically been transferring dangerous technologies into the hands of Third World countries. At the same time we continue to ignore these opportunities, we tell the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries that we will not trade with them with tele-

phone switching systems, telecommunications equipment and other information technologies that can help to reform their economies.

It is time for us to understand that as we reap the whirlwind that we sowed the seeds ourselves, that we, as Pogo would say, have the finger of historic responsibility in our own chest as much as any other country in the world. If we are going to dig our way out of this hole we have to do away with the denial of the past and not pretend that we are not responsible, and put together a comprehensive energy policy, a nonproliferation policy and arms proliferation policy that can sufficiently, adequately, intelligently deal with the challenges of the 1990's. Otherwise we are doomed to repeat the past over and over again.

BASE CLOSINGS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today I join several of my colleagues in bringing to the Nation's attention the fact that our Secretary of Defense wishes to close bases with great discrimination, and with little foresight. Right now, at Fort Monmouth in New Jersey, in my congressional district, workers who have been targeted by the Army for eventual elimination are working overtime. That's right. The Army says these workers are unnecessary, and yet they are working overtime.

We need to close obsolete bases, certainly, wasteful bases. What we do not need to do is take aim at bases like fish in a barrel. We need a plan, Mr. Speaker.

To win a war, you need a plan. To solve a deficit, you need a plan. To modernize our Army, we also need a plan.

Mr. Speaker, today the defense authorization bill provides such a plan. It provides a fairness process as it is called, and it should not be amended.

I simply ask that the Secretary of Defense formulate the larger picture. These are delicate times as we all know, and without fairness and foresight our military will remain ill-equipped in this new world.

WHO IS PROPOSING NEW TAXES?

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I waited until the end because I wanted to hear all of the 1 minute speeches from the other side of the aisle, some of which turned out to be 5 or 6 minutes. But briefly, let me just say that Members have heard the gentleman

from Connecticut and others on the Democratic side complain that George Bush wants to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the summeiteers had better come back to Capitol Hill so the Democrats will know who is proposing what. Just in case they do not know, it is the Democrats who are proposing to raise the income taxes of middle America up to 35 percent. It is the Democrats who want to raise energy taxes 9 cents on a gallon of gasoline. It is the Democrats who want to put on an oil import tax to raise the home heating fuel costs in my State. It is the Democrats who want to raise the taxes by 2 percent on all of the energy, gas, and oil that is consumed in this country. And it is the Democrats who want to tax alcohol, tobacco, life insurance premiums, and telephones for senior citizens.

Let us get it straight. A majority of Republicans are not going to vote to increase any taxes. So let us get together and we will side with you. No taxes. Let us get the spending cuts in this country that we need.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 461 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 461

Resolved, That during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4739) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels of fiscal year 1991, and for other purposes, no further amendment to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, shall be in order except as specified by H. Res. 457 or the amendments designated in section 2 of this resolution. Said amendments shall be considered in the order and manner specified and shall be considered as having been read when offered. Each amendment may only be offered by the Member designated for such amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, or in this resolution, or by his designee. Debate on each amendment made in order by this resolution shall not exceed the time specified in this report of the Committee on Rules, to be equally divided and controlled between the proponent and an opponent. Any period of general debate specified in this resolution, unless otherwise specified, shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. No amendment shall be subject to amendment except as specified in the report of the Committee on Rules. No amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be subject to demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are hereby waived.

Sec. 2. It shall be in order to continue consideration of amendments as follows:

(A)(1) When the Committee on the Whole begins its consideration of H.R. 4739 pursuant to this resolution, it shall be in order to debate the subject of base closures for a period not to exceed forty minutes. It shall then be in order to consider the amendments relating to base closures printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules in the following order: (1) by Representative Martin of Illinois; and (2) by Representative Aspin of Wisconsin. If more than one of said amendments is adopted, only the latter such amendment which is adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House.

(2) Following disposition of said amendments, it shall be in order to debate the subject of the B-2 bomber for a period not to exceed forty minutes. It shall then be in order to consider the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules relating to that subject by Representative Skelton of Missouri.

(3) Following disposition of said amendment, it shall be in order to consider en bloc the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules offered by Representative Dickinson of Alabama.

(4) Following disposition of said amendment, it shall be in order to debate the subject of economic adjustment for not to exceed forty minutes, with ten minutes to be controlled by Representative Aspin of Wisconsin, with twenty minutes to be controlled by Representative Dickinson of Alabama, and with ten minutes to be controlled by Representative Oskar of Ohio. It shall then be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules relating to that subject; (A) by Representative Mavroules of Massachusetts; and (B) a substitute therefor offered by Representative Hopkins of Kentucky.

(5) Following disposition of said amendments, it shall then be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules in the order and manner specified in the report. It shall be in order for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to offer one amendment en bloc, consisting of amendments and modifications in the text of any amendment which are germane thereto, printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Such amendments en bloc shall be considered as having been read, shall not be subject to amendment, or be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Such amendments en bloc shall be debatable for not to exceed twenty minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The original proponents of the amendments offered en bloc shall have permission to insert statements in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc. It shall be in order for the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone for up to one legislative day recorded votes, if ordered, on any amendment considered under this paragraph until the conclusion of consideration on all the amendments printed in part 2. The Chair may reduce to a minimum of five minutes the period of time within which a recorded vote may be taken on all said amendments following the first vote in that series.

(B) It shall be in order for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, after giving at least one hour notice, and after consultation with the ranking minority member of that committee, to request the Chair to recognize for the consideration of amendment groups in an order other than that prescribed by H. Res. 457 or by this resolution.

SEC. 3. At the conclusion of the disposition of all amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, no further amendments shall be in order and the question shall occur on the amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended. The Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Debate on any motion to recommit with instructions shall continue not to exceed sixty minutes, equally divided and controlled by the offeror and a Member opposed thereto.

□ 1110

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELED). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for the purpose of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 461 provides for further consideration of H.R. 4739, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991. The initial rule providing for consideration of the bill was adopted by the House earlier this week.

Madam Speaker, the resolution makes in order the amendments specified and no other amendments, except those specified in the initial rule, are in order. All the amendments are to be considered in the order and manner specified and may be offered only by the Member designated, or his or her designee. The amendments are debatable for the time designated, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and an opponent. Any period of general debate specified in this resolution, unless otherwise specified, shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. No amendment shall be subject to amendment except as specified, nor are they subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments are waived.

Chairman ASPIN, after giving at least 1 hour notice, and after consultation with the ranking minority member of that committee, may require the Chair to consider amendment groups in a different order than

prescribed in this or the initial rule for H.R. 4739. Yesterday, Chairman ASPIN asked for and was granted unanimous consent to restructure debate on the bill. That debate will proceed as follows: We will have general debate on major issue clusters which will include burden sharing, 30 minutes; SDI funding, 60 minutes; an SDI alternative budget, 30 minutes; base closings, 40 minutes; economic conversion, 40 minutes; the B-2 bomber, 20 minutes; and an en bloc amendment to be offered by Chairman ASPIN, 20 minutes.

After general debate on all of these issue clusters, we will then begin voting on specific amendments in the issue areas, with 10 minutes of debate time before each vote. Only those amendments specified are in order.

Mr. Speaker, we have clustered these votes in the late afternoon in order to permit those Members participating in the budget summit an opportunity to work without being interrupted for votes throughout the day.

Following disposition of the amendments in the issue clusters, we will begin consideration of amendments printed in part 2 of the report. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes.

These amendments may be considered separately or may be included as part of an en bloc amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]. Chairman ASPIN may include some or all of the part 2 amendments with germane modifications. The en bloc amendment is debatable for 20 minutes. Original proponents of amendments included in the en bloc have permission to include a statement in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone recorded votes on any part 2 amendment until conclusion of debate on all part 2 amendments but may not postpone votes for more than 1 legislative day. After the first vote in the series, the Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time in which each of the other recorded votes is taken.

The resolution also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions, debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed.

Madam Speaker, this resolution permits us to continue this very important debate on our national security priorities and needs in a changing world. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is only with reluctance that I ask Members not to oppose this rule. Out of consideration for the summeiteers out at Andrews Air Force Base, I am not going to ask for a vote on this rule. I do so only because the legislative process has to go for-

ward. But even moving the process along may not get us anywhere, because the administration is making a very serious threat to veto this bill if it is not changed substantially from its present form, through this amendment process.

This second rule does not hold much promise of letting the House have that opportunity of changing this bill more to the administration's liking. Nevertheless, so that the House may work its will, let Members pass the rule today and let us get on with further consideration of amendments. The misgivings I have about this rule are rooted in the perception that we are presented in this rule with a more partisan approach than we had in the first rule, which I strongly supported on this floor and voted for.

□ 1120

Madam Speaker, I note, for example, that 34 individual amendments are made in order by this rule for inclusion in a large en bloc amendment. Any of these amendments that do not go into the en bloc package can be called up separately and debated under a strict 10-minute time limit.

What concerns me is the disparity of how these individual amendments are apportioned; 25 are by Democrats, and only 9 are by Republicans. That is not fair, nor is it keeping with the traditional bipartisan approach with which defense bills have been considered in the past.

But my principal concern, I say to my colleagues, is this: This rule will not provide the House with an opportunity to vote directly on the matter of Operation Desert Shield. Many Members have drawn attention to the fact that H.R. 4739 has been brought to the floor under circumstances that are dramatically different than those that prevailed when this bill was marked up in committee over 6 weeks ago.

Madam Speaker, this bill cuts too much out of our defense needs. I offered a motion yesterday in the Committee on Rules that would have made in order an amendment adding \$7.5 billion in authorizations to this bill. Such an amendment would have brought the funding level in H.R. 4739 up to an amount that is approximately the same as is contained in the Senate version of this bill. The administration and the Pentagon are estimating that under the present circumstances, with Desert Shield in effect, we are going to have a shortfall from this House bill today of about \$15 billion over the next 12 months. What this amounts to is that we are going to be short about \$7.5 billion in budget authority and short about \$5.5 billion in outlays over the next 6 months. If such an add-back amendment had been allowed, it would have represented a realistic

commitment in support of our people who are serving over in Saudi Arabia today.

My motion was shot down on a straight party line vote. We were told there would not be adequate time to consider such an amendment on this floor.

Madam Speaker, I say, let us try telling that to our servicemen and women, all 130,000 of them, in Saudi Arabia. While they work in 100-degree heat, we cannot find an hour—and that is all it would have taken for that amendment—to sit here in air-conditioned comfort and make sure they have the support that they need. That is a shame.

I will not go any further right now, Madam Speaker, and at least I want to end on a positive note. I am grateful to the Rules Committee for making in order the right for the minority to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, with a full hour's debate on that motion. At least some of what I have been talking about will be included in that motion to recommit. However, motions to recommit, as we know, have a lot of other things in them. But the Members can be sure we will make the most of it.

This provides, I believe, enough redemption for me to ask the Members to approve this rule here today so that the House can proceed without further delay on this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Later today, in fact very shortly, under the burden sharing portion of the rule, I will be offering an amendment that will force Japan to pay for the cost of United States troops stationed there or else we are going to bring them home.

I think everyone would agree that we are extremely proud of the role the United States has played in the defense of freedom throughout the world, particularly in this latest excursion into the gulf, and we will continue to lead the world with our military strength. But I think my colleagues will agree also—and the President alluded to this yesterday when he spoke to us and to the country—that it is time for our allies, especially Japan, which is receiving up to 70 percent of the benefits of the oil in the Persian Gulf, and the Europeans, to pay their fair share. Japan can afford to pay for the defense of their own territory, and they can afford to pay for the defense of their oil supplies in the Persian Gulf.

They announced a package a couple of weeks ago, about \$1 billion in aid, to

help the international effort against Iraq. That is welcome, of course, but if I could say this to my colleagues, it is woefully inadequate—\$1 billion is a very small amount, compared to what is going to be needed in that region for the next year. It has been estimated that the cost to us could be upward of \$15 billion.

The Japanese are one of the main beneficiaries of this policy that will ensure those supplies of oil so they can have adequate supplies to run their factories and run their mills and keep their economy going.

I watched Senator McCain last night on one of the shows. He called the Japanese contribution an insult. I want my colleagues to know that they can do much better.

Too often we have seen the Japanese promises and no action. They should pay a great share in the Persian Gulf, and they should pay for our troops who are protecting them.

My amendment was drafted before this whole crisis broke out in the gulf, but it is needed now more than ever. The American taxpayers are tired of footing this bill. We have 50,000 troops, we spend \$4.5 billion a year to pay for Japanese nationals working at installations in Japan protecting Japan, with benefit packages which I will describe a little later when I am yielded the time, which far exceed those that are being received by American workers in health care and housing and other areas.

So, Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to be supportive of the amendment when it is offered.

Mr. HUCKABY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HUCKABY. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment.

I would like to point out today that the Japanese are receiving some 3.2 million barrels of oil from the Persian Gulf, whereas the United States receives 1.8 million barrels. Perhaps we could work this thing around, if the Japanese are not willing to pay their fair share, so that we could impose some type of an oil tax on oil from the Persian Gulf, so that we might be able to work with the countries in that region if we are going to be there for the long haul. We have got to have burden sharing.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments, because I think it is important to recognize that we are all in this together. We are all allies together, and they have to pick up their fair share.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has introduced legislation requiring burden sharing, and I recommend that to my colleagues. I would ask them to look at

that, because it is an important part of putting this all together. So I look forward to speaking on this in just a few minutes when we get to this bill and begin debate on this portion of the bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would just say to the previous speaker that we certainly share his concerns. I have told him so privately in the past.

As a matter of fact, I met with the White House not long ago stating the same concerns the gentleman has expressed here on the floor. Secretary of the Treasury Brady and Secretary of State Baker have both been traveling throughout the world trying to generate help.

I would just call attention to the fact that the Japanese and the West Germans, who are strong allies, have, I think, used a crutch in pointing out that their Constitutions do not allow them to participate militarily in this Persian Gulf crisis. That may well be true. Maybe we are partly responsible for that because we urged them to adopt that provision and we helped write that into their Constitutions. But there is absolutely nothing that prevents either of those two countries, as well as many others, from participating monetarily, especially, as the gentleman from Louisiana has said, those countries who benefit so much from the oil that comes from the Persian Gulf area.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for his support.

I also want to make one more important point here. When the Senate considered this bill—and they have finished with it—they did not address this question. This is the last vehicle we have before going to conference. And it is a tough measure. I would be the first to agree that this amendment is tough, but, believe me, it has got to be tough. They do not understand anything but "tough." And I am not so naive to think that this is probably going to hold throughout the conference. That is why indeed it has to be tough.

So if we want a vehicle to take over to the conference to put pressure on them to ante up and be a part of the solution rather than the problem, I would suggest that the Members support the amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his concern, and let me just say that it is not only the situation in the Persian Gulf that is exacerbating. Look at trade, and, unfortunately, our Japanese friends

are very good at shaking hands; they are very good at smiling, winking, and then giving us nothing.

□ 1130

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], perhaps to have a colloquy on how this debate is going to continue for the rest of the day. I know we want to delay votes as much as we can to benefit the Members participating in the summit. Perhaps if I would just let the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York, they could have that colloquy, because the gentleman from New York will be handling the debate later on.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question about how we proceed from here?

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of a question, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Madam Speaker, in the simplest terms, it is my understanding that to accommodate the summiteers who are out at Andrews Air Force Base, what we are going to do is take up for general debate only those general areas of burdensharing for 30 minutes, to be followed by SDI dollars, SDI policy, base closure, economic conversion, and the B-2, and that there would be no votes during that period of general debate, at which time somewhere around 4 o'clock we would hope we would come back and take up the amendments in order or burden sharing and then SDI dollars and the other areas of general interest, the idea being that in all probability after each of those amendments we would have a vote and it would be some time between 4 and 7 this afternoon. Then we would be standing down to let the summiteers return to Andrews Air Force Base. Is that correct?

Mr. FROST. That is my understanding. Of course, it is impossible to predict the exact time of the votes, but it is the intention on our side that those votes be scheduled between 4 and 7, that is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Madam Speaker, there has been reference made here today about the fact that we are going to be conducting our business in such a way as not to interrupt the work of the budget summit that is now going on out at Andrews Air Force Base, since the President and his designees, and the Speaker and his designees, are busy in a budget summit attempting to decide what taxes are going to be raised on the American people and which parts of their Medicare cover-

age is going to be cut and which parts of their veterans' benefits are going to be cut in order to lower the deficit. Yet, Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the biggest part, the biggest single item in the budget today is the \$170 billion that we continue to spend every year to subsidize the defense of Europe and Japan, a sum which 45 years after World War II is ridiculous and unnecessary. The recipient does not need it and we do not have it.

Now we read in the newspaper and see on the television news that the Japanese and the Europeans are unwilling to share the cost that we are not incurring to defend an area of the world, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, which is their principal source of oil, not ours.

I submit to you today that it is time we woke up and started a budget balancing process, not by talking about how we are going to raise taxes on the American people or how we are going to cut their medical benefits or further deny access of veterans to veterans' hospitals, but instead start talking about how we are going to balance the American budget by telling the Europeans and the Japanese that 45 years after World War II it is time you paid your own bills. It is time the American people got the benefit of that \$170 billion and not these other parts of the world to whom we have been so generous.

I am here to ask in the course of this rules debate today of the Democratic leadership of this House, and I am talking about the Speaker and I am talking about the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, why they will not allow us to have a serious debate on removing the burden of paying for the defense of Europe and Japan from the shoulders of the American people, rather than a short, abbreviated debate, on a watered-down version of burdensharing that is going to be permitted in the debate today.

The two rules that have been taken up, one which has been passed already and the one that is under consideration now allow a consideration of the most superficial of the burdensharing amendments. The one by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is a good amendment. I intend to support it. I am sure he would be for something much tougher if he could get the Rules Committee and if he could get the Speaker to allow us to consider it, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am sure that he would. I am going to support the one he has offered, but the fact of the matter is that we had the opportunity to consider an amendment that would say to the Japanese, not 10 years from now, as the Bonior amendment says, but right now, beginning next year, that you the Japanese are going to pay the full cost of defending your

country or else we are going to begin to pull out immediately, because we do not have the money anymore and because they do not need the help anymore. But we were not allowed to consider that amendment.

The amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] with regard to South Korea is a good one, but it does not go far enough. It does not recognize the realities of today. I intend to support it. I am sure he would like to have even more, but that is the best we could get.

The amendment that is going to be in the second rule that I have offered, I am glad it is in there. I am going to support it, of course; but it is a watered-down version of what I had asked for. And what had I asked for? Simply to ask these foreign countries to begin to pay the cost of hiring their civilian personnel to work in our military installations which are there to protect them, rather than making the American people pay the cost of hiring those civilians to work in military installations which are there to protect these foreign countries, as we do today.

I rise to publicly complain to the Speaker and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and to the other leadership on our side, and I exclude the Republicans. They have dragged their feet on this for years. They have never been there when we have pushed these initiatives.

I am focusing my criticism now on the folks that I think I have a right to appeal to, the folks who are supposed to be in agreement with the majority of the Democrats Caucus, but who have stood in the way of a meaningful burdensharing debate at a critical time.

We are taking up this Armed Services bill at a time when we have been informed that Europe and Japan are not going to contribute adequately to our effort in the Middle East, and yet we do not have a vehicle with which to respond and say to them what we ought to say, and that is, if you are not going to contribute in the Middle East, then by golly, we are going to take it out of your hides with regard to what we are sending over to you to defend you as we have for the last 45 years.

Finally, I would just simply say that I think it is incumbent upon our leadership not only not to raise obstacles to the legitimate consideration of this on the floor of the House, but to encourage debate in this area, because this is an area where we can achieve real savings that will not worsen our recession, but will serve the interests of the American people, help us to balance our budget and return us to common sense.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas on his arguments. I think they are absolutely right on. I know he has been working so hard in this area.

I know the gentleman's frustrations is like mine. We hear constantly, "yes, yes we agree with you, but not now, not this time, not this day." It is never convenient.

For those of us who have been talking about this for 4 or 5 years, it really looks to me that we are at a very serious crunch point, especially with the Germans. I think the way the Germans have told us, "Forget it, we are not doing anything," has really been very shocking.

So I salute the gentleman. I am sorry he did not get to offer this amendment. I think it is an excellent one and I think we must stay in there and tell people it is the time to talk about this and vote on this.

Mr. BRYANT. Well, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewomen from Colorado for adding her remarks to my comments. She was a pioneer in this area, there is no question about that.

I simply say that I am not rising only with regard to my amendment, a portion of which is in the rule, but more to talk in terms of the overall area that we have not been allowed to consider in a meaningful way, even at a time such as this when we need to be sending a message to our allies with regard to the Middle East. We cannot expect to have these nations take us seriously if we are afraid to consider the issue of burden sharing in a meaningful way on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Weiss].

Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, first let me express my appreciation to my distinguished friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Frost] for yielding time to me.

I am amazed to hear that just about everybody on both sides of the aisle, with the exception of the gentleman from Texas, is unhappy with this rule, and yet apparently the rule is going to be adopted as is.

Well, I, for one, am opposed to the rule. I can remember back only three or four Congresses ago when in recognition of the fact that the Defense Department Authorization legislation was the single largest authorization of

all the bills that come before us, close to \$300 billion, and because it considers the most important matters in regard to the national security of this country, Members were allowed to debate openly whatever amendments they felt were appropriate; and yes, it took some time, but the House worked its will.

Then there was a subtle change and we got to a point where the Rules Committee came out and said, OK, there will be certain amendments which will have class A category, and certain amendments that will have class B category, and class A's would get a lot of time, and class B's would get a little bit of time, and then there would be class C's, which would not get any time at all, but at least there would be votes on those amendments.

□ 1140

Maybe not the fairest, Madam Speaker, but at least again the issues were allowed to be resolved on the floor and the House was allowed to work its will.

Madam Speaker, this is not the fault of the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules, in fact, is the creature of the leadership, of the Speaker of the House. The Committee on Rules has been told to come forward with a rule that in essence places the House into a straitjacket. No longer does the membership decide what is important as far as national security is concerned. The leadership makes that decision, and what the leadership decides is important is the only thing that gets considered.

That is absolutely and abjectly wrong, Madam Speaker. The House should not sit still for it. I am amazed that the other side of the aisle is sitting still for it. I do not think that is the way for this body to go if it wants to continue to consider itself the most important deliberative body in the western world.

There are amendments that could have been offered that have been offered in years past affecting billions of dollars of wasteful expenditure whose time had run its course, and now, when we do not need the exotic weapon systems, when we need to have a buildup of conventional weapon systems and capacity to delivery to those troops and supplies as needed, no chance to debate. Commitments that were made by leadership as to amendments that would be permitted to be offered because of this rush to save time, have been wiped out.

This rule is unfair and wrong. I urge its defeat.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 65, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

YEAS—327

Ackerman	Dorgan (ND)	Jontz
Alexander	Downey	Kanjorski
Anderson	Durbin	Kaptur
Andrews	Dwyer	Kasich
Anthony	Early	Kastenmeier
Applegate	Eckart	Kennedy
Aspin	Edwards (CA)	Kennelly
Atkins	Edwards (OK)	Kildee
Baker	Emerson	Kleczka
Barnard	English	Kolbe
Bartlett	Erdreich	Kolter
Bateman	Espy	Kostmayer
Bates	Evans	LaFalce
Beilenson	Fascell	Lagomarsino
Bennett	Fawell	Lancaster
Bentley	Fazio	Lantos
Bereuter	Feighan	Laughlin
Berman	Fish	Leach (IA)
Bevill	Flake	Leath (TX)
Bilbray	Flippo	Lehman (CA)
Boehlert	Foglietta	Lehman (FL)
Boggs	Frank	Lent
Bonior	Frost	Levin (MI)
Borski	Gallegly	Levine (CA)
Bosco	Gejdenson	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Boxer	Gibbons	Lipinski
Brennan	Gillmor	Livingston
Brooks	Gilman	Lloyd
Broomfield	Glickman	Long
Browder	Goodling	Lowey (NY)
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Lukes, Thomas
Bruce	Gradison	Lukens, Donald
Buechner	Grandy	Machtley
Bustamante	Grant	Madigan
Byron	Green	Manton
Callahan	Guarini	Markey
Campbell (CO)	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Martin (NY)
Carper	Hall (TX)	Martinez
Carr	Hamilton	Matsul
Chandler	Hansen	Mazzoli
Chapman	Harris	McCloskey
Clarke	Hatcher	McCollum
Clay	Hawkins	McCrery
Clement	Hayes (IL)	McCurdy
Clinger	Hayes (LA)	McDade
Coleman (MO)	Hefner	McDermott
Coleman (TX)	Henry	McGrath
Collins	Herger	McHugh
Condit	Hertel	McMillan (NC)
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	McMillen (MD)
Costello	Hopkins	Meyers
Courter	Horton	Mfume
Cox	Houghton	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Hoyer	Miller (WA)
Crockett	Hubbard	Mineta
Darden	Huckaby	Moakley
Davis	Hughes	Mollinari
de la Garza	Hutto	Mollohan
DeFazio	James	Montgomery
Derrick	Jenkins	Moody
Dickinson	Johnson (CT)	Moorhead
Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Morella
Dingell	Johnston	Morrison (WA)
Dixon	Jones (GA)	Mrazek
Donnelly	Jones (NC)	Murphy

Murtha	Rose	Stenholm
Myers	Roukema	Stokes
Nagle	Rowland (CT)	Studds
Natcher	Rowland (GA)	Swift
Neal (MA)	Roybal	Synar
Neal (NC)	Sabo	Tallon
Nelson	Saiki	Tanner
Nielson	Sangmeister	Tauke
Oakar	Sarpalius	Tauzin
Oberstar	Sawyer	Taylor
Obey	Schaefer	Thomas (CA)
Olin	Scheuer	Thomas (GA)
Ortiz	Schiff	Thomas (WY)
Owens (UT)	Schneider	Torres
Oxley	Schroeder	Torricelli
Pallone	Schuetz	Trafficant
Parker	Schulze	Traxler
Pashayan	Schumer	Udall
Patterson	Sensenbrenner	Unsoeld
Paxon	Sharp	Valentine
Payne (NJ)	Shumway	Vander Jagt
Pelosi	Shuster	Vento
Penny	Sikorski	Visclosky
Perkins	Siskiy	Volkmer
Petri	Skaggs	Walgren
Pickett	Skelton	Walsh
Pickle	Slattery	Washington
Porter	Slaughter (NY)	Waxman
Poshard	Smith (IA)	Weldon
Price	Smith (TX)	Wheat
Pursell	Smith (VT)	Whittaker
Rahall	Smith, Robert	Williams
Rangel	(OR)	Wise
Ravenel	Snowe	Wolf
Ray	Solarz	Wolpe
Rhodes	Solomon	Wyden
Richardson	Spence	Wylie
Ridge	Spratt	Yates
Rinaldo	Staggers	Yatron
Ritter	Stallings	Young (AK)
Robinson	Stangeland	Young (FL)
Roe	Stark	
Rogers	Stearns	

NAYS—65

Armey	Gallo	Packard
Ballenger	Gekas	Quillen
Barton	Gonzalez	Roberts
Billrakis	Goss	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Hammerschmidt	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (CO)	Hancock	Roth
Bunning	Hastert	Saxton
Burton	Hefley	Shaw
Combest	Hiler	Shays
Conyers	Holloway	Skeen
Coughlin	Hunter	Slaughter (VA)
Craig	Hyde	Smith (NE)
Crane	Inhofe	Smith (NJ)
Dannemeyer	Jacobs	Smith, Robert
DeLay	Kyl	(NH)
Dellums	Lewis (FL)	Stump
DeWine	Lightfoot	Sundquist
Dornan (CA)	Lowery (CA)	Upton
Douglas	Marlenee	Vucanovich
Dreier	McCandless	Walker
Duncan	McEwen	Weber
Fields	Owens (NY)	Weiss

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bryant

NOT VOTING—39

Annunzio	Gingrich	Regula
Archer	Gray	Rostenkowski
AuCoin	Hoagland	Russo
Campbell (CA)	Ireland	Savage
Coble	Mavroules	Serrano
Conte	McNulty	Smith (FL)
Dymally	Michel	Smith, Denny
Dyson	Miller (OH)	(OR)
Engel	Morrison (CT)	Towns
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Watkins
Ford (TN)	Panetta	Whittem
Frenzel	Parris	Wilson
Gaydos	Payne (VA)	
Gephardt	Pease	

□ 1204

Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. JACOBS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to House Resolution 457 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4739.

□ 1205

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4739) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal year 1991, and for other purposes with Mr. DURBIN (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, September 11, 1990, it had completed consideration of the following subject areas: First, acquisition work force; and second, home-

Pursuant to House Resolutions 457 and 461, and the order of the House of Tuesday, September 11, 1990, the Committee of the Whole will engage in general debate in the following subject areas as specified: First, 30 minutes on burden sharing; second, 60 minutes on appropriate levels of funding for the strategic defense initiative; third, 30 minutes on the strategic defense initiative; fourth, 40 minutes on base closing; fifth, 40 minutes on economic adjustment; and sixth, 20 minutes on the B-2 bomber.

General debate on these subjects will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, except for the subject of economic adjustment, which will be divided as specified in section 2(a)(4) of House Resolution 461.

DEFENSE BURDEN SHARING

It is now in order to debate the subject of defense burden sharing.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado, [Mrs. SCHROEDER], will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the rule provides one-half hour of debate on burden sharing, following by 10 minutes of debate and a vote on each of three

amendments. The amendments are all of considerable importance:

DAVE MARTIN's amendment to strike the dual basing and Crotone prohibition from the bill;

DAVE BONIOR's amendment to force the reduction of United States troops in Japan unless the Japanese pay all the costs of stationing United States troops in Japan; and

BOB MRAZEK's amendment to set a troop ceiling on the number of United States troops in Korea.

I will discuss each of these amendments later.

BURDEN SHARING IN THE PERSIAN GULF

In the limited time I have, I want to say loudly and clearly on the record, that our allies are not doing their fair share to stop Iraqi aggression on the Arabian Peninsula. And, it is not just me saying this. Listen to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher:

It is sad that at this critical time Europe has not fully measured up to expectations. The only countries in Europe which have done significantly more than the minimum are Britain and France. It's not what you say that counts but what you do.

We cannot expect the United States to go on bearing major military and defense burdens worldwide, acting in effect as the world's policeman, if it does not get a positive and swift response from its allies when the crunch comes—particularly when fundamental principles as well as their direct interests are just as much at stake.

Prime Minister Thatcher is right.

I include in my full statement a listing of how each country is acting in response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. This list was gathered from the public media. Getting official information from the administration on burden sharing has been quite difficult.

REFERENCES: COUNTRY ACTIONS ON IRAQI-KUWAIT

Warning: This is not a complete listing; it reflects positions reported in recently available media.

Afghan Mujahideen: Participating in Joint Arab-Islamic Force to defend S. Arabia [WP 08/29/90, A161].

Argentina: Oil and trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Australia: Oil embargo; two frigates and supply ship to Gulf; plans to interdict Iraqi shipping to enforce UN sanctions, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Austria: Oil and trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11. Permitting U.S. military aircraft overfly en route to Persian Gulf, WP 08/22/90, A29.

Bahrain: Granted aircraft staging rights to U.S., WP 08/22/90, A29.

Bangladesh: Announced it would send "token military contingent" to supplement force assembling in S. Arabia, WP 08/16/90, A31. Military sources say likely to send some 5,000 men [WP 08/26/90, p. A24].

Belgium: Oil embargo, froze Iraqi assets; will send 2 minesweepers and a supply ship to enforce sanctions in Gulf, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Brazil: Oil and arms embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Britain: Has one destroyer, two frigates, and three minesweepers in PG [WP 08/08/90, A1, A12, A14]. Sent one fighter aircraft squadron to Oman and one to Saudi Arabia [WP 08/09/90, A33, A37]. Oil and arms embargo; froze Iraqi assets; two fighter aircraft squadrons, incl. 1,000 men, to back U.S. force in Saudi Arabia; offered U.S. use of bases to launch operations against Iraq; plans to interdict Iraqi shipping to enforce U.N. sanctions, WT 08/07/90, 11. Ships in Gulf under West Europe Union (WEU) command, NPR 08/21/90, 1735 EST. Four warships in PG and three minesweepers heading there; will send 12-aircraft squadron on Tornado fighter-bombers to Bahrain to supplement 12 in S. Arabia and 12 Jaguar jets in Oman [WP 08/26/90, p. A24].

Bulgaria: Oil and trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Canada: Oil and economic embargo; sent two destroyers and a supply ship to aid "multinational" fleet in Gulf, WP 08/17/90, 11.

Chile: Oil, trade, arms embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

China: Arms Embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11. Considering resuming food shipments to Iraq [WP 09/08/90, A13].

Colombia: Plans to boost oil production to cover loss from UN embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Cuba: Reportedly involved in air shipping military-related equipment to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Cyprus: Oil and trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Czechoslovakia: Oil, trade, arms embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Denmark: Oil, trade embargo; would join naval blockade of Iraq if authorized by UN, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Egypt: Sent estimated 5,000 troops to S. Arabia, WP 08/19/90, A33. According to U.S. officials, willing to send two army divisions (over 30,000), WP 08/14/90, A1. Begun sending a mechanized infantry division (12,000 personnel) and artillery batteries to S. Arabia "to bolster U.S. forces and an all-Arab defense force", WP 08/22/90, A24. 5,000 troops in Saudi Arabia, at Hafr al-Batin, including 2,000 special forces [WP 08/26/90, pp. A21, A24]. 2,000 troops in Saudi Arabia [discrepancy with previous figure of 5,000; may be a case of only counting the special forces troops]; Egypt has agreed with Saudi Arabia to send two army divisions (30,000 personnel) with tanks and artillery [WP 09/09/90, A25].

Finland: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

France: Oil, arms embargo; froze Iraqi assets; increased naval and air forces in Gulf but only under French command, WT 08/17/90, 11. Foreign Ministry announced instructions to naval units to apply "measures of verification, control and constraint" (apparently boarding, using radio interrogation, possibly warning shots), WP 08/20/90, A15. Pres. Mitterand announced ground reconnaissance forces would be part of troop contingent to be sent to Arabian Peninsula, WP 08/22/90, A29. Ground forces troops sent to UAE consist of 180 paratroopers who are "specialists in field intelligence"; technical advisors sent to Saudi Arabia will service 15 Mirage F-1 fighter aircraft recovered from Kuwaiti air force [WP 08/24/90, A31]. Has 3,500 men aboard four warships in Gulf; aircraft carrier Clemenceau en route; agreed to send reconnaissance units to UAE and military instructors to S. Arabia. Combat planes, warships, and troops from Djibouti and Indian Ocean bring total

strength to 8,500 men [WP 08/27/90, p. A24].

Germany, E: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Germany, W: Considering changing constitution to permit troops to be sent to Middle East, NPR 08/21/90, 1705 EST. Oil embargo, froze Iraqi assets; offered U.S. use of bases to launch operations against Iraq; "Sending 4 or 5 minesweepers to Gulf", WT 08/17/90, 11. Sent three mine hunters, two minesweepers and a tender to the east Mediterranean to replace U.S. ships diverted to Gulf; will provide U.S. with 10 Fuchs vehicles designed to test air for CW agents [WP 08/26/90, p. A24].

Greece: Embargoed oil, allowed U.S. warplanes to overfly to Gulf, WT 08/17/90, 11. Announced it will send "military ships to the Middle East to join French and British air and naval units", WP 08/22/90, A29.

Hungary: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

India: Considering resuming food shipments to Iraq [WP 09/08/90, A13].

Iran: Announced on 08/13 that it would abide by UN resolution ordering economic sanctions against Iraq, 73 AP 08/20/90, 0913 PET. Considering resuming food shipments to Iraq [WP 09/08/90, A13].

Italy: Oil, arms embargo; froze Iraqi assets, WT 08/17/90, 11. Announced it will send "military ships to the Middle East to join French and British air and naval units", WP 08/22/90, A29. Two frigates heading for the Gulf [WP 08/26/90, A24].

Ivory Coast: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Japan: Oil embargo, no trade or aid, WT 08/17/90, 11. Pledged economic assistance to Egypt to help its economy recover from effects of PG crisis; similar pledge to Jordan if it helps enforce UN sanctions against Iraq (Japanese constitution bars sending troops overseas) [WP 08/23/90, p. A40]. Premier Kaifu announced aid package on 08/29/90: send medical team of 100 pers; help with transport; help finance efforts by countries participating in multinational effort; provide financial assistance to countries affected by crisis, incl. immediate grant of \$10 million+ to Jordan [Embassy of Japan, Washington, Press Release 08/29/90]. Promised \$1 billion in supplies and transit aid to Gulf force, plus further aid to countries near Iraq; Japan Foreign Minister said might contribute twice that much; 800 four-wheel drive vehicles already en route on ship Sea Venus for U.S. troops [WP 09/08/90, A15].

Jordan: Will observe UN sanctions, reports say helping Iraq break embargo thru port of Aqaba, WT 08/17/90, 11. Concern about leakage of embargoed goods thru Jordan remains high in State Dept and White House / but / Pentagon spokesman says flow of goods thru Aqaba has virtually stopped [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Korea, S: Will observe U.N. sanctions, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Korea, N: Reportedly involved in air shipping military-related equipment to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Kuwait: Exiled emir offered \$5 billion this year to help pay US mil deployment and compensate affected states, divided about evenly between Desert Shield and embargo relief [WP 09/08/90, 11].

Libya: Qadhafi would support naval blockade if approved by UNSC; criticized US moves to impose blockade without UN approval; voted against 10 Aug Arab summit resolution to condemn invasion and send an Arab force to Saudi Arabia, WP 08/21/90,

A6, A11. Air shipments of weapons getting through to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Luxembourg: Oil embargo, froze Iraqi assets, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Malaysia: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Mauretania: Cited by unnamed admin officials as defying UN trade embargo [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Morocco: Sent estimated 1,000 troops to S. Arabia, WP 08/19/90, A33 (between 600 and 1,000 with a promise of more, WP 08/22/90, A24). In Hafr al-Batin, Saudi Arabia: 1,000-man contingent from a motorized brigade that saw combat service in W. Sahara [WP 08/26/90, pp. A21, A24]. Provided 2,000 troops, dispersed along Saudi northern and northeastern border [WP 09/05/90, A22].

Netherlands: Oil embargo, froze Iraqi assets (but allowing Dutch company to continue work on Iraqi port); will send two frigates "to join multinational force in Gulf", WT 08/17/90, 11.

New Zealand: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Niger: Decided to send symbolic military detachment to S. Arabia, according Saudi FonMin official [FBIS, Dakar PANA 1112 GMT 7 Sep 90].

Nigeria: Plans to boost oil production, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Norway: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Oman: Granted aircraft staging rights to U.S., WP 08/22/90, A29.

Pakistan: Will contribute troops to help protect S. Arabia, WT 08/17/90, 11. According to U.S. officials, committed to send 5,000 to "multinational force", WP 08/09/90, A37. Committed 5,000 troops to military effort but none arrive yet [WP 09/05/90, A22].

Panama: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Philippines: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Poland: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Portugal: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Qatar: Will open military facilities to US-led multinational units [WT 08/29/90, 8].

Romania: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11. Considering resuming food shipments [WT 08/30/90, 11].

S. Arabia: Invited U.S. troops, reported ready to boost production by 2 mbd (about 1/4 of Iraqi-Kuwaiti production), WT 08/17/90, 11. King Fahd gave US an explicit commitment to devote billions of dollars in windfall oil revenues to underwrite US mil deployment and ease burdens on Egypt, Turkey, Jordan [WP 09/07/90, 11]; including fuel, transportation, water, and other necessities for US forces [WT 09/08/90, 11].

Singapore: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Solomon Is.: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Spain: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11. Announced it will send "military ships to the Middle East to join French and British air and naval units", WP 08/22/90, A29. A frigate and corvettes heading "to the area" [WP 08/26/90, A24].

Sri Lanka: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11. Wavering in spt of UN sanctions; US warship blocked freighter delivering goods bound for Iraq on 08/28; noted that Sri Lanka is major supplier of tea to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Senegal: Pres announces will dispatch military contingent to S. Arabia; demanded immed/uncondit Iraqi withdrawal and reinstatement of Sabah regime [FBIS Paris

AFP 1914 GMT 4 Sep 90, also noted in WP 09/07/90, A301.

Sudan: Cited by unnamed admin officials as defying UN embargo on Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Sweden: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Switzerland: Oil, arms embargo; froze assets, restricted other trade, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Syria: Pledged unspecified size contingent to S. Arabia, WP 08/19/90, A33 (unofficially reported to have sent 1,200, WP 08/22/90, A24). In Hafr al-Batin, Saudi Arabia: 1,200-man contingent, from special forces [WP 08/26/90, pp. A21, A24]. Provided 3,200 troops [possible this is misprint for early figure of 1,200], dispersed along Saudi northern/northeastern borders [WP 09/05/90, A22].

Tunisia: Considering resuming food shipments to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11].

Turkey: Froze Iraqi assets, refused to allow ships to load Iraqi oil at terminus of Iraqi pipeline; Parliament approved measures to allow government to declare war on Iraq, WT 08/17/90, 11. Reinforced Second Army group defending southern border by 10,000 men, for total of 70,000 in the area; U.S. fighter-bombers based in Turkey within striking distance of Iraq [WP 08/26/90, p. A24].

UAE: Cheney announces UAE agreement to host U.S. C-130 unit with support personnel, WP 08/21/90, A5, A7. Announced would raise oil production to compensate for boycott [WP 08/30/90, A33, 37].

Uruguay: Oil, trade embargo, WT 08/17/90, 11.

USSR: Arms embargo; two warships sent to Gulf to protect Soviet shipping, WT 08/17/90, 11. Soviet Defense Ministry said 193 Soviet military personnel still in Iraq, teaching Iraqi soldiers how to use, repair and maintain Soviet-made weapons; will leave Iraq "after they have reached their contractual obligations." WP 08/23/90, A38. Voted for UNSC Res. 665 but "we have no plans to use force or take part in such an operation" ... will "carry out its responsibility" if UNSC decides to set up an international force in the Gulf [WP 08/27/90, A13]. Gorbachev said number of Soviet military experts in Iraq was 196 (presumably before invasion), but number has dropped to about 150 [WP 09/10/90, A20].

Venezuela: Plans to boost oil production, WT 08/17/90, 11.

Yemen: "Will help Iraq break U.N. sanctions." WT 08/17/90, 11. Agreed to turn away an Iraqi oil tanker, 352 AP 08/21/90 0345 AET (conflicting info on off-loading, WP 08/22/90, A24. British For'n Minister claimed Yemen violated embargo. Yemen officials said Iraqi tanker, Ain-Zaleh, carrying 20,000 tons of Iraqi crude, stopped unloading cargo five hours after it docked at Aden on 08/21/90; also denied reports it was allowing Iraqi aircraft to pick up food in Yemen [WP 08/26/90, p. A24]. Air shipments of food getting through to Iraq. [WT 08/30/90, 11]

Yugoslavia: Considering resuming food shipments to Iraq [WT 08/30/90, 11]

Arab League: Adopted resolution on Aug. 3 condemning invasion and calling for withdrawal of Iraqi troops by vote of 14 to 5, with Libya and Iraq not participating in the vote. Special Arab summit meeting on Aug. 11 confirmed previous resolution, rejected Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, denounced Iraqi threats to Gulf states by vote of 12 to 3, with 2 absentions, 3 not voting, and one absentee. Also agreed "to respond to Saudi

Arabia and other Gulf Arab states' request to transfer Arab forces to support their armed forces to defend their land and regional security against any outside aggression. This Arab force reportedly has been expanded into a Joint Arab-Islamic Force comprising troops from the Gulf states, Egypt, Morocco, Syria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Afghan guerrillas, Senegal, and Niger. Passed resolutions on 09/01/90, demanding Iraq make no demographic or border changes re Kuwait; calling on Iraq to annul annexation; pay reparations to Kuwait; allow all foreigners to leave Kuwait and Iraq; protect civs; allow embassies to operate in Kuwait. Passed by 12 to 1 (Libya); not attending: Algeria, Tunisia, Sudan, Mauritania, Jordan, Yemen, PLO [WP 09/02/90, A34].

Gulf Cooperation Council: As part of the council's defense agreement, they have a joint force (called "Peninsula Shield") consisting of 10,000 troops, including reservists called up during the current crisis, committed to help defend Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states [WP 09/05/90, A22].

European Community: Agreed to send \$2 billion emergency aid package to Turkey, Jordan, and Egypt to help offset embargo effect [WP 09/08/90, A13].

West European Union: Six member states (out of nine²) agree to coordinate naval forces under a European command, NPR 08/21/90, 1805 EST. WEU foreign ministers decided on coordinated military response, urged UNSC to give Persian Gulf forces more power to help enforce UN sanctions. Per communique, all warships will remain under their national commands; coordination will extend to zones of operation, task sharing, logistical support, info exchange. Only Portugal "expressed reservations" about joining in multinational military effort. 35 AP 08/21/90, 0906 PET. Foreign and Defense Ministers of 9-nation WEU agreed to expand naval operations in the Middle East and share responsibility with the United States for enforcing UN sanctions against Iraq. Senior military official from WEU countries will meet on 08/24/90 to work out the "the sharing of tasks, logistical support and exchange of intelligence" among their forces. WP, 08/22/90, pp. A23, A29.

The administration knows how to say the words "burden sharing"; there is still a question as to whether they know what it means. Let me talk about what some of our key allies are doing.

France has reinforced its naval, air, and ground presence in the Persian Gulf area. The United Kingdom has deployed additional air and naval assets, but no ground troops. Other NATO allies—Belgium, Canada, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain—are each sending a ship or two, but not putting any soldiers or aviators on the ground. Our European allies have rebuffed U.S. suggestions that they help defray

the cost of the U.S. military effort in the Gulf.

Germany, highly dependent on Persian Gulf oil and our best friend when Germany needed our support for unification, has told us to stick it in our ear. No troops, no ships, no money, no help, nein danke. Perhaps, the most offensive aspect of the German debate was the view expressed by the proponents of German participation that they should help out as a show of gratitude for President Bush's support of German unification. Germany should do its part in the Persian Gulf because it is in the interest of Germany as a member of the community of nations. Burden sharing is not a matter of returning favors. It is a matter of sharing the common responsibility and burden.

The European Community, as a group, has decided to aid the front line nations of Turkey, Egypt, and Jordan. The amount of aid being discussed places no strain on any European treasury. This joint effort may, however, have the effect of preempting more responsible contributions from more responsible allies.

If burden sharing by our NATO allies in the Gulf crisis is bleak, the situation with Japan is grim. Japan has said it will provide \$1 billion in support to the United States. On questioning, however, it turns out that the \$1 billion figure is just the limit. Japan will have to approve expenditures on a project-by-project basis. The first approved project, sending four wheel drive vehicles, ran into problems when the seamen on the ship refused to sail. And, like so much of Japan's aid, Japan sets the conditions. Japan will not give us money to buy Jeep Wagoneers. Rather, Japan will send us Toyota Land Cruisers. Japan has also said it would aid the front-line states. Last night, Tokyo announced that this aid package would come to \$2 billion. But as we know from the Kuwaiti reflagging exercise, Japan takes a long time to negotiate aid packages, Japan restricts the use of the money, ties the purchases, and strongly prefers loans to grants. In other words, it is likely that a large chunk of this \$2 billion will be for loans. It is hard to give the Japanese credit for loaning \$2 billion which they will be repaid.

The countries in the Middle East—Turkey, Egypt, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Morocco, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman, and the UAE—are sending troops and contributing money to the fight. They are the ones in the center and they are making the large sacrifices.

The Pentagon is talking about \$1 billion or more a month to support the operation. The committee is trying to parse this figure to find out what these costs are. It appears that some

¹ Gulf Cooperation Council is a sub-regional economic and defense grouping established in 1981; consists of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, and Oman.

² Members include France, Britain, W. Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, and Luxembourg. The six nations participating in naval deployments to Persian Gulf appear to be France, Britain, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Spain.

of these costs—oil and water—will turn out to be unnecessary because the Saudis will provide these vital resources at no cost. Still, the costs are very high. And our allies should have the same interests we do: The interest in stopping Saddam Hussein from invading and annexing independent nations, the interest in preserving the free flow of oil, the interest in supporting allies. Our allies should respond to these interests by supporting Operation Desert Shield militarily and financially.

With a few exceptions, the efforts of our allies have been far too little. They have let Uncle Sucker do their heavy lifting for them again.

As a result, I would love to pass an amendment saying that our allies have failed us again in the Persian Gulf crisis; that they are not sharing their part of the common defense burden; that Americans are tired of having to protect free commerce and to stop military aggression all by themselves. Unfortunately, such an amendment is not in order. What is in order are three amendments filed before Saddam Hussein set foot in Kuwait.

Let me address the Bonior and Mrazek amendments before going into great detail on the Martin amendment.

BONIOR AMENDMENT

The Bonior amendment is attractive in that it gives the Japanese a good swift kick. And, that is something for which I would love to vote. Still, the Bonior amendment has a number of major problems:

First, the amendment has nothing to do with Japan's poor showing on burden sharing in the Persian Gulf. It addresses the presence of United States troops in Japan.

Second, the Bonior amendment would force the reduction in the number of United States troops stationed in Japan if the Japanese did not pay the bill. The problem is that United States forces are stationed in Japan for American security interests, as well as Japanese security. By withdrawing our troops, based solely on Japanese performance and without regard to our own security calculations, we may be punishing ourselves more than the Japanese.

Third, the amendment kicks the Japanese. The Germans, in particular, deserve reproach even more than the Japanese. At least the Japanese pick up about half of the direct costs of our troops—excluding compensation costs. Will we send a wrong message to Bonn if we pass the Bonior amendment without passing something even more offensive to the Germans?

Fourth, the Bonior amendment will be greeted with great anger in Tokyo. Maybe, that would do some good. I fear, however, that if we pass the Bonior amendment now, the paltry amount the Japanese have already

committed to the Persian Gulf operation may vanish and hopes for more appropriate help will disappear.

Fifth, the Bonior amendment could be read to require the Japanese to pay for the salaries of our service members stationed in Japan. I believe in burden sharing and cost sharing. However, I am a little troubled by turning our soldiers, sailors, and fliers into mercenaries.

Sixth, Congress passed a strong and clear provision last year telling the Japanese what we expect of them. The Bonior amendment changes and raises the demand. We ought to be looking for ways to enforce last year's requirement on the Japanese before changing the standard. And, we should find a way to send the Japanese a clear message about the Persian Gulf.

I believe the Bonior amendment should be defeated. Still, I want the Government of Japan to know that Congress is mad as hell at their inadequate burden sharing in the Persian Gulf.

MRAZEK AMENDMENT

The Mrazek amendment would establish a troop ceiling on United States troops in Korea at 30,000, of which 20,000 would be Army. The administration hates troop ceiling, including the longstanding European troop ceiling, claiming that such congressional limitations are unconstitutional.

There have been three recent changes in Korea which should lead to a decline in the United States troop presence in Korea.

First, the Korean Army has become first rate. This means that the Koreans can take over much more of the command and ground combat role.

Second, Korea has prospered economically but has done little to defray the cost of the American presence. The Republic of Korea has enjoyed economic growth at nearly 10 percent a year. But, for the Koreans, burden sharing has meant that they would buy us a new golf course so that they could take over the golf course at Yongsan in Seoul.

Third, North Korea is beginning to squirm under international isolation losing its traditional allies to the winds of change sweeping across the Soviet Union. The two Koreas have just had the first Prime Ministers' meeting in their history and more are scheduled. North Korean leader Kim Il Sung says he is interested in reducing tensions at the DMZ.

Adm. Huntington Hardesty, our Pacific forces commander in chief, has announced that American presence in Korea will drop. And, the Defense Department, in answer to language in last year's defense authorization bill, has told us that they plan to reduce United States troops in Korea to 37,000 by December 31, 1992. That is about 7,000 higher than called for in

this amendment. Pentagon planners have been projecting the American presence in Korea based on a higher end strength than in this bill. And, this amendment provides until September 30, 1993, to reach the lower level in Korea.

So, the Mrazek amendment is not inconsistent with Pentagon plans and is not inconsistent with the troop levels contained in this bill. The only question is whether we should legislate a troop ceiling. I will vote for the Mrazek amendment to let the Pentagon know that it is time to start reducing our troop level in Korea at a rate consistent with the new realities in Korea as well as the end strengths provided for in this bill.

MARTIN AMENDMENT

The Martin Amendment would strike two sections of the authorization bill, section 2801 (dual basing) and section 2802 (Crotone). Dave Martin moved to strike these provisions in subcommittee—failing by a vote of 7 to 11—and in full committee—failing by a vote of 22 to 32.

I consider the dual basing and Crotone provisions to be key elements of the American defense posture of the future. Each provision moves us from the fixed position, forward deployed, NATO-oriented, expensive military of the 1980's to the mobile, flexible, worldwide deployable, and lower cost force we will need in the future. Operation Desert Shield has demonstrated the wisdom of the Armed Services Committee votes on these issues.

DUAL BASING

Section 2801 directs the Secretary of Defense to provide for the dual basing of units of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps by March 1, 1994. Dual basing means that most units would be permanently stationed in the United States and would forward deploy for short-term assignments to foreign bases—which would be provided by the host government—for training and exercises. In other words, dual based troops would be permanently based at a military installation in the United States and would face 3-month or 6-month assignments to a post overseas.

By March 15, 1991, the Secretary of Defense would be required to report on which units should be exempted from dual basing because dual basing would render the unit incapable of performing its mission. The Secretary's determination is solely within his discretion. Units involved in intelligence gathering, maintaining and securing prepositioned war material, maintaining liaison with host nations, and providing for the reception of rotated or reinforcing troops would certainly be exempt from dual basing.

The administration argues that we should retain heavy forward deployment of troops abroad to provide regional and global stability. With de-

clining budgets, reduced Soviet threat, and decreased tolerance for the stationing of U.S. troops by other countries, that is not an option. The choice for the future is between homebased which forward deploy to provide an American security presence and home-based troops which do not forward deploy. In 5 years, we will not have 450,000 troops stationed abroad. We may have 100,000. Dual basing provides us with access and influence throughout the world, at lower cost, with less intrusion on the sovereignty of other nations, and with less possibility of unwanted confrontation.

The experience with Desert Shield shows that dual basing works and is needed. Not one soldier or one tank has come out of Europe to support our buildup in Saudi Arabia. Why? Perhaps, we did not want to renege on any of our commitments to NATO. Perhaps, the troops in Europe are structured and trained only to fight on the plains of central Europe. Whatever the reason, the large, heavy permanent troops presence in Europe has interfered with and added to the cost of meeting a real crisis in the Persian Gulf. Dual basing would eliminate this problem.

The cost savings from dual basing will be immense. No longer will we have to support bakers, barbers, budgeteers, and bartenders at little American cities on the banks of the Rhine. As between having 100,000 Army troops permanently stationed in Europe and having 100,000 permanently based in the United States with 25,000 forward deploying for 6 months at a time, the savings are more than \$700 million a year, according to a CBO estimate. With the reductions in the size of the military coming about in any case, there is no need to build new bases to accommodate troops in the United States. Dual basing would require no new construction in the United States. It would mean, however, that some domestic bases which might otherwise close would have to be kept open.

Essentially, the Pentagon knows that dual basing is the way to go in the future. The administration opposes mandating dual basing by law, however. Section 2801 mandates a dual basing program, but does not specify how many troops can remain permanently based abroad or in which countries. In other words, passage of section 2801 would force rapid transition to dual basing, but would not usurp any basing or foreign policy judgments which now reside in the administration.

If we do not pass the dual basing language, however, I fear that bureaucratic inertia, NATO politics, and preoccupation with the Middle East will mean that no reduction in our permanent overseas basing will occur. Section 2801 will force the administration

to get serious about reducing our overseas basing structure and will permit this reduction to take place in a way that meets our commitments.

CROTONE

Section 2802 provides that no funds available to DOD may be used to relocate functions at Torrejon, Spain, on June 15, 1989, to Crotone, Italy, or any other location outside the United States. This prohibition applies to contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program as well.

The United States currently has 72 F-16 fighter aircraft stationed at Torrejon, Spain, just outside Madrid. Last year, the United States and Spain negotiated a new base rights agreement which prohibits us from continuing to station the planes at Torrejon after May 9, 1992. The administration and NATO decided it was essential to keep the F-16's in the southern region of NATO. They persuaded Italy to host the planes. The NATO Infrastructure fund—28 percent of which is made up of American contributions—is supposed to pay for most of the facilities. The United States pays for the rest. Under last year's defense authorization bill, the U.S. payment to build Crotone is limited to \$360 million.

Last year's authorization bill attempted to force our NATO allies to more fairly share the cost of meeting our defense needs in Europe. With the spectacular change in the world over the last year, we do not need a new base at all. The CFE agreement will likely result in vacant runway, apron, and hangar space elsewhere in Europe. The planes could be stationed in the United States, either with the Active Forces or the Reserves, and be deployed to Europe in time of crisis.

The General Accounting Office has just completed a massive review of the Crotone project. Their report is classified. But I do have a letter from GAO recommending that we consider delaying the project until questions about mission, alternatives and cost are answered. I include the text of that letter in the RECORD.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION,

September 11, 1990.

B-235882.

Hon. PAT SCHROEDER,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

Hon. DAVID MARTIN,
Banking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

On September 4, 1990, we provided you our draft report concerning the relocation of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing from Torrejon, Spain. We are finalizing this report in response to your November 15, 1989, request. Our report addresses (1) how political and military changes in Europe may have affected the need for a new peace-

time training base at Crotone, Italy, to accommodate the 401st; (2) whether Department of Defense (DOD) cost estimates for building and relocating to a new base are accurate; and (3) whether DOD has fully analyzed alternatives to a new base at Crotone.

Subcommittee Chairwoman Schroeder asked for an unclassified summary of our findings and conclusions to use in congressional debate on September 11, 1990. Because of the extent of classified information in the report, however, we cannot provide a full summary. We hope the following information, which is discussed more fully in the report, meets your current needs.

Since 1988, when NATO decided to build Crotone as a peacetime base for the 401st, significant events in Europe have substantially changed the relationship between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. These changes raise questions about the role of the 401st and where it should be based. Until questions about the 401st's future missions are resolved, the Congress cannot be sure that the U.S. share of NATO construction costs for Crotone represents a wise allocation of funds, given U.S. budget deficit problems and competing national priorities.

DOD has estimated that the costs to relocate the 401st and other units at Torrejon will be about \$320 million. This estimate is not based on the best available data, does not include some potentially significant costs, and understates some known costs. Although DOD is not likely to exceed the congressionally imposed cap of \$360 million because it expires in 1993, a more reliable estimate for the project would be about \$412 million. Actual costs could be higher or lower depending on factors such as exchange rate fluctuations and economies of scale realized during construction.

Although DOD has taken some steps to evaluate alternatives to a new base at Crotone for the 401st, DOD and NATO have not fully analyzed the costs and benefits of such options as deactivating the wing, moving it to the United States, moving it to an existing base in Europe, or building a scaled-back base at Crotone. Such alternatives may be more viable today than they were when the initial decision was made to build Crotone.

Existing unresolved operational problems could limit the usefulness of Crotone as a peacetime training base for the 401st.

In our report we are recommending that the Secretary of State, working with the Secretary of Defense and through the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, seek the support of other NATO members in (1) reassessing the 401st's missions and the need for a U.S. tactical fighter wing to be permanently based in NATO's Southern Region; (2) assessing alternatives to Crotone; (3) considering the potential impact of unresolved operational issues; and (4) limiting, to the extent possible, infrastructure fund expenditures for Crotone until the reassessment is completed. We are also recommending that the Secretary of Defense revise DOD's cost estimate to reflect the best available data.

Further, the Congress may wish to consider restricting DOD's use of appropriated funds for relocating the 401st to Crotone until the Secretary of Defense, after consultations with NATO, provides (1) a statement of the 401st's mission that addresses the changed threat and (2) an analysis of alternatives which demonstrates that Crotone is critical despite changing U.S. and NATO military needs, cost, and political considerations.

We provided copies of our draft report to the Departments of Defense and State for comment. We have not yet received comments from either Department. However, DOD provided us a letter on September 7, 1990, that cites the need for additional time to respond to the draft report, notes that DOD has serious reservations about the substance of the report, and outlines some of DOD's concerns (see enclosure). DOD states that our conclusions are based on assumptions relating to the 401st's future roles and missions, which are no longer valid. DOD further states that the report does not consider the impact of nuclear weapons reduction agreements, changes in force structure, and revised basing requirements stemming from the changed threat.

Our conclusions are based on the current stated roles and missions of the 401st and not on assumptions about future roles. Moreover, the report acknowledges that, according to DOD officials, NATO and DOD are reassessing NATO strategy and U.S. force structure in light of the changed threat. We also note that any changes in strategy and structure should be considered in reassessing the need for a U.S. fighter wing in the Southern Region. During our work, we were told that such reviews are still underway and that information concerning the specific changes being considered could not be released.

We hope this information is of value to you. With your concurrence, we can also make copies of the draft available to other Members of Congress as appropriate. We plan to issue our report within the next several days.

FRANK C. CONAHAN,
Assistant Comptroller General.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 7, 1990.

MR. FRANK C. CONAHAN,

Assistant Comptroller General, National Security and International Affairs Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CONAHAN: The Department of Defense (DOD) has serious reservations with the substance and presentation of the GAO Draft Report, "Overseas Basing: United States and NATO Should Reassess the Need for an Air Base at Crotone, Italy." Dated August 31, 1990 (GAO Code 392562), OSD Case 8458.

The report conclusions are based on assumptions relating to future roles and missions for the base at Crotone and the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing that are not valid and have long been acknowledged as such by the DOD. At the same time, the report does not take into account the fact that the DOD has reassessed the need for the base within the context of the emerging new situation in Europe. The report does not consider the impact of nuclear weapons reduction agreements, changes in U.S. forward deployed force structure, revised basing requirements stemming from force reductions in Central Europe and potential NATO out of area interests and support—all of which are crucial considerations in the DOD and NATO's decision to continue with the base. The costs developed in the GAO report are based on raw data and, in some cases, on estimated costs for requirements that have never been validated by the DOD, especially in regard to Military Airlift Command relocation needs. In addition, it does not take into account the fact that, as Secretary of Defense Cheney emphasized to the NATO Allies in November 1989, the Department

will abide by the \$360 million cap legislation. These errors of omission and unbalanced treatment of factual material seriously degrade this report and its usefulness as a credible reference.

The DOD is also disturbed with the inadequate time allowed to review the report. The GAO submitted the draft to the DOD on the afternoon of August 31, 1990, requesting DOD comments by September 7, 1990. Although advance copies were distributed at that time, formal tasking through the Inspector General's office was not possible until September 4, 1990. This leaves little time for the indepth review this subject deserves and needs. The short review process does not allow senior DOD, Air Force and Joint Chiefs of Staff leaders time to be consulted and have their opinions included. An adequate response could have been provided within the statutory 30-day period.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. HADLEY.

DOD says Crotone is needed to provide a rapid response nuclear deterrent in the southern region of NATO. But, DOD's analysis does not reflect changes in the threat—both in capabilities and in intentions—and other NATO capabilities in the region—including both U.S. carrier based air power and assets of other NATO nations. Crotone is a peacetime beddown location from which planes forward deploy in crisis. Today, there are few interesting targets within the unrefueled range of an F-16 operating from these bases. If the planes are needed to provide stability in the Middle East, basing should be in Turkey, not Italy. Besides, NATO and Italy, in particular, have never shown much interest in out-of-area missions, such as in the Middle East. Remember: Crotone is a NATO base and the Middle East is not part of NATO's mandate.

A U.S. decision not to go forward with the base would not undermine the alliance. Most of our NATO allies are making their own huge reductions in their defense spending. Britain announced a major reduction of their troops committed to the alliance. More pertinent is the problems we are having with Italy on the air-to-ground training range, joint military-civilian airfield use, air traffic control patterns, archeology, and dual basing. All these problems make Crotone a very troubled base, even without congressional concerns.

In response to last year's defense authorization bill language, DOD revised the U.S. share of the cost of Crotone from \$466 million to \$320 million. This change was due entirely to U.S. unilateral actions. The allies made no concessions. Rather, DOD achieved savings: By using a more favorable, although unrealistic, exchange rate. DOD assumed an exchange rate of \$3.434, while the most recent rate is \$4.068. By cutting the number of family housing units to 10 percent below the number of units needed.

There is no housing available on the private market in the area of the airbase. By changing the repayment methods of U.S. to NATO for the housing. Unfortunately, NATO has not agreed to this change. By scaling back relocation plans for units at Torrejon other than 401st TFW. The estimate for the new MAC facilities at Rota, for example, is well below what MAC says it should be. Not surprisingly, GAO has told us that the DOD estimate is unrealistically low. In particular, the cost estimate does not include any of the costs of interim basing.

Crotone will not be ready until 1996 or later. The F-16's have to leave Spain by May 9, 1992. This will require interim basing. Current plans call for interim basing in United States, in Germany, and at another Italian base. The interim basing plan may be a good permanent basing scheme.

The Martin amendment strikes both of these provisions. Both section 2801 and 2802 are solid, responsible legislation. Desert Shield has proven the wisdom of the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services. I urge you to vote no on the Martin amendment.

□ 1210

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under the general heading of burden sharing we are going to have three amendments that will come up later this afternoon, perhaps around 4 o'clock to be debated and then voted on in order. I would like to speak about a couple of them in the time I have allotted myself.

First I would like to speak to the amendment that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], concerning the Japanese paying for all expenses of our troops stationed in Japan. I want to say at the outset that I share with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] wholeheartedly the outrage about the pittance that Japan has offered to pay relative to the enormous cost of the crisis presently going on in the Persian Gulf, and my frustrations are at least as high if not higher than this with respect to that.

I would like to point out to the House and to the gentleman something that kind of puts this in a catch-22 situation as we try to express our concern and our outrage, if you will, concerning their offer. Over the past few years as we have worked on this burden sharing issue, and the gentleman from Colorado and many Members are concerned about us picking up a disproportionate share of maintaining world peace. The problem is that we have been begging our European allies and friends and others throughout the world to take the Jap-

anese standard in the kinds of things they have done relative to the Japanese facilities improvement program, their willingness to pick up the pay and retirement and all of that as far as Japanese nationals working on our bases. So on the one hand I have the outrage as to what the cost is going to be in the Persian Gulf, and the pittance that they offer, contrasted to that standard, the kind of standard that if all our allies, as the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] said so many times, had lived up to of supporting our troops as Japan had done, we would be a lot better off. So we are caught in that situation, and I understand the gentleman's frustration. I would like to support the amendment which will call on them for support, and I want to make sure they pay at least a proportionate share of the cost of our troops being over there in Saudi Arabia at the present time.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], has spoken on her time about my amendment that relates to, as she pointed out, Crotona, and the dual basing concept. I would like to say only this relative to Crotona, that we have debated that over the course of the last 2 years and it still remains the No. 1 priority of NATO. I do not think this is the time to be bashing NATO of all times, given the situation in the world. But this is going to be the first time that the United States has made a line-item veto and told our NATO allies that that particular project cannot be built.

Second, with respect to the dual basing concept, I want to point out that I spoke to Secretary Cheney only yesterday concerning this. He is unalterably opposed. Why?

It is not that they are not in the process of considering all of these things, and as a matter of fact reducing substantially our troops that are on foreign soil. But this particular proposal that is in the bill that came through the committee structure, we have not had 1 minute of hearings on this provision that affects the stationing of every unit of the Marine Corps, the Army, and the Air Force, not just in Europe but around the world. There is no consultation with the host nation, no consultations with any of our allies and absolutely no input from the administration, particularly the Secretaries of Defense and State.

It is just once again the House of Representatives, and I will admit it sounds good, saying, "I will tell you what, we will bring all the troops home, forget the rationale or the consequences."

It is interesting, as I was watching the garbage trucks race across the 14th Street Bridge into Washington yesterday morning, and was caught in traffic, a news commentator on WTOP

pointed out that the French were going to loan us four ships to move our troops around the Persian Gulf. I think that is very nice of the French, but the pathetic truth of it is we do not have the sealift nor the airlift to do the dual basing concept even if it was Secretary Cheney's ideal wholeheartedly. Please support the Martin amendment and allow the Secretary of Defense some input.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me restate again what I said a little earlier, that the American people are very proud of the role that the United States has played in the defense of freedom throughout the world, and we will continue to do that.

But let me also say and tell my colleagues that we have 50,000 American troops in Japan costing the United States taxpayers \$4.5 billion a year. And even that figure is grossly inflated by Japan's high land values and by the fact that the dollar has fallen dramatically in relationship to the yen.

We pay salaries and benefits for half of the 22,000 Japanese nationals who work at these 31 installations that we have there. It is ludicrous that we give a better benefit package to Japanese workers on foreign bases than we provide our own workers here in the United States of America.

Let me tell Members a little bit about what those benefits are. They are substantial. It includes health benefits, housing allowances, moving allowances, lots of paid vacations and holidays. In essence, in Japan workers basically get 13 months' pay for about 12 months of work.

What about American workers? What about American health care? We have 37 million people in this country with no health care, 50 million who are underinsured.

What about housing in this country? We have dire needs here at home, and it is time that this Congress and this country start focusing on taking care of the needs of our own people here today.

I want to also indicate that it seems to me that with Japan, as everyone knows, being our most difficult and tough international competitor, we should not be subsidizing our toughest trading competitor. Last year nearly half of our United States trade deficit, \$45 billion, \$45 billion was with Japan, and every region of the country, nearly every State has felt the effects of these trade barriers, whether it is rice and feed grains in the Midwest, wood products from the Northwest, footwear and shipbuilding in the Northeast, high technology from Cali-

fornia, autos from my area. The Japanese have a \$60 billion auto parts industry. We get 1 percent of that market because they close it to us, and yet we are going to subsidize their workers at our military installations protecting them at the rate of almost \$5 billion a year.

No, Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. It is a tough amendment. But it is a good amendment, and if there is one thing we have learned, one thing we have learned in these 45 years is that we have to be tough when we bargain with the Japanese.

□ 1220

The Senate put nothing, nothing in their bill in relation to this. We have got to take something tough into conference to get something out of conference.

So I encourage my colleagues to get the burden-sharing issue in front of us. This is a wakeup call. This is a real wakeup call for the new world order, and I would hope my colleagues would support the amendment when it comes before us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding this time to me, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama. [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we begin consideration of the burden-sharing amendments, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support the Martin amendment. As events in the Persian Gulf have so recently reminded us, the United States and our allies have an active shared role to play in maintaining peace and the rule of law. The United States cannot shirk or avoid its role as a world leader.

The Martin amendment halts the blind U.S. retreat of isolationism caused by dual basing. It prevents the United States from adopting a blatant anti-NATO stance which prohibits the stationing of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing anywhere except the United States, after it leaves Spain.

Let me try to put this into perspective. The Spanish made the decision that we should remove the 401st Fighter Wing of F-16's, 72 of them, from Terrajon and remove them from the country.

NATO was very much upset about this and looked around for an alternative basing mode. In casting about for a place to put it, the Italians came up and offered a site. We looked into this on our Military Construction Subcommittee, and we thought they were charging us too much. We said we will pay our share, our NATO portion, but not anything over and above this.

NATO says, after studying it, this is so important to them they would pre-fund it and urge that this be put forth as their primary and highest priority.

Now, even though NATO has gone on and funded it, we funded it last year up to our NATO level, this takes out all money and says you cannot even have the flexibility to move them some place else—not even 20 miles down the road. You have to bring the 401st back to the United States.

What most people do not know is that 24 of the planes of the 401st today have been transferred and are flying in the Persian Gulf for our protection and capability there.

We need the capability, and everybody I have talked to associated with NATO or with the U.S. forces, say that we need the capability there. We have not had any hearings on this in the committee.

I think it is shortsighted indeed to require dual basing. This not only applies in Europe, it applies around the world.

What we are doing is setting foreign policy here. I think we have not thought it through adequately. I think it is a mistake to do it at this time, and I think we should at least have hearings in the committee.

For that reason, I am supporting the Martin amendment, and I would hope all of my colleagues would do the same.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the arguments advanced by my very good friend from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], on behalf of his amendment.

I must say that I find myself in agreement with much of what he has to say. I certainly share his view that Japan does need to share more of the collective defense burden, and I subscribe to his endorsement of his amendment as a very tough amendment.

The only problem is that it is also a counterproductive amendment.

The Bonior amendment would provide that, unless Japan assumes literally all the costs associated with the deployment of American forces in Japan, that the number of our troops there would have to be reduced by 5,000 a year for each fiscal year in which the Japanese declined to assume the totality of our fiscal burden associated with the maintenance of our forces in their country.

The problem with this amendment is that it assumes, first of all, that the purpose of the American forces in Japan is primarily to defend Japan. But the fact is that the forces we have deployed in Japan have been sent

there not just to defend Japan but as a regional reserve for contingencies elsewhere in Asia. They are there to deal with the possibility of aggression on the Korean peninsula. They are there to deal with the possibility of aggression in the Persian Gulf. And indeed some of the very first forces sent to the Persian Gulf, after the Iraqi invasion, came from Japan.

And so it seems to me not to make very much sense to put a gun to the head of Japan and say that unless they pick up all of the costs associated with our forces in their country, we will begin to withdraw those forces, when our forces are there not just to help Japan but to defend important, indeed vital, American interests in other countries as well.

But I have another problem with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Under his amendment, the Japanese would be required to pick up literally all of the costs associated with our forces in Japan. That includes not only the logistical costs but the salaries of the soldiers themselves. And if we were to have Japan pay for the salaries of our troops, something that no other country does anywhere else in the world, not even in Saudi Arabia, our troops would become latter-day Hessians.

While certainly we want other countries to contribute to host-nation support, I do not think the American people want other countries paying the salaries of our troops.

We are not renting our soldiers. They are American citizens, they are American soldiers, they are fighting for American interests, and they should be paid for by the American people.

Once we begin to have other countries paying the salaries of our troops, they would soon be in a position to tell them where to go and whom to fight. And that is something that is incompatible, compatible neither with our Constitution nor with our own fundamental interests.

Finally, let me say to my very good friend from Michigan and to other Members of the House that the Japanese are already contributing 40 percent of the costs of maintaining our forces in Japan. They have one of the best records on burden sharing of any nation in the world where we deploy forces. We ought to urge them to do more, but not in the counterproductive manner proposed by my friend from Michigan.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, the Bonior amendment makes sense. We are in a new post-cold war era where collective security means collective financial responsibility.

Our policy is an anachronism. It is an anachronism in Japan, it is an anachronism in Europe. We are subsidizing countries that have accumulated vast wealth up from the post-World War II rubble, subsidizing our competitors, contributing to our trade imbalance.

It does not make sense anymore.

The Bonior amendment is a very limited approach to all of this. The United States is at 6 percent of GNP, the Japanese are at 1 percent. The arguments of the gentleman from New York about the payment of troops is but one small fraction of the overall costs that we and our taxpayers are expending for global collective security, a global collective security which Japan has been one of the great beneficiaries of in their global trading ways, keeping those seelanes open, democracy and capitalism there. They have benefited. It is time to begin to share.

Our focus on defense industries and defense products has cost us dearly in the global competitive struggle with the Japanese. And, I might add, with the Germans as well. It is time to start weaning our prosperous allies off the U.S. defense budget.

□ 1230

Again, it goes for our European allies as well. The world has changed dramatically. The vanquished of the post-World War II era are now the victors in the global economic struggle.

The Bonior amendment would save our taxpayers more than \$4 billion a year, and it makes sense that the Japanese become more important partners in this global collective security. Let Members vote for it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership through the years on this issue, and for yielding time to me. I also thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his amendment.

I heard the arguments against this amendment. It seems to me they slide by the point. Yes, America is strong, and as the Persian Gulf shows, in the diplomatic and geopolitical and military areas we are clearly No. 1. However, if we let the economic area fall where we may not be No. 1 5 years from now, all the rest, as history teaches everyone, will go down the drain. The great powers of the world, when they lose their economic edge, when, in fact, other nations sort of catbirded on to the expenses we pay for the military to do all the things that benefits Japan, Western Europe, et cetera, we lose, and we ultimately lose everything.

This amendment sees the future. It says that as long as the Japanese, the

Germans, the French, and everybody else do not pay their fair share, America as a whole will be weakened, no matter how strong our armies, no matter what the diplomats say. We must restore America as number one economically. One important way is an amendment that makes burden sharing a reality.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER].

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Martin amendment and against the Bonior amendment. First of all, I would like to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], as he spoke against the Bonior amendment.

I think it is important to recognize, as he indicated, that American troops deployed in that part of the world, particularly in Japan, are not there to defend Japan necessarily, but to defend the vital interests of the United States of America. That is why we have troops in Europe. That is why we are sending troops to Saudi Arabia. That is why we have troops in the four corners of the globe. Not to protect their interests, but to protect ours.

Therefore, that amendment, I think, would be a dangerous one. A dangerous one because it would set a precedent, that would not be helpful to this body in planning future foreign policy for the United States.

Second, the Martin amendment is extremely important because it deletes a provision in the bill that would prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds, including NATO contributions, for construction of a base in Crotone, Italy. The problem is the fact that our allies, our NATO allies, including the United States, made a joint decision to utilize funds, joint funds, for the construction of a military base in a strategically important part of the world. I might add, that it is much more strategically important because of the events in the Middle East. How would the Congress like it if our allies in Western Europe and other parts of the world that belongs to NATO, if their general assemblies, if their congresses said that funds which the United States and the entire NATO allies determined, that we jointly recognize must be used for the purposes of mutual defense, could be restricted by any one country. That would be the beginning of the end of NATO. NATO does not necessarily do precisely what the United States wants them to do.

This is a group. It is a group, a security group that is helpful for the national security of this country and other countries. The United States should not by this action today have a veto power over the joint agreement of all NATO commanders, and all coun-

tries that belong to that important defense body. Therefore, I urge Members of this body, let Members not destroy NATO. Let Members not send a signal by the United States that unless NATO agrees specifically with what we say, regardless of what the other NATO allies say, joint funds could be restricted.

The Martin amendment improves the bill. The Martin amendment must be passed in order to preserve NATO as an important defense security mechanism for the United States and the free world.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. Mr. Chairman, the same voices of apology are rising today to defend the status quo in which 45 years after World War II the American people still spend \$170 billion a year defending Europe and Japan. The same voices have risen in the past. I strongly hope that the House will not heed those voices one more time.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] said a moment ago that "We have been begging our allies to meet a certain standard of doing better" with regard to burden sharing. I think his use of the word "begging" is instructive regarding the purpose of the amendment pending, particularly, the Bonior amendment. It is time to stop begging. It is time for Members to tell and not ask Japan and Europe, that 45 years after World War II it is time for them to pay for their own defense. We do not have the money, and they do not need the money. We are borrowing this money. We are giving it to them. Some of it we are borrowing from them, giving it back to them. They, then, invest the savings that they can earn as the result of not having these defense obligations in their own industry. They compete with the United States, beat the United States in international trade, and they come back and buy our farms, our ranches, our corporations, our biggest assets. It is a preposterous circle, one that historians will look back upon with astonishment. Oppose the Martin amendment, vote for the Bonior amendment, and support what we can do today with regard to burden sharing.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I just wanted to speak to what the previous speaker said, and also to embrace what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] said relative to the Bonior amendment.

The object of the exercise of our having troops in Japan is in our interest. They are not there for the defense of Japan. As I said before, as far as the Japanese facilities improvement program and those kinds of things, and the amount of money the Japanese

have contributed to the support of our troops there are in our mutual interest has been far more than what some of our other allies have done.

Again, I would just like to advise the Members and hope that in voting and considering the Bonior amendment, that we do not allow our frustrations over embarrassing offer of contribution that Japan made for the crisis in the Middle East, to cloud their view that our troops are in Japan in our security interest every bit as much as the security interests of Japan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I rise to support the committee, to support the Bonior amendment, and to oppose the Martin amendment.

I have, for a number of years, served as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. We get the job of finding the money to pay for the decisions of the Committee on Armed Services and of the administration, and of the policymakers on defense matters. For example, we will be struggling to find \$1.8 billion in new money with which to construct permanent facilities in Saudi Arabia to house United States troops. That is on the way.

With the continuing collapse of communism, we are seeing changes in defense policy and defense actions that we never envisioned. Just a year ago we were trying to find money to build more sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missiles, strategic bombers, expensive equipment, and now we are talking about mobility, rapid response, and more training for our troops in order to have quality deployment. We have seen in the Middle East troops moved forward rapidly from the United States, from places like Georgia and Washington to California and Florida, over to the Middle East in a matter of hours.

□ 1240

That is called dual basing. That is called deploying troops at home and moving them abroad for deployment and/or for training.

Those troops did not come from Western Europe. Not one of the units from Western Europe was moved to the Middle East. They came from bases here in the United States. The committee has wisely stated in the committee bill the concept of dual basing when possible in order to save money, in order to provide better training and better housing for our troops, and in order to outline a post-cold war defense strategy.

I want to compliment the committee as well for opposing the wasteful

spending proposed by the administration to build an unneeded base in Europe at Crotone. It is cold war-era thinking that went into that base. It is not needed. It is a waste of money, and I think the committee should be supported and we should not build it.

Finally, let me say this: Our allies will allow us to pay the expenses of their defense as long as Uncle Sugar will do it. Sure, it is our defense, but it is also their defense. But what really gets me is that they do not respect us unless we stand up and say that "part of that cost should be paid by you because you are being defended. Your interests, as well as our interests, are being defended."

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members here today to oppose the Martin amendment and to oppose these debilitating amendments that will be aimed at crippling the committee bill.

Mr. DICKERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bonior amendment. At the outset let me say that since I have been in Congress I have never supported a protectionist trade bill on the floor of this House. I am one who believes in free trade, and this amendment should not be viewed as attacking or bashing anybody. But let me say that all of us in this body and all of us in this country know that the Japanese have not paid their fair share with regard to what is taking place in the Middle East. We all know it.

We know it, and some of us want to say it and some of us do not. We know it, the Bush administration knows it, the Democratic Members of Congress know it, the Republican Members of Congress know it, and I will mention some who know it even more than we do—the American people know it.

I have heard Mr. SOLARZ and others say what will happen if we pass the amendment. Let me tell the Members what will happen if we do not pass this amendment. If we do not pass this amendment, we will send the word back to the Japanese Government and the members of the Japanese Diet that the Congress has gone on record to say that it is not necessary that they do more. So my sense of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is saying is that by voting no, we are saying this is a message. He is not locked in precisely on each and every term, but this is a message.

So I would say that if we vote no on the Bonior amendment, we will send a message to the Japanese Government that they are doing enough and they do not have to help in the Persian Gulf, that they do not have to carry a

greater burden. None of us want to do that.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us do what I think is important and what the American people would tell us they want us to do if they were here today. Let us support the Bonior amendment, and perfect the language, if necessary, in conference.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to close this debate by pointing out that we have put into the RECORD a list of every country and what they are contributing. I think the Members will find that very interesting. I point out that we have a letter from the Government Accounting Office urging Members to vote and sustain the committee position, vote against the Martin amendment vis-a-vis Crotone. They point out that there has been some hanky-panky, I guess, or some maneuvering around, because we really do not have the Crotone figures down, and that the allies have made no concessions, even though we have tried to bring the costs down.

They point out that the savings rate we are talking about is based on an unrealistic exchange rate, that they have cut the number of family housing units below the number that is absolutely needed. And they have changed the repayment method to NATO for housing, but NATO has not agreed to it.

So I think it is very, very important that we say at this time, no, we do not go forward with Crotone. And I think we must agree on dual basing, which I think the Persian Gulf incident has shown us is the wave of the future.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the Members will vote against the Martin amendment.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of amendments being offered by Congressmen MRAZEK and BONIOR. Both are representative of a realistic approach to U.S. foreign policy and defense spending.

We must decide whether maintaining our military presence in Japan and South Korea is both desirable and financially practical. While I believe it is desirable to maintain the present level of military forces in both Japan and South Korea, I no longer believe that it is financially practical. We cannot afford to unquestioningly borrow to financially secure the defense of our allies. In this day and age of huge deficits, there must be practical limits to our overseas defense commitments. We cannot ask our Federal employees to take unpaid furloughs when our allies are not willing to adequately commit financial resources to their own security.

But while the Mrazek and Bonior amendments would reduce our commitment to Japan

and South Korea, neither amendment eliminates our military defense of both those nations. Let me reiterate my continued support for the mutual defense of those two key trading partners.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Mrazek and Bonior amendments.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendments to be offered later today by my colleagues Mr. BONIOR and Mr. MRAZEK, as well as the portions of the bill currently being considered that implement similar burden sharing provisions.

These amendments and provisions promote a concept that I have advocated for many years: Making other countries contribute to the cost of American support.

The United States simply cannot afford to be the policeman of the world. Nor should we be. America can no longer singlehandedly foot the bill for the defense of other nations. This is especially true when the other countries in question can well afford to support military protection on their own.

The concept of burden sharing is one whose time has come. As we all are painfully aware, the United States is in serious financial straits. Just a few miles away, our colleagues are trying to determine whether or not to reduce Federal funds for programs that are vital to the well-being of our country, such as Medicare, education, and the war on drugs.

Yet there are some among us here who would argue that we should continue to support the defense of countries such as Japan, Korea, and others who are not faced with similar financial woes.

This does not make sense. This does not make sense to me; it does not make sense to a number of my colleagues; and, most importantly, if the people in my district are any indicator, it does not make sense to the American public.

There are presently 43,000 troops in Korea at a cost to the United States of nearly \$3 billion annually. This cost is the equivalent of imposing a 3-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline.

How can we justify this cost to the American taxpayer when the United States last year had a negative trade balance of almost \$7 billion with South Korea?

In the case of Japan the numbers are even more unbalanced. Our trade deficit with Japan last year was \$49 billion. Yet we are spending approximately \$5 billion a year to station United States troops in Japan to provide for its security. Our colleague, Mr. BONIOR, is right on track in demanding that Japan bear a greater financial cost in paying for its own defense. Let the Japanese use some of the money they spend in their economic battles with the United States on their own defense, and let us invest some of these savings in our own economic system.

These are critical questions of equity and common sense, and I commend our colleagues for offering these amendments. Regardless of the outcome of the votes today, I intend to continue to pursue this matter across the globe.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Armed Services Committee for its recognition of the need to insist that foreign nations foot the personnel costs of their own

citizens who work in the U.S. military installations overseas.

The committee states that we are "serving notice that the overseas basing support budget should be reduced by fiscal year 1994 to half of the fiscal year 1990 funded levels * * *". The committee then went on to find that the host nations should begin paying for construction, maintenance, and foreign labor costs.

These findings are similar to those developed by the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittees on Human Resources, which I chair. As a result of investigations conducted by my subcommittee, it is clear that foreign nations reap enormous benefits through the employment of their citizens at U.S. overseas military installations. It is only proper that foreign nationals who work at American bases be increasingly paid by the host nation rather than exclusively by the American taxpayer.

While I realize that in some cases this will mean entering into treaty renegotiations, I would argue that given this new world order that so many of us are celebrating, the treaties currently in place need to be reexamined. This is certainly the case with our bases in Germany, Japan, and Korea, as well as a number of other nations with vibrant economies.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to discontinue the practice of straining the American budget so that other countries, wealthy countries, may receive free defense. Today we are in a deadly serious economic competition with a number of the countries whose defense we are providing.

We must demand countries who can afford to do so begin to pay their share of the defense burden. We should not force Americans to moonlight so that other nations might sleep well.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired on the subject of burden sharing.

It is now in order to debate the subject matter of appropriate levels of funding for the strategic defense initiative.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. DICKINSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the members of the committee that we now begin 1 hour of general debate on the strategic defense initiative. I might point out parenthetically that this is the first debate on the strategic defense initiative occurring in the so-called post-cold-war era. I think there is some significance in that fact.

Mr. Chairman, we have been allocated 1 hour, and I reserve 30 minutes. Before I go into my general presentation, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mrs. BOXER], who is the cosponsor of the Dellums-Boxer

amendment on the strategic defense initiative.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding this time to me.

We have worked together on this type of an amendment for 4 years now. We have stood before this body and we have said, "Let us reduce the level of spending for star wars to basic research."

I believe we have been correct for the past 4 years. The record of star wars proves to me that we were absolutely correct.

What the gentleman from California and I, along with several others in this body, have said is that the original vision of star wars put forward by President Ronald Reagan was a fairy tale, an absolute fairy tale. It was presented as a solid shield to protect our people from Soviet missiles, from all the Soviet missiles that they could toss at us.

We said at the time that to spend billions of dollars on a fairy tale was ludicrous, that it was robbing money from other things we needed to do, not only in the military but for our people.

Last year the Pentagon decided that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] and others were correct, that the Ronald Reagan vision of star wars was indeed a fairy tale, was indeed a myth, and that the most they could stop in terms of missiles coming into this country would be 30 percent of the missiles thrown at us from the Soviet Union. Yet they still wanted to spend more and more billions of dollars on this new system.

The gentleman from California, with all the eloquence he has in him, and I stood up before this body and explained to the American people that even if 1 percent of the missiles thrown at us by the Soviet Union got through, this country would be history, there would be no one left to talk about how star wars failed. We tried very hard to explain that it was madness to pursue this course, that the course that had to be pursued was sitting down with the Soviet Union, negotiating treaties, and getting away from this madness.

This year the gentleman and I are back, and with all the history of this program behind us, we feel very confident that if people listen to this debate, we will win.

□ 1250

We will take this program back before the star wars days and make it a program of strong missile defense research, and that is what our number speaks to, \$1.5 billion which would do that.

The world has changed. Last night I sat in this Chamber. President Bush talked about the new world order, held

a press conference sitting side by side with the President of the Soviet Union, saying that it is time that we worked together against evil, against the rule of the jungle, and yet in this budget we still have the biggest expense in the budget for star wars.

Now, star wars, whether it was aimed at stopping 100 percent of Soviet missiles or 30 percent of Soviet missiles was aimed at the Soviet Union. That was the idea, to be able to win a fight with the Soviet Union. Those days are gone. So there is a little bit of panic in the military industrial complex, I say today, because they now have to look for another mission for star wars, because their first fairy tale was not true and the modified fairy tale did not make sense and now there is no need for it whatsoever. The walls have come down.

I just came back from Prague, Czechoslovakia. The countries of Eastern Europe that we have been protecting, that we have been protecting NATO from, now want to join NATO, now want to make one new organization where Eastern Europe and Western Europe can be together and defend Europe together.

It is a new day. How ludicrous for us to spend billions of dollars for a weapons system, even if it could work, and we have discussed that it could never work, is aimed at an old day, at an old world order. It makes no sense, especially in light of our terrible budget situation.

So star wars was created for fighting a war with the Soviet Union, and it is, my friends, a new day. So the military industrial complex now has told us that we need star wars to fight Saddam Hussein. We need star wars to stop the SCUD missiles. They have renamed it Brilliant Pebbles.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

The SCUD missile was sold to Iraq by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is sitting down with our people to teach us how to stop the SCUD missile; and do you know what, I think we need to learn how to stop the SCUD missile, but it is not going to be stopped by Brilliant Pebbles. It is a low flying, short-range missile.

We need other kinds of research. The Dellums-Boxer approach would give us the funds we need to look at that type of research.

So to use the Middle East as an excuse, to continue a system that was dreamed up by Ronald Reagan to fight the evil empire, the Soviet

Union, is absolutely a cruel joke on the American people.

I hope that this body will wake up today and join with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and myself and give us a really strong, good vote, so that we can bring this program back to basic missile defense.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from California for their leadership on this issue.

The world is now about to beat a path to their door, because they were right originally in suggesting that this program was absurd. It only existed with any degree of validity in the minds of those who believed it to be a useful bargaining chip to deal with the Soviet Union, and now that rationale has disappeared.

As the gentlewoman has suggested, the latest rationale for star wars will be the fact that some Third World nation might have a ballistic missile and might have a nuclear capability and that we should spend tens of billions of dollars on the off chance this happens to prevent it.

There are much more effective ways of delivering nuclear weapons by a nation that may have the technology. They may be able to build a bomb and put it on a ship and sail it into New York Harbor. That is a real possibility. Their ability to do that on a ballistic missile is not a real possibility.

I would just simply suggest that the gentlewoman is correct. The amount of money that is suggested here is the appropriate level of funding. Once again I want to add my strong support to the outstanding work both the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from California have done.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman so much.

This is such an important time for our Nation. We can feel so optimistic because really the people of the world are choosing our system of government.

Does this mean that there will not be threats, that we will not have to be prepared? Of course not. We can see that we need to be prepared, but it is a different type of threat.

This vote on star wars is crucial to us, because if we continue to fund a program whose mission has changed so many times that it has lost all credibility, whose only function I think right now is make work, I think we will have lost this golden opportunity to change what this Nation is about, to turn from these weapons of destruction and to finally begin to invest in our people so that we win the new war, which is the economic war.

I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. It has been so wonderful to work with him on this issue for these many years. I think we are making progress and I hope today's vote moves us closer to sanity.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, in preparation for this year's SDI debate, I looked back over my comments of last year to reflect and see if my thinking had changed, or the situation had changed.

Last year I said, talking about SDI, that we need it. It is justified. It is doable, and I say again nothing has changed. It is important that the Congress let the SDI research proceed at an aggressive pace so that President Bush is in a position to make an informed deployment decision by the year 1993.

Neither the committee funded level of \$2.9 billion nor the proposal of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] of \$2.3 billion will keep the SDI Program, or a deployment decision, on track.

You know, Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to hear the debate and see the players as they come on stage, pro and con. As we talk about SDI here, and talk about the Defense bill in general, it is really striking as you look over the history of the defense debates and the bills in the past few years, the people who oppose SDI today and yesterday are the same people who voted to gut the defense of this country for the last 10 years or more.

It is no accident that the Berlin Wall crumbled and that it is down today. It is no accident that the Warsaw Pact is in disarray and is crumbling as a military force. It is no accident that the whole thinking of the Soviet Union at the present time has swung around to where communism is being disavowed and they are going toward socialism or maybe even toward democracy. These things did not just happen out of a vacuum. They happened because the United States is strong, we are resolute, we are able to care for our defense programs and make the world safe for democracy.

It is not just one thing that does it. We had to be strong in our conventional forces. We had to be strong in our strategic forces, and SDI is a portion of this.

Many, many of the same people who would gut or kill SDI would gut or have killed our ICBM capability. I think you will hear in the debate today from some of them. These are the things that have made us strong, that are making us strong, that give us credibility when dealing with the Soviet Union. If we want to have a START agreement, as has been allud-

ed to, it is only because we have the capability of responding.

Nobody has ever suggested, that I know of, that there is going to be a leakproof shield if we deploy SDI, that it is going to give 100 percent assurance that we are going to be able to stop all incoming missiles.

□ 1300

SDI was never proposed that way. The thing it was proposed to do, though, was give enough capability to the United States so that the Soviets would know that some of their missiles would be stopped. A portion of their missiles would be stopped, and this removes the threat to us because they could not make a first strike without suffering irreparable harm in exchange.

SDI is important. Our ICBM modernization program is important. Our conventional capability is important. Certainly the money spent in the past 10 years on our defense capability has brought us to where we are today, where we are able to respond to an emergency situation in the Middle East, where we are able to sit down now and speak rationally and as a friend with former potential adversaries and enemies.

Mr. Chairman, I have today received a letter from President Bush, and it says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKINSON: I want to underscore the importance of the SDI program and express my concern about Congressional action to further cut SDI funds or restrict our ability to manage the program.

When I entered office, I ordered a thorough review of the SDI program—both the progress of its technology and our policy governing it. I concluded that SDI had made tremendous progress toward giving us the technological means to strengthen deterrence through introducing defenses. As the technology matures, we will need to conduct rigorous and realistic tests—consistent with the ABM Treaty—in order to make an informed decision on the feasibility of defenses.

Until we had the SDI, our only defense was a counter capability: "If you shoot us, we're going to shoot you." This gives us the only defense, the only shield in the world.

He says further:

Nonetheless, in making up the Defense Authorization Bill, the House Armed Services Committee has cut over a billion and a half dollars from my SDI request. Such a cut would devastate SDI, forcing us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use all the time in discussing this. I would just like to say that SDI is a very small fraction of our total defense budget. But it is essential, it is necessary, and the administration needs it. All the people in the Pentagon who are in positions of influence, the Joint Chiefs, the service chiefs, they say that we need it, we want it, it is affordable, it

is doable. There are no technological showstoppers of which I am aware in the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say, "Let's go forward with building a capability for defense, not offense. Don't gut the program. Don't say that the money we've spent to date has been wasted so that we cannot go forward with it."

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that when the Members are given the opportunity of voting that they will not go to the lowest figure or go to the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. What we are asking for in the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] here today is funding at least year's level. Last year's level. No increase in funding.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is fair. I think it is doable, and, as the President has said:

As you and your colleagues consider the Defense Bill, I hope you will take into account the tremendous progress and promise of SDI, and will provide us with the means to manage an effective program.

Just let me say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that we have already brought what I think is a bad bill to the floor. We have cut too deeply. We are now realizing, in part, that we have cut too deeply, even in conventional capability. We are looking to ways to restore it in view of what has been happening in the Middle East. I think that the bill, in its present form, will not have my support, and I do not think the President will support it, but if my colleagues continue to decimate the programs and keep cutting the funding, I think it can guarantee them that the final product will look something like a lace doily and will not be signed by the President. What we are doing here today is futile, and will have no effect.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, shortly after I come to this Chamber, after World War II, the question of SDI was a question before Congress, and it was decided in those early years that a study should be made to see how to stop incoming ICBM's and other projectiles of that nature. Some 20 billion, or thereabouts, was spent before President Reagan gave it its title, SDI, but the program was well under way before President Reagan was elected. It is an important program.

The chairman of the committee allowed me the privilege of chairing a panel to bring before us former Secretaries of Defense and others who were specialists in this field, and they testified that a figure of somewhere between \$2 and \$3 billion a year was ample for research in this field, and, therefore, it has been my effort in the recent years to set a figure of about \$3

billion for the research aspect of this program.

Unfortunately though, when we have a program like this, the industrial complex gets involved, and parochialism gets involved, and it is very hard to put the thing in context.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is an effort being made today in our country to actually throw out the ABM Treaty which said that there was not going to be an SDI for Russia, or for the United States or for any other country, that there was not going to be that. There was going to be a limitation on this type of defense. There was going to be a limitation on this type of defense, and that now is a subject being talked about, and efforts are being made to change that treaty.

Mr. Chairman, that treaty has worked pretty well for the last 40 years. We have had 40 years of not being involved in that kind of warfare, and so I feel pretty good about it. It seems to work. I ask my colleagues, "Why would you want to change something under those circumstances?"

Now something has changed, and the world has already been talking about it, and that is a question of whether or not it is viable to think about Russia attacking the United States with ICBM's. This was discussed at a time when Russia would seem to be developing an SDI, and at that time Mr. Weinberger advised President Reagan that there was an obvious answer to SDI since it is not going to be perfect, as has already been testified to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON]. Nobody ever expected it to be perfect. It was said by Weinberger, "Well, in those circumstances we'll be well protected because we'll just produce more ICBM's, and due to the fact that it will be a leaky umbrella, we'll just produce more."

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the situation that would occur. That is a very dangerous situation. That does not add to the likelihood of our survival. It does not have much to do with having a peaceful world working things out for the best for everybody concerned. It adds to the danger of the world, and that is the reason it is in the ABM treaty that we cannot do that. Protection under the treaty has to be done on just a particular location, it cannot be done on a universal pattern.

Mr. Chairman, as I approach the figure today in this bill and the figure which I have in my amendment, 2.35 billion, it is a figure which is arrived at in two ways. First, the \$3 billion which I thought was a reasonable amount when we were in prosperous times as far as national defense is concerned is working it down to a figure which is more comparable to today's financial opportunity with regard to defense

matters. And the other one was really expressed pretty well by our friend on the other side, Senator NUNN, when he said the Senate ought to have a figure which, together with our figure, could be compromised at a reasonable figure. So, this figure, compromised with their figure, would give us \$3 billion, assuming we compromise to that point.

One other thing before I conclude my remarks, and that is to say that things have changed in more ways than one. Actually SDI should be channelled in directions today which it is not really channelled for. It should be channelled in directions to see what we are going to do to stop low-flying missiles, guided missiles and things of that type which are much more of a danger to ourselves. Also it should be looked at in a way in which we can look at the possibility of a country like Iran or Iraq, or some other country like that, getting nuclear arms, and what would we do about that.

Mr. Chairman, obviously our answer to that would be that we could just absolutely flatten them with what we have. If they send a missile or two over, we could just flatten them with what we have, which is enough to flatten Russia, as far as that is concerned. So, we have a pretty good answer to that, but we do not have a good scientific basis for saying how we would distinguish this circumstance without having an envelope over all the United States.

□ 1310

We should do that study because that is really the challenge today. It is not the erstwhile challenge of the Russian standoff with regard to ourselves. So for this reason my amendment has a \$2.35 billion figure on it, which, when averaged together with the Senate figure, would give us the \$3 billion, and I think that would be adequate.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise Members that from this point on I will be controlling the time on my side.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is devoted to the appropriate spending levels for SDI. As we all know, the President requested \$4.46 billion. The Senate passed an amount for SDI which was the same as last year's level of funding for SDI. It is \$3.57 billion, and that is the level of the amendment which I will be proposing later on. Last year's level, the same thing the Senate passed, and that will be my amendment. Without an inflation factor, of

course, it represents a real dollar cut in the program.

Let me tell Members what the President of the United States said in a letter to Senator WARNER with respect to the funding level when the bill was before the Senate.

A vote to cut SDI below the Senate Armed Services Committee mark, which was \$3.57 billion, will force us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts, and therefore is essentially a vote against strategic defense for America.

The President has said in effect that the bottom line for him is the Senate level of \$3.57 billion. As I said, that is the level which is included in my amendment.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] quoted from a letter that was just sent to him by the President today. I would like to reiterate something the President said in that letter.

In marking up the defense authorization bill, the House Armed Services Committee has cut over a billion and a half dollars from my SDI request. Such a cut would devastate SDI, forcing us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts.

It makes little sense to force us to forego realistic tests of promising SDI technologies. Indeed, Congress has always insisted that we fly before we buy systems.

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the problem of the Hubble telescope, where we were pennywise, but pound foolish. That was science. This is defense, where we cannot afford to be wrong.

There are essentially three reasons for the SDI Program. One is the expanding Soviet strategic modernization. They still have 12,000 warheads aimed at the United States.

Second is the proliferation of ballistic missiles around the world. As CIA Director Webster has said, over 15 Third World countries will possess this technology by the end of this decade, approximately six of whom will also have nuclear capability.

Of course, the third reason that we have SDI is to help develop a balance between defense and offense, driving our defense in space talks toward an accommodation with the Soviet Union for a safer world.

Mr. Chairman, let me talk just a little bit about the Third World proliferation here. Unfortunately, missiles are with us. They have been invented. The genie is out of the bottle.

As CIA Director Webster said, and as this chart illustrates, there are people all over the world now who are acquiring this ballistic missile technology. As you will see, these are not the most stable countries in the world. They are in very unstable areas of the world.

An example, of course, is Iraq. That is the example that is with us today, because there are three Iraqi missiles, all of which have capability to reach our forces deployed in that region of the world. They have the capability of

reaching our ships and of reaching our allies in that part of the world. Mr. Chairman, today there is no real defense against those missiles.

SDI will provide that defense. We cannot ignore the threat any longer. This is no longer just a cold war problem. We can have a defense in 5 years or so for the next Iraq.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is very clear that we are going to have Third World conflicts in the future. We are going to ask ourselves why we did not prepare for that when 5 years from now we are confronted with a similar threat and we have sent our young women and men into battle and not provided them the protection which they deserve.

There is a quotation from Abul Abbas of the Palestinian Liberation Front, September 1990, from the Wall Street Journal, where he said:

There is an Arabic saying that revenge takes 40 years. If not my son, then the son of my son will kill you. Some day we will have missiles that can reach New York.

So whether it is in a theater like the Middle East, or a threat against the continental United States, we need the strategic defense initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close with respect to the arms control negotiations. I have two very recent letters. One is from the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I would like to put both of these letters and the President's letter in the RECORD.

This letter from Ron Lehman reads as follows, and I will only quote part of it.

I urge you and your colleagues to support the Strategic Defense Initiative program during House consideration of the fiscal year 1991 defense authorization bill. Specifically, I recommend your opposition to proposed amendments that would dramatically reduce necessary SDI funding and impose crippling programmatic restrictions. Such amendments, should they be enacted into law, would undermine our arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union and could deny the President the opportunity to move in the direction of a far more stable, secure deterrence.

SDI has provided significant negotiating leverage in the Strategic Arms Reduction or START negotiations. This will be no less true in the START follow-on negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lehman goes on to talk about the important need for support for SDI by the Congress today when discussing funding levels.

In a letter of September 4 from Ambassador David Smith, the Chief Ambassador of the Defense and Space Talks, expressly speaking to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], he says:

I urge you and your House colleagues to oppose these amendments to the defense authorization bill. These amendments would undercut the United States in the Defense and Space Talks. I am convinced that

the Bennett and Spratt amendments would constrain the program in ways that could only pull the rug from under my negotiating team and me.

Mr. Chairman, what are we doing here? We have got to support the U.S. policy to have a balance between offense and defense. We cannot pull the rug out from under our negotiators. What that means in the President's own words is that we have got to support a funding level which is at the Senate level of \$3.57 billion, at a minimum.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I will urge my colleagues later to support that funding level which is embodied in the Kyl amendment, and to oppose the Bennett amendment and the Delums amendment, which would cut the funding level far below that.

Mr. Chairman, I include these letters for the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 12, 1990.

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKINSON: I want to underscore the importance of the SDI program and express my concern about Congressional action to further cut SDI funds or restrict our ability to manage the program.

When I entered office, I ordered a thorough review of the SDI program—both the progress of its technology and our policy governing it. I concluded that SDI had made tremendous progress toward giving us the technological means to strengthen deterrence through introducing defenses. As the technology matures, we will need to conduct rigorous and realistic tests—consistent with the ABM Treaty—in order to make an informed decision on the feasibility of defenses. To fund these tests I asked for an increase in the SDI budget, even as we faced an overall cut in the Defense budget.

Nonetheless, in marking up the Defense Authorization Bill, the House Armed Services Committee has cut over a billion and a half dollars from my SDI request. Such a cut would devastate SDI, forcing us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts. Some in Congress are also seeking to manage the SDI program themselves by cutting my request for the most promising SDI technologies. In many ways this is more serious than a funding cut. A vote to fence funding of the most promising technologies amounts to a vote against strategic defenses even before we have the data from critical tests. As Congress imposes cuts in the Defense Budget, at the very least, I need flexibility to manage our programs. It makes little sense to force us to forego realistic tests of promising SDI technologies. Indeed, Congress has always insisted that we fly before we buy weapons systems.

As you and your colleagues consider the Defense Bill, I hope you will take into account the tremendous progress and promise of SDI, and will provide us with the means to manage an effective program. SDI will be among the most important factors in my evaluation of the Defense Authorization Bill.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,

Washington, DC, September 10, 1990.

Hon. JON KYL,
Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KYL: I urge you and your colleagues to support the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program during House consideration of the Fiscal Year 1991 Defense Authorization bill. Specifically, I recommend your opposition to proposed amendments that would dramatically reduce necessary SDI funding and impose crippling programmatic restrictions. Such amendments, should they be enacted into law, would undermine our arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union and could deny the President the opportunity to move in the direction of a far more stable, secure deterrent.

SDI has provided significant negotiating leverage in the strategic arms reduction (START) negotiations. This will be no less true in the START follow-on negotiations. Continued development of space-based defenses such as Brilliant Pebbles, which are particularly effective against large MIRVed ICBMs in the boost-phase, would provide substantial incentive to the Soviet Union to de-MIRV its ICBM force—a long-standing objective of U.S. arms control policy. Defenses may also provide a safer path to reductions.

In their joint statement at the Washington Summit on follow-on negotiations, President Bush and President Gorbachev also called upon both sides to "implement an appropriate relationship" between offensive and defensive forces. If we are patient and persistent in pursuing both our negotiating objectives and a vigorous SDI program, there is good reason to believe the Soviets will join us in deploying defenses in a way that enhances the security interests of both sides. I strongly believe that a robustly funded SDI program provides critical leverage to motivate the Soviet Union to agree to a cooperative transition to a more balanced offense-defense force posture.

Efforts to reduce drastically funding for SDI and to restrict the program manager's flexibility seriously undermine our ability to achieve our arms control objectives and reduce the potential to move deterrence onto a more stable and secure plane. I strongly urge your support in defeating any amendments which would harm the SDI program.

Sincerely,

RONALD F. LEHMAN II,
Director.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE
NEGOTIATIONS ON NUCLEAR AND
SPACE ARMS WITH THE SOVIET
UNION,

Geneva, Switzerland, September 4, 1990.

Hon. JON KYL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KYL: In response to your inquiry, I am pleased to convey my views on the effect the Spratt and Bennett amendments will have on the Defense and Space Talks here in Geneva. I urge you and your House colleagues to oppose these amendments to the Defense Authorization Bill. SDIO Director Ambassador Cooper has already shared with you the debilitating effect they would have on the SDI program. These amendments would also undercut the United States in the Defense and Space Talks.

Our talks are at what I would call the conceptual stage, similar to the negotiations which took place in the early and mid-1980s in START. Then we had to convince the Soviets that Western concepts of deterrence and stability would enhance not just our, but also their security. We are now seeing the fruit of those patient and determined efforts in the emerging START Treaty and in the Joint Statement on Future Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms and Further Enhancing Strategic Stability, issued at the Washington Summit in June.

Now, my Geneva negotiating team and I have a similar challenge, this time on the defense side.

We are encouraged by small, but nevertheless real, Soviet steps here at the talks on predictability, or confidence-building measures. We are even more hopeful that the fascinating Soviet public debate on the value of defenses, made possible by glasnost and new thinking, will turn up patches of common ground which we can work to expand here in Geneva. It is clear that a number of knowledgeable Soviets agree that a safer, more stable strategic balance can be achieved by increasing reliance on defenses. This would be for the good of both countries, and a negotiated, cooperative transition to this safer balance may be achievable. This would be the first cooperative transition since the dawn of the nuclear era.

However, I must tell you frankly, our work in Geneva to seek Soviet agreement on ways to strengthen deterrence will be insufficient without a strong SDI program. If the Soviet Union is going to join hands with us in designing this safer world, it must see that it is technologically feasible and that America is determined to get there. This will mean diverting some of the still considerable money, manpower, technology resources, and political commitment the Soviet Union now applies to its extensive strategic offensive nuclear weapons. Only the knowledge that the United States is proceeding with a credible strategic defense program will provide incentive to do this.

If we can expand the footholds of common ground we see emerging, if our SDI program is progressing in accordance with the realistic timetable established by President Bush, there will be an opportunity for success in the Defense and Space Talks. The President's timetable, a realistic schedule for a Phase I deployment, and our proposals here in Geneva would converge to allow time for ample discussion of all relevant issues and negotiation of a cooperative transition. If, however, Secretary Cheney and Ambassador Cooper are prevented from running the SDI program in a way which supports President Bush's plan to make a decision within his first term in office, I see no hope of success at the Geneva talks. Insufficient funding, inflexible program restrictions, or a combination of the two, will create such a situation. I am convinced that the Bennett and Spratt amendments would constrain the program in ways that could only pull the rug out from under my negotiating team and me.

Best regards,

DAVID J. SMITH,
Chief Negotiator,
Defense and Space Talks.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 3, 1990.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I am writing to underscore the importance of the SDI program and express my concern about Congressional action to further cut SDI funds or restrict our ability to manage the program.

When I entered office, I ordered a thorough review of the SDI program—both the progress of its technology and our policy governing it. I concluded that SDI had made tremendous progress toward giving us the technological means to strengthen deterrence through introducing defenses. As the technology matures, we will need to conduct rigorous and realistic tests—consistent with the ABM Treaty—in order to make an informed decision on the feasibility of defenses. To fund these tests I asked for an increase in the SDI budget, even as we faced an overall cut in the Defense budget.

Nonetheless, in making up the Defense Authorization Bill, the Senate Armed Services Committee has cut almost a billion dollars from my SDI request. The House seems determined to cut more. But a vote to cut SDI below the Senate Armed Services Committee mark will force us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts, and therefore is essentially a vote against strategic defense for America. Some in the Senate are also seeking to manage the SDI program themselves by cutting my request for the most promising SDI technologies. In many ways this is more serious than a funding cut. As Congress imposes cuts in the Defense Budget, at the very least, I need flexibility to manage our programs. Moreover, it makes little sense to force us to forego realistic tests of promising SDI technologies.

As you and your colleagues consider the Defense Bill, I hope you will take into account the tremendous progress and promise of SDI, and will provide us with the means to manage an effective program. SDI will be among the most important factors in my evaluation of the Defense Authorization Bill.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I make a number of my points, I would simply like to respond to a few statements that have been made. First, with respect to the reference to the Berlin Wall, I would like to assert very aggressively that the Berlin Wall did not come down because we spent, and in my humble opinion, wasted, \$20 billion pursuing star wars.

The Berlin Wall came down because of the power of ideas, and human beings' understanding that when they collectively decide they wanted to change the course of history, that they had the capacity to do that. Not because America had star wars and MX and small mobile and B-2 bombers. Anyone who asserts that, in my humble opinion, is asserting an absurd idea.

Second, the strategic defense initiative was sold to the American people

as the great peace shield, that in some way we would return to the naive days before there were nuclear weapons. We would build a Houston Astrodome over America, and the nuclear weapons will fall blithely away from the American people.

Then that idea clearly became fanciful. Suddenly we found ourselves not advocating a population defense, but a point defense. The American people had been sold great propaganda. We suddenly found out star wars was not about protecting them, but about protecting other missiles and other military assets.

Now we find that our colleagues want to sell the strategic defense initiative as a way of addressing the problems of the Third World. In the course of my remarks, I will focus very briefly upon that.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of talking points I would like to make. Some of them I will not pursue in great detail, because over the years we have tried to make these points diligently, in the past.

No. 1, I would like to focus the attention of Members on the ABM treaty. The deployment of SDI, as we have said on many occasions, will abrogate the ABM Treaty, will put it at risk.

The fact of the matter is that the logic of ABM and the logic of SDI are contradictory ideas. To pursue one is to challenge the other. No one has effectively argued that that is indeed not the case.

Mr. Chairman, the ABM Treaty was agreed upon by the United States and the Soviet Union many years ago because they recognized that without ABM, we would pursue an offensive and defensive missile arms race that would plunge both nations into economic despair and the world into great danger. And here we are.

□ 1320

Mr. Chairman, I think anytime we are proceeding to take action that would abrogate a significant treaty we ought to move with great caution and great care.

Some people have been candid before the Committee on Armed Services. The most recent Director of SDI has said, yes, indeed, to pursue SDI, to pursue Brilliant Pebbles is to force the Nation at some point to abrogate the ABM Treaty.

Question, query: Is that what you choose to do? Answer: Each time over the last several years that the Congress of the United States, as representatives of the American people, have been asked that question, they have overwhelmingly voted to support the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty. Mr. Chairman, the ABM Treaty is central to ongoing arms-control agreements. This is important. We should not throw it out the window

casually. It is certainly not a bargaining chip, Mr. Chairman.

Soviet negotiators have continued to insist that U.S. violation or withdrawal from ABM Treaty as traditionally interpreted would mean the end of Soviet offensive reductions under START. So to pursue this madness is to fly in the face of our ultimate objective which is to move the Soviet Union to reduce offensive weapons capability, not pursue them to lay that down.

Let us now look at Soviet strategic modernization. As this gentleman has been briefed, Soviet modernization is START-compliant. I repeat for emphasis: START-compliant. There has been no evidence to suggest, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that the Soviets are planning some Sunday punch on the United States. Soviet strategy, strategic modernization, according to administration briefings, is START-compliant. Their method of modernization continues to be one that fiddles at the margins with existing weapons systems but no major new waves of weapon systems, and if the Soviets really, if they really wanted to exploit ABM, why do they not expand their Blackjack bomber capability which briefings indicate that they are not doing?

Let us now focus, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, on this new idea that SDI must now save us from Third World threats. I would begin by making this assertion: SDI was originally conceived, and improbably, as a shield against a massive strategic attack from the Soviet Union. It was never designed to preclude a missile attack from a Third World country. Most of the systems that SDI was focused on such as Brilliant Pebbles cannot intercept low-flying missiles such as the Iraqi tactical missiles, the SCUD or other short-range missiles, and I repeat, cannot attack those weapons.

Second, Third World technology is overstated. If I might have my colleague's attention, answer this argument, Third World technology is overstated. No Third World country's weapon will be aimed at the United States, because none can reach us. At least a dozen countries are trying to acquire missiles with ranges of hundreds of miles, but there is a huge technological difference between a 5-ton missile capable of lobbing a chemical weapon across a border and a 50-ton missile that can toss a nuclear warhead across an ocean.

The third point, the combination of factors needed to comprise a threat is not likely even if a Third World country succeeded in acquiring an ICBM, and successes in acquiring nuclear capability and mating the two will have to combine, Mr. Chairman, several other factors to constitute a threat to the United States, extreme hostility

toward us, a leadership virtually immune to international opinion, a leader who is insane, and not just insane in the sense that this word is casually applied to some Third World leaders, but insane in clinical terms, Mr. Chairman, psychotic, because for a nation that lobbs its three or four hard-earned nuclear missiles in the direction of the United States it would likely literally be annihilated within a matter of minutes if not a few hours.

Mr. Chairman, delivery would not be by an ICBM, I would assert very aggressively, Mr. Chairman. It would be much more clandestine, and even if one grant that somehow a crazy gets his or her hands on a bomb and an ICBM, why would they try to deliver the weapon in the one way that identifies their country unambiguously as the source of the attack, thereby assuring their own and their peoples' incineration and total annihilation.

I would assert, rather, that the weapon would be small, transportable, and, thus, more capable of being hidden and concealed. A crude nuclear weapon may weight more than 50 pounds of backpack nuclear weapons, but not more than about 1,000 pounds, which means it could be conveniently located in a footlocker. Mr. Chairman, it could be flown into the country undetected in a lightweight aircraft, moved about in a Chevy van to the White House, to the Capitol, to Wall Street or anywhere.

SDI would be no use in such a more likely scenario.

We have already spent \$20 billion on a bizarre idea. We do not need Third World countries as a rationale of spending billions of hard-earned American dollars to pursue this level of madness.

The obvious point that this gentleman seeks to make is that SDI is a strategic defense initiative, not a tactical defense initiative. This is just another desperate attempt to rationalize and justify a system that no longer has a rationalization in a rational mind.

In the case of a prospective attack on an allied state, other systems, not SDI, are designed to face that threat, and I would like the Members to hear this, Mr. Chairman, that the United States is currently supporting work on a number of other systems intended to intercept ballistic missiles such as Scud.

Outside the SDI Program, improved versions of the Army's Patriot anti-aircraft missile have been modified to give them the ability to intercept ballistic missiles, a greater Third World threat.

The Office of SDI is in pursuit of phase 1 deployment and has virtually ignored this threat that everybody is now talking about on the Third World. We are pursuing Brilliant Pebbles,

and, ironically, the programs in SDI which may be aimed at this sort of threat are not part of the phase 1 SDI, and nobody is talking about it, but I assert it on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, the phase 1 program, the programs that would affect these kinds of missiles, have low funding priorities. As a matter of fact, out of all of the money that is being requested here, over \$4 billion, only \$143 million goes to missile interception and the kinds of programs, the extended-range interceptor, the theater high-altitude air defense, the Arrow that the Israelis are developing; only \$143 million in fiscal 1991 budget for the development of these kinds of systems.

Let us not play games here to rationalize it in some way, Brilliant Pebbles, putting thousands of miniature nuclear weapons in space, and, incidentally, each one will weigh about 88 pounds and cost \$1 billion a copy, and you are talking about thousands of them in space. Not only would they abrogate the ABM Treaty, but they certainly would play no role in challenging a threat in Third World countries.

Mr. Chairman, finally, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] and myself have come to this floor saying let us put this genie back in the bottle. Let us only deal with basic research.

Before Mr. Reagan dreamed up this idea, we were doing basic research. We would at this point be spending about \$1.5 billion in that basic research.

I find it interesting that this administration, through the SDI Office, are only asking for \$1.5 billion in basic research, so the gentlewoman and I are right on target. We do not need to bend metal and engage in testing that threatens the ABM Treaty, that moves us toward some phase 1 deployment that serves no useful purpose.

Mr. Chairman, basic research allows us to move with greater flexibility, with greater care and greater caution, Mr. Chairman, so that if we did have to develop research to deal with the real-life threat, we could do it, not the \$143 million that goes against the Third World threat when we are talking about billions of dollars that goes against a strategic threat that no longer exists.

I ask my colleagues to support the Dellums-Boxer amendment to bring this absurd level of funding down to \$1.5 billion, and put it back in basic research, put it back in the laboratory where it should have been.

□ 1330

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the last speaker.

I know the gentleman from California misspoke and probably realizes he misspoke when he indicated that the cost of each Brilliant Pebbles would be \$1 billion. It is something less than \$1

million, and I know he appreciates that fact.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield briefly, I did misspeak. It is \$1 million a copy.

Mr. KYL. I knew the gentleman knew that and I wanted to clarify that.

Second, I would also like to clarify for the record that while it may be true that Brilliant Pebbles could not intercept a Scud missile because of its low trajectory, two other Iraqi missiles, al-Abbas and al-Hussein, would be interceptable with Brilliant Pebbles.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who is acknowledged by both the last speaker, the gentleman from California, and myself, as well as our colleagues in this body to be an expert on the issue of strategic matters in defense.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this appears to be a contentious debate, but frankly I am very optimistic about where we are going on this strategic defense, and I will tell Members why I say it.

Our side has been pushing the idea of strategic defense for a very long time. It started out with President Reagan as the concept of a leak-proof shield. The liberal side of the Democrat Party particularly was opposed to any concept of strategic defense, arguing that we basically ought to keep it in the research and in the laboratory, and that all it does is really to invite a major attack, and that the system was unworkable and it is technically not achievable.

Let me tell my colleagues where we are right now. Both sides are coming to agreement that there is value in strategic defense. The issue is what level of strategic defense, what kind of strategic defense. Secondly, how much money should we spend at what particular point in time in order to achieve it.

We now as a Congress have decided that it does make sense in this country to have some system in place to protect us against incoming ballistic missiles. We tend to think that we ought to be more robust in our efforts to develop the technologies. The liberal side of the Congress tends to think we should be less robust and more cautious.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I only have 2 minutes, I am sorry. I would love to yield and be able to have a debate, and I wish I had 10 minutes to have a good debate on this, but the debate time is not long enough.

My point though is I am no longer a believer in the leak-proof shield concept, and I am not sure I ever was. I kind of dismissed that notion. I believe in a robust defense to protect us against what I think the threat is in

the future, and that is the Third World threat, the limited attack, and, in fact, I was a sponsor, the first sponsor in the Congress for a study to figure out if we could develop the technologies, the JOHN KYL supported technologies and those that JOHN SPRATT is supporting, laser beams and particle beams, and KYL is supporting the Brilliant Pebbles. None of those concepts are inconsistent with what we ultimately want to achieve, and that is some level of effective strategic defense.

So rather than this being a contentious argument, really it is just a debate over the details and the fringe, and I support Kyl because I want to be more robust. It is a difference of about \$600 million between the Kyl proposal and the committee.

I think we ought to be more generous. Some think we should be less, and some support Bennett. The bottom line is we all support strategic defense, and thank God we do. It is just the type and the level at which we proceed that we disagree on.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER].

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding me 3 minutes, which is not a long period of time so I would ask my colleagues not to ask me to yield. I will try to get my statement done in that period of time.

First of all, I think I would like to say that quote unquote star wars has nothing to do with the stars, it has nothing to do with war. It has everything to do with peace. It has everything to do with deterrence. It has everything to do with America having the capability of defending its homeland and our troops abroad.

Everybody in this body, particularly those who enjoy debating, probably debate in high school or college. I think we can simplify this extremely important debate about what type of strategic doctrine or conventional doctrine our Nation must have. If we think back about those questions when we are debaters in high school, the question, if we were debaters in high school, before us today would be resolved: Should the United States of America have the capability of stopping in midflight a ballistic missile armed with a nuclear, a chemical, a biological or conventional warhead aimed and targeted at our men and women in uniform launched by Saddam Hussein? That is the question we have before us today. Should the United States forgo that capability of defending 100,000 men and women halfway around the world or should we move as rapidly as we can toward developing a capability to stop a missile launched by Mr. Hussein?

If the question is placed in that way a simple resolution, in high school, in college, in law school debates, Americans, in that debate the winning side would say yes, America should develop the capability of defending our troops by stopping such a missile launched by Mr. Hussein.

Also, the ability to defend ourselves is a lot more humane than deterrence based on mutually assured destruction. It is more moral; it is as American as apple pie for America to develop the capability of stopping a ballistic missile aimed at ourselves or our soldiers.

Also I might say that mutually assured destruction is what we have today. That has been rejected I think in this body for Israel. Mutually assured destruction is basically saying I am defenseless and if you attack me we will kill you. It is based on the moral concept of revenge, and we want to go beyond that in this body.

Finally, there is a great irony, and I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] hinted at it. The State of Israel right now is placed in an unfortunate situation. Israel almost must start a war in order to win a war. The reason that Israel is now in that position is because another side, if they start a war, would decimate Israel. Israel today has to preempt if they think a war is coming, and in essence has to start a war. That is an unstable situation.

The United States of America must build the capability of defending Americans whether they be abroad or whether they be here at home. This debate is fundamental. We are talking about moving in one direction or another direction.

Please give support to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and his amendment to have a robust effort so that Americans can deter conflict and protect our own in foreign lands.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, in 1 minute I just wanted to say I think it would be extremely foolish of our country to let go of this technology. We cannot keep making progress without scientists, and we cannot underfund a program and retain the best scientists that are needed.

The nuclear genie will not climb back into the bottle.

The Soviet Union may talk peace, and I would love to see the lamb lie down with the lion, but the facts are they are building modern missiles, SS-24's which are rail-mobile, SS-25's which are road-mobile, they are modernizing the SS-18, the Typhoon class nuclear submarines, the Delta 4 class. So while all of this is going on, plus 15 countries in the Third World by the

year 2000 will have an intercontinental ballistic missile capability, it would be very foolish of us not to move from mutual assured destruction to mutual assured survival.

The spinoffs from this technology in medicine, in computers, in optics are amazing, and this is the most open and reported-on program in the history of the world. Read the report and understand it is critical that we not yield this technology by underfunding the program. The Soviets are spending as much for strategic defense as they spend for strategic offense. This program is important as we move from mutual assured destruction to mutual assured survival.

□ 1340

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from a trip to the Middle East, and I can attest to the danger in the area there.

Over the last year I made a point of traveling to almost every major national laboratory and visited most of the contractors dealing with SDI. Those trips are incredibly interwoven.

The fact is that SDI already has been a success, and we have the technology to do the job for which it is intended. If ever deployed, and I am not absolutely optimistic that it will ever be deployed, but if deployed, we can successfully stop intercontinental ballistic missiles from purposely or accidentally hitting the people of the United States. And I think that is a noble purpose, it is a worthwhile purpose, it is one that we owe it to our people to pursue.

On the first point it has been a success because we have already, through the SDI Program, developed \$20,000 motors that you can hold in the palm of your hand. We have electrical valves to turn these motors on and off in thousands of a second, some 100 times faster than we ever thought feasible.

We have developed cameras which have been scaled down to the size of a human eyeball with a tiny electronic retina and fisheye lens that gives incredibly extraordinarily sharp images. When equipped with infrared ultraviolet sensors, they can see through darkness or clouds.

We have new chips and new ways of wiring which would give us a mini-Cray computer able to do as many as a million calculations per second and are small enough to fit easily in a soft drink can.

I would say that the SDI Program has been an extraordinary success.

Combine the available technology with what we know about independent radical adversaries around the world,

regardless of what has happened, thankfully, between the Soviet Union and the United States in the last 12 months; when you consider that as recently as May 10, 1990, Saddam Hussein was quoted as saying,

With the help of Allah, we shall rid that region of American influence. Our missiles cannot reach Washington, but if they could we would hit there as necessary. However, we can still hit Washington in other ways, and other U.S. targets around the world.

Consider the fact that Iraq's recent missile tests showed it is only a matter of time before Hussein has ICBM's. Or that Iran, North Korea, Libya, and others are doing their darndest to get and acquire intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

Libya's Mu'ammarr Qadhafi recently said that "if we had the deterrent force of missiles able to reach New York [during the American raid in 1986], we would have directed them at that very moment."

Those countries, by the way, are not signatories to the ABM Treaty and have no relevance whatsoever to that treaty.

We have to be prepared to contend with the threats before us in this world, and we have to utilize the technology available to us.

I emphatically support the amendments by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], and oppose the committee bill and those amendments of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], and the gentleman and lady from California, Mr. DELLUMS and Mrs. BOXER.

[From NBC Nightly News, NBC-TV, Apr. 21, 1990]

NEW THREAT FROM COLONEL QADDAFI

Garrick Utley: What today brought from Libya is the latest threat from Colonel Qaddafi. He said Arab nations must develop nuclear weapons within the next several years. He also said that if he had had nuclear missiles when American planes attacked Tripoli in 1986, he would have retaliated by firing those missiles at New York City.

That from Colonel Qaddafi today.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for this brief opportunity to speak on the 1991 defense authorization bill and specifically, on behalf of the strategic defense initiative program.

I have been a strong supporter of SDI programs since their inception. SDI has become the cornerstone of our country's "peace through strength" program, by bringing our Soviet counterparts to the bargaining table for peace treaties and decreased tension between the superpowers.

I, like many of you, welcome the decreased tensions with our Soviet coun-

terparts, however we are not out of the woods yet. In general, military spending decreases must be viewed in the light that they could have a devastating effect on our ability to maintain worldwide stability.

Today's Persian Gulf crisis has once again demonstrated that the United States cannot weaken our military position in the world.

Continued research and development of SDI is integral to our continued ability to help maintain our security on our own continent and help maintain world stability and order in future years.

CIA Director William Webster estimates that between 15 and 20 nations will possess ballistic missile capabilities within 10 years; and 6 of those nations will have nuclear capabilities. Proliferation of ballistic missiles to the Third World threaten to reshape fundamental concepts of global security. This is a serious threat which cannot be ignored.

SDI theater defense programs will be able to counter the threat of tactical ballistic missiles, aircraft and some cruise missiles. SDI systems are being designed to destroy targets in flight before they hit their intended destination.

This essential program, the cornerstone of our peace through strength initiative, costs slightly more than 1 percent of our current defense obligations—a bargain for our most effective program.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Kyl amendment, to continue the essential research and development of SDI.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is very clear that the SDI Program is not simply an anti-Soviet system. There are 14, possibly 15, countries on the face of the Earth with nuclear capability. If we do not recognize that this is a system that is designed to ensure peace throughout the world, we are not going to be able to effectively maintain the gains of the revolution of 1989. I think SDI, as one person told me in West Germany, is clearly responsible for the crumbling of the Berlin Wall.

I think we need to recognize that to weaken our position now would be a gross mistake, and I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this year marks the 7th anniversary of Reagan's SDI speech, but in spite of all of the media attention that SDI has received, more than half of Americans still believe that the United States currently has a defense against missile attack.

Logic dictates the need for such a system. The theory of mutual assured destruction supposes that we are only safe as long as neither

the United States nor the U.S.S.R. have any defense at all. Who could support such a theory?

Yet, even if this made any sense, the Soviet Union has violated the spirit and the letter of the ABM Treaty in developing a \$200 billion defensive system. In fact, the Soviets have 12 large laser facilities, 6 laser testing sites, 10,000 scientists working on the program. The Kremlin has an existing and updated defense system around Moscow; thousands of portable radars in storage; and has tested lasers against helicopters and even their own satellites.

Indeed, Senior Soviet Foreign Ministry official Mikhail Aleksandrov, said what many of us in Congress have been saying for years: "It appears that the trend toward the development of defense technologies is correctly oriented, and far from leading to destabilization, it may result in a better model of strategic stabilization than the one we have." He is not the only Soviet official to say as much. Others including Ednan Agayev, of the Foreign Ministry, V. Etkin, the Chief of Applied Physics at the Soviet Institute of Space Research, and even Estonian Foreign Minister Lennart Meri, have all agreed with the rationale of SDI. I would argue that as a result, we now have a tremendous opportunity to move away from offensive nuclear deterrence, and toward a system based on defensive deterrence.

There is an even more pressing need for developing this technology. In the next 10 years, at least 15 nations, including Libya, Iraq, Iran, and India, will possess long-range ballistic missiles. Imagine a Colonel Qaddafi with a long range chemical or nuclear missile. He already tried attacking United States forces with two SCUD B missiles off the coast of Italy in 1986.

Just this week, Palestinian Liberation Front leader Abul Abbas himself, gave Americans a powerful and real world reason to pursue SDI by saying that "There is an Arabic saying that revenge takes 40 years. If not my son, then the son of my son will kill you. Some day, we will have missiles that can reach New York."

Other speakers have focused on the threat posed by Iraq's Saddam Hussein. Who could vote to keep our scientists from developing a defense against attacks from his chemical missiles—or a radical fundamentalist Muslim in Azerbaijan who had captured a mobile Soviet SS-24—or Abul Abbas.

Meanwhile, the United States has no missile defense, and Democrats in Congress want to keep it that way.

These 7 years have seen tremendous technological progress in developing a defense against nuclear attack. When Reagan first announced his plan for a defense against attack, liberals and scientists denounced it as technologically unfeasible. Many argued that the system would cost more than \$1 trillion. Seven years of progress has demonstrated that the doomsayers were wrong. Not only is an effective system within grasp, its cost has fallen to at most \$140 billion for a complete system, and around \$55 billion for the Brilliant Pebbles system, spread over a 10-year period. Some have estimated that such a system would add up to only \$40 per person.

Americans spend nearly \$80 billion every year on alcoholic beverages; \$20 billion per

year on soft drinks; \$40 billion on tobacco. Is \$55 billion over 10 years too much to spend to protect our children from the threat of missile attack? The total SDI Program cost represents less than one-third of 1 percent of the total U.S. budget.

Technologically, progress has been unbelievable. For instance:

An internal measurement component weighed 41 pounds and cost \$70,000 in 1970. SDI has reduced that to 6 ounces and \$8,000.

Data processors which once filled entire rooms, now can fit in the palm of a hand.

New computer switches are being developed which may be able to handle up to 1-trillion operations every second; contemporary switches can handle only around one one-thousandth that many.

Several tests have demonstrated the ability of a non-nuclear kinetic weapon to intercept and destroy a ballistic missile within the atmosphere.

I could continue almost indefinitely.

Let me conclude by making a few points. First, the Soviets have not in any way, shape, or form reduced spending on nuclear missiles. Should Gorbachev be overthrown, and a hard-liner come into power, or radicals in one of the individual Soviet Republics capture a mobile nuclear weapon, these missiles would pose an enormous threat to us. In addition, Third World maniacs now are developing ballistic missiles as well.

Second, the cost of a phase I SDI Program is less than what the United States spends in a single year on alcohol. Such a system would protect us against accidental launch by the Soviets, or any launch by a Qaddafi or Khomeini type, and would also convince any future Soviet leader that a nuclear attack against the United States would be futile.

Last, when I visited Eastern Europe in January, numerous Poles, Hungarians, and Czechoslovaks told me that it was SDI which convinced the Soviets that they could not compete with the United States, and therefore, led to many of the changes that we now see sweeping Eastern Europe. It is amazing that a defensive system, which has not even been deployed, could have such a tremendous impact.

President Reagan had a vision. He hoped that U.S. technological skill could find a way to eliminate the possibility of a nuclear holocaust. Our scientific community is in the process of doing so. They are developing a defensive program that could revolutionize warfare. No longer would we solely develop weapons that would kill people in order to deter war; SDI destroys weapons.

SDI made sense in 1983; it makes even more sense 7 years down the road.

So do the Soviets who have said the following:

SOVIET SUPPORT FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

An effective missile defense system puts a nation in the position to assure its own security . . . rather than having to rely on the other side's good will.—General Nicolai Talsensky, Soviet military historian.

It appears that the trend towards the development of defense technologies is correctly oriented, and far from leading to destabilization, it may result in a better model

of strategic stabilization than the one we have.—Mikhail Aleksandrov, Soviet Foreign Ministry.

In order to get to the truth, it is necessary to call everything into question. And hasn't the present 'offensive deterrence' been long ripe for that. The only modern deterrence is defensive.—Ednan Agayev, Soviet Foreign Ministry.

Safeguards from accidental launches, or more importantly, extremist groups * * * such a system * * * lies in the realm of possibility.—Vladimir Etkin, Chief of Applied Physics, Soviet Institute of Space Research.

Defensive systems guard against someone deciding to violate any arms reduction treaty.—Andrei Gromyko, former Soviet Foreign Minister.

Henry Kissinger wrote in 1977 that when President Johnson first proposed the idea of limiting defenses, Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin replied that: "The idea of not engaging in defenses was one of the most ridiculous propositions I have ever heard."

SDI was a brilliant strategy. It is the real reason that the Soviet Union has been forced to develop its new strategy.—Lennart Meri, Estonian Foreign Minister, June, 1990.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of confidence in SDI from the Soviets leads me to conclude that we should provide at least the President's funding request.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McCRERY].

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Kyl amendment to increase funding for strategic defense programs to \$3.57 billion. The Kyl amendment provides the bare minimum amount required to maintain a credible SDI research and development program.

Saddam Hussein has reminded us that the world remains a dangerous place and it is made more so by the fact that the technology needed to produce both chemical and nuclear weapons and the ballistic missiles required for their delivery has become increasingly accessible. CIA Director William Webster recently testified that as many as 20 additional nations will develop a significant ballistic missile capability by the year 2000; 6 of those will have nuclear capability.

And please consider, with some of these Third World nations, traditional notions of deterrence will not prevent them from using their new-found technology. The leader of Libya Col. Mu' ammar Qadhafi, has stated that, had he possessed nuclear missiles when United States planes attacked Tripoli he would have retaliated by firing those missiles at New York City.

The strategic defense initiative provides the only possible avenue we have to protect America and her allies from these dangers and I urge your support for the Kyl amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, recently I escorted a group of Russians into the mountain at Norad at Colorado Springs. While they were there watch-

ing the monitors, a Russian plane approached the coast of Alaska. Not only did they identify that plane at Norad, they told them exactly what kind of a plane it was. The Russians were tremendously impressed.

Prime Minister Thatcher was there recently. She also was impressed.

I have been there and I have watched them simulate attacks on the United States, and it was impressive to me to know the scientific knowledge that we have and they way that we can identify things coming toward us.

But what is not impressive is that we cannot do one doggone thing about it. We have no defense. We cannot do anything about it. You go to your town meetings and you ask people what would happen if Qadhafi shot a missile at us. They said, "We would shoot it down." Most folks think we have some defense.

We call that building out there at the Pentagon the Department of Defense. Yet we have no defense against incoming missiles. The only hope we have for defense against incoming missiles is SDI.

We must proceed aggressively so that the President has the information necessary to make an intelligent deployment decision.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, by my count I have 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California does have the right to close.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield 3 minutes and 45 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] in order to close. At this moment I yield myself 15 seconds.

First of all, let me say, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee that the last Brilliant Pebbles experiment had to be blown up. The four prior to that were clearly less than a success. I would suggest they failed.

Anyone who attempts to assert on the floor of the Congress that the star wars technology is ready to be put into space is taking a flight into fancy.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN].

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, as was mentioned by the previous speaker, the average American using common sense can come to this conclusion: Mr. Qadhafi says, "If I had the missiles to hit Washington, I would have." Mr. Hussein said 5 months ago, "If I could hit New York, I would."

There is no way to prevent this technology from going to the Third World over this next decade. Rest assured the first time some maniac displaces some sovereign and uses that capacity to threaten or blackmail the American President, there will not be enough

committee rooms around here for us to hold hearings as to who was mind-ing the store.

Why do we spend all of this money and still are unprotected? Vote for SDI. It only makes common sense.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire, does the gentleman from California intend to close with all of the time that he has remaining?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman is prepared to yield the entire remaining time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in order to have a real debate on this issue, we need more time and we need to engage each other in direct questions and answers. It would be nice if we could do that.

□ 1350

Unfortunately, the limited time has Members hurling accusations or assertions back and forth, and there is frequently not the kind of connect that would inform our colleagues as to what the truth is.

There are some things I would like to respond to here. The gentleman from California for whom I have high regard, has just said that the last Brilliant Pebbles test was blown up, and the three previous tests were unsuccessful. Every one of the Brilliant Pebbles tests has been very, very successful. It is one of the reasons, when President Bush went to Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in February to view the Brilliant Pebbles and discuss the status with the people there working on it, that he said in the 1990's SDI makes more sense than ever before, precisely because of Brilliant Pebbles. And with respect to the last test the reason the rocket had to be destroyed was range safety; it had nothing to do with Brilliant Pebbles. This is the kind of assertion that can easily be made, and takes time to respond to, but the truth is that the Brilliant Pebbles technology is at hand. That is what the President has said, and I think most knowledgeable people agree with that.

The real question is one of cost. As our colleague from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] said on the question of cost, we do not necessarily have to spend all the money that was originally anticipated for a leak-proof shield, if that is what some wanted to call it. We could just deploy a system against some of the threats, including limited threats of the Third World, and accidental launch, and that sort of thing. That would begin to provide us a kind of defense. For this year's funding, there is no necessity of making a choice between Brilliant Pebbles and something else, or between a Soviet threat or Third World threat. The question is the appropriate funding level to pursue for all of the relevant technol-

ogies. And I would remind my colleagues that it was President Bush who said that the \$3.57 billion funding level is the required funding level to move this program forward, and he urged Members to support that funding level.

Therefore, I would conclude by urging my colleagues, when the time comes, to support the Kyl amendment for \$3.57 billion and to oppose the amendments that would reduce the funding below that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 3½ minutes, to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I think it is just appropriate for Members to review just a little bit of the history of the strategic defense initiative, since it has been reinvented at least three or four separate times on the floor.

It was the brain child of one of the world's most dangerous men, Edward Teller, selling the idea to one of the world's most gullible men, Ronald Reagan. It resulted in a March 1983 speech where President Reagan said that he saw a world where nuclear weapons would become impotent and obsolete, where there would be a Houston Astrodome protection of the United States.

Now sadly, only the President of the United States believed that. No person in the Department of Defense thought that could ever be accomplished. However, there was something that could be done with this kernel of an idea that had before not been possible. That is to abrogate the ABM Treaty and move ahead not only with offensive weapons, but also with defensive weapons. So, Ronald Reagan's dream, every budgeteer's nightmare, became a reality. As it became clearer and clearer over time that an umbrella defense of the United States was not possible, so, too, did the rationale change for SDI. It then became a limited defense, and now in its latest incarnation, it is a protection against Third World countries and Saddam Hussein. That was nonsense then, and this is nonsense today.

What the gentleman and the gentleman from California want to do is not denude the United States of a defense, but to provide \$1.5 billion which was the prefantasy consensus of what was necessary to do basic research on missile defenses.

It is possible at some point in the future that we and the Soviets might want to provide a change to the ABM agreement, to provide some limited defense against the threat of a Third World state. I do not think that is necessary to do. But if it is, we can then negotiate that. For the time being, to protect the United States, there are a whole variety of things, one of which

President Bush mentioned last night, that will work. We can make sure that there is a nonproliferation treaty with respect to ballistic missile technology. We can ban ballistic missile flight tests. We can improve the IAEA regime so that nuclear systems, the proliferation of plutonium, and enriched uranium is not spread around the globe. That will work. That is reality. That is something we can do in a new world order, with a Soviet Union that wants to cooperate against Third World threats.

However, to suggest that the old showman rationale for the SDI are somehow valid, when we are cutting basic defense, is crazy. We started off having smart rocks and brilliant pebbles. And we find out today that it is innocuous grains of sands that slow down our military in the desert, what we need to protect ourselves against. That is what we need our money for. Not some harebrained scheme thought up 7 years ago. That did not have a valid rationale then, and has absolutely no place today.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time for general debate on this issue has expired.

It is now in order to debate the subject matter of the strategic defense initiative.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] or his designee will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the amendment I will offer to structure the strategic defense program. We have debated the level of strategic defense spending, which is important, but it is time to debate how the billions we authorize are actually to be spent. SDI is not so much a program as an umbrella, and beneath it are many programs: sensors and surveillance systems; terminal interceptors, mid-course interceptors, boost-phase interceptors, and lasers systems, or directed energy weapons. Some are space-based; some are ground-based. Some comply with the ABM Treaty; some do not. The time has come when Congress should start deciding which of these programs to push and which to hold back; or, indeed, deciding how to keep the research evenly paced, so that no single system is selected prematurely to the detriment of others.

Through fiscal year 1990, Congress will have appropriated nearly \$20 billion for the strategic defense initiative since it was first started in fiscal year 1984; and by any reckoning, that is real money. Furthermore, since fiscal year 1984, Congress has let the SDIO

have \$20 billion with extraordinary latitude in deciding how to spend it.

If SDIO is left to spend the next \$20 billion as it sees fit, a good share of it is probably going to be sunk in developing a Phase I deployment scheme, the centerpiece of which is Brilliant Pebbles. Brilliant Pebbles is the nickname for space-based interceptors; single, autonomous satellites, launched literally in the thousands, to form a basket-weave of interceptors, constantly orbiting several hundred kilometers over the Soviet Union. Their mission is to spot, track, and destroy Soviet ICBM's in the boost phase, as they rise from their silos, or in the post-boost phase, as they off-load their RV's. Brilliant Pebbles is a conceptual coup; it solves in concept many of the weaknesses in the satellite interceptors that SIDO first proposed. But if it answers some questions, it begs many more. Can a single, light-weight system be made that is satellite, sensor, and rocket interceptor all in one? As we struggle to make simpler standoff systems like the AMRAAM work, we have reason to ask if space-based interceptors, tasked with a far more stressing mission, can ever work? And if they ever work just, how effective will they be? SDIO concedes that these space-based interceptors will take out only a fraction of ICBM's in their boost phase. If Brilliant Pebbles will only thin out the attack, there may be other more effective and less expensive ways to get the same results, such as making our own land-based missiles mobile. In any event, before we develop or deploy the space-based interceptors, we will need to know if other SDI systems, such as the ground-based interceptors, can take up the slack, and destroy the RV's that the Brilliant Pebbles let through. Finally, space-based interceptors mean that sooner or later we will have to abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The ABM Treaty made possible SALT I and SALT II, and it undergirds support for START. I don't think that we should remain hide-bound by its terms forever; but before we abandon it, we should have a practical assessment of the strategic defense system we put in its place.

I support strategic defense; if it can be made to work, it has a place in a world where each superpower has fewer warheads. The amendment I will offer will focus the objectives of the SDI Program as follows:

First, to encourage research on exotic technologies that might result in a revolutionary breakthrough in the technology of strategic defense. If any technology offers the possibility of defense against nuclear attack, it is the speed-of-light beam weapons that might conceivably destroy ICBM's as they lift off from their bases in the Soviet Union. The administration's

early deployment scheme does not include beam weapons, and by emphasizing early deployment, it threatens stable funding for research on these systems.

Second, to support development of ground-based systems that might be deployed to defend against a missile attack, launched accidentally or by a rogue commander, and that might be used to defend specific targets such as ballistic missile silos; and

Third, to balance funding for the development and deployment of the space-based, phase I strategic defense system, favoring in the short run ground-based, treaty-compliant systems.

I originally submitted two amendments to the Rules Committee. These two amendments were consolidated into one amendment with two sections. The first section would impose funding restrictions on SDI research and development spending as follows:

First, not less than \$130 million would be obligated and spent for the Free Electron Laser [FEL] Program. Research on a ground-based FEL could lead to a breakthrough in ballistic missile defense, and it may also result in an effective anti-satellite weapon.

Second, not less than \$142 million would be authorized for the Ground Based Interceptor [GBI] Program, and not less than \$95 million for the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor [HEDI] Program. These two ground-based interceptors could be employed in an interim, treaty-compliant defense against accidental attacks.

Finally, not more than 30 percent of the total SDI budget for fiscal year 1991 would be available for initial systems as defined by SDI; and of this amount, not more than \$120 million would be authorized for research on the space-based interceptor concept, Brilliant Pebbles. \$129 million is the amount allocated to SDIO to Brilliant Pebbles this year, so Brilliant Pebbles would not be cut, and certainly not eliminated; but it would not be allowed to ramp up to \$340 million, as SDIO proposes.

The second section of my amendment would require the SDI Organization to submit two budget requests. The SDI organization has consistently submitted unrealistic budgets that have been significantly cut by Congress. Over the last 6 years, the administration has requested \$7.4 billion more in spending authority than Congress has granted; and each year, the cuts and resistance to spending on SDI seem to run deeper. Last year, for example, the budget request for SDI was \$5.6 billion but the Congress approved only \$3.6 billion. This year the request is for almost \$4.5 billion, and Congress is unlikely to provide more than \$3 billion.

My amendment would require that an alternative budget be submitted by the President, based on the budget authority provided in fiscal year 1991 and constant dollar funding at the same level for the next 5 fiscal years. My amendment would require that the alternative plan be structured so that the SDI program:

First, does not pursue in the near-term the deployment in space of directed energy weapons or kinetic energy interceptors;

Second, remain consistent in the near-term with the customary interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty;

Third, pursues instead in the near-term a treaty-compliant system of ground-based interceptors as an option for development and deployment;

Fourth, pursues research into directed-energy systems that are promising, particularly those capable of ground-based deployment; and

Fifth, continues support for antitactical ballistic missile interceptors to counter the threat rising from the growing proliferation of ballistic missiles.

In an effort to expedite today's proceedings, I have reached an agreement with opponents to modify my amendment. When my amendment is called up, I will ask for unanimous consent to amend my amendment by dropping the restrictions on SDI spending. The other body has already imposed such restrictions, and the level and extent of these restrictions can be decided by the House-Senate conference committee when the overall level of spending on SDI is finally decided. My amendment would retain the requirement for the submission of an alternative budget proposal.

My decision to reach a compromise on this amendment does not reflect a change of heart, it simply reflects a desire to seek a compromise that would set SDI on a stable and sensible path.

Mr. Chairman, all our defenses are strategic defenses if they deter war. And if they deter war generally, they reduce the risk of nuclear war specifically, because war is the time when the risk of nuclear attack is greatest. With today's budget limits, funds spent on SDI will be funds not spent to strengthen our forces. If the end result of all this spending is a strategic defense system that is marginally effective at most, then the Nation's defenses could be made weaker, not stronger. That is why we need to look with more discrimination at how the billions authorized for SDI are actually being spent.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I will come back with a further explanation later.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, first, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I will begin by saying that it is my pleasure to serve as the ranking member on a special panel chaired by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] of the Committee on Armed Services known as the Department of Energy Defense Facilities Panel. In that capacity I have enjoyed working with this Member, who is very thoughtful and very careful in his deliberations and has a great deal to contribute to the defense of our country.

It is not often that we disagree, and when we do, it is generally over technical matters rather than general directions. We do have one disagreement to which the gentleman has spoken here today, and I think this is rather important. It is addressed in a letter and a statement from which I would like to quote. It is the question of how rapidly we should be pursuing the Brilliant Pebbles technology and how much promise that has. It is my contention that Brilliant Pebbles has a great contribution to make to the strategic defense initiative, and that we ought to be funding it at a very robust level.

The Directors of the two national laboratories most involved in this recently wrote a letter to Secretary Watkins. I am speaking of John Nuckolls who is the Director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Siegfried Hecker, the Director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. They submitted to Admiral Watkins a paper which summarized their position on the technologies involved in SDI. This paper was authored by John Browne and Greg Canavan of the Los Alamos National Laboratory and Edward Teller and Lowell Wood of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. I am quoting from their paper:

Brilliant Pebbles offer effective and survivable space-based means for addressing near- and long-term missile threats in the boost phase. The timely development of "Brilliant Pebbles" must be viewed as the cornerstone of the SDI program and pursued accordingly.

They go on to say this:

Both interceptors and directed energy weapons must be pursued to have a strategic defense strategy that can evolve to meet all presently foreseen threats, thereby maintaining sufficient effectiveness to deter potential adversaries from attack well into the next century.

Their point is that a balanced program, with Brilliant Pebbles as well as these other programs the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has spoken of, is critical to the strategic defense initiative.

Mr. Chairman, in order to balance the time, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the strategic defense initiative and providing the President of the United States with the funding and flexibility he needs to pursue this program in the best interest of the American people.

I find it almost incomprehensible that anyone could be opposed to a program which will significantly increase the ability of the United States to defend itself against the devastating and far-reaching threat of ballistic missiles. Our strategic triad of land- and sea-based ICBM's and manned bombers has been most effective in deterring the Soviet Union from launching an all out nuclear attack on the United States. But the ballistic missile threat is rapidly changing. The Soviet Union is continuing to modernize its own strategic triad. And our ability to retaliate, while still needed, will not defend us against an accidental launch. Nor will they deter Third World leaders such as Saddam Hussein or Mu'ammarr Qadhafi who are developing ballistic missile capabilities and who have neither the morality nor the wisdom to rationally control their use. We need the ability to destroy these missiles and the chemical, biological, or nuclear warheads which they can carry before they can cause their devastation.

The rapid proliferation of ballistic missile capabilities in the Third World and the Soviet Union's continuing modernization of their strategic forces leave us no other choice. To counter these threats, we must have the ability to make a fully informed decision on deploying strategic defenses by mid-1993. This will not be possible with the current level of funding in the authorization bill and it certainly will not be possible if we reduce these funds even further or put unnecessary constraints on how they are spent.

We were able to prevent Saddam Hussein from carrying his outrageous acts of aggression even further not because he listens to reason or empty threats. And the growth of democracy in Eastern Europe did not happen because we sat back and wished and hoped for it. Both of these actions were possible because past Congresses and past Presidents had the wisdom and foresight to realistically see emerging threats and took the necessary actions to ensure that we had the systems and manpower to defend against them.

Now is the time for this Congress to demonstrate the same wisdom and foresight. We cannot hope to face tomorrow's threats with yesterday's technology. And we cannot defend ourselves with weapons systems which are merely an idea on some engineer's drawing board. We must have the right capabilities at the right time. The SDI Program will do exactly that,

and we need the funds and flexibility to do it.

□ 1410

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, we have not seen much reflection of the events taking place in the Middle East in today's debate. What we will probably see is an effect on the voting patterns, not so much the debate. We are hearing some of the same old tired arguments here that we have heard over the last 7 years. We are debating whether or not the United States of America should fulfill its constitutional obligation as espoused in the preamble to our Constitution, to provide for the common defense, with all the impact of what that word "defense" means, defending our homeland.

There is no obligation by any U.S. Senator or Congressman or Congresswoman more important than defending our homeland. That is what we are discussing at this moment.

Now, if a former member of this body who served here with great distinction for 4 years, and now President of the United States, were in this well today, I believe he would repeat the remarks embodied in his letter dated today, September 12, to the vice chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, our distinguished leader on the Republican side, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

First, I would like to point out that the President sent a similar letter the day after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait—as the President puts it, the swallowing whole of the nation of Kuwait—to Senator JOHN WARNER basically the same plea that he made today to Congressman BILL DICKINSON.

The President predicted, because we were debating this issue in a markup over in the Rayburn Building at this time, the President accurately predicted that the House was determined to cut even more savagely into his request for SDI funds than the Senate had done. The Senate had cut over a billion dollars from the executive branch request of \$4.46 billion.

The President then went on to tell Senator WARNER that a vote to cut SDI any further is essentially a vote against strategic defense for America.

Now, here is his letter dated today to Congressman DICKINSON.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKINSON: I want to underscore the importance of the SDI program and express my concern about congressional action to further cut SDI funds or restrict our ability to manage the program.

When I entered office, I ordered a thorough review of the SDI program—both the progress of its technology and our policy governing it. I concluded, as President, that SDI had made tremendous progress toward

giving us the technological means to strengthen deterrence through introducing defenses. As the technology matures, we will need to conduct rigorous and realistic tests—consistent with the ABM Treaty—in order to make an informed decision on the feasibility of defense. To fund these tests I asked for an increase in the SDI budget, even as we faced an overall cut in the defense budget.

That is the burden of the Commander-in-Chief, my colleagues.

Nonetheless, in marking up the Defense Authorization bill, the House Armed Services Committee has cut over a billion and a half dollars—

That is below the Senate billion dollar cut—

Such a cut would devastate SDI, forcing us to delay critical tests and cancel contracts. Some in Congress are also seeking to manage the SDI program themselves by cutting my request for the most promising SDI technologies. In many ways—

the President says—

this is more serious than a funding cut. A vote to fence funding—

There is that word fence. In real estate it is escrow.

A vote to fence funding of the most promising technologies amounts to a vote against strategic defenses even before we have the data from critical tests. As Congress imposes cuts in the defense budget, at the very least—

the President implores—

I need flexibility to manage our programs. It makes little sense to force us to forgo realistic tests of promising SDI technologies. Indeed, Congress has always insisted that we fly before we buy weapons systems.

As you and your colleagues consider the Defense bill, Mr. DICKINSON, I hope you will take into account the tremendous progress and promise of SDI, and will provide us with a means to manage an effective program. SDI—

the President closes—

will be among the most important factors in my evaluation of the Defense Authorization bill.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] quoted from Monday's Wall Street Journal an Arab expression that, "Revenge takes 40 years, even if your grandchild does the killing." All my life I have known the expression from the Arab world that, "The sweetest wine of all is the wine of revenge," and as in the case of slaughtering an entire jumbo jet full of passengers over Lockerbie, Scotland, and killing another 11 people on the ground, that did not take 40 years. That took from July 4 until December, a year ago December, when that revenge was eked out.

I will return during the debate on the Dornan amendment for the full administration President Bush funding.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER].

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time. I think I can probably do it in less than two minutes.

What I would like to do is speak specifically on the Spratt amendment. I regretfully have to oppose it.

According to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, William Webster, between 15 and 20 developing nations will possess ballistic missile capabilities by the end of this century. Six of those countries will have nuclear weapons capabilities. The end of this century is just a number of years away, and so while it is very important to make sure that we robustly research and develop the capabilities of defending ourselves against some future threat 20 years, 30 years, 15 years from today, by the exotic efforts of laser beams and other types of things which the Spratt amendment really does, it is likewise important to defend ourselves against the present threat. America must defend itself against future threats which the Spratt amendment does, but also must have the present capability within the near future to defend ourselves against the threat of today.

We not only in America have a problem perhaps in the next 20 years, the real problem is now. So as much as I admire the gentleman from South Carolina, indeed it is important to fund these exotic new systems that will come on line decades hence, the danger now is not decades hence. The danger is in the Middle East. The danger is in the next 5 years when an additional 15 nations will have ballistic missile technology capabilities, 6 of which will have nuclear missile capabilities.

□ 1420

So, please, vote no on Spratt so America has the capability to defending present threats, as well as future threats.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina if he intends to close and use all of his time? Is that correct?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have 5 minutes left, and I would like to use it simply to explain my amendment and to have a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Dicks] about the amendment as well. But it makes no difference to me whether I close or not.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I presume that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] would prefer to close, and I would be happy to go ahead and use all of our time now.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUBIN). The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to come to the well because I wanted to show my colleagues what we are really talking about here when we talk about Brilliant Pebbles. We are talking about the object directly behind me. I

do not know if my colleagues can see it here, but that is all Brilliant Pebbles is. It is a very small, very light weight, relatively inexpensive, purely passive defensive kind of protection.

The amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is all about priorities. He would devote less of our efforts to Brilliant Pebbles and more of it to some of the long-range, more exotic technologies.

President Bush has said, "Please let me have the flexibility to manage this program in a balanced way," and the lab directors who are responsible for these more long-range technologies, who would clearly benefit from having more money thrown their way and less going to Brilliant Pebbles, have also acknowledged their support for the Brilliant Pebbles as part of SDI, just part of the program, but, as was said, as the cornerstone for the strategic defense initiative.

So, the point is to have a balanced program and to allow the President flexibility.

Now just to show this item behind me:

This is not some futuristic thing that we cannot possibly achieve. It is being tested now. It is being flown in rockets. It is capable of acquiring, and tracking, and ultimately honing in on a missile that we want to destroy; and with the deployment of many of these in space, we would have the capability, not only of intercepting the ICBM's that might be launched against us from the Soviet Union, but also weapons of much lower trajectory and shorter range, including a couple of the missiles possessed by Iraq.

So, Mr. Chairman, Brilliant Pebbles is not some futuristic thing. It is here today. It needs to be funded in a robust way, and we need to allow the President and the Secretary of Defense the flexibility to do that.

My closing point is this. As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] just pointed out to us, the need is now to defend against present threats, not something far in the future, into the next century. We need therefore, to have a balanced program that not only conducts the robust research into the neutral particle beam and the various kinds of lasers which will provide that protection far into the future, but the near-term existing kind of defenses like Brilliant Pebbles, and that is why the President needs the flexibility to fund that kind of a program now while also funding these longer range programs which will not have payoff until much later in the future.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], although I believe that Mr. SPRATT will later make some announcement regarding his intentions with respect to his amendment and will be willing to

give the President more flexibility to operate the strategic defense program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. What would be the cost of deploying Brilliant Pebbles?

Mr. KYL. It depends on how many we wanted to deploy.

For example, if we wanted an accidental launch and minimum protection system, the deployment cost would be in the neighborhood of \$12 billion.

Mr. DICKS. What is the present intention of the administration?

Mr. KYL. The administration wants it developed, and, by the way, that \$12 billion not only buys us the necessary Brilliant Pebbles, but also a complement of a certain number of ground-based missiles which would add to the protection.

So, Mr. Chairman, such a deployment would be a combination of both ground-based and space-based assets. What we do depends upon what the Congress and the administration decides we want to do.

For example, we could start with the deployment of a minimum number of Brilliant Pebbles and ground-based interceptors, and either stop there or build onto it, depending upon the threat that we saw. But, the critical thing is to get the program into a mode where we could deploy it, and that requires funding now for the development and testing.

Mr. DICKS. Would it be effective against just an accidental launch in the Soviet Union, or would it have worldwide capability against a Third World type threat as well?

Mr. KYL. The \$12 billion program that I am speaking of would provide protection of the continental United States and protection for our allies really almost anywhere in the world from an accidental launch or a launch of a few missiles by a Third World country or, perhaps, a rogue commander in the Soviet Union. Numbers are classified, as my colleagues know, but it would protect against the launch of a few missiles by Iraq, for example.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] if it is offered, and support flexibility for the President's program.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, let me go back to explaining the amendment

that I have offered and also the amendment that I intend to offer to the amendment I originally filed and obtained approval for from the Committee on Rules.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I said that the amendment would guarantee \$130 million for the free electron laser program. That is because I think it is the program which holds the greatest promise, unproven as yet, of providing us with a revolutionary breakthrough probably some time in the next century. But the money is worth spending now to build to that potential, at least to test it.

Second, not less than \$142 million would be authorized for the ground-based interceptor program, including not less than \$95 million in addition to that for the high endo-atmosphere defense interceptor. That is the HEDI Program.

So, in answer to my colleague, whom I respect, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER], this is the initial system which this amendment would favor, a ground-based interceptor which would be treaty compliant and would give us a system that would afford us practical experience and the feasibility of a nuclear defense and also would give us protection, treaty compliant protection, against unauthorized and accidental launches that were not in large quantities.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, not more than 30 percent of the total SDI budget for fiscal year 1991 would be made available for initial systems. Again the efforts here is to keep the program balanced, even-paced. Of this amount, not more than \$129 million could be spent on Brilliant Pebbles.

Mr. Chairman, that does not eliminate the program, does not even cut the program because \$129 million is the amount of money allocated by SDIO to Brilliant Pebbles for fiscal year 1990. So, we are simply providing for fiscal year 1991 the same amount of money that would be provided for Brilliant Pebbles, but would not be able to rank that program up from \$129 to \$340 million and leave the other programs, so to speak, the competitive programs, the complementary programs, in the dust behind it.

Mr. Chairman, there is a second section of my amendment. It would require SDIO to submit two budget requests. SDI has consistently submitted to Congress unrealistic budget requests, and we have consistently cut them. Over the last 6 years the administration has asked for \$7.4 billion more in spending authority than the Congress has seen fit to grant, and each year it seems that the cuts and the resistance to increases in spending on SDI seem to run deeper.

Mr. Chairman, last year the administration asked for \$5.6 billion. We gave them \$3.6 billion. We cut it \$2 billion. This year the request is for \$4.5, \$4.6

billion. We are likely to appropriate somewhere in the neighborhood of 3, perhaps just a bit more, \$3 billion.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require that an alternative budget be submitted by the President based on budget authority provided this year for next year and the constant dollar funding at the same level be assumed for the next 5 fiscal years, and my amendment would be required so that the alternative budget be structured to give the SDI Program the priorities that I already have described.

However, in an effort to expedite today's proceedings, I have reached an agreement with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and opponents to modify my amendment. When the amendment is called up, I will ask for unanimous consent to amend my amendment and drop the restrictions on SDI spending.

Mr. Chairman, the other body has already imposed these restrictions at the level, and the extent, and reach, and nature of these restrictions we can better decide in conference when we have decided the overall level of spending on SDI. My amendment would retain, however, the requirements for submission of an alternative budget proposal.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]. I think he is clearly one of the leading experts in the House on this important issue of SDI. I would also like to commend him on his efforts to investigate a treaty compliant limited protection system.

□ 1430

It has become very apparent that we need to have something in the nature of a defensive system that is treaty compliant against Third World possibilities. Maybe we would have to amend this to give it nationwide coverage, but I think this is something we ought to continue to investigate.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the Senate, the other body, is making a very major cut in SDI. So this notion of having a budget that is more realistic is very, very timely. I think it would do the administration good. I think it is more realistic. I think it is what Congress is going to do, because clearly we are going to hold down money in this area. I think it is just a vote for realism. I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for his integrity.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kyl amendment to maintain SDI funding at last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, our relationship with the Soviet Union clearly has taken a turn for the better. This progress is being used as an excuse to attack the administration's strategic programs. Critics claim that the enemy has disappeared and, as for justification for SDI.

The debate over the threat still posed by the Soviet Union's enormous and expanding strategic capability is justified. However, the Soviet Union is not the only reason America needs SDI.

What about the Saddam Husseins, Mu'ammar Qadhafis, and Kim Il-songs of the world? Generally speaking, they don't have the capability to threaten the United States or our allies with ballistic missiles yet. But this situation too will change. The technology we have seen developed just in the last decade convinces me that today's circumstances are not the only basis for planning for tomorrow. We must envision the future, and use foresight to understand, and prepare for, America's future challenges.

A growing number of hostile powers are gaining chemical, biological, and nuclear capabilities. Many of these countries have acquired, or may soon acquire, ballistic missiles able to deliver their deadly payloads.

Today's third and fourth rate powers may soon be our primary threat. The wildman in Iraq is threatening to use ballistic missiles against Israel, and the lunatic in Libya has vowed that he would use ballistic missiles against the United States if he had them. The point is, we must prepare to live in a world where these weapons are in the hands of less stable regimes.

The democratic nations of the world need SDI to ensure their future security. The technology works, and it is getting less expensive everyday. Just this month, a combined effort between the United States and our Israeli counterparts successfully test fired the Arrow antiballistic missile system, which is designed to intercept and destroy short-range ballistic missiles. The Arrow would provide the type of protection our fighting men are now lacking in the Middle East. Why are some supporters of Israel willing to give that protection to Israel and not to the United States?

President Eisenhower once said that the future belongs to the brave and to those who prepare for it. There is an ever-increasing relationship between security and technology. If we are to be secure as a people, and if we are to be a force for stability, peace and freedom in the world, we must have courage and be prepared with the weapons, equipment, and technology needed to provide leadership in tomorrow's world.

Our leadership is founded in our moral authority, economic might, and military capability. In the past, our ability to protect our friends under a nuclear umbrella made the American voice the most clearly heard in the world. In

the future, the nuclear and ballistic shield provided by SDI will ensure that the voice of democracy and freedom continues to be heard.

I ask my colleagues not to gut our capacity to develop this shield. I ask you to support the Kyl amendment and oppose the Dellums and Bennett amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dellums-Boxer amendment to terminate the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] program. This amendment would eliminate the strategic defense initiative organization and limit SDI funding to \$1.5 billion for basic research. I commend my colleagues, Congressman DELLUMS and Congresswoman BOXER, for their leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need SDI. SDI was initially designed to protect American cities against the threat of a large scale intercontinental ballistic missiles [ICBM's] attack launched from the Soviet Union. The dramatic changes in the political landscape of Eastern Europe and the Warsaw Pact have greatly reduced that threat. In fact, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA], Judge Webster, has stated that the threat posed by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact has irreversibly declined.

SDI will not help the United States to deal with the threats posed by the post-cold war international order. There have been suggestions that SDI can protect the United States against an attack from ballistic missiles launched from Iraq and other Third World countries. Such a claim is outrageous. Gen. George Monahan, former head of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization [SDIO], stated before Congress that latest SDI Design, the so-called Brilliant Pebbles concept, would be unable to stop Third World missiles because they fly too low and for too short a distance for a space-based SDI to intercept them.

What SDI will do is frustrate arms control negotiations, abrogate the ABM treaty, and devour a staggering sum of money. By continuing the current SDI Program, we would spend \$60 billion on a program without a purpose and help to undermine negotiations to reduce the threat of nuclear war.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Dellums-Boxer amendment to terminate this extremely expensive, ineffective, unnecessary, and destabilizing weapons system.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Chairman, as we enter a new era of defense requirements, one weapons program we can do without on such a grand scale is star wars. We are asked to continue spending billions on a system that won't perform as originally advertised.

President Reagan envisioned an astro-dome-type shield that would protect Americans from nuclear attack. Seven years later, and billions of dollars squandered, we now know the system will not protect people, but our nuclear missiles.

If we are hard pressed to justify scarce dollars for defense, why are we spending money for a system that won't work? With the likely response to star wars being the Soviets building more intercontinental ballistic missiles, and further escalating the nuclear arms race—I say let's not continue a spending race and start protecting the human race.

I will support the Dellums SDI amendment, that scales back the Star Wars Program and permits basic research into the technology. The era of spending billions of dollars on defense programs with little or no basis is over. We cannot waste tax dollars for a program that has thus far, only served to protect us from the reality of its true costs—trillions of dollars.

Vote yes on the Dellums amendment and stop this senseless spending.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time has expired on this debate.

It is now in order to debate the subject matter of appropriate levels of funding in consideration of base closures. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] or his designee will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] or his designee will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], a distinguished Member who has worked very hard on this issue.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear to everyone that we need to examine our infrastructure and that we need to close and eliminate obsolete facilities. But the question is one of whether we are going to do it the right way, whether we are going to look at this rationally, or whether we are just going to go in blindly or perhaps engage in some partisan politics.

I would like to discuss for just a minute the plan that has been proposed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense came out with a list earlier this year, without stating why the bases were on that list. We have had cases that have come up with Operation Desert Shield that have demonstrated the lack of wisdom in that list. Now we are being asked to give the Secretary of Defense an expedited process.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that is a fair nor wise thing to do. I think we should look at the defense authorization bill's five-point plan, which has a clear process laid out. That process requires a rational force structure plan.

It requires the Secretary of Defense to come forward with a base closure process proposal. It has a moratorium on any closures for the January 29 list or the subsequent list, and it has a provision to prohibit bleeding of those bases in the meantime. It then has a fifth part of that process, which provides for economic adjustment assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to consider the portion of the defense authorization bill which takes a rational, fair approach to closing those bases.

We know that it has got to be done, but the question is whether we are going to do it the right way.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to support the defense bill as presented and to reject the Martin amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, will control the time as soon as I conclude my remarks. In the meantime, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the base closure provisions in the bill, which are identical to those in the Aspin amendment, contain some of the most counterproductive language that I have seen in recent days. Here are some examples of the provisions that prohibit future base closures or realignments from taking place. We all remember the drill we went through to enable the administration and the Department of Defense to close any bases. We had not had a base closed for 12 years, because political forces would keep them from being closed.

Mr. Chairman, I admit there are some proposed base closures that I do not agree with at all, but this is the broad concept and the broad effect of what happened under the present bill.

The Secretary of Defense must provide a 5-year force structure plan on overseas bases. There is nothing wrong with that. I think he should.

The Secretary of Defense must submit a legislative proposal to enact base closure or realignment by January 1991.

The Secretary of Defense must submit a legislative proposal for worker retraining and economic conversion for adversely affected communities. But it prohibits any base closure or studies. You cannot even study a base closure until January 1992.

As we are building down our forces and creating our vacancies on bases, this thing says that you cannot even study a proposed base closure until 1992, or when base closure legislation is approved by the Congress.

It mandates domestic bases must receive at least 75 percent of the average funding received over the last 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, what we are proposing here is taking away most of the flexibility given to the administration and to the Department of Defense. The mandates and the provisions go on and on.

Congress has given Secretary Cheney the incredible task of reducing our national defense by 25 percent over the next 5 years. How can we expect the Secretary to even think about such force reductions if he is unable to close or realign unnecessary bases? If we continue to cut force structure like we do in this bill, we will have a Nation full of unmanned bases.

Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating that the Secretary of Defense should be allowed to pick and choose which bases to close, willy-nilly. I am saying that he ought to be able to function as the manager of the Department of Defense and to allocate his dwindling resources in the most efficient manner possible. Not to deny him the flexibility which he needs.

Mr. Chairman, the Martin amendment accomplishes this objective without giving up congressional oversight. The Martin amendment simply codifies the base closure and realignment procedures approved by the Congress in 1988, which state that the Secretary of Defense must include a base closure recommendation in his annual authorization request to Congress, and satisfactorily complete six impact studies on the fiscal, local economic, budgetary, environmental, strategic, and operational consequences of the closure or realignment.

Closing or realigning a base under such circumstances would be extraordinary, but it will be downright impossible under the Aspin amendment, and that is the author's intent.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subterfuge, I would contend. It is couched in nice language, but the effect of what is in the bill now says that the Secretary of Defense cannot close a base. It flies in the face of what the Congress did 2 years ago. I think the Martin amendment corrects an inequity. I think it is a mistake not to pass the Martin amendment, and I urge Members, if they really want to affect the economy, as most claim they want to do. If you want to give the Secretary of Defense the ability to build down our force structure, pass the Martin amendment, and support it when it comes up later today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1440

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman sitting next to her, the gentleman from Alabama, for the excellent leadership they have shown along with the help and the cooperation of the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], and in having the courage and the foresight to establish new rules of the road dealing with base closure.

Let me just first assure this House and the country that we know that base closures are coming, and we are happily looking forward to them. That suggests, obviously, that we have made a turn, as the President said last night

from this very place, and that we are entering a new world order which promises greater chances of peace, a greater opportunity for cooperation with the other superpower, the U.S.S.R., and a greater opportunity to deal with our differences and conflicts on a regional basis using conventional arms. So we are in a new era which means that we will have less tension and less military need for some of the bases which we now possess here at home and abroad. Some of them should be closed. All we are saying is the current procedure for closure is not fair. It is not equitable. It does not identify those bases that ought to be kept open.

For example, I represent the city of Louisville in which Navy Ordnance Station Louisville, is located. Naval ordnance is on Secretary's Cheney's January hit list for closure or realignment. It just happens that Naval Ordnance Station Louisville is the only naval facility in the country which does overhauling of the Phalanx, computer-driven, close-in antimissile system which is on all of the ships bearing our flag, now operating in the Persian Gulf. Phalanx is a conventional weapon system. It is a system which naval ordnance station overhauls and maintains, and does very well, and does cost-effectively. Ironically, this facility of the Navy is on Secretary Cheney's list.

I would urge adoption of the Aspin-Schroeder-Browder base-closure language today, and I would urge my colleagues in the House to oppose the Martin amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Armed Services Committee five-point plan on military base closures.

The bill adopts a logical, fair, and nonpolitical plan for deciding how to close domestic military bases. And, make no mistake about it, we should close domestic military bases.

Unfortunately, earlier this year, the administration adopted an upside-down process for closing bases.

First, the Secretary released a list of bases to be studied for closure. But there was no strategic vision for our future defense. There was no force reduction plan.

The administration's approach was also blatantly political. Is it an accident that 93 percent of the bases slated for closure sit in Democratic districts? Is it coincidence that 99 percent of the workers who will lose their jobs live in Democratic districts?

The strategy is clear: We have a Defense Department playing political football with our constituents—trying to intimidate us by threatening to close the bases where they work. Well, I'm not intimidated.

The Armed Services Committee bill makes more sense. First, come up with a comprehensive force reduction plan.

Then, considering that force reduction plan, close bases in a fair, objective, nonpolitical manner.

Let's talk about what the bill does not do.

It does not block bases closures. It does not handcuff the Secretary of Defense.

Should we close bases?

Absolutely.

But only in a fair, rational, strategic, and bipartisan manner. That's what the Armed Services Committee plan would do.

Vote no on the Lynn Martin amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just take a few minutes in the general debate to talk about the whole concept of base closings. We have just gone through this a couple of years ago, and we did, in fact, pass a rather clearly defined package by use of an instrument for decisionmaking that a great many of us had difficulty accepting, the idea of a commission.

I well understand that a great many Members of Congress prefer not to use commissions. I myself prefer not to use commissions, but a couple of years ago when, in fact, it had been some 17 years since a base had been closed, it seemed to be a matter of impasse. It seemed necessary at that time and, of course, Congress agreed that it was necessary to use a commission.

I am not sure that is the case now. The reason is I would suggest, one, and most importantly, as over and against conditions 2 years ago or 3 years ago, today we are in a period of time when clearly circumstances with respect to Eastern European potential threats of aggression have been reduced, and the fact of the matter is the U.S. Congress is repeatedly and pressingly calling upon the Secretary of Defense to live with reduced expenditures, even reduced troop strength, and, in fact, to make a major realignment, redefinition of our defense structure. If the Secretary is going to do that, and it is going to be a rational, sane, integrated redefinition of the manpower, the hardware, the technology and the deployment of our defense resources, he must have the freedom to integrate this very sensitive issue of base closings into the plan so that we can get effective integrated restructuring of defense.

I do not think the committee mark on this, as brought to the floor in this bill, accommodates very well to that need and that requirement. I think, on

the other hand, that the amendment that will soon be offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] does accommodate to that need, and it is a very important need. At the same time, we cannot discount, and we never have discounted, the serious concern that many Members of Congress have in this body over the history of base-closing experiences throughout the post-World War II period, and that is the possibility that decisions will be made for something other than military-effectiveness reasons, reasons of parochial guardianship on the one hand which threaten, I think, the sanity of the process and, on the other hand, there is a threat that has been realized certainly by some Members here in historical experience of administrations using base closing or potential base closings as leverage against individual Members.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's point about political or other nonmilitary purposes intervening in the process of winnowing out which bases to leave open and which to close. That is why I thought the gentleman's proposal for a commission 2 years ago had such a broad support in the body. I still do not understand what has changed that has caused the gentleman to drop that concept and now embrace one that gives almost total control to the Secretary of Defense to make these decisions with minimal input from this branch of government.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's point. I was moving to the point of what input we would have, because it is absolutely essential to us to know that we have an input.

If I can make the two points, one, what has changed is the fact that today we are undertaking a long-term, comprehensive redefinition, restructuring, and subsequently redeployment of our defense.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this bill, as drafted, emphasizes the need for a 5-year defense plan, the very kind of thing that the gentleman says is under way. Once that is in place, then we can move on and make some of these decisions.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate that, and I do want the gentleman to understand that I do appreciate the polemical stage-setting rhetoric in the bill, but when I get down to the line item, chapter and verse, I do not believe it lives up to that promise.

□ 1450

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, our concern is that we are making these decisions before this restructuring is completed.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's point. But the other point that I want to make is what protection do we as a body have for our prerogative. What we would like to see happen in this process is the elimination of the ability of an individual to obstruct the process while retaining, as the Martin amendment would, the ability of Congress as a body to adjudicate the case as brought by the Secretary of Defense or an individual that may be looking out for a parochial interest, and bring it to a vote for the body as a whole to decide on the basis of true defense needs.

Mr. FAZIO. We are asking the administration to submit to us a fair process that would mitigate against that individual standing in the way of what is best for all of us. So I would think the gentleman ought to support the bill as drafted. I really think it goes in the direction that his speech takes us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Martin amendment.

A review of recent base closure history will reveal that Defense Secretary Cheney's slate of potential base closings is not rooted in any rational plan for the future of the Nation's defense forces. For example, on January 29, Secretary Cheney released a list of 34 bases as potential candidates for closure. This list was prepared without the benefit of a 5-year defense plan laying out the future structure of U.S. military forces. When the sole purpose of military bases is to support U.S. military forces, it would be premature, at best, to decide which bases are to be closed before a determination is made as to what the future military force structure will be.

The Martin amendment would only serve to put in place a procedure where basing decisions can be made in an even more capricious manner. I find the Martin approach highly suspect when you consider that Secretary Cheney has been perhaps the most stalwart proponent of going slow in reducing defense budgets and restructuring our defense forces. Yet, for some reason, he is advocating moving full speed ahead with base closings.

There is very strong evidence to indicate that Secretary Cheney's base closing announcements are politically motivated. In the January list of potential base closings, fully 99 percent of the civilian job losses that would result from the closings were concentrated in congressional districts represented by Democratic Members of the House, even though 40 percent of all bases nationwide are in congressional districts held by Republican Members.

It is precisely these politically motivated and premature basing decisions that we can least afford. Just take a look at Fort McClellan in Alabama which was included on Mr. Cheney's list. Fort McClellan contains the only facility in the world where our troops can receive defensive training against live chemical agents. Our troops are already facing the possibility of being bombarded with chemical weapons in Saudi Arabia—one of the most gruesome and deadly weapons in existence. Imagine the devastation these weapons would wreak on

our soldiers if they didn't have any defensive training for chemical weapons. In effect, this is what the Martin amendment advocates.

This is the type of situation that must be avoided.

The Armed Services Committee has developed a reasonable approach to ensure that base closings proceed in a rational manner. First, the Secretary of Defense must submit a force structure plan that details the number and kinds of military units needed over the next 5 years based on the new strategic requirements and on anticipated funding levels. Second, the Secretary must submit a legislative proposal creating a fair process for selecting bases for closure based on the force structure plan. Third, the plan prohibits any closures or planning of closures until Congress has approved a new base closure process, or until January 1, 1992. Fourth, the plan protects the "bleeding" of bases by requiring that all domestic bases receive at least 75 percent of the average amount of repair and maintenance dollars received over the last 5 years, so that they cannot be reduced to rubble before a fair base closure process is developed. Finally, the Secretary is required to develop and submit a proposal for worker retraining and economic conversion in communities hurt by base closures.

We all realize that reductions in defense are on the way and that a consequence of these reductions will be base closings. However, we should not rush into making these decisions. As we proceed in restructuring or defense forces to reflect changes in the world, this restructuring must be based on a strategy that is as clear and well defined as any defense strategy developed during the height of the cold war. We simply can't afford to let premature or politically motivated decisions undermine our future defense capabilities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the Martin amendment and support fair, rational planning in military basing decisions.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out one glaring example of the errors contained in the list of base closures and realignments announced by Secretary of Defense Cheney on January 29, 1990: the Secretary's decision to deactivate the 63d Military Airlift Wing in California and send 20 of its giant C-141 military transport planes to the scrapyard. In addition and perhaps more importantly, the Secretary's action would cause the dissolution of a 4,300 person military airlift wing. That wing contains the personnel with the experience and skills needed to fly not only C-141's but the military transport planes of the future.

Mr. Chairman, if we have learned one thing from the Iraq crisis, it is that we need more air and sea lift, not less. In fact, we didn't even need the mobilization to the Middle East to tell

us that; even an action as small as the Grenada invasion evidently caused strains and unveiled major shortcomings in the level of staffing and equipment in our Military Airlift Command. As many of us know, military transport and other "nuts and bolts" aspects of our military structure have typically received the short end of the stick compared to more glamorous weapons programs. Hopefully, the current mobilization will be a wake up call to us that such a practice must end.

Mr. Chairman, I speak from some degree of direct experience on the base closure issue: Norton Air Force Base in my district was recommended for closure by the 1988 Commission on Base Realignment and Closure. If any more bases are to be closed or military forces reduced or realigned, then Congress must ensure that the decision is made by a fair process which ensures that a long-term assessment of the nation's military needs is considered.

Unfortunately, the long list of base closures and realignments proposed by Secretary of Defense Cheney is January 1990 is not, in my opinion, either fair or forward-looking. While there are some actions on the Secretary's list that should be carried out, others make little sense when the Nation's military needs are fully considered. Our Nation's long-term military needs urgently require rethinking before we launch ahead with more base closings and realignments.

While Norton Air Force Base in my district is scheduled to close, the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended that the 63d remain intact and merely transfer 20 miles away to March Air Force Base. However, Secretary Cheney's 1990 closure and realignment list calls for the 63d to be deactivated.

Mr. Chairman, I seriously question whether we should be going ahead with the deactivation of the 63d Military Airlift Wing, and I think that a comprehensive reassessment of our long-term military needs would support the retention of the 63d. Looking at the big picture, I wonder whether there are other base realignments and closures on the list that would also look highly suspect alongside a comprehensive assessment of our military needs in the post-cold war era.

I thus call on the Secretary of Defense to reconsider his decision to deactivate the 63d Military Airlift Wing in light of the new knowledge of our airlift needs, and I call on the House of Representatives to support a process which is fair and in line with comprehensive long-term military plan for deciding which, if any bases, should be closed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for giving me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an argument for closing or for opening, it is simply to state very very briefly that the language in the committee's bill sets up a fair and orderly procedure to look at this whole question of base closing. I have none in my district so I am not advocating that you close yours but not mine.

I simply want to say given the fact that Secretary Skinner recently called for an expansion of the merchant marine fleet, given the crisis we face now in the seaways, it seems to me most appropriate for us to look at this, because I will cite Long Beach as an example of a facility which is threatened with closing, not to mention strategic interests of Long Beach. Another facility is the Air Force Research Center in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE]. If we close that center it means that the Air Force will not have access to the aerospace industry.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the subject, went through a process 2 years ago with the Base Closure Commission. Some have suggested that we ought to do that again. As a very practical matter, I do not see any such commission passing this House again.

I am not sure that I can support the amendment by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. LYNN MARTIN. But I do know one thing, I am certainly not comfortable with the language that was provided for in our bill. We are in the process in this bill of talking about cutting something in the order of 130,000 uniformed personnel out of the Armed Forces over the course of the next year, and talking of reducing up to 500,000 uniformed personnel over the course of the next 5 years. Yet under the provisions that are in the committee bill the Secretary of Defense not only cannot propose closing any bases until 1992, he cannot even study it. We are telling the Secretary we are going to lay off probably 500,000 uniformed personnel, but he is not even allowed to think about closing bases.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on that point, just about the study, I heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] say that, and the gentleman from New York has now said it, but there is nothing in this provision that would prohibit an internal study within the Department of Defense of base closure. I want to make that clear.

The problem, of course, is when the word gets out to communities all across the country that there is a study going on and we may close your base, economic problems occur within those communities, and I think that is the only reason, in fact I know that is the only reason that the language is there. So I want to reassure the gentleman from New York.

I have his same reservations about any commission, but I have to say I do not know another way to do it, and I think the way the committee has done it is the best way, and again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a good point as far as it goes. The gentleman makes the good point that he would hope that the Department of Defense would be making contingency plans if we are going to be cutting 500,000 personnel out of the armed services. The problem the gentleman points to is what would terrify the Pentagon, that plan would be leaked, and then that would cause his community, or my community, or other communities terrible problems. But in my reading of this, if it were to become the law, the Department of Defense ought to be very reluctant to even conduct an in-house study as to what they would do if they are going to cut 500,000 people out of the services.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to a very distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of serving on this subcommittee as the ranking majority member. I have never voted for any base closures, and there were very few of us around here about 3 years ago that voted against the Army proposal. But I do think what we have done in this bill is logical, reasonable, and we have had hearings on it. I do support what is in the committee provisions, and I hope that the Members will stay with the committee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON].

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that people all over the country today who are listening to this debate do not think we are all losing our minds.

In light of what is going on in the Middle East and an obvious need to redirect our policy in Europe, it is ludicrous that we are even here today discussing the possibility of closing Myrtle Beach Air Force Base or any other domestic military base without the slightest indication from the Pentagon of what our force structure needs will be.

Like most Members of Congress, I am concerned that we take a good look at what our true defense challenges

will be before we dismantle any bases. Especially in light of the events of the past month.

If anything, these events lend a tremendous amount of credence to what the House of Representatives has proposed to combat the current reckless base closing process.

Our five-point plan, first and foremost calls for a Pentagon assessment of the real threats to American security, such as regional conflicts, and to produce a long-term strategic plan.

Our plan also calls for closing domestic bases according to realistic military necessities.

Perhaps the most important part of the House five-point plan is that it would place a moratorium on the current process.

I believe this is our only option because we are facing an unknown future in our conflict in the gulf.

We all know we need savings from our defense budget.

But now, more than ever, we must step gingerly.

If our threats are not of superpower magnitude, then we must obtain our savings from those weapons systems designed for a superpower conflict.

Now is the time to truly consider putting in perspective strategic weapons such as star wars Asat's, and MX missiles where cuts may be made without sacrificing our national security interest.

I urge Members to vote for the committee bill and reject the Martin amendment.

□ 1500

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I am in favor of the Martin amendment, as I interpret this amendment it boils down to this: If you are looking out for your district, you say "no" to the Martin amendment; but if you look out for what is the best interest for our country, then you say "yes" to the Martin amendment.

We must codify the 1988 base closing guidelines. Now the Secretary of Defense needs six impact statements before he can close a base? Come on, it is ridiculous.

We have 300,000 troops in Europe. How long are you going to keep them in Europe? We have 50,000 troops left in Japan. How long are you going to keep them in Japan? I mean how long are we going to be able to afford this? We cannot. We cannot afford 3,000 bases for the United States of America. We do not need them.

You allow the Secretary of Defense to cut back the number of troops in uniform, but you do not give him any discretion to close bases. What do you

want, every soldier to have his own base? It is getting to the point of being ridiculous and totally unreasonable.

Right now we have our budgeteers at Andrews tearing their hair out: Asking how are we going to balance the budget. Well, this is where we have to make some tough decisions. Decisions with American good in mind. We do not need 3,000 bases. This Congress cannot totally shackle the Secretary of Defense. He needs flexibility.

The Secretary of Defense needs flexibility in this area. That is all we proponents are saying.

I think Congress should set the policy, yes, but to get down to the nitty-gritty on every single base, we are going to vote on the floor of Congress on whether we are going to close 3,000 bases one at a time? Well, that is what you are looking for, yes, it is.

And that is why I think this amendment is so important. So, again, I must say this, as I interpret this, what it boils down to is this: If you want to vote for your district, you vote against the Martin amendment; if you do what is in the best interest of the country, you vote for the Martin amendment.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TALLON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, I have a problem when we talk about parochialism. We have troops in the Middle East, we have 159 tanks chasing 1,500 Soviet-made Iraqi tanks. If you do not think we need the A-10's from Myrtle Beach Air Force Base and other A-10's from other bases that are studied for closure, then I think we really are not thinking and putting this thing into perspective. It is vitally important that we maintain these.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE].

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, later today we will be voting on the Martin base closure amendment.

With the fading Soviet threat and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, we will over time begin force draw downs and close military installations. No one disputes those facts.

At issue here is what procedures will be established to determine what, how many, and where U.S. military bases will be closed.

I believe a base closure policy should be consonant not only with our budgetary limitations but also with our total defense strategy and the shape of our force structure.

The Armed Services Committee, concerned about changing defense requirements in a new world order, asked Defense Secretary Cheney to submit a force structure plan to fit a new defense strategy as a foundation to a base

closure policy. He has not produced one, and we are still waiting.

The five-point plan on base closures contained in this bill is a rational way to go about identifying bases for deactivation.

It inspires confidence that base closure decisions will be based on sound defense strategy, not partisan politics.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Martin Base closure amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, last evening, the House voted, 230 to 188, for the Molinari amendment which said do not close bases until a force structure plan is developed. That policy, which is contained in the committee bill, would be wiped out by the Martin amendment. The Martin amendment would permit the Secretary of Defense, at his sole discretion or whim, and without the benefit of any force structure plan, to close any base he pleases. I do not see how anyone who voted for Molinari can, in good conscience, explain a vote for Martin.

At bottom, the committee position and the Martin position aim at the same target: Closing bases. We need to close bases to save money. We need to close bases as the size of the force comes down. We need to close bases because the current basing structure is inefficient.

In terms of how bases are picked for closure, however, the House has a stark choice. We can adopt the Martin amendment which invests the Secretary of Defense with unbridled, unlimited power to close military bases in our districts or we can adopt the committee bill which requires a force structure plan and a fair process to select bases to be closed. The question is, when the jobs of thousands of your constituents are at stake, how much unrestrained power you want to give to a single political appointee.

What I want is a process which sets out the details of the military of the future, including how many planes tanks and ships we will operate, and then has a dispassionate, nonpartisan group decide on the most efficient base structure to house that military of the future. The five point plan in this bill accomplishes that objective.

For this scheme to work, the Secretary of Defense has to be a central player. That is why the provision leaves it to the Secretary of Defense to propose a fair way to select bases for closure. Some think another commission is the best way. I am not so sure. Maybe we should agree on objective criteria for closure and instruct the military services to make the decisions while GAO watches to make sure the criteria is rigorously followed. Whatever way the Secretary selects is fine as long as it is fair, nonpartisan and based on objective criteria.

But having the Secretary do it solo is not good enough. I like and respect Dick Cheney. But, the base closure list he submitted on January 29, 1990, shows the flaws with giving him unilateral power to pick bases for closure.

The flaw of the January 29 list is obvious: 91 percent of all military reductions and 99 percent of all civilian job losses occurred in Democratic districts. Maybe that wasn't intentional. Still, the January list was hardly one to inspire confidence in the fairness of the process.

The list was based on no force structure plan and no objective criteria. We held hearings and quizzed the services on how the list was developed. They had no answers. We asked what criteria they used. They had no answers. We asked why the list was so partisan. They had no answers.

The January 29 list reads like a sick joke in the wake of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Consider:

Secretary Cheney proposed closing the only chemical weapons school in the Army, at Fort McClellan, AL. Had he gotten his way, Secretary Cheney would have eliminated the primary capacity we have to learn how to deal with a chemical weapons attack.

Secretary Cheney proposed deactivating the 2d Armored Division out of Fort Hood, TX. When Desert Shield began, the 2d Armored was the first to go because they were the best tank troops we have.

Secretary Cheney had RIF notices sent to the 5,000 employees of the Troop Support Command in St. Louis, MO. This unit provides needed logistical support to Army troops. Once Desert Shield started, the RIF notices were pulled and every employee was put on double shifts.

Secretary Cheney tried to close the Air Force Base at Myrtle Beach, SC, home of a unit of A-10 anti-tank attack aircraft. Today, A-10's are the most valuable piece of equipment we have in the Saudi desert.

Secretary Cheney tried to deactivate the C-141 aircraft at Norton Air Force Base, CA. For the last month, every transport plane in the inventory has been in virtually constant use bringing soldiers and equipment into Saudi Arabia.

Secretary Cheney proposed major reductions in combat and combat support units in the reserves in January. Today, many of the units he proposed for elimination have been called up to support operation Desert Shield.

The last 9 months have proven that no one individual is smart enough, fair enough, and respected enough to have the unchecked power to close military bases. The committee proposal on base closure provides the checks necessary to ensure that the base closure process commands respect. At the same time, the committee proposal guarantees

that bases will be closed and the taxpayers will save money.

Reject the Martin amendment. Support the committee plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I really would like to comment on the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ROTH's statement and also the statement of Mr. ARMEY.

First of all, with respect to Mr. ARMEY's statement, I really did not understand why all of a sudden now he is changing from supporting a base closing commission 2 years ago and now coming up with a proposal to allow the Secretary to have full discretion. It really makes no sense.

Frankly, his argument with Mr. FAZIO raised, really did not bring out his rationale except he wants to support the President and the administration.

With respect to Mr. ROTH, there is no question we have 3,000 bases. Times have changed, and we have to close some military bases. One of my bases, one of the 86 under Mr. ARMEY's proposal, I supported its closure, after seeing the rational way in which the Base Closing Commission operated.

The problem is that the Secretary has come up with a list of about 46 bases. We do not know how rational that list is.

I have been trying for the last 9 months to get at least some documents from the Secretary's office giving an explanation why the Army depot in Sacramento was on his list. We have not seen anything at all.

I think my other colleagues who have bases that are being proposed to be closed, have the same problem.

I mean if you talk about rationality, the Schroeder-Aspin proposal is the way to go. We need a force structure for 5 years, and then what we need also is to come up with a rational way to close bases.

All we are asking in this proposal is for Mr. Cheney to come up with a proposal. We are not mandating anything on him.

You talk about discretion. Give him discretion, have him come up with a proposal to give himself some discretion. I do not know what you people are afraid of on this particular matter.

We all acknowledge that military bases will be closing. The question is making sure that it is done in a way that in the year 2000 those bases that we closed should not have to be reestablished again.

Second, put an element of fairness in this particular process. That is all we are asking.

That is why I cannot understand why there is no support for the Schroeder-Aspin measure.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the base closure language contained in the bill

and to urge my colleagues to oppose the Martin amendment.

The bill language was carefully crafted by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, LES ASPIN, and the respected chairwoman of the committee's Installations and Facilities Subcommittee, PAT SCHROEDER in complete consultation with the House membership.

The predominant theme running throughout the debate on almost all parts of this year's defense authorization is a genuine commitment to restructuring our force structure. Certainly, those reductions will necessitate the closure of some military bases at home and abroad. Yet there are many strategic questions that need to be answered regarding that restructuring that have nothing to do with dollars.

The issue simply comes down to this: should we develop a plan to close military bases in response to a long-range strategic plan, as the Aspin-Schroeder plan recommends, or should we close military bases first, and then determine our strategy, as the Martin amendment would allow.

For over 40 years, we have been posturing our military primarily to do one thing—defend the United States from nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. The events in the Middle East and the United States-Soviet cooperation in dealing with that threat are proof that our defenses need to be redirected. Those events will also set the tone for the future of modern warfare, and, combined with the changes in Eastern Europe, will hopefully result in a new military vision, which concentrates on low-intensity conflict and conventional mobile forces.

To date, however, we have no such direction, and until we have a force structure plan in place which reflects the rapid changes in what we define as a security threat, it is simply premature to talk about closing domestic bases, much less providing the Secretary of Defense with an expedited process for carrying out base closures.

The Aspin-Schroeder proposal provides the Pentagon with the proper direction to come to Congress with a base closure process which we can all support. Placing the onus upon the Secretary to put base closures within the broader context of force restructuring and taking steps to assure that the Department will not bleed individual bases to death by withholding repair and maintenance funds is the most responsible approach to take with respect to the base issue.

Furthermore, directing the Secretary to submit a plan for retraining displaced workers forces the Department and Congress to consider the impacts of base closures on individual employees. Seeing to the well-being of potentially affected employees is the only responsible way to address this issue and must be an integral part of any base closure proposal.

Base closures will undoubtedly be a consequence of our search for a peace dividend. We should make them a rational consequence, however, rather than a case of putting the cart before the horse. I urge you to support the Aspin-Schroeder proposal on

base closures and reject the Martin amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to redirect the discussion just a minute away from the base closure issue to an issue that I think is extremely important that has not been discussed today.

There was a letter sent by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to every Member of Congress. In that letter, second paragraph, he says:

Although the committee did not anticipate Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, we did recognize that historic changes require a general reorientation of our defense priorities away from the fading confrontation with the Soviet Union in Europe, now that we have won the cold war.

He says we won the cold war.

Then he says in another section, "We should fund forces for new threats over redundant cold war nuclear forces." He wants to do away with much of our nuclear deterrence and not fund that.

Now, I did a little research after I read this letter from Chairman ASPIN. I found that Mr. Gorbachev, just before he came over and signed the Intermediate Range Nuclear Disarmament Treaty with President Reagan a few years ago, that he made this speech to the Supreme Soviet, and in the speech, the last paragraph of the speech reads this way:

In October 1917 we irreversibly departed the Old World. We are heading to a New World, the world of Communism. We shall never deviate from that path.

Now, everybody says, well, that has changed. Mr. Gorbachev is our old buddy, we do not have to worry. Communism is a thing of the past.

Well, we all hope so. There are changes taking place in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe which are very heartening, and we hope that communism is on its death throes.

But the fact of the matter is, six times since the Bolshevik Revolution, this sort of thing has happened. The first glasnost—remember that word—happened in 1921, when Lenin came up with a new economic policy [NEP] which was a reversal of communism. It had an implicit message, that we were moving away from communism in the Soviet Union and toward capitalism. We all know that that did not happen. It was a ploy to get investment and capital from the West. And he was successful.

The second glasnost was in 1936 to 1937 under Stalin. Stalin said he was returning to a western-style constitutional government, and he called for radical reform, or perestroika. Have you heard that word before?

We first heard that in 1936 and 1937 when he called for profits and incen-

tives. He said that he wanted to see an openness in the society. That ended with the Communist purge that killed millions of people in the Soviet Union in 1937 and 1938.

□ 1510

And perestroika, so-called, turned into what was called the great terror. The third glasnost was 1941 to 1945. Again, under Stalin, necessitated because of the invasion of Russia by Hitler. And Stalin said there was going to be manifest change, and he opened his arms to the West, but that was because he had to because of the defense of his nation. The fourth glasnost took place in February 1956, this time under Krushchev, and he said he was going to have political and economic reforms, openness. There was going to be freedom of assembly of the speech and meetings, and so forth. All we all know how that ended. The fifth glasnost was under Brezhnev, 1970 to 1975. Members remember the word "détente?" That was part of the fifth glasnost. There was a new constitution. Again, freedom of speech again, freedom of assembly and so forth. They even signed the Helsinki accord, and we found that this was all baloney in 1976 when our CIA found out, instead of them having 100 or so missiles pointed at the United States, nuclear missiles, we found that there was well over 1,000, and that Brezhnev had been lying to the United States.

Now we have Mr. Gorbachev. We all hope Mr. Gorbachev is a change from the past, but his mentor was Andropov, who was the head of the KGB, who lined up the 100 freedom fighters, after he said he was going to give them amnesty, then he came in and shot them down. His pride and joy was Mr. Gorbachev.

Now, we all hope that there have been changes in the Soviet Union, and we hope these are true changes, and they are going to move toward capitalism and away from communism. However, we must not let down our defenses. We must not lose sight of the fact they have lied to the United States in the past. It is my view that we must keep our nuclear deterrent, that Chairman ASPIN is right, there should be some changes in our structures. But we must not let our guard down because they have lied to the United States five times in the past, and this could be the sixth, and the worst of all.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it the gentleman's position that the Martin amendment lets our guard down, or the committee bill does?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I deviated from the discussion because this is the only time I could get, and I apologize for that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distin-

guished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I am compelled to add to the statement that was just previously made. I got a letter from someone in my district not long ago, after a meeting between the President and Secretary Gorbachev. He told me that next time I met with the President to warn him that Mr. Gorbachev was soft on communism, and do not believe anything he says.

I am here today, though, to talk about base closings. Some years ago, one of the bases in my district was recommended for closure. I checked it out, and it was true that it was not needed. So we closed it. Some bases simply are not needed. However, I appreciate the work of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for a reasonable, rationale, fiscally responsible bipartisan approach to base closings. It is a process that everyone can be comfortable with, can be confident about, and can be proud to be a part of in order to address this question of bases that are needed and not needed in this post-cold war era that we are now in.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon took action last January which was in search of a policy. What the committee has done is to develop a policy that we can all be proud of. Now, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] said 1 minute ago that the process that is set up by the committee even prevents studies. That is not correct. In the bill, on page 430, it says that studies, of course, can be initiated. Any study necessary to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act are applicable to the closure or realignment of military installations. Additionally, that the funds cannot be used to identify bases that are being considered in a public announcement, or to close or realignment any military installation until specifically authorized by the 102d Congress, or until January 1, 1992, whichever comes first.

I am here today to oppose the Martin amendment. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the committee amendment which is a rationale, fair process for base closure.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Martin amendment, an amendment that will give the Secretary of Defense the power to close any military base.

Before we vote on this amendment, I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read article I,

section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. The section of our Constitution that gives the Congress the authority to declare war, to rise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the Government, and regulation of land and naval forces. I will remind the proponents of this measure that the Constitution very clearly gives this power, this responsibility, and above all, this duty to provide for the common defense, to the Congress of the United States, not to some appointed bureaucrat in Washington.

I urge my colleagues to honor the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. I urge them not to shirk their duty, and above all, I urge them to defeat the Martin amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] has 1 minute remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that if there is any time remaining, that I could not then be recognized for a motion to strike the requisite number of words. It is my intent, and I have discussed this with the gentlewoman from Colorado, to acquire 5 additional minutes, but I cannot do that as long as I am retaining any time. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] yields back the balance of his time, and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] now has 2 minutes remaining.

Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] wish to strike the last word at this time?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, if it is permissible, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in response to what we can all agree have been very profound and positive changes in the world, the Committee on Armed Services has brought to the floor a defense bill that anticipates very deep and lasting reductions in our Nation's defense force.

Right off the bat it cuts \$24 billion from the President's budget request—a full 10-percent cut from CBO baseline for defense. It cuts the procurement account by over 20 percent and it cuts troop strength by 129,000.

Over 5 years, the committee anticipates a 25-percent reduction in overall force structure. From 18 Active Army divisions we could go to 12. From 36

Air Force fighter wings, we could go to 25. We would reduce the size of our naval force from 566 ships to 455 ships. We would cut manpower by an additional 300,000 troops.

To the vast majority of Americans, Mr. Chairman, it would seem logical that cuts of this magnitude in combat forces would argue for a proportionate reduction in the military base structure. Why pay for a three tank garage—so to speak—when you have only got two tanks and you are going broke. What this legislation actually says about base structure, however, is hands off.

H.R. 4739 tells the Secretary of Defense to formulate a 5-year force structure plan and submit it to Congress with the 1992 DOD budget request. It also tells him that the plan may not make either direct or indirect reference to military installations inside the United States that may be closed or realigned under that plan.

In addition, the committee provision states that none of the moneys appropriated to DOD through January 1, 1992 may be used to close or realign any bases other than those identified under the 1988 base closing process, and that no moneys shall be used to even identify, through a message to Congress or, indeed, any public announcement, military installations that the Secretary might want to consider for closure.

The committee's provision reads like a gag order. The only thing that the committee has not said is that the Secretary cannot think about closing a base, and one gets the impression that if such things could be legislated the committee would have included such a restriction.

If the committee believed that it was impossible to make reasonable decisions on base structure absent a "5-year force structure plan," then how can the committee believe it reasonable to cut nearly \$25 billion from the President's budget—cut \$25 billion out of force structure and readiness accounts—prior to having such a formal guidance document in place?

The argument that with respect to base structure we need to proceed on a whole different basis is clearly hogwash. It is a transparent attempt to protect congressional pork while at the same time shouting from the mountain about the need to cut defense spending and give American a peace dividend. It is the Congress of the United States at its worst.

The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, expressed very strong and successful opposition to the inclusion of a similar provision in the Senate's Defense authorization bill, saying that it was absurd to be proposing cuts of the magnitude that we are talking about while at the same time telling the Secretary of Defense that he cannot even

consider closing a military base for 2 years. I think that the Senator's characterization applies very well to what the committee is attempting to do.

Later in the day, Mr. Chairman, I will introduce an amendment that will replace the committee language with an effective base closing provision—the same provision, in fact, that the Senate—with the leadership of majority Members, has included in its Defense authorization. I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to review my amendment and to support it when it comes to the floor.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, this is tough. These could be your bases, and, yes, I thought even one in my district would have been included the last time, although it was not. But a lot from my State were included, and as I look around among the Members, the possibility is that bases could be closed for each Member on the floor. But how do we ever talk about cutting defense if we are never going to cut bases, especially if they are in our districts. The American people do not believe that.

Even as much as we want to protect what is in our districts, it is time to put the greater good of America ahead. If we need to cut foreign and domestic bases, we must do so. I look forward to this and hope that we will rise above petty parochialism and do the right thing when my amendment comes along.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond by saying that I think the pork charge around on this floor is very unfair. If we really want to do that and get down to the dirt, there are a lot of Members on the other side of the aisle who voted for a little pork yesterday vis-a-vis the brand-new opening of a naval base when we do not have any homeless ships. So it is kind of interesting how we change our tune, depending on the day.

This has nothing to do with not closing bases. This debate is about whether we are going to unilaterally give to a person who is not elected or appointed by the President the right to close any base and waive a lot of the environmental laws or whether we are going to put together a process with that person i.e. the Secretary of Defense that we all think is nonpartisan and will be taking into account very critical things.

How do we know which bases to close if we do not know what the force structure is going to be? That is the first thing to consider. Let us get the force structure. Then we invite the

Secretary of Defense to propose what he thinks is fair, and then we come up with a bill that we promise will do it.

Attacking this committee and saying that they have not been closing bases is absolutely wrong. This committee has moved forward with the 86 bases that were on the closure list. Not a single one has fallen off the list that came up under the Commission proposal that this Congress backed. This committee also put into the bill \$100 billion to expedite the closing of those 86 bases.

What we are saying is that the difference between those 86 bases selected by the Commission and these recent bases that were done by the President's appointee, the Secretary of Defense, is very apparent. We had long hearings looking at the January list that came over to us. These were done unilaterally and not done in a bipartisan fashion. We asked the Services, "How did you get these names? Where did you get these bases? How did you make these decisions?"

Their answer to every one of those questions was "We don't know. We don't know. We don't know."

So obviously the decisions about which of the bases were put on the closure list that came out this January did not come from the services; they came from the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I think the fair way is to stay with the committee. This is the best way to close bases, and that is the way we want to go, the best way and the most frugal way.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Martin amendment, which would allow the Secretary of Defense to identify, and with congressional consent, close obsolete foreign and domestic bases through the same expedited procedure provisions that were in the 1988 base closing bill and that are in the defense authorization passed by the Senate.

The bill we are considering today reduces military procurement by 21 percent and military manpower levels by 129,000. Over 5 years, the committee anticipates a 25 percent reduction in overall force structure. This would mean that the 18 Active Army divisions, could be reduced to 12, and that manpower would be reduced over 5 years by an additional 300,000. Our naval forces would be reduced from 566 ships to 455 ships, and the 36 Air Force fighter wings would be reduced to 25.

H.R. 4739 forbids the Secretary of Defense to identify directly or indirectly military installations that might be closed or realigned in the 5-year force structure plan he is required to submit under the bill. It also forbids the Secretary from identifying bases that are under construction for closure or realignment until 1992.

How can we propose these enormous cuts in our force structure without allowing for proportionate reductions in our base structure? With a projected \$232.3 billion deficit, we simply cannot afford to maintain underutilized or obsolete bases.

The amendment would not give the Secretary of Defense authority to singlehandedly

shut down bases. Under existing law, the Secretary has to take several steps before he can close a base. He must first send Congress a budget with base closure and realignment recommendations, and then prepare for Congress six separate reports on the economic, operational, environmental, local fiscal, budgetary and strategic affects of the closure and realignment recommendations. After that, Congress has 30 legislative or 60 calendar days to react. Ultimately, the only way that any bases could be closed is if Congress passes an appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, it is hypocritical to advocate sharp defense cuts and at the same time forbid the consideration of closing obsolete bases. The Martin amendment would simply make permanent the streamlining procedures we adopted in 1988, on a one time basis, to allow the Secretary of Defense and Congress to close bases that are no longer needed. We have an obligation to the American taxpayer to ensure that their hard earned tax dollars are not being wasted on unnecessary military installations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Browder base closing amendment provisions of H.R. 4739, the 1990 Defense authorization bill. The Browder amendment would establish a fair, bipartisan process to close U.S. military bases. I commend Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ASPIN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER for their leadership and commitment to this important issue.

The Browder amendment represents the Aspin-Schroeder five point base closure plan and is the result of months of discussion and hard work. It would prevent closures which do not reassess American military strategy or force structure in light of both events in Eastern Europe and the crisis in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, in order to structure our military in a way which addresses genuine national security concerns, we must establish a base closing process which is based on a prudent analysis of future military needs. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Browder amendment and a rational base closing process.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. DURBIN). Under the rule, all time for general debate on the topic of base closures has now expired.

It is now in order to debate the subject of economic adjustment. Pursuant to House Resolution 461, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] or his designee will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] or his designee will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if I misunderstood or if the Chair misspoke.

It was my understanding that this gentleman had 20 minutes and the time for the other side was split, 20

minutes, 10 and 10. That was our agreement.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will recheck the rule.

The gentleman from Alabama is correct. Ten minutes is allocated to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] or his designee, 10 minutes is allocated to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] or her designee, and 20 minutes is allocated to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer our economic adjustment amendment to the defense authorization bill today. The crafting of this economic adjustment, diversification, conversion, and stabilization program represents months of work by many members. Under the leadership of the majority leader RICHARD GEPHARDT, we were able to achieve consensus on a pragmatic \$200 million plan to expand community adjustment and worker retraining programs. Our package relies heavily on existing programs and organizations as well as the enhancement of the President's Economic Adjustment Committee to coordinate and implement necessary community planning and worker assistance efforts.

Representatives OAKAR, GEJDENSON, and WEISS—in particular, worked for months along with the majority leader and myself developing the elements of our core adjustment program. Quite frankly, I wish we could have done more. However, the amendment before us is a solid beginning. It is a beginning that will send a signal of reassurance to workers and communities hard hit by the downturn in defense spending.

Over the past 2 days we have heard a considerable amount of debate on the importance of sustaining high levels of defense spending in the wake of the Iraqi aggression. However, despite the current funding requirements of Operation Desert Shield, I can assure you that the scope and magnitude of spending cuts in defense procurement programs over the next several years will be very significant.

Make no mistake about it. The fading Soviet threat and end of the cold war in Europe portend substantial economic dislocation throughout this country. Conservative estimates of defense budget reductions over the next 5 years of 10 to 25 percent could result in over 1 million lost defense jobs. That is 1 million laid-off Americans in less than 5 years.

Putting in place a defense adjustment and diversification program is not only a responsible step. It is an essential step. At present, we do not have sufficient resources to meet a potential explosion of demand for such economic assistance. That is why pas-

sage of this amendment is so important.

The amendment I am offering today was coauthored by myself and Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR and introduced last February. Since that time, both the Banking and Armed Services Committees have held hearings. Every effort has been made to accommodate the committees of jurisdiction in drafting the amendment before us today.

Specifically, the amendment would provide a statutory basis for the President's Economic and Stabilization Council and require development and implementation of an economic adjustment program to assist industry civilians—\$100 million would be earmarked for community planning assistance through the Commerce Department's Economic Development Agency and the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment. Another \$100 million would be funneled into the Labor Department's Jobs Training and Partnership Act. Additional initiatives which do not require funding authorizations are specified for small business export enhancement and venture capital development program.

Mr. Chairman, funding for this amendment will be provided through a cut in the funding requested by DOD for its general purpose automated information systems. This cut will in no way impact our operations in the Gulf.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my gratitude to the majority leader for the timely leadership he demonstrated in making it possible to bring this amendment to the floor today. I also want to express thanks to SAM GEJDENSON, TED WEISS, and MARY ROSE OAKAR—all of whom deserve credit for today's amendment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Sept. 10, 1990.

**SUPPORT DEFENSE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT
INITIATIVE**

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Despite the current funding requirements of operation Desert Shield on the Arabian Peninsula, the scope and magnitude of anticipated spending cuts in defense procurement programs over the next several years remain very significant.

While deep cuts in the defense budget are a welcome byproduct of the fading Soviet threat and the end of the Cold War in Europe, the potential economic dislocation for workers and communities resulting from these spending reductions could become very disruptive on the local level. In our judgment, it makes sense to establish a modest and effective Defense Economic Adjustment program to assist communities, workers and businesses in coping with large scale economic dislocations. This program would rely heavily on existing programs and organizations as well as enhance the ability of the President's Economic Adjustment Committee to coordinate and implement necessary community planning and worker assistance efforts.

The amendment which will be offered to the DOD Authorization bill by Congressman Nick Mavroules is based on H.R. 3999,

legislation crafted by a coalition of House Members who have worked over the years on the policy issues of defense economic adjustment and conversion. It will provide \$200 million from non-critical DOD accounts to more adequately fund economic adjustment planning, implementation and worker retraining programs conducted by the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment, the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor.

It should be noted that estimates on the impact of the real growth long-term defense budget proposed by the administration in April 1989 still forecasted reductions in defense related employment of 370,000 jobs over five years. The magnitude of the necessary defense budget reductions over the next five years of 10 to 25 percent certainly suggests a far greater potential for worker dislocation in these sectors. Some independent estimates put the number of defense industry civilian workers potentially affected over the next five years at over one million. And while some of these job losses may be absorbed assuming a period of continued economic expansion, a defense economic adjustment program as proposed is a responsible step to take to meet this problem head on.

It is clear that at present we do not have sufficient resources to meet a potential explosion of demand for such economic assistance on a timely basis should the deep cuts in defense procurement be implemented in line with the House Budget Resolution and the House Armed Services Committee bill.

Notwithstanding events in the Persian Gulf which will require a temporary adjustment in defense spending, the long term trends for the overall defense budget should remain steeply downward.

We hope that you will support our economic adjustment amendment to the FY 1991 Department of Defense Authorization bill. It is truly the culmination of many months of work by many Members. Importantly, every effort has been made to accommodate the committees of jurisdiction in drafting this amendment. We think it is a start in the right direction.

Sincerely,

RICHARD GEPHARDT.
LEE ASPIN.
NICK MAVROULES.
BEVERLY B. BYRON.

□ 1530

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I understood the Chair a little earlier about how the time has been allocated on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The minority side, by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] or his designee, has been allotted 20 minutes under the rule.

The majority, through the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] or his designee, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] are each allotted 10 minutes under the rule.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, during today's debate and consideration of the defense economic conversion issue, the House will be able to choose between two distinctly different approaches.

Both approaches recognize that we need to face the real prospect of continued cuts in defense spending, and that we should, as a matter of policy, look at the possible impacts such cuts will have on the national economy and what appropriate steps can be taken to minimize economic dislocation.

From this point on, however, the two approaches part ways.

The Mavroules package takes the traditional approach—set up a new bureaucracy, new procedures and laws and, of course, sprinkles around a lot of new money.

The Hopkins substitute, on the other hand, attempts to address this issue in a manner consistent with our fiscal situation and with the demonstrated need.

The Hopkins substitute builds on the existing structure of programs and sharpens its focus to deal with this issue.

The Hopkins substitute provides the Defense Office of Economic Adjustment with additional funding to continue carrying out its job of helping affected communities.

And finally, unlike the Mavroules amendment, the Hopkins substitute does not raid the Defense readiness budget in order to fund domestic programs.

Mr. Chairman, Defense economic conversion, as defined by the majority's proposal, is founded on the belief that somehow the Federal taxpayers owe employees of defense contractors preferential treatment and funding.

This approach establishes as Government policy a system where if one of our constituents works in a factory that makes widgets that go into tanks or missiles, he or she is somehow special and eligible for all of the programs, funding, and special attention contained in the Mavroules amendment.

But if a similar constituent makes the same widget, but this widget happens to end up in a dishwasher or a car or any other nondefense product, then these workers somehow fail the test, they get no special treatment, they get no special help, they have no Government program dedicated for them.

Do we really want to send the message that defense workers are somehow more deserving of Federal assistance than say, steel workers or automobile workers or any other category of workers?

Are we saying that defense workers are more patriotic or have achieved

some special status which entitles them to a taxpayer subsidy?

I realize that Congress has adopted programs in the past which singles out categories of workers and industries for special help.

But, just because we have done it in the past doesn't make it sound policy.

And there is simply no convincing evidence that compels us to head down that road once again in the name of defense industry workers.

I believe this is an important and basic equity issue which the Mavroules amendment fails to address.

Mr. Chairman, the Mavroules amendment also assumes that the Defense budget will be cut by 25 percent over the next 5 years.

Maybe it will, maybe it won't.

The point is, we simply don't know what is going to happen in 5 years and may not know even if the budget summit is able to reach an agreement on a comprehensive 5-year budget plan.

There are simply too many variables out there, not the least of which is our growing military commitment in the Persian Gulf.

But even when we use this worst case scenario of 5-percent cuts per year for 5 years, the figures still don't show a problem that is in need of fixing.

The Department of Defense estimates that cuts of this magnitude would translate into the loss of 120,000 jobs per year in a national economy of 115 million workers.

To put these figures in the proper perspective, consider that the State of California alone could absorb these kind of job losses as its economy creates over 300,000 jobs every single year.

Under this worst case scenario of a 25-percent cut, defense job losses in States such as Virginia and Connecticut would represent less than 1 percent—0.5 percent—of their overall employment. And this is without factoring in the offsets from jobs created.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, the Mavroules/leadership package is an overreaction, founded on exaggerated claims of economic dislocation.

There is no evidence to support the contention that existing programs are inadequate to deal with any increase in demand for retraining and adjustment assistance and anyone who takes a close look at the numbers used to support this proposal shows they are written in sand.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pioneering work of the House Armed Services Committee on H.R. 4937, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991, and for the economic stabilization

amendment that will be offered by Mr. MAVROULES later today.

In response to the demise of the Warsaw Pact in 1989, the Armed Services Committee has been engaged in a careful and decisive reshaping of U.S. Armed Forces. For this initiative, Chairman ASPIN and his committee are entitled to the commendation of this House and the thanks of the Nation.

I am delighted that, as a part of that effort, an amendment to assist in the transition of defense facilities, defense contractors and their workers, as encouraged by committee Chairman ASPIN and drafted by subcommittee Chairman MAVROULES. I would like to thank the Rules Committee for making such an amendment in order.

I am proud to say that the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, developed the economic stabilization legislation that served as a framework for the Mavroules amendment during 3 years of hearings, research, consultation and drafting. Our bill (H.R. 3999) was introduced on February 7, 1990, revised into a committee print of July 10, marked up by subcommittee on July 19, presented to the Armed Services Committee the same day, and ordered reported by a vote of 30 to 19 by the full Banking Committee September 11. The Banking Committee is the only House committee to act upon the bill and will be the only committee to file a report on it. This Banking Committee involvement is appropriate because of the potentially substantial impact of reductions in the Defense budget on economic stability, and I would like to thank my own committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for his support and assistance in reporting H.R. 3999.

Also in order is a heartfelt commendation to the other major authors of the legislation in this body, Representatives MAVROULES, GEJDENSON, and WEISS. I especially commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MAVROULES, and the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, whose plan to include, this matter in the Defense authorization bill made this issue mainstream. I would also like to thank Congressman TORRES.

As we are poised to approve this measure, I believe it is extremely important not to oversell this amendment or, especially, to undersell it.

Reality has dictated that the present amendment is only a first step. The provisions to be considered today fall short of my own expectations in several ways:

It was not possible to include extended unemployment compensation, on which the Ways and Means Committee has been working hard for several years.

It was not possible to include health, medical or retirement considerations for laid-off defense workers.

Expansion of small business programs to finance transition activities of inventors, small and medium-sized contractors and subcontractors was not included.

Innovative programs for retraining and reeducation, which we considered to be of great promise, are not included.

I am also concerned that the ample additional financial assistance, which we provide through the Economic Development Administration, is not, in my opinion, sufficiently targeted to the problems and opportunities of Defense budget reductions.

The assistance on an industrywide basis to assist in developing new products, new process and new export markets did not make it into the amendment.

The amendment does not go far enough toward establishing a multiyear program, matched to the long-term Defense budget reduction, and adequately funded, as I recommended in my testimony to the Armed Services Committee on July 19.

Coordination between the several committees having jurisdiction over these diverse matters needs to be improved for implementation purposes, and for the many improvements called for in the future.

However, there will be other years and other Congresses for us to work on these matters, and these shortcomings should not cause us to lose sight of the overriding significance of the Mavroules amendment.

It should be noted that many valuable provisions from H.R. 3999 were incorporated into the armed services amendment:

A President's Economic Adjustment Council, which emphasizes good management, good analysis and coordination in devising a Governmentwide program of Federal assistance,

The sum of \$200 million, to be divided between communities and labor benefits,

A direction to combine foreign market information, export promotion and export financing activities to help companies transitioning to peacetime production, and

Help to workers for retraining, job search and relocation.

Second, just as the Defense authorization bill—and my Defense Production Act amendments bill (H.R. 486) which Banking Committee ordered reported on September 11—reflect this country's iron resolve to be prepared for war, the economic adjustment amendment is a concrete reflection of America's commitment to prepare for a more widespread peace. The approval of this amendment sends a clear signal to the leaders and people of the

U.S.S.R. that the ultimate objective of the American people is peace, and we wish to shift as much investment as possible, as soon as possible, to the civilian sector. That is one of the reasons I believe the administration's opposition to this program is unwise. In the absence of such an indication from the White House, I hope that Congress will go ahead and emphasize the peace-loving character of the American people.

It has been the vision of the world's prophets since ancient days that men beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and that nation should not lift up sword against nation. In 1990, we have the opportunity of a generation, or a century, to help to fulfil that vision.

We hope and pray that the Persian Gulf engagement will be a brief interruption in the transition to a world of lower Defense budgets.

In 1988, expenditure for armaments reached the staggering total of \$1 trillion worldwide, with 29 million men and women in military service. Nations and populations are literally staggering under these burdens. I say to Mr. Gorbachev and the people of the U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe, and the Baltic States, that we in Congress wish you well in your desire for better economies and better lives. We wish the same for our own people, and will try to help by seizing this opportunity to shift resources from military to civilian production.

In my opinion, President Bush should join us in this endeavor by inviting the principal sponsors of this legislation to the oval office and joining the forces of his administration to the development and implementation of the best possible economic adjustment program. Imagine what Presidents Kennedy, Johnson or Truman would have done at a moment like this.

Instead, the administration is busy publishing reports opposing "conversion," which is a concept of limited application that accounts for a minor fraction of the economic adjustment process.

Today's amendment is aimed at giving a helping hand to the workers, professionals, businesses, and communities whose skills and steadfastness over the past 45 years made it possible to prevail in the cold war and open the way to freedom and economic improvement to millions of people around the globe. It is positively ungrateful to forget about these firms, people and cities at the moment of victory, and let them twist in the wind while the economy readjusts.

We know, from the base closings of the past 25 years—where civilian employment is higher than military employment by almost 50 percent—and from the highly successful skills conversion project of the 1970's, that the

targeted and transitional assistance envisioned by this legislation will pay huge dividends in economic competitiveness and economic stability. This bill uses existing institutions and the strength of our traditional free market system to facilitate economic adjustment to declining Defense budgets we hope to see in the future.

I hope this House will overwhelmingly endorse the Mavroules amendment and the Defense Department authorization bill to start us down the road of planning for more peace oriented economies for our own people, and for other peoples around the world.

□ 1540

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very generous country. We heard the President recently propose waiving 7 or 8 billion dollars' worth of Egyptian debt. We help small countries around the globe on a regular basis. Eastern Europe emerges from 40 years of Communist control to democracy, and the United States is there to lend a helping hand even when we have our own fiscal crisis at home.

What do we offer defense workers, those who built the equipment that gave us the finest military in the world, those people who we entice to help defend America in its toughest years?

The proposal by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS], my good friend and a member of the committee, is frankly inadequate. Not simply is the \$4 million spread across the entire United States in this program, but the agency that he looks to to provide the service is simply not suited to deal with the problems we face; \$150 billion to defend Western Europe and Japan, \$7 billion for Egypt, \$4 million for the American defense workers.

In my district at United Nuclear we have had the office that the gentleman will speak of, OEA. They cannot do the job. They are not equipped to help develop new industry, to retrain workers. We have, for workers who have lost their jobs because of foreign trade, provided additional assistance.

What we are saying is that in this case where the Government's policy determines what the future of the worker is, whether he can pay his mortgage, send his kids to school and buy his family's food is determined by Government policy, there the Government has some responsibility to give him an opportunity to go through that transition, to give that mother an opportunity to have some planning time so she can raise her children.

□ 1550

What we ask for here is not a hand-out, but a helping hand, to give indus-

try and workers and communities a chance to adjust so they can prosper and build a stronger economy.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mavroules economic conversion amendment and in support of the Hopkins substitute of which I am a cosponsor.

The Mavroules amendment, which is certainly well intentioned, is simply another backdoor scheme to bleed the defense budget by an additional \$200 million to help ease the dislocation that the House Democrat's massive \$24 billion cut made in defense.

We have seen time after time a reduction of our defense spending. We have seen a defense budget come over to be reduced. Then we see other hands reaching into the defense spending budget and bleeding it off for some other purpose.

I recognize there will be some dislocation, and I am not insensitive to this, nor do I feel that it should not be given proper attention.

The Mavroules amendment takes \$200 million from defense and gives it to programs within the Department of Commerce and Department of Labor which have no bearing on providing for our national defense. If they want to find \$200 million someplace else and set up such a program, that is a different thing. But do not take it from defense. We have ample needs that this money could go to if we do not spend it for the things for which it was originally budgeted.

Basically, the Department's budget is being sacrificed as a cash cow for Commerce and Labor programs.

The Mavroules amendment represents the same old approach to public policy—let's build up a new bureaucracy and throw some money at it, the more the better.

The Mavroules amendment is founded on the assumption that defense cuts in the coming years will be so drastic that they will lead to massive layoffs and severe economic dislocation in the defense industry.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt anyone today will argue that we are not going to have serious defense cuts.

As I pointed out, \$24 billion was cut by this committee from the budget of the House from the administration's own request.

By how much, and how quickly, remain open questions as to what will be the final figure. We have to wait, I guess, until the group comes back from Andrews Air Force Base, this afternoon or tomorrow, to find out what the final figure is.

Moreover, the evolving situation in the Persian Gulf may not lead to

future increases in the domestic defense business. Strangely enough, it might lead to additional overseas business for our defense industry.

I know, in fact, that according to the paper, according to publications in the industry, we are looking for several billion dollars of increased spending to our friends and allies around the world, whether it be Saudi Arabia or other Persian Gulf countries, or even Great Britain.

The evolving situation in the gulf may lead to increased business, and I would hope that would be so, if it comes to ameliorating any layoffs of our civilian industrial workers.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Mavroules amendment sends a message to the country that its proponents may not fully realize.

What this amendment says is:

Mr. Defense Worker, because it's an election year, we are going to single you out for special treatment. We in Congress are going to set up a nice entitlement program for you, fund it with \$200 million carved out of an already decimated defense budget, and hopefully this will distract you from the fact that it is the Congress who is dictating these defense spending cuts which threaten to put you out on the street.

Mr. Chairman, we concede that defense cuts require that we pay closer attention to economic consequences, and the Hopkins substitute does just that.

It beefs up DOD's Office of Economic Adjustment so they can continue to help affected communities.

It sets up an early warning system so affected communities can receive adequate notice to begin planning and adjusting.

It encourages the President to closely monitor existing Federal retraining and adjustment programs to ensure they have enough resources to meet any additional demand.

In summary, we agree that something must be done in this area.

But, Mr. Chairman, we reject the inconsistent approach of the Mavroules amendment which proposes to ease the pain of defense cuts by cutting defense even further.

The DOD is not a Federal welfare center for every town that is going to feel the economic pain of impending cuts in defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, I think \$6 million that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS] proposes to set up to study and make adjustments that are deemed necessary would be adequate, certainly at the inception, to get this started. We do not need the Mavroules amendment, which would take \$200 million additional out of defense and allocate it to another agency of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote no Mavroules and aye on Hopkins.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] has just returned from the Persian Gulf. As one who has a great deal of experience with the defense posture of this country and the authorization bills that he has helped craft for several years, certainly he is in a position to know whether or not we are going to need additional funds for the Persian Gulf, from which he just returned.

My question to the gentleman is could he briefly tell us about what is needed over there, and are we not waiting now to see if the budget is going to allocate additional funds for our costs in the Persian Gulf?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is the inconsistency or the anomaly of the situation we are now discussing. We are expecting the Budget Committee to come in and give us an additional spending figure based on our present needs and anticipated needs in the Persian Gulf. We think it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$7 billion for the first 6 months in the Persian Gulf.

What this amount will do is take an additional \$200 million out of defense, while at the same time we are waiting to hear how much we are going to beef defense up. I think it is anomalous in the extreme to say we know we are going to need more money, that there is not enough in the present bill. We should increase, not decrease, what is in the defense bill, but, by the way, let us take out \$200 million and give it to Commerce and Labor. I think it is well-intentioned, but not very well thought out.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, in other words, what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] is saying, is the Mavroules amendment will take \$200 million out of readiness, the very place that we are hoping to be able to put additional money when the budgeteers come back to us in the next couple of days, is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, exactly. We are just using this as a cash cow to funnel money to another agency of Government, while at the same time we are saying, "Hey, we are running short as it is. We need additional funds." In the meantime, we give it away to another agency of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine anything more inconsistent.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The Chair will advise at this point in the debate that the gentle-

man from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS] has 6½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], controlling time for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mavroules amendment and in opposition to the Hopkins substitute. The United States must put in place a defense economic adjustment program to deal with massive layoffs and community dislocation that result from cuts in defense spending.

While deep cuts in the defense budget are a welcome byproduct of the fading Soviet threat and the end of the cold war in Europe, they also can be a tragedy on the local level. Communities all over the country have already begun to experience the disruption associated with such cuts. Weekly reports detail defense industry layoffs. As the Wall Street Journal recently reported, for instance, United Technologies will eliminate 4,000 jobs over the next 3 years. McDonnell Douglas announced plans to layoff 17,000 workers. Defense analysts forecast that more than 800,000 jobs are at stake over the next 5 years.

If we don't have an adjustment program, these dislocated workers will be thrown into the evergrowing pool of the unemployed. A recent General Accounting Office report found that dislocated workers remain unemployed more than 14 weeks, with an estimated productivity loss of almost \$4,500 per worker. Considering the economic crisis the United States is in, it cannot afford to lose the productivity, nor keep these workers on public assistance.

The Mavroules amendment provides for a much-needed adjustment program. Although this program is a modest one, it will help workers and communities adjust to dislocation resulting from defense cuts. The amendment does so by establishing a President's Economic Stabilization and Adjustment Council to coordinate and implement national defense economic adjustment and provide information to localities on relevant loan, grant and job training programs.

The Mavroules amendment will also authorize \$100 million through the Jobs Training Partnership Act for a special worker retraining program for unemployed defense-related workers, and \$100 million for the Economic Development Administration planning and assistance grants.

Although this amendment will help workers and communities adjust, it does not deal with what I consider economic conversion. Economic conversion is a political, economic and technical process for assuring an orderly transition of economic resources now being used for military-related purposes to alternative civilian uses.

A genuine and comprehensive policy of economic conversion includes advanced planning. It would have plans for the conversion of the facility drawn up before contract reductions are announced. If this is done, then when the contract is cut back, a facility will be able to convert, retrain its workers, and start production without the massive employee layoffs and community disruption which often occurs with contract cancellations.

A policy of economic conversion also must provide dislocated workers with financial assistance that would enable them to maintain their health benefits while they retrain and while the facility converts to civilian work.

While the Mavroules amendment does not create a genuine policy for national economic conversion, it does take some steps to help workers adjust to dislocation related to defense cuts. It is a modest amendment that simply enhances programs that are already in place. It escapes me how anyone concerned with the well-being of defense workers and their communities could oppose such a modest proposal.

□ 1600

I urge my colleagues to support the Mavroules amendment. In the meantime for the sake of America's economically dislocated communities and employees. I will continue to attempt to persuade my colleagues to adopt legislation providing for a genuine program of economic conversion.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am convinced that many of our colleagues in this body do not yet appreciate the scope of the economic hardship that will be felt in communities throughout the Nation as the defense budget is drawn down over the next 5 years. While the long-term effect of Desert Shield on the defense budget is uncertain, it remains clear to me that the lessening of world tensions must inevitably result in reduced defense spending.

I have long held the view that communication is the key element in any successful plan. The strength of the gentleman's amendment is that it creates the necessary formal management structure, and mandates timely coordinated effort between Federal

agencies, State and local government, and local labor and business.

I would like to ask the gentleman if the Job Training Partnership Act provisions of the amendment include a reference to employer associations, and an authority to establish training and job placement demonstration projects?

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BYRON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentlewoman from Maryland that her concerns are accommodated in the amendment.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think the employer associations are often overlooked as a source of expertise in creative thinking. I had the Maryland Hospital Association come to me with an exciting proposal that would facilitate movement of many of our highly skilled employees from the defense industries to fill a shortage that we are seeing in the health care community. I think that is just probably one example that we can find of potential opportunities to transfer highly qualified defense employees to skills in other areas that are needed, sorely needed here in this Nation. So I want to once again congratulate the gentleman from Virginia and also the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her support.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, another problem with the Mavroules proposal is the highly irregular procedure used to develop it.

This proposal has not been formally adopted by any of the committees of jurisdiction, certainly not the Armed Services Committee.

It was crafted outside of the normal legislative process by an ad hoc task force appointed by the majority leader that even the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has taken exception to.

We have heard Members talk about the position of this administration.

Let me quote briefly from a letter he wrote to Speaker FOLEY on August 2, outlining his objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI wrote to—

Express my serious concerns about the highly-irregular process that has been used to develop this legislation. Measures within the jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House should be considered by those Committees and not by ad hoc task forces. Such task forces . . . are directly violative of the institutional processes and committee prerogatives of the House.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI continues—

This irregular procedure of circumventing the normal Committee process results in a

legislative product that has not had the benefit of any public hearings, investigative scrutiny or official legislative history in a Committee report. . . . The absence of such procedural and interpretive protections . . . can and usually does, result in deficient legislation whose provisions are subject to independent interpretation.

Clearly, this legislation suffers from the procedural deficiencies cited by Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and should be sent back to the committees of jurisdiction for proper consideration.

This is no way to conduct business on an issue of important public policy and we should not be asked to jump blindly off the cliff on something that has not received the careful scrutiny and deliberation of the committee process.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, proponents of the Mavroules package claim that the \$200 million they are taking out of the defense budget to bankroll this program is not really needed in the account where they got it; that is, general purpose data processing.

Well, if this is true, and I will take their word for it, I know of 60,000 or so young Americans in the middle of a desert somewhere who have plenty of ideas on how this \$200 million can be put to a more pressing and important use than shifting it to the Departments of Labor and Commerce for programs of dubious priority.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to correct the gentleman, because the fact is that our committee did report out, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which has jurisdiction of titles I, II, III, and part of V, and that is the only thing we reported out, that in essence is the Mavroules amendment, and, as a matter of fact, in deference to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that section related to unemployment compensation is not included, is not included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. So, in fact, we have reported out of the committee, 30 to 19, this amendment, and, in essence, the gentleman's information is incorrect.

Mr. HOPKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would add at this point in the RECORD that what they pointed out, in my opinion, was H.R. 3999, not this amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. In essence it is the same.

Mr. HOPKINS. In summary, our colleagues have two distinctly different choices to make on defense economic conversion.

They can jump on the same bandwagon that helped create the problem at issue, throw more money around,

create new and unnecessary bureaucracies and cut defense readiness by another \$200 million.

This is the choice represented by the Mavroules amendment.

Or they can take the more rational, measured and responsible approach, which—I admit, it may not grab the headlines—but it certainly serves the interests of the taxpayers and the integrity of our defense budget.

I urge my colleagues to make the right choice, support the Hopkins substitute and vote down the Mavroules amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss for a moment with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] the schedule. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the rule requires us to give notice to the Members before we have votes and calling up amendments as to what we are going to do and in what order and after discussing the issue with the gentleman from Alabama, I would like to propose the following schedule today.

We have been conducting general debate on a whole series of issues. It would be the proposal of the chairman that at the end of the discussion here that we are completing on the issue of the conversion that we would not do the other item listed for discussion today which was the B-2, but, in fact, to put that off until tomorrow, and to proceed, according to the wishes of the people who are conducting the economic summit negotiations, to proceed with some votes.

We were looking at votes roughly between 4 o'clock and 6 or 7 o'clock. It would be, after discussing the matter with the gentleman from Alabama, our suggestion that with the end of the discussion then on the conversion, as the chairman allocated that there was relatively little time remaining, that we would then proceed to the votes. There were three votes on the burden-sharing issue, so there would be three votes coming on the burden-sharing issue. The first would be an amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], and according to the agreement of yesterday, there would be 5 minutes in support of the amendment, 5 minutes opposed to the amendment, and then a vote on the amendment. That would be a 15-minute vote to be followed by the two other votes on the burden-sharing issue, which would be the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

□ 1610

At the conclusion of that, those would be three votes that would take care of the burden sharing issue. We would then proceed to have the votes

on the base closing amendments. There are two amendments listed under base closing, the amendment by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN], and then the amendment that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] and I are offering on the base closure amendments. Those both would follow from that.

At that point it would be our intention to complete our business here today and to rise. It was the desire of people working the negotiations on the budget summit that we have whatever votes we have in a short time tonight, and then we would quit fairly early because they are going to go back and continue their negotiations.

But what we would be looking at is, starting probably about 4:30, five votes. I would guess each of those votes is going to take a half an hour. I would guess that we are talking about 7 o'clock adjournment tonight. Anyway, this was what we were working out.

Tomorrow then it would depend a little bit on what we hear from the people coming back from the budget negotiations as to the schedule tomorrow. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] and I would like to consult with them and see about that before we announce anything definitive about tomorrow. But we do plan, of course, to continue the B-2 debate which we did not get to this afternoon.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the Members, we had originally thought that we would be able to conclude the entire bill by going late tonight. It has become obvious that this is not the case, especially in view of the fact that we are trying to work in conjunction with the budget summit committee. They will not finish their work today we are told, even though they will be back about now, and we expect they would go back sometime this evening, and then we will have the final budget figure to work to.

It is the chairman's intent, as I understand it, and he can correct any part that is wrong, that he has some amendments that he will offer when he gets the final figure, and that will be one of the last things that will be offered tomorrow. When we start, we will start off with general discussion of the B-2. We anticipate no vote on the B-2, but there will be some 20 minutes I believe was the last figure that was mentioned of general discussion on the B-2. Then we will go forward to another subject.

Staff just commented that we do not know after that point where we are going. But things still need to be adjusted. We have some general amendments, and those that are not contro-

versial can be lumped. Those that would not be agreed to or that would create some controversy we will probably have votes on.

I think the last amendment would probably be that of the chairman in trying to conform the budget deficit summit committee to what dollar figure we are given. After that the only thing left is a motion to recommit and final passage.

Have I substantially stated it as the chairman understands it?

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman from Alabama is absolutely correct. We are now in the position where we have more votes to do than talking to do. The problem is that for the budget summiters to meet we cannot have votes, so we are a little bit stymied as to how we proceed from today. But clearly we have a block, we have four amendments on SDI to vote out, and we have an SDI policy amendment to vote on, and of course we have a couple of amendments that we are discussing here, the Hopkins amendment and the Mavroules amendment in connection with economic conversion that we need to vote on. So what we need out of the scheduling here is voting time. But what the economic summit needs is quiet meeting time. So when they get back here we have to sort this out.

Mr. DICKINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I just would like to point out to the membership we appreciate their forbearance and understanding. We are operating under a unique set of circumstances that we have never faced before. We are doing the best we can to conclude the entire bill. We thought we would have it done this evening. Obviously that cannot be due to no fault of those on the floor.

We anticipate that probably we will be able to finish the entire thing early tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. ASPIN. Depending again upon what they say.

Mr. DICKINSON. And I am not in a position, nor is the chairman I think, to speak for the leadership, but we were told that the next item of business then would be the crime bill, unless that has been changed.

Mr. ASPIN. That really is another department.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HOPKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the schedule you have proposed, we would end today with the final vote on base closure; is that correct?

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOPKINS. There would be no vote today on economic conversion?

Mr. ASPIN. Not today.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask if we would then tomorrow pick up on the schedule that we discussed earlier today, or would that be changed?

Mr. ASPIN. It seems to me that one thing that we could do tomorrow, the only thing we have not debated is the B-2 amendment, so we would probably go back to debating the B-2 amendment. But then the next logical thing in order here is the votes we did not get to today, and I would anticipate that the first set of votes is the SDI cluster, including the policy amendments, and then the amendments on the economic conversion.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then the schedule, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the schedule would then continue as was outlined in our meeting this morning, no change in that?

Mr. ASPIN. Exactly. Not yet.

Mr. HOPKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The Committee will now resume debate on the economic conversion issue.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield my final one-half minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Mavroules amendment providing for defense economic adjustment assistance.

This amendment is based on H.R. 3999, legislation of which I am proud to be an original sponsor, and which was approved yesterday by the Banking Committee. Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR's Economic Stabilization Subcommittee has spent years working on economic adjustment proposals. H.R. 3999 is the culmination of countless hearings and meetings and has truly undergone an evolutionary process. It is an excellent product and I am pleased that the amendment we are considering today includes the basic elements of H.R. 3999. It provides an urgently needed package of assistance to workers, to businesses, and to communities that will soon begin to feel the impact of defense spending cuts.

In July, Ms. OAKAR's subcommittee joined my Small Business Subcommittee in Los Angeles to hear firsthand just how badly the situation is likely to become in southern California.

California ranks No. 1 in the country in defense spending, with nearly \$56 billion and hundreds of thousands of jobs at stake. Cutbacks at the large defense contracting firms in southern California will have a ripple effect through the aerospace industry on the thousands of subcontractors and sup-

pliers, small businessmen, in the region.

It is imperative that we have in place a strategy for the Nation to adjust to the reality of declining defense budgets. Although I would have preferred the stronger provisions in H.R. 3999 to become a part of this DOD bill, this amendment is a modest approach that will help us plan for the massive conversion of our best minds, talents, and technologies from military to peaceful production.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a juncture where we are all thankful for the monumental events transpiring in the world that are now compelling us to convert our military strength into economic strength. Let us capitalize on the situation rather than fear it. There is no reason why peace should bring pain.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the author of the amendment has the right to close debate. We do not have any speakers at this time, so I would reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is the Chair's position that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], representing the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], has the right to close this debate, and the gentleman from Kentucky may utilize his time or yield back his time.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, in order to close the debate, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. BRENNAN].

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mavroules amendment on economic conversion.

In my home State of Maine we are proud of the many contributions we make to the national defense. As a State that is heavily influenced by defense budgets, we know that it is only a matter of time before the defense budget reflects the changing world climate.

Despite the current Persian Gulf crisis, our defense spending is heavily geared to fight a war with our former chief adversary, the Soviet Union, and we know that likelihood has been greatly diminished.

The Federal Government must now adjust its defense spending. We have a special responsibility to assist the affected communities to make the transition from yesterday's high level of defense spending to tomorrow's more realistic budgets. We need to retrain workers. We need to assist businesses to move to alternative production, and we need to help affected communities.

The Mavroules amendment to me will serve as a very important first step in making that change to a peace-

time economy. I urge my colleagues to assist our fellow citizens who have contributed so much to the defense of this Nation and help them make that important transition. I urge support for the Mavroules amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mavroules economic conversion amendment to H.R. 4739. This amendment addresses the problems that businesses, workers, and communities face as they cope with defense budget cuts. I commend Mr. MAVROULES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. GEPHARDT for their commitment to developing this important legislative package.

The Mavroules amendment would be an important component of H.R. 4739 for two reasons. First, the economic savings from defense budget cuts are meaningless if the communities which depend on defense dollars aren't around to enjoy the savings. This legislation will help communities weather the bad times and capitalize on resources which are freed up through base closing and defense cuts.

The Mavroules amendment will also help fulfill a promise made by the Base Closing Commission of 1988 to provide economic assistance. Base closings without economic conversion is an empty promise.

Mr. Chairman, the challenge we face is to move from the plight of economic loss to the promise of economic conversion. We can achieve that promise by voting for the Mavroules amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Mavroules amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mavroules amendment.

For the first time in 45 years, our Nation is faced with the prospect of developing defense and economic policies in a non-cold-war frame of reference. The Warsaw Pact has collapsed, the Berlin Wall has come down, and we are on the verge of reaching historic arms control agreements with the Soviet Union.

I think we all welcome these changes. However, they have at the same time created new problems for us. With these changes, reductions in defense spending are inevitable and base closings, mass layoffs, and plant closings are on the way. Already, Lockheed has announced the layoff of over 7,000 employees at its Los Angeles-based facilities. In addition, we are currently in the process of closing 86 domestic military installations as a result of legislation enacted in 1988.

We now face a difficult task of developing methods to help communities, workers, and businesses make a transition to an economy with greater reliance on private sector involvement rather than defense spending.

In California, though our economy is diverse and strong, we have many communities, businesses, and literally hundreds of thousands of workers who will be affected by declining defense budgets. Six to seven percent of all jobs in California are defense related. That's nearly 800,000 jobs, which is more than double that of any other State.

The defense industry is shrinking. New markets have to be created. Diversification must take place. The Mavroules amendment lays the groundwork to provide communities, work-

ers, and businesses with the tools they need to reduce their defense dependency and take advantage of economic opportunities in the civilian sector.

The Mavroules amendment authorizes \$200 million to provide assistance to workers, communities, and businesses that suffer economic dislocation due to defense spending reductions. These funds would be used for a variety of purposes. For example, it would help communities plan the conversion of a military base to an airport or whatever use is determined to be in the best interest of the community. The funding would supplement job counseling and retraining services for defense workers and expand Small Business Administration loan programs for impacted businesses.

The Mavroules amendment expands existing programs in order to meet the growing demand that will result from declining defense budgets. I commend my colleague, Congressman MAVROULES, for the time and energy he has committed to this issue. He has crafted a fair and balanced measure which is probusiness, prolabor, and procommunity. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Mavroules amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on this issue has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 457 and the requisite notice given by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Service yesterday, it is now in order to consider the amendments printed in House Report 101-668, relating to Defense burden sharing, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes each, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto, and shall be considered in the following order:

First en bloc amendments by Representative MARTIN of New York;

Second, by Representative BONIOR; and

Third, by Representative MRAZEK.

□ 1620

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. MARTIN OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows: Strike out section 2801 (relating to dual basing) and redesignate the subsequent sections and the table of contents accordingly.

Strike out section 2802 (relating to Crotona, Italy) and redesignate the subsequent sections and the table of contents accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Is the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in opposition to the amendments?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. This gentlewoman is in opposition to the amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman MARTIN, to strike sections 2801 and 2802 from this bill.

These sanctions are being represented as cost-cutting measures. Actually, they are nothing more than isolationism in disguise. If these provisions become law, they would force the United States to abruptly and unilaterally abrogate its treaty obligations, something that would be detrimental to U.S. foreign policy.

It would come as bad news to many small, defenseless nations that rely on America's military might and honest dealing to preserve peace and stability around the world. Our Armed Forces played a vital part in the defeat of Germany and Japan in World War II, and in the maintenance of peace after the war.

The crisis in the Persian Gulf has demonstrated that much of the world still relies on the United States as the ultimate guarantor of peace. But we cannot continue to perform this role without forces deployed in forward positions outside the United States.

I understand the frustration many Members feel when military bases in their districts are closed while overseas bases are kept open. But we should not try to strengthen the Nation's economy by weakening the Nation's defenses.

Instead, let us work together to form a rational and coherent post cold war defense policy that continues to preserve the security America has enjoyed for 45 years.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that this is not isolationism. I resent that label very much. Isolationism ended with the technology such as the jet plane, the satellite dish, many other such things.

We are a global village.

What this amendment does is it helps adjust to the world as it has changed today. We are no longer in a bipolar world. When we had a bipolar world, it made sense to predeploy our troops in Europe. Right now, we have got 325,000 troops in Europe defending

West Germany from East Germany, while all the East Germans are in West Germany shopping at the malls.

Tell me where that makes sense. We have not taken one of those predeployed troops to the Persian Gulf. I think what we are talking about here with dual basing is giving us the most flexibility. It allows the Secretary of Defense total discretion to determine what troops must remain overseas, total discretion to do that. Then the next part is to look at what is left and see if there is not some way to bring them home and then only assign the service member to bases overseas. We have cost estimates that for every 100,000 Army troops permanently stationed abroad, if you station them instead in the United States with their families you would save \$700 million per year per that unit.

Why? Because you do not have to send barbers and butchers and budgeteers and bartenders and bakers for them, because they are back in the United States, and that saves us an incredible amount of money.

It then gives us the most flexibility to move to wherever the next crisis is. That is very, very important.

Again, this is not totally cost saving either. This is an adjustment. We mandate nothing here. We only say that in the next 5 years it is highly unlikely 450,000 troops will continue to be deployed abroad and, therefore, we should be looking at how we are going to deploy them before we close all our bases at home and have to turn around and buy them all back to put them when we start seeing the changing world.

I think it is also very important to point out that this amendment, if it passes, you will also be voting to keep Crotona.

Now, the General Accounting Office has looked at this and spoken very strongly, recommending that we go with the committee position on Crotona. They point out that the response to last year's Defense authorization bill was really smoke and mirrors. In last year's Defense authorization bill, we put a cap on what was going to be spent at Crotona.

We have been told now that they can meet the cap. GAO says, "Oh, yeah"? Let me tell you how they are going to meet the cap. They are putting savings in that project a more favorable exchange rate than we have ever seen, with the dollar dropping hourly; they have cut the number of family housing units to below the number of families that are going to move there. Where are the rest of them going to live, in a tent? They have changed the repayment to NATO, slowed it down without getting NATO to agree to it.

They have scaled back all sorts of things that are very unrealistic. They

also have not gotten one new concession from the allies nor reopened that. Furthermore, this will not even be ready to open until 1996. The base has to have all these planes moved out of there by 1992. So those planes are going to go somewhere else.

We are going to hear in the debate that these planes must be there because we will need them for the whole Mideast region. Well, if we want to be in the Mideast region, it makes a lot more sense to put them in Turkey.

Also, we know that our NATO allies have been doing zip, very, very little in this whole Persian Gulf area. They do not let us use our troops stationed there because they do not want them out of theater. Well, then why are we building a NATO base when we are not going to be allowed to use it out of theater?

The only thing that it can be redeployed against realistically is the Warsaw Pact, which is about as militarily effective today as the Holy Roman Empire was in its day.

I think we ought to point that out.

We are going to hear a lot more about NATO. When even Mrs. Thatcher is attacking NATO for not doing more, I think we ought to look at this. Furthermore, Mrs. Thatcher has called down the number of their troops they have committed to NATO.

We just saw an agreement yesterday when all the allies came forward and came up with a new plan for getting troops out of West Germany and West Berlin. We are seeing all of this moving along. Everyone else is unilaterally starting to change and adapt to the changing world.

We are saying, "No." The American taxpayers must continue to spend the billions of dollars to predeploy troops in Europe, all over the Pacific, in Korea, and now in Saudi Arabia, and close all of our bases at home? Come on. It really does not make sense.

This is a very moderate, sensible amendment, and I hope everybody votes against this amendment and stays with what the committee put in because what the committee put in fits the modern world; what the amendment does is stays with the cold war world. I think we had better be getting a little more flexible and a little more into reality.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND].

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Martin amendment.

I rise in support of the Martin amendment to strike section 2801 of the bill. This provision calls for increased use of dual basing, in which permanently stationed units of the Armed Forces at military installations in the United States are given short-term rotation assignments to overseas military bases for training and exercises. The idea is that these rota-

ing assignments would take the place of permanently stationed forces—at a lower cost.

In the unstable world that we live in today, I think dual basing is shortsighted. It constitutes a return to isolationism. It disregards treaty arrangements, and could undermine our ability to protect vital national interest abroad.

Dual basing is ill-advised at this time—particularly in view of our demonstrated shortage of sealift and airlift. Dual basing could, for example, end our forward deployments in such places as Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and elsewhere in the Indian Ocean and Pacific.

Those forward deployments have played a key role in our ability to move quickly in response to Hussein's invasion of Kuwait. Those very same bases are permanently occupied by Marine Corps units. They provided a major launching point for the first combat units to go ashore in the Middle East in significant numbers with heavy weapons and equipment, including several hundred tanks. Those tanks arrived on the scene ready to go long before the Army tanks, which had been transported from the United States by ship, began to trickle in.

If Hussein had moved large-scale armor forces against Saudi Arabia immediately following the occupation of Kuwait, we would have had real problems. Given our continuing shortage of airlift and sealift, we need to permanently station U.S. combat forces as close as possible to potential trouble spots.

Some dual basing makes sense—such as that now being used selectively in Europe. But section 2801 is too far reaching too soon. I ask you to join me in voting for the Martin amendment to strike that provision.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, obviously the gentleman from Colorado and I strongly disagree on this issue. We also disagree on the reading of the CBO report and the recommendations. We certainly disagree on the comment about no active forces coming from Europe to go to the Persian Gulf.

I have a list that I will submit for the record of the five units that came out of Germany, the United Kingdom, and Spain that are now in the Persian Gulf. One of them happens to be the 401st tactical fighter wing that is scheduled, under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to go from Terajon, Spain, over to Crotone, Italy.

□ 1630

There is something more basic about this amendment that causes me to offer it. I am perhaps old fashioned, but I think we still live in a very, very dangerous world. I know it is a good week for NATO bashing, because last month was the month when everyone was satisfied that the last sword had been ground into a plowshare, and we were in a world of peace. We find ourselves in a very difficult situation at the present time in Iraq and Saudi Arabia, and who do we have to look to to help the United States in this? That

is our allies. That is NATO and all the bilateral relationships we have around the world. Those are the kind of people we need in difficult times.

But what does the committee bill do? For openers, we come up with this concept of dual basing. We have not had 1 minute of hearings on either in the subcommittee, and I do not think the people on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, quite matter of factly, even knew about it. Not 1 minute of hearings, and yet we are going to affect every relationship we have worldwide. This is not just Europe, my friends. We are talking worldwide. This abrogates every agreement we have with every country that we have any association with as far as the common defense.

Have we even asked the Secretary of Defense? Have we even asked the Secretary of State? Have we even asked our colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their input before we unilaterally abrogate every one of these agreements? The answer is no. What we have is a 5-minute debate here on the floor. As far as Crotone, Italy, is concerned, and the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing, people joked that we do not need it over there any more. Those folks, this evening over there in Saudi Arabia are over there protecting our soldiers, sailors, and marines and providing air cover. We do not live in a perfect world. There are very few people in this Chamber, but perhaps more every day who say they could have predicted what would have happened in Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait only a month ago. Where is it going to be next month? Where are we going to be if we decide we are so arrogant that, as one member of NATO, we are going to dictate what they can build with infrastructure funds? If this is not NATO bashing, I do not know what it is. If we happen to disagree with anything, I have to say we would be more than happy next to have Members come in front of our subcommittee or our committee, and perhaps we could haul off and have a hearing, maybe something a half hour or an hour, so at least the Secretary of Defense and Members would have an opportunity to have an input on this most important subject. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Under the rule, all time for debate for this group of amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 249, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

AYES—174

Archer	Green	Pursell
Armey	Gunderson	Quillen
Baker	Hammerschmidt	Regula
Ballenger	Hancock	Rhodes
Bartlett	Hansen	Richardson
Barton	Hastert	Ridge
Bateman	Henry	Rinaldo
Bentley	Herger	Ritter
Bereuter	Hill	Roberts
Berman	Holloway	Robinson
Billakis	Hopkins	Rogers
Billie	Horton	Rohrabacher
Boehlert	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Broomfield	Hubbard	Rostenkowski
Buechner	Hunter	Roukema
Bunning	Hyde	Rowland (CT)
Burton	Inhofe	Saxton
Callahan	Ireland	Schaefer
Campbell (CA)	James	Schiff
Chandler	Johnson (CT)	Schuetz
Clinger	Kasich	Shaw
Coble	Kolbe	Shays
Coleman (MO)	Kyl	Shumway
Combest	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Conte	Lent	Skeen
Coughlin	Levine (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Courter	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Cox	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Craig	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Smith (VT)
Dannemeyer	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Robert
Davis	Machtley	(NH)
DeLay	Madigan	Smith, Robert
DeWine	Marlenee	(OR)
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Snowe
Dicks	Martinez	Solarz
Dorman (CA)	McCandless	Solomon
Douglas	McCollum	Spence
Dreier	McCrery	Stangeland
Duncan	McDade	Stearns
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Stump
Engel	McGrath	Sundquist
Fasell	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Meyers	Thomas (WY)
Fields	Michel	Torricelli
Fish	Miller (WA)	Upton
Foglietta	Mollinari	Vander Jagt
Frenzel	Moorhead	Vucanovich
Galleghy	Morrison (WA)	Walker
Gallo	Murtha	Walsh
Gekas	Myers	Weber
Gibbons	Nielson	Weldon
Gillmor	Oxley	Whittaker
Gilman	Packard	Wilson
Gingrich	Parris	Wolf
Goodling	Pashayan	Wyllie
Goss	Paxon	Young (AK)
Gradison	Petri	Young (FL)
Grant	Porter	

NOES—249

Ackerman	Bruce	Dixon
Alexander	Bryant	Donnelly
Anderson	Bustamante	Dorgan (ND)
Andrews	Byron	Downey
Annunzio	Campbell (CO)	Durbin
Anthony	Cardin	Dwyer
Applegate	Carper	Dymally
Aspin	Carr	Dyson
Atkins	Chapman	Early
Barnard	Clarke	Eckart
Bates	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Bellenson	Clement	Emerson
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	English
Bevill	Collins	Erdreich
Bilbray	Condit	Espy
Boggs	Conyers	Evans
Bonior	Cooper	Fazio
Borski	Costello	Feighan
Bosco	Coyne	Flake
Boucher	Crockett	Filippo
Boxer	Darden	Ford (MI)
Brennan	de la Garza	Frank
Brooks	DeFazio	Frost
Browder	Dellums	Gaydos
Brown (CA)	Derrick	Gedensson
Brown (CO)	Dingell	Geren

Glickman	Matsui	Sabo
Gonzalez	Mavroules	Saiki
Gordon	Mazzoli	Sangmeister
Grandy	McCloskey	Sarpallus
Gray	McCurdy	Savage
Guarini	McDermott	Sawyer
Hall (OH)	McHugh	Scheuer
Hall (TX)	McMillen (MD)	Schneider
Hamilton	McNulty	Schroeder
Harris	Mfume	Schulze
Hatcher	Miller (CA)	Schumer
Hayes (IL)	Mineta	Sensenbrenner
Hayes (LA)	Moakley	Sharp
Hefley	Mollohan	Sikorski
Hefner	Montgomery	Sisisky
Hertel	Moody	Skaggs
Hogland	Morella	Skelton
Hochbrueckner	Morrison (CT)	Slattery
Hoyer	Mrazek	Slaughter (NY)
Huckaby	Murphy	Smith (FL)
Hughes	Nagle	Smith (IA)
Hutto	Natcher	Spratt
Jacobs	Neal (MA)	Staggers
Jenkins	Neal (NC)	Stallings
Johnson (SD)	Nelson	Stark
Johnston	Nowak	Stenholm
Jones (GA)	Oaker	Stokes
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Studds
Jontz	Obey	Swift
Kanjorski	Olin	Synar
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tallon
Kastenmeier	Owens (NY)	Tanner
Kennedy	Owens (UT)	Tauke
Kennelly	Pallone	Tauzin
Kildee	Panetta	Taylor
Klecicka	Parker	Thomas (GA)
Kolter	Patterson	Torres
Kostmayer	Payne (NJ)	Towns
LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Traficant
Lancaster	Pease	Traxler
Lantos	Pelosi	Udall
Laughlin	Penny	Unsoeld
Leach (IA)	Perkins	Valentine
Leath (TX)	Pickett	Vento
Lehman (CA)	Pickle	Visclosky
Lehman (FL)	Poshard	Volkmer
Levin (MI)	Price	Walgren
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Washington
Lightfoot	Rangel	Weiss
Lipinski	Ravenel	Wheat
Lloyd	Ray	Whitten
Long	Roe	Williams
Lowey (NY)	Rose	Wise
Lucken, Thomas	Roth	Wolpe
Manton	Rowland (GA)	Wyden
Markey	Roybal	Yates
Martin (IL)	Russo	Yatron

NOT VOTING—9

AuCoin	Miller (OH)	Watkins
Ford (TN)	Serrano	Waxman
Gephardt	Smith, Denny	
Hawkins	(OR)	

□ 1654

Mr. GORDON and Mr. BROWN of Colorado changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. COBLE, BLILEY, and RICHARDSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments en bloc were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Pursuant to House Resolution 457 and the requisite notice given yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], it is in order to consider the amendments printed in House Report 101-668 relating to defense burden sharing by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] which shall be de-

batable for 10 minutes, with time equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and a Member opposed to the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONIOR: At the end of part D of title XIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 1346. CONTRIBUTION BY JAPAN TO THE SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN JAPAN.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to require Japan to offset the direct costs incurred by the United States related to the presence of United States military personnel in Japan.

(b) PERMANENT CEILING ON UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN JAPAN.—After September 30, 1990, funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act or any subsequent Act may not be used to support an end strength level of all personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in Japan at any level in excess of 50,000.

(c) ANNUAL REDUCTION IN CEILING UNLESS SUPPORT FURNISHED.—Unless the President certifies to Congress before the end of each fiscal year that Japan has agreed to offset for that fiscal year the direct costs incurred by the United States related to the presence of all United States military personnel in Japan, the end strength level for that fiscal year of all personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in Japan may not exceed the number that is 5,000 less than such end strength level for the preceding fiscal year.

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) This section shall not apply in the event of a declaration of war or an armed attack on Japan.

(2) This section may be waived by the President if he declares an emergency and immediately informs the Congress of the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1990.

□ 1700

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a wakeup call for a new world order. I want to reiterate that America will continue to lead the world in the defense of freedom, but our allies must bear their fair share of the burden.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is indeed a wakeup call for a new world order. Collective security means collective responsibility. We have 50,000 Armed Forces stationed in Japan at 31 installations, at a cost to the United States taxpayer of nearly \$5 billion a year. With this amendment we send a clear message: Japan must pay its share of the burden.

Japan, as everyone knows, gets almost 70 percent of its oil from the Middle East. Yet Japan has offered to pay only \$1 billion toward the defense of the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Chairman, while those who are working on the budget at Andrews Air Force Base, and they have a most difficult job, threaten to cut millions from Medicare and entitlements for American citizens, we are giving a better health care package to Japanese workers on foreign bases than the average American gets here in the United States. I know that may seem hard to believe, but it is true.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to take care of our own. American workers are paying to protect Japan, while Japan closes its markets to us. We have seen it in every corner of this country, whether it is shipbuilding and shoes in the Northeast, lumber in the Northwest, computers and high technology in California, automobiles in my part of the country, or feed grains in the Midwest, it is happening all over this country. Too often we have seen Japan make promises and we have seen very few results.

This is a tough amendment. This is a very, very tough amendment. But history has shown we need to get tough to get action from Japan, on trade, on tax subsidies, and now on defense.

Mr. Chairman, we are tired of carrying the Japanese economy on the backs of American workers.

I want to mention to Members that the Senate has no similar language in their DOD bill, not even report language. It is important. It is our only chance to send a wakeup call to Japan and the world that they have to pay their share.

Mr. Chairman, we have got people in this country who are in need of health care, who are in need of housing, who are in need of good jobs. When they find out that we are going to do a budget deal and we are going to continue to pay \$5 billion a year to support the infrastructure and defense of Japan, they are going to be outraged.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. This is a wakeup call to the new world order. It is collective responsibility in a collective world that we live in today. I urge Members to support it.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] on his comments. I want to join in his remarks. My only regret is the amendment does not apply to other forces than in Japan where we are based, such as West Germany and other portions of the world. It is time to bring those troops home. We have no business defending nations where there is no threat.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for us to take responsible action. Again, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. Our security

is not enhanced by these troops being there. Their security is.

Mr. Chairman, the warfare of the next century is economic. This Nation is ill-prepared to wage it. They are. It is through foolishness such as maintaining our Armed Forces abroad, where there is no risk to ourselves, but we are protecting them against non-existent threats. The gentleman is totally correct, and I join with him in this effort.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee position, which is in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I only wish that we would have had as many Members in the Chamber when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] spoke on this subject during general debate, and for those who had the opportunity to read the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] with respect to this amendment, both eloquently in opposition to Mr. BONIOR's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], with his exasperation with Japan contributing or saying they are going to contribute such a pittance to the conflict in Saudi Arabia and Iraq at the present time, with them being a great beneficiary of what we are doing there. It is an absolute outrage. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

But that is not what the amendment speaks to. I would hope that every Member here would understand, as upset and outraged as one might be with Japan not supporting the conflict in Kuwait at the present time, that those 50,000 troops for the length of time they are going to be in Japan are there for our defense, and not solely for the defense of Japan. That entire part of the world, where we have so much of our future, depends on the bases we use to have influence in that area of the world.

Mr. Chairman, however one feels about the Japanese and their lack of contribution to the problems that we face today, please do not make a decision that is going to hurt our national security and really have very little effect on the Japanese and certainly not their economy.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Let me just say that many times in the debate in the House we say that we want to send a message. This is a chance to send a message. This is not going to be approved in the conference committee, but it lets people of Japan know we are sick and tired of their lack of effort to support their own defense and to support our efforts in the gulf.

Mr. Chairman, I join with Senator McCain in expressing my deep disgust with the lack of commitment and the lack of support that we have received from the Japanese, and I urge Republicans and Democrats to support the Bonior amendment, maybe not all the specifics, but in spirit, and let us send them a very clear message.

□ 1710

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that I am not so sure what is going to happen in the conference committee notwithstanding what my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, might have said, but I am certainly with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] in spirit but cannot support the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I think has been our frustration is our country has done such a good job with burden sharing, and it could be an example for the Japanese. Our country lifted the burden of debt on Egypt because of its terrific role in the Persian Gulf. I think there is nothing in the Japanese Constitution that would prevent them from lifting some of the burden of debt on the United States for their role in the Persian Gulf, and I think one of the things we might do here today, and it is a shame the gentleman from Michigan could not change his amendment, because it was written before this all happened, but my guess is that even the gentleman from Michigan would love to tell the Japanese that one of the ways that they can help is to lift the burden of debt from the United States, as we know, we are one of the big debtors, for the role we played in keeping their oil flowing and keeping their economy moving.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from New York would agree on that.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, that is for certain.

I wish to say that the exasperation we have with the Japanese, we also have exasperation because we are here in a situation where we do not have an adequate vehicle to do what I would like to do in sending a message to the Japanese, but I think the committee feels, and I feel, that this would be more detrimental to the United States defense and certainly to the Japanese.

I commend the gentleman, because I think this debate is worthwhile. If the Japanese are listening, they had better get their act together and support us in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES]. Regrettably, I can give no more time.

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the people in my Louisiana district are hostages. Some are hostages because they have the background in oil exploration so they are physically within the country that was invaded. Some are hostage because we do not have an energy policy.

Most of their kids are presently ready to lay down their lives to defend traffic lanes to Japan. All of them wish that they could pay money to avoid that kind of nightmare.

To ask the Japanese to contribute is not to ask much, but we expect nothing less, and we will accept nothing less.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bonior amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there is a toll-free number that our friends and allies call whenever they run into trouble: 800-USA-FREE. Yes, anytime they face a threat to their economic opportunity or political security they call Uncle Sam on our nicker.

Japan, more than any other nation, has rung up the biggest tab on this toll-free line.

DESERT SHIELD AS A SCREEN

In the Middle East, the Japanese are using Operation Desert Shield not as an opportunity to share the burden of mutual defense but as a screen to hide behind. Even though it imports 70 percent of its oil from vulnerable sources in the Middle East—and almost twice as much as the United States, Japan is not willing to contribute a commensurate share to the cost of the operation. This operation is going to cost the United States taxpayers over \$15 billion during the next several months, but Japan has promised only to offer

only \$1 billion altogether to mitigate the impact on friendly nations.

In other words, Japan reaps most of the benefits while the United States foots most of the bill.

It works the same way in Japan. The United States stations 50,000 troops and provides the protection for Japanese sealanes and airlines and guess who picks up most of the tab. Yes, the United States pays over 60 percent of these mutual defense costs. Japan, by contrast pays only about \$3 billion for a \$7.5 billion bill. It's a greater deal for Japan. They ship us stereos, sedans, and software, while we provide safe passage.

And while they open their arms to our sailors and soldiers, they close their markets to our telephones and TV's. That's why we have a \$45 billion trade deficit with Japan.

It's time to blow the whistle on this nonsense.

It's time to expect the second wealthiest nation in the world to pull its weight on mutual defense. It's time to insist that a partnership should require both participants to make proportional contributions and to draw proportional benefits.

I pursued this goal with an amendment to last year's defense bill. It called for the President to negotiate an agreement in which Japan would cover two-thirds of the host nation costs instead of the one-third they were paying. The amendment cleared the House and Senate without a whimper, but the President noted his objection only to this specific provision and few others when signing the bill.

Since then, Secretary Cheney has taken a more assertive tack in pushing the Japanese to do more. However, the Pentagon just reported to me that we are still hoping for Japan to split the costs within the next 2 years. It's time for us to stop hoping and for Japan to start helping.

Now I understand that Japan's Constitution limits its ability to commit its self-defense forces overseas. Many Asian nations would fear such involvement. But that does not prevent Japan from paying its fair share. A bigger chunk of Desert Shield and a larger share of host nation support.

A FAIR SHARE FOR JAPAN

The Bonior amendment calls for Japan to fully absorb the \$7.5 billion cost for United States forces in Japan. Failing such a contribution, the United States would begin withdrawing troops at the rate of 5,000 a year.

This amendment makes good sense. It sends Japan and the Bush administration a wake-up call that the days of cheap security are over. It does not require Japan to extend its military reach but it does require Japan to expend more on its own defense. It would not trigger a reckless reduction in U.S. forces, but it would mandate a

reasonable drawdown of American troops.

The Bonior amendment is fair, but tough. It requires Japan to do no more than its Constitution allows, but no less than its economy can shoulder. It takes the Dorgan amendment a step further by requiring United States troop withdrawals if Japan does not start acting like a responsible partner.

It also calls on Japan to fully pay for the full cost of United States troops in Japan. But since the Senate had no comparable provision, we need tough language to ensure that a meaningful burden-sharing provision emerges from the conference.

The Bonior amendment does not deny that the United States has an interest in the security of Japan and the Pacific. However, it does argue that the burden of mutual defense should be shared according to the ability of each partner to pay and to participate. Under Bonior, the United States would still provide ships, planes, troop, and equipment. The difference would be that Japan would absorb all financial responsibility for these costs—not just one-third of them.

This is tough medicine. But the administration muffed its chance to finalize a new arrangement with Japan under the less stringent provisions of last year's Dorgan amendment. I ask my colleagues to note, however, that the amendment also permits the President to waive the Bonior amendment in an emergency.

Times have changed, Mr. Chairman. Twenty years ago, Japan's GNP was one-third of ours. Now it amounts to more than one-half of our national output. The burden of defense must shift with these changes in wealth. Both partners should expect to make such an adjustment.

If we do not pass the Bonior amendment, Japan will continue to believe that the United States should pay more than its fair share of mutual defense. If we do pass the Bonior amendment, we will put the word mutual back into the United States—Japan Mutual Defense Pact.

I urge my colleagues to take out the toll-free defense line to Japan. Japan can afford to pay for its own call. It must pay its own share of mutual defense costs. If we can risk the lives of our sailors, airmen, and soldiers, then surely Japan can invest three-tenths of 1 percent of its GNP on mutual defense.

The Bonior amendment makes good sense. It deserves our unanimous support.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There are 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, Members talk about how exasperated they are, and they wish there was some other way to do it. There could have been. They chose not to offer it.

This is the only chance Members have got, and Members have said that it would be OK if the money was going to go to help Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. The money is fungible. Nothing says that the money that we get here cannot be used to offset our costs. So if you really believe that we ought to get a contribution for that purpose, this is the only game in town.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 370, noes 53, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—370

Ackerman	Clement	Flippo
Alexander	Clinger	Foglietta
Anderson	Coble	Ford (MI)
Andrews	Coleman (MO)	Frank
Annuzio	Coleman (TX)	Frost
Anthony	Collins	Galleghy
Applegate	Condit	Gallo
Archer	Conte	Gaydos
Atkins	Conyers	Gejdenson
Baker	Costello	Gephardt
Ballenger	Coughlin	Geren
Barnard	Coyne	Gibbons
Bartlett	Craig	Gillmor
Barton	Crockett	Gilman
Bates	Dannemeyer	Glickman
Bellenson	Darden	Goodling
Bennett	Davis	Gordon
Bentley	de la Garza	Goss
Bereuter	DeFazio	Grandy
Berman	DeLay	Grant
Bevill	Dellums	Gray
Bilbray	Derrick	Guarini
Billrakis	DeWine	Gunderson
Billey	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Boehlert	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Boggs	Donnelly	Hammerschmidt
Bonior	Dorgan (ND)	Hansen
Borski	Dornan (CA)	Harris
Bosco	Douglas	Hastert
Boucher	Downey	Hatcher
Boxer	Dreier	Hayes (IL)
Brennan	Duncan	Hayes (LA)
Brooks	Durbin	Hefley
Broomfield	Dwyer	Hefner
Browder	Dymally	Henry
Brown (CA)	Dyson	Herger
Brown (CO)	Early	Hertel
Bruce	Eckart	Hiller
Bryant	Edwards (CA)	Hoagland
Buechner	Edwards (OK)	Hochbrueckner
Bustamante	Emerson	Holloway
Byron	Engel	Hopkins
Callahan	English	Horton
Campbell (CA)	Erdreich	Hoyer
Campbell (CO)	Espy	Hubbard
Cardin	Evans	Huckaby
Carper	Fawell	Hughes
Carr	Fazio	Hunter
Chandler	Feighan	Inhofe
Chapman	Fields	Ireland
Clarke	Fish	Jacobs
Clay	Flake	James

Jenkins	Murphy
Johnson (CT)	Murtha
Johnson (SD)	Nagle
Johnston	Natcher
Jones (GA)	Neal (MA)
Jones (NC)	Neal (NC)
Jontz	Nelson
Kanjorski	Nielson
Kaptur	Nowak
Kasich	Oakar
Kastenmeier	Oberstar
Kennedy	Obey
Kennelly	Ortiz
Kildee	Owens (NY)
Kleczka	Owens (UT)
Kolbe	Pallone
Kolter	Panetta
Kostmayer	Parker
Lancaster	Parris
Lantos	Pashayan
Laughlin	Patterson
Leach (IA)	Paxon
Lehman (CA)	Payne (NJ)
Lehman (FL)	Payne (VA)
Lent	Pease
Levin (MI)	Pelosi
Levine (CA)	Perkins
Lewis (CA)	Petri
Lewis (FL)	Porter
Lewis (GA)	Poshard
Lightfoot	Price
Lipinski	Pursell
Lloyd	Quillen
Long	Rahall
Lowery (CA)	Rangel
Lowey (NY)	Ravenel
Lukens, Thomas	Regula
Lukens, Donald	Rhodes
Machtley	Richardson
Manton	Ridge
Markey	Rinaldo
Marlenee	Ritter
Martin (IL)	Roberts
Martinez	Robinson
Matsui	Roe
Mavroules	Rogers
Mazzoli	Rohrabacher
McCandless	Ros-Lehtinen
McCloskey	Rose
McCollum	Rostenkowski
McCrery	Roth
McCurdy	Roukema
McDade	Rowland (CT)
McDermott	Rowland (GA)
McGrath	Roybal
McHugh	Russo
McMillan (NC)	Sabo
McMillen (MD)	Saiki
McNulty	Sangmeister
Meyers	Sarpalius
Mfume	Savage
Miller (CA)	Sawyer
Miller (WA)	Saxton
Mineta	Schaefer
Moakley	Scheuer
Molinari	Schiff
Mollohan	Schneider
Moody	Schroeder
Moorhead	Schuetz
Morella	Schulze
Morrison (WA)	Schumer
Mrazek	Sensenbrenner

NOES—53

Army	Hamilton	Packard
Aspin	Hancock	Penny
Bateman	Houghton	Pickett
Bunning	Hutto	Pickle
Burton	Hyde	Ray
Combest	Kyl	Shumway
Cooper	LaFalce	Sisk
Courter	Lagomarsino	Skaggs
Cox	Leath (TX)	Smith, Robert
Crane	Livingston	(OR)
Dickinson	Madigan	Solarz
Dicks	Martin (NY)	Stenholm
Fascell	McEwen	Stump
Frenzel	Michel	Torres
Gekas	Montgomery	Vucanovich
Gingrich	Myers	Walker
Gradison	Olin	Weber
Green	Oxley	Weiss

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—8

AuCoin	Miller (OH)	Smith, Denny
Ford (TN)	Morrison (CT)	(OR)
Hawkins	Serrano	Watkins

□ 1732

Mr. MIDIGAN and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LIGHTFOOT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Pursuant to House Resolution 457 and the notice given by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, it is now in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 101-668, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK], relating to burden sharing, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto.

Is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] in opposition to the amendment? Mr. KYL. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona will control the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MRAZEK

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MRAZEK: At the end of Title 13 of the bill, insert the following section:

SEC. 1346. PERMANENT CEILING ON THE NUMBER OF UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) REAFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENT.—Congress reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the security and territorial integrity of the Republic of Korea, and in light of the announced reductions in the number of United States troops in the Republic of Korea, determines that further reductions can be made in United States force levels without adversely affecting the security of the Republic of Korea or lessening the United States commitment to its Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea.

(b) PERMANENT CEILING.—After September 30, 1993, none of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act or any other Act enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act may be used to support an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in the Republic of Korea at any level exceeding a permanent ceiling of 30,000, of which not more than 20,000 may be members of the Army.

(c) PHASED REDUCTION.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should achieve the permanent ceiling required by subsection (b)—

(1) in approximately equal annual reductions;

(2) as the beginning of a phased withdrawal of the Second Infantry Division and other ground combat units;

(3) in close consultation with appropriate Republic of Korea officials.

(d) **ARMS CONTROL.**—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) reductions in United States force levels in Korea should be part of an arms control and peace process on the Korean peninsula aimed at reduction of tensions and reduction of force levels by the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as the United States;

(2) reductions beyond the permanent ceiling required by subsection (b) should be based on reciprocal actions by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

(e) **EXCEPTIONS.**—(1) This section shall not apply in the event of a declaration of war or an armed attack on the Republic of Korea.

(2) This section may be waived by the President if he declares an emergency and immediately informs the Congress of his action and the reasons therefor.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite simple. It simply puts this House on record as supporting the administration and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Cheney, in planning a phased reduction of troops on the Korean peninsula, based upon an improvement of conditions on the Korean peninsula, and with the proviso that if the situation were to change on the Korean peninsula the President would be in a position to tell Congress that an emergency has arisen and, therefore, this sense-of-Congress resolution cannot be guaranteed or followed through on.

The resolution is based upon a recognition that a lot has changed since 1954.

One of the things that has happened since 1954 is that we have invested about \$100 billion to improve the security posture of the Republic of Korea and the interests of our own national security. This was based on the fact that the Republic of Korea had a very close relationship with the Soviet Union as well as mainland China.

Well, some things have changed since 1954. For one thing, it is important to know that the Soviet Union is seeking to normalize relations with South Korea. The idea that Kim Il Sung of North Korea could count on Soviet participation and support in the event of military hostilities is not exactly accurate.

Some other changes have taken place. Rather ignominiously, the United States was required to leave the Government of South Vietnam in April 1975. Thereafter, one of our very large bases, Cam Ranh Bay, was taken over by the Soviets. It was their advanced position in the Pacific.

Well, it is important to understand that the Soviet Union has withdrawn unilaterally all of its forces from Cam Ranh Bay, all of its Badger bombers, its Mig's, its submarines, and in fact when Senator ROBB and Congressman

RIDGE and some of us were meeting with a high-level delegation of the Vietnamese not too long ago, they suggested maybe it would be a good idea if we came back to Cam Ranh Bay.

I would submit to you these are fairly fundamental changes.

So what we would be doing in passing this amendment is recognizing that those changes have taken place, that the administration itself and Secretary Cheney would like to see a phased reduction of troops of the 2d Infantry Division, based upon an improvement in the situation there, and our amendment adds 6,000 troops of the 2d Infantry Division over the next 3 years. That is an additional reduction of 2,000 troops per year. It would save a time of fairly significant budget necessity, it would save us \$3 billion over the next 5 years without affecting our deterrence capability.

□ 1740

I would submit to Members, those Members on the Committee not on Armed Services, that maybe there are some more constructive ways in terms of flexible deployment and other weapons systems that we know we might need, than to save that \$3 billion on the Korean peninsula with a continued static deployment that does not make a lot of sense any more.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN) The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Mrazek amendment and urge my colleagues to defeat this measure. While I appreciate the good intentions of the amendment, now is not the time to take unilateral disarmament actions in Korea. North Korea has done nothing really to lessen its threats or change its dictatorial policies to warrant us lowering our guard. If enacted, I believe the Mrazek amendment could seriously jeopardize the security situation on the Korean peninsula, increase the instability, and raise the possibility of another war—not lessen it.

When President Carter proposed to reduce American troops in South Korea early in his administration, he met a storm of protest and provoked serious shock waves in United States-South Korean relations. It was a proposal that was ill-conceived, ill-timed, and ill-advised. Nothing has changed in the past 13 years to make those troop reductions any more appropriate.

We have witnessed a series of incredible events over the past year, especially in Eastern Europe and to a lesser extent in the Soviet Union. We contin-

ue to witness real democratic change and political reforms in the Republic of Korea where free and fair Presidential, assembly and local elections have been held. Sadly, no such changes are occurring in North Korea. While Koreans in the South go to the polls to freely express themselves and build a better future, Koreans in the North live under the harshest of tyranny devoid of any real human rights.

The military threat from North Korea has certainly not changed. North Korea has not reduced its strength and the balance of forces remains greatly favored toward the North. It has a 2-to-1 superiority in many key categories of offensive weapons. The North continues to procure sophisticated military equipment from the Soviets, like Mig-29 fulcrum aircraft. North Korea continues to forward deploy hundreds of thousands of combat shock troops right along the DMZ poised offensively to attack the South. The North continues to build invasion and infiltration tunnels under the DMZ. North Korea is also believed to be working on developing nuclear weapons. American soldiers along the DMZ must still carry loaded weapons on the ready because of the threats of the North. We cannot even trust—sadly through experience—the North Koreans from kidnaping or murdering, even mutilating with an ax individual soldiers along the DMZ. Why should there be a difference on the larger scale?

Accompanying North Korea's unchanged military posture is North Korea's unchanged aggressive policy. While I am encouraged by the recent series of diplomatic initiatives between the North and the South, like the recent visit of North Korea's Prime Minister—unfortunately not a figure with much authority—to Seoul, the results of these meetings have been minor. They are steps in the right direction, but they are very small steps not warranting the significant actions of the Mrazek amendment. However, the overall North Korean policy of subversion, support for international terrorism, and opposition to any real political or economic reforms remains unchanged.

I have hope that changes may come to North Korea. The Soviets appear to be less willing to support their Stalinist allies and are concentrating instead on problems at home. Improved relations between the Soviets and us have moved the world into a new "post cold war period." However, as Saddam Hussein in Iraq has violently proven, this new world order can be subject to greater instability as renegade dictators pursue their own agenda now that the type of containment of conflict governed by American-Soviet rivalries is becoming removed. Kim Il Sung is just as dangerous as Saddam Hussein

in many of the same ways. I am sure Kim and his henchmen are closely monitoring the Persian Gulf situation in an effort to measure U.S. resolve. If we do not stand up for our friends and interests in the gulf, then why should we in Korea?

Our decision on the Mrazek amendment is also a test of our resolve. Passing this amendment, I believe, signals that we believe the North Korean threat has diminished even though it has not. It could serve in the worst case as greenlight to Kim that now is the time to take action, even military action, to attain his objectives in the South. And, with our rapid deployment forces already committed to the Persian Gulf, we are stretched thin to react. With Soviet aid diminishing, South Korea getting stronger both militarily and economically, and North Korea unable to keep up, time is not in Pyongyang's favor.

However, even if North Korea does nothing, the removal of many United States forces and the capping of Army ground forces at 20,000 means we, and that includes our South Korean allies, will not have the capability to withstand an attack—or the pressure—from the North. And, with our rapidly deployable forces in the gulf, we have few ready reserves and woefully insufficient transport capability to bolster our smaller contingent in Korea.

The Mrazek amendment turns the United States forces in Korea into a tripwire—a very costly one. There would be enough Americans in Korea to sustain very high casualties, yet not enough to really contain the North. From a security standpoint this is one of the worst situations in which to be.

We should know by now through many painful experiences that unilateral disarmament does not work when confronting aggressive, repressive dictators. Similarly it will not work in Korea and, in fact, increases the possibilities of war and instability. While this amendment does call for arms control with the North, without real, dependable verification about the North's military program and compliance with any arms control agreements, basing security decisions on such flawed agreements is dangerous and foolish. Furthermore, we should not be weakening our capabilities and hope that the North Koreans will follow suit. There is certainly no internal public pressure for them to do so.

I look forward to the day when an amendment like Mr. MRAZEK's is timely and helpful. However, today is not that day. The ball is in North Korea's court to make the kind of military, political, and economic changes—real changes and actions, not cosmetic ones designed to woo public opinion in the South and the U.S.A.—that will facilitate force reductions on the Korean peninsula. We have fought a war costing millions of Korean and

American lives to protect freedom, liberty, and democracy in Korea. We cannot gamble the sacrifices and freedom, liberty and South Korea away on the naive wish that North Korea will be accommodating—especially since the North through its actions is showing just the opposite.

This amendment strikes at the long, solid United States-South Korean relationship. South Korea is a strategic interest of the United States, not to mention an important trading partner. This amendment jeopardizes that relationship and the gains we have made. I very strongly urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the last amendment. I thought it was right, but I did it without a great deal of enthusiasm, because I do not like the idea of tampering with our great President's foreign policy. Clearly, this amendment goes much further than that.

I believe this amendment is a dangerous amendment, and I say that with a great deal of respect for my friend from New York, the author of the amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, I was in Korea and had an opportunity to meet with our commander there, with the Ambassador, and it is very clear that one of the most dangerous spots on the face of the Earth is that border between North Korea and South Korea.

Now, this amendment goes much further than the 7,000 troop reduction which is planned and being scheduled and overseen by our great Secretary of Defense, but unfortunately to go further than that would, I believe, be a tremendous mistake. It would send the wrong signal.

When I was there, we of course were talking just a few days ago about the situation in the Persian Gulf, and Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent to me that a signal could be sent by Saddam Hussein to Kim Il-sung, and it is not the right signal. It is not the right signal that we want. We have U.S. combat troops literally minutes away from potential conflict, and I think to take that kind of step sends the wrong signal, at the wrong time. I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. There are four strong reasons. First, in a region where U.S. forces are just minutes from combat, the amendment potentially cuts U.S. ground combat strength, the 2d Infantry Division, in half without any reciprocal reduction by North Korea.

Reducing the 2d Division, viewed by the North Korean as the strongest sign of United States resolve to defend South Korea, is seen as a sign of weak-

ness. North Koreans have always taken advantage of perceived United States weakness, or preoccupation in other areas of the world. It is how the Korean war started, and how the *Pueblo* incident occurred.

Second, the United States already plans to reduce our forces in Korea by trimming United States strength by 7,000 troops, which does not significantly cut the 2d Division, but further cuts will have to depend on North Korean reductions.

Third, cutting U.S. ground combat forces is not likely to save money. In fact, given the limited United States troop strength available now to cover this vast region, any troops withdrawn from Korea would likely remain based in the Pacific area, at an additional cost, according to CBO, of up to \$1.5 billion.

Finally, since 1988, South Korea has begun to pay an increasing share of support for the cost of United States troops. In 1991, those payments will be in excess of \$140 million, and South Korea has agreed to assume the \$1 billion to \$3 billion cost of moving United States headquarters.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. The existing plan for United States troop withdrawal need not be rushed. Haste often makes waste, and the United States experience in Korea has been that waste is often measured in United States lives. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Mrazek amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would point out that the situation is changed on the Korean Peninsula. The Soviet Union is certainly not ready to come to the assistance of North Korea when it is normalizing relations with South Korea. There are 44 million South Koreans, and there are a little over 20 million North Koreans. There are 545,000 Reservists ready to get into uniform in South Korea to join the active duty forces. There is a qualitative advantage of the South Korean forces over North Korea as things now stand.

This is not a dangerous amendment. It is simply a reflection, an accurate reflection, of the way this planet is rapidly changing, and how \$3 billion over the next 5 years could be better spent in terms of our own national security needs. I would ask for an aye vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 265, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—157

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Owens (NY)
Alexander	Gordon	Owens (UT)
Andrews	Gray	Panetta
Annunzio	Guarini	Payne (NJ)
Applegate	Hall (OH)	Pease
Atkins	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Bates	Hawkins	Perkins
Bellenson	Hayes (IL)	Petri
Bereuter	Hefley	Pickle
Bonior	Henry	Poshard
Borski	Hertel	Rahall
Bosco	Hochbrueckner	Rangel
Boucher	Holloway	Regula
Boxer	Hubbard	Roe
Brennan	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Brooks	Jenkins	Rostenkowski
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roybal
Brown (CO)	Johnston	Russo
Bruce	Jontz	Sabo
Bryant	Kanjorski	Sangelmeister
Bustamante	Kaptur	Savage
Cardin	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Chapman	Kennedy	Schneider
Clay	Kildee	Schroeder
Clement	Klecza	Schumer
Collins	Kolter	Sharp
Condit	Kostmayer	Sikorski
Conte	Lehman (CA)	Skaggs
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Slaughter (NY)
Costello	Levine (CA)	Stark
Crockett	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Darden	Long	Studds
DeFazio	Lowe (NY)	Synar
Dellums	Manton	Tallon
Dingell	Markey	Tauke
Donnelly	Matsui	Towns
Dorgan (ND)	McCloskey	Trafficant
Downey	McDermott	Traxler
Duncan	McMillen (MD)	Unsoeld
Durbin	McNulty	Vento
Dymally	Mfume	Visclosky
Early	Miller (CA)	Walgren
Eckart	Moakley	Washington
Edwards (CA)	Moody	Weiss
Engel	Morella	Wheat
Espy	Mrazek	Williams
Evans	Murphy	Wilson
Flake	Nagle	Wolpe
Foglietta	Neal (MA)	Wyden
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Yates
Frank	Oakar	Yatron
Frost	Oberstar	
Gaydos	Obey	

NOES—265

Anderson	Campbell (CO)	Dreier
Anthony	Carper	Dwyer
Archer	Carr	Dyson
Armey	Chandler	Edwards (OK)
Aspin	Clarke	Emerson
Baker	Clinger	English
Ballenger	Coble	Erdreich
Barnard	Coleman (MO)	Fascell
Bartlett	Coleman (TX)	Fawell
Barton	Combest	Fazio
Bateman	Cooper	Feighan
Bennett	Coughlin	Felds
Bentley	Courter	Fish
Berman	Cox	Flippo
Bevill	Coyne	Frenzel
Bilbray	Craig	Galligly
Bilirakis	Crane	Gallo
Billie	Dannemeyer	Geddenon
Boehlt	Davis	Gekas
Boggs	de la Garza	Geren
Broomfield	DeLay	Gibbons
Browder	Derrick	Gillmor
Buechner	DeWine	Gilman
Bunning	Dickinson	Gingrich
Burton	Dicks	Glickman
Byron	Dixon	Goodling
Callahan	Dornan (CA)	Goss
Campbell (CA)	Douglas	Gradison

Grandy	McCandless	Schiff
Grant	McCollum	Schuetz
Green	McCrery	Schulze
Gunderson	McCurdy	Sensenbrenner
Hamilton	McEwen	Shaw
Hammerschmidt	McGrath	Shays
Hancock	McHugh	Shumway
Hansen	McMillan (NC)	Shuster
Harris	Meyers	Sisisky
Hastert	Michel	Skeen
Hatcher	Miller (WA)	Skelton
Hayes (LA)	Mineta	Slattery
Hefner	Molinar	Slaughter (VA)
Herger	Mollohan	Smith (FL)
Hill	Montgomery	Smith (IA)
Hoagland	Moorhead	Smith (NE)
Hopkins	Morrison (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Horton	Murtha	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Myers	Smith (VT)
Hoyer	Natcher	Smith, Robert
Huckaby	Neal (NC)	(NH)
Hughes	Nelson	Smith, Robert
Hunter	Nielson	(OR)
Hutto	Olin	Snowe
Hyde	Ortiz	Solarz
Inhofe	Oxley	Solomon
Ireland	Packard	Spence
James	Pallone	Spratt
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Staggers
Jones (GA)	Parris	Stallings
Jones (NC)	Pashayan	Stangeland
Kasich	Patterson	Stearns
Kennelly	Paxon	Stenholm
Kolbe	Payne (VA)	Stump
Kyl	Penny	Sundquist
LaFalce	Pickett	Swift
Lagomarsino	Porter	Tanner
Lancaster	Price	Tauzin
Lantos	Pursell	Taylor
Laughlin	Quillen	Thomas (CA)
Leach (IA)	Ravenel	Thomas (GA)
Leath (TX)	Ray	Thomas (WY)
Lent	Rhodes	Torres
Levin (MI)	Richardson	Torricelli
Lewis (CA)	Ridge	Upton
Lewis (FL)	Rinaldo	Valentine
Lightfoot	Ritter	Vander Jagt
Lipinski	Roberts	Volkmer
Livingston	Robinson	Vucanovich
Lloyd	Rogers	Walker
Lowery (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
Lukens, Thomas	Rose	Waxman
Lukens, Donald	Roth	Weber
Machley	Roukema	Weldon
Madigan	Rowland (CT)	Whittaker
Marlenee	Rowland (GA)	Whitten
Martin (IL)	Salki	Wise
Martin (NY)	Sarpalius	Wolf
Martinez	Sawyer	Wylie
Mavroules	Saxton	Young (AK)
Mazzoli	Schaefer	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

AuCoin	Miller (OH)	Udall
Ford (TN)	Morrison (CT)	Watkins
Gephardt	Serrano	
McDade	Smith, Denny	(OR)

□ 1808

Mrs. BENTLEY and Mrs. PATTERSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JENKINS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Pursuant to House Resolution 461 and the requisite notice given by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] earlier today, it is now in order to consider the amendments printed in part 1 of House Report 101-693 relating to base closures as follows: first, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN];

second, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Said amendments are not subject to amendment, are considered as read, may be offered only by the Members designated, or their designees, and are debatable for 10 minutes each, equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto.

If both amendments are adopted, only the last amendment adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MARTIN OF ILLINOIS

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois:

Strike out section 2831 (page 426, line 15 through page 433, line 20) and insert in lieu thereof the following (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 2831. BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

(a) MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense shall formulate and implement a plan for reducing and terminating operations by the United States at installations outside the United States and shall transmit a copy of such plan to the Congress as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.—Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (i); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may, subject to the provisions of this section—

"(A) take such actions as may be necessary to close or realign any military installation, including the acquisition of such land, the construction of such replacement facilities, the performance of such activities, and the conduct of such advance planning and design as may be required to transfer functions from a military installation being closed or realigned to another military installation, and may use for such purpose funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for use in planning and design, minor construction, or operation and maintenance;

"(B) provide—

"(i) economic adjustment assistance to any community located near a military installation being closed or realigned, and

"(ii) community planning assistance to any community located near a military installation to which functions will be transferred as a result of the closure or realignment of a military installation,

if the Secretary of Defense determines that the financial resources available to the community (by grant or otherwise) for such purposes are inadequate, and may use for such purposes funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for economic adjustment assistance or community planning assistance;

"(C) carry out activities for the purposes of environmental restoration and mitigation, and may use for such purposes funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for environmental restoration and mitigation; and

"(D) provide outplacement assistance to civilian employees employed by the Department of Defense at military installations being closed or realigned, and may use for such purpose funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for outplacement assistance to employees.

"(2) Nothing in this section restricts the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned to obtain architectural and engineering services under section 2807 of this title.

"(e) MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.—(1) The Administrator of General Services shall delegate to the Secretary of Defense, with respect to excess and surplus real property and facilities located at a military installation closed or realigned under the procedures established by this section—

"(A) the authority of the Administrator to utilize excess property under section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483);

"(B) the authority of the Administrator to dispose of surplus property under section 203 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 484); and

"(C) the authority of the Administrator to grant approvals and make determinations under section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)).

"(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Defense shall exercise the authority delegated to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) in accordance with—

"(i) all regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 governing the utilization of excess property and the disposal of surplus property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

"(ii) all regulations in effect on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 governing the conveyance and disposal of property under section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)).

"(B) The Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Administrator of General Services, may issue regulations that are necessary to carry out the delegation of authority required by paragraph (1).

"(C) The authority required to be delegated by paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Defense by the Administrator of General Services shall not include the authority to prescribe general policies and methods for utilizing excess property and disposing of surplus property.

"(D) The Secretary of Defense may transfer real property or facilities located at a military installation to be closed or realigned under this section, with or without reimbursement, to a military department or other entity (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality) within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard.

"(E) Before any action may be taken with respect to the disposal of any surplus real property or facility located at any military installation to be closed or realigned under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Governor of the State and the heads of the local governments concerned for the purpose of considering any plan for the use of such property by the local community concerned.

"(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be deposited into the Account all proceeds—

"(i) from any transfer under paragraph (2)(D); and

"(ii) from the disposal of any property or facility made as a result of a closure or realignment under this section.

"(B) In any case in which the Secretary of Defense requests assistance from the General Services Administration in the management or disposal of property or facilities under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall reimburse the Administrator of General Services in accordance with section 1535 of title 31 for any expenses incurred in such activities.

"(f) APPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—(1) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to—

"(A) the actions of the Secretary of Defense in selecting a military installation for closure or realignment;

"(B) in selecting a military installation to receive functions from an installation to be closed or realigned; or

"(C) in the preparation of the notification and evaluation required by subsection (b).

"(2)(A) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall apply to actions of the Department of Defense under this section (i) during the process of property disposal, and (ii) during the process of relocating functions from a military installation being closed or realigned to another military installation after the receiving installation has been selected, but before the functions are relocated.

"(B) In applying the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to actions referred in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the military departments concerned shall not have to consider—

"(i) the need for closing or realigning the military installation which has been selected for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"(ii) the need for transferring functions to the military installation which has been selected as the receiving installation; or

"(iii) military installations alternative to those selected.

"(3) A civil action for judicial review, with respect to any requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to the extent such Act is applicable, of any act or failure to act by the Department of Defense or the military department concerned during the closing, realigning, or relocating of functions referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(A), or of any act or failure to act by the Department of Defense or the military department concerned under this section, may not be brought more than 60 days after the date of such act or failure to act.

"(g) INAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—The Secretary of Defense may close or realign military installations pursuant to the procedures set forth in this section without regard to—

"(1) any provision of law restricting the use of funds for closing or realigning military installations included in any appropriations or authorization Act enacted before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1991; and

"(2) section 2662 of this title.

"(h) BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACCOUNT.—(1) There is established on the

books of the United States Treasury an account to be known as the 'Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment account' which shall be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury as a single account.

"(2) The Account shall be composed of—

"(A) funds appropriated to the Account;

"(B) any funds transferred to the Account by the Secretary of Defense from funds appropriated to or for the use of the Department of Defense, other than funds appropriated to the Account, after the Secretary of Defense transmits to the appropriate committees of Congress written notice of, and justification for, such transfer; and

"(C) proceeds described in subsection (e)(3)(A);

"(3) The Secretary of Defense may use the funds in the Account only for the purposes described in subsection (d).

"(4) When funds in the Account are used to carry out a construction project under subsection (d)(1), and the cost of the project will exceed the maximum amount authorized by law for a minor construction project, the Secretary of Defense shall notify, in writing, the appropriate committees of Congress of the nature of, the justification for, and the amount of the expenditures for the project. Any such construction project may be carried out without regard to section 2805 of this title."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The term 'Account' means the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment account established by subsection (h).

"(6) The term 'appropriate committees of Congress' means the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

SEC. 2832. COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

Section 2391(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), and (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) In the case of a publicly announced planned reduction in Department of Defense spending, the cancellation or termination of a Department of Defense contract, or the failure to proceed with a previously approved major defense acquisition program, assistance may be made under paragraph (1) only if the reduction, cancellation, termination, or failure will have a direct and significant impact on a community and will result in the loss of—

"(A) not less than 2,500 jobs, in the case of an urban area;

"(B) not less than 1,000 jobs, in the case of a rural area; or

"(C) a number of jobs equal to or greater than 1 percent of the employed labor force in either such area."

In section 2832, strike out paragraph (1) of subsection (b) (page 434, lines 12 through 16) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The Secretary of defense shall include, as part of the plan required by section 2831(a), an estimate of the fair market value of the improvements made at the installations at which the plan provides for a termination of military operations by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in question strikes language from the bill which would most assuredly prevent the Secretary of Defense from closing a single military installation in the United States for at least 3 years. Like many, I have talked about how we must lower defense costs, but I have also argued the reality is difficult. We cannot lower force strength without closing bases, and grief in any district where that happens is real and complete.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, it is time for the Congress to do what it knows it must do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] who was such an important figure in the last debate.

□ 1810

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewomen for yielding. Let me just make some points that I think are important here. I have had an opportunity to study the provisions of the bill as brought to the floor and the provisions of the amendment brought by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN]. If in fact we want as a body to close additional military bases in a sane and rational manner, with defense preparedness as our supreme criteria, this can be done with the amendment by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN]; it cannot be done by the committee mark.

If we need to avoid unilateral decisions that are punitive in nature by the administration, or parochial decisions to block the closing of bases by individual Members of Congress, this can be achieved with the Martin amendment; it cannot be achieved with the committee mark.

If we want and need to have flexibility in a build-down in modernization and redeployment of our military by the Secretary of Defense, we can achieve that with the Martin amendment; we cannot achieve that with the mark of the committee.

If we charge the Secretary to do these things on behalf of the security needs of our children and our Nation, and at the same time retain the right of Congress as body to make a final decision on the closure of individual bases or a package of base closures, we can achieve that result with the

Martin amendment; we will not achieve that result with the committee mark.

I ask all Members who believe it is necessary and desirable to eliminate wasteful, unnecessary basing of scarce military resources to support the Martin amendment and oppose the mark of the committee.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if I may just finish, and I would hope the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] would hear this, because I think it is of some interest to her, I recognize that the gentlewoman has some particular concerns. We all understand that base closing is important. I also understand the calls that have been made to Members on the other side of the aisle.

This is not an amendment for political mischief. Therefore, understanding the role of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Committee mark from the Senate, rather than make the long speech about either hypocrisy or who is doing what, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Pursuant to House Resolution 461 and the requisite notice given by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services earlier today, it is now in order to consider the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] of the issue of base closure. That amendment is not subject to amendment and is considered as read.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment, and a Member in opposition to the amendment will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, the Member I designate to offer the amendment is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] will control 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWDER

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWDER: Page 426, strike out line 14 and all that follows through line 20 on page 433 and insert the following:

SEC. 2831. CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN AND TERMINATION OF OPERATIONS AT INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall formulate a force-structure plan for the Armed Forces of the United States based on an assessment by the Secre-

tary of the probable threats to the national security in the five-year period ending September 30, 1996, and of the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense purposes during such period. Such plan shall include, without any reference directly or indirectly to military installations inside the United States that may be closed or realigned under such plan—

(A) a description of such assessment;

(B) a description (i) of the anticipated force structure during and at the end of such period for each military department (with specifications of the number and type of units in the active and reserve forces of each such department), and (ii) of the units that will need to be forward based (with a justification thereof) during and at the end of such period;

(C) a description of the anticipated implementation of such force-structure plan; and

(D) the plan described in paragraph (2).

(2) The Secretary shall formulate and implement a plan for reducing and terminating military operations by the United States at installations outside the United States.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—(1) As part of the request for authorizations of appropriations for fiscal year 1992, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing—

(A) the force-structure plan formulated pursuant to subsection (a)(1);

(B) a description of the actions carried out and to be carried under subsection (a)(2), including a list of the installations outside the United States at which military operations by the United States will be reduced or terminated and an estimate of the extent of each such reduction;

(C) a legislative proposal containing (i) a fair process, as described in paragraph (2)(A), by which military installations inside the United States could be selected for closure and realignment as part of the implementation of the force-structure plan referred to in subsection (a)(1), and (ii) the policy referred to paragraph (2)(B); and

(D) a proposal for assistance (including worker retraining and economic conversion assistance) for individuals and communities that will be adversely affected economically by the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under such force-structure plan, including recommendations for any legislative action that the Secretary determines is needed to provide such assistance.

(2) The legislative proposal referred to in paragraph (1)(C) shall provide—

(A) a fair process for selecting military installations inside the United States for closure or realignment solely on the basis of objective criteria designed to achieve effectively and efficiently the military objectives of the Department of Defense contained in the force-structure plan transmitted under paragraph (1); and

(B) a policy ensuring the prompt environmental restoration of all property that will become excess to the needs of the Department of Defense as result of a military installation inside the United States being selected for closure or realignment.

(3) The proposal for economic assistance referred to in paragraph (1)(D), in addition to providing for economic assistance generally to individuals and communities adversely affected economically by the closure or realignment of a military installation, shall provide for appropriate economic assistance

to State and local governments that made expenditures in reliance on, and in support of, Federal plans to establish or continue to operate a military installation that was not opened or was selected for closure.

(C) **MILITARY INSTALLATIONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—(1) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may, except as provided in paragraph (4), be expended (whether obligated before the date of enactment of this Act or not) to—

(A) identify, through any transmittal to the Congress or through any other public announcement or notification, any military installation inside the United States as an installation to be closed or realigned or as an installation under consideration for closure or realignment; or

(B) close or realign any military installation inside the United States,

until specifically authorized by law during the 102nd Congress or until January 1, 1992, whichever occurs first.

(2) None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations in this Act may be obligated or expended, except as provided by paragraph (4), to initiate any study necessary to meet the requirements of section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, or the National Environmental Policy Act that are applicable to the closure or realignment of military installations.

(3) In providing for the repair and maintenance of facilities at military installations inside the United States during fiscal year 1991, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments shall, except as provided in paragraph (4), expend an amount during such fiscal year, with funds appropriated for operation and maintenance pursuant to authorizations made by this Act and with other funds that may be available for such purpose for such fiscal year, for repair and maintenance at each such installation equal to not less than 75 percent of the average annual amount expended for repair and maintenance of facilities at the installation concerned during fiscal years 1985 through 1989.

(4) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall not apply to—

(A) closures and realignments carried out under title II of Public Law 100-526; and

(B) closures and realignments to which section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, is not applicable.

(d) **PROHIBITION AND REMEDIAL ACTION.**—(1) The provisions of the transmittal to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense, dated January 29, 1990, identifying certain military installations as candidates for closure, and the provisions of any other proposal (whether transmitted to the Congress or not) developed during the year ending on the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to identifying military installations for closure, shall not be used as the basis for any decision concerning the assignment of mission, personnel, or resources to any installation identified in such provisions.

(2) The Secretary of Defense—

(A) shall review all actions taken during the year ending on the date of the enactment of this Act with regard to any installation identified in any provision referred to in paragraph (1); and

(B) shall take such steps as may be necessary to remedy the damage to such installation that has resulted from any such action.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—(1) For purposes of this section—

(A) the term "military installation" means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport, facility or any ship, or any other

activity under the jurisdiction of a department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense, including a leased facility, except that such term shall not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbor projects, or flood control projects;

(B) the term "United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia; and

(C) the term "realignment" has the meaning given such term by section 2687(e)(3) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraph (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) any realignment with respect to any military installation referred to in paragraph (1) that would result, during any two-year period, in a reduction of more than 1,000 in, or by more than 50 percent of, the number of civilian personnel authorized to be employed at such military installation at the beginning of the two-year period concerned; or"; and

(B) in subsection (e)(3), by striking out "includes" and inserting in lieu thereof "means".

(3) For the purpose of making determinations with respect to closures and realignments carried out on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, the amendment made by paragraph (2)(A) shall be applied to include reductions of civilian personnel occurring during any two-year period beginning after the date that occurred two years before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) **CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2687(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department" and inserting in lieu thereof "under the jurisdiction of a department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense, including a leased facility";

The **CHAIRMAN** pro tempore. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a good bit of discussion of this amendment today. I think everyone agrees that we have got to do something about our military infrastructure. We are going to close bases, and we are going to realign our forces. The question before us tonight is whether we are going to do it the right way.

We have a process before us presented by the Secretary of Defense. I would like before I talk about the Secretary of Defense's proposal, to repeat a statement made by the President in these Chambers last night, in which the President said:

The world is still dangerous. Surely that is now clear. This is no time to risk America's capacity to protect our vital interests.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is good sense to that. But if we had followed the plan of the Secretary of Defense, let me tell you what would be happen-

ing to us in our defense, in our deployment in Desert Shield. Fort McClellan, AL, the only facility in the world where our troops can receive defensive training against live chemical agents, may be closing. Fort Hood, TX, home of the 2d Armored Division, which had been designated for deactivation and which is now being deployed for Desert Shield, we would have been deprived of those forces. Troop Support Command, St. Louis, MO, in early August the Army issued 5,000 reduction in force notices. Within days of those RIF's, the same employees were told to report for double shifts in order to keep up with troop needs.

At Myrtle Beach, SC, the A-10's were deployed to the Middle East in mid-August. The A-10 tank killers are among our frontline air forces ready to repel an invasion of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Chairman, we have a five-point plan which first requires a rational defense strategy and force structure. Second, it requires the Secretary of Defense to prepare a proposal to us for a bipartisan base closure plan. Third, it establishes a moratorium until January 1992, 1 year. If the Secretary comes prior to that time and Congress authorizes, bases can be closed.

Fourth, it prevents bleeding of those bases. Fifth, it has an economic adjustment assistance provision.

Mr. Chairman, we have a choice. I urge this House to vote for a fair proposal, to vote for a rational defense strategy, and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just take this time as a sponsor of this amendment to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] for his leadership and work on the committee for a reasonable, rational, bipartisan approach to base closing.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], for yielding. I salute him on his outstanding work on behalf of this amendment. I rise in support of this amendment and am proud to work with the gentleman.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Budget Committee, no one is more aware of the need to reduce defense costs than I. But my commitment, and the commitment of the citizens I represent, to reasonable reductions in defense spending does not necessitate a headlong, reckless rush into

across-the-board base closures and reductions.

Mr. Chairman, that January 29 list released by the Secretary of Defense was compiled over 2 or 3 weeks exactly 1 year ago. My colleagues may recall that just 1 year ago the Berlin Wall had not yet fallen and Vaclav Havel was still an outsider in Czechoslovakia. The small teams of hit men charged with developing the Secretary's base-closure list had no idea what the Department of Defense's grand strategy, force structure, budget plans and basing plans would entail today, much less 4 years from now. We cannot allow the Department of Defense to substitute quick strike, quickly obsolete base-closure schemes for rational planning. We cannot allow the Department of Defense to throw entire economic regions into chaos willy-nilly. There simply has got to be some kind of rationality built into the process. There has got to be a process, period.

Thus, it has been clear from day one that the Defense Department's current base closure process is not based on the slightest bit of defense strategy or fiscal planning in response to the tumultuous world events of the last year. The Secretary of Defense's unprecedented and unofficial release of a list of bases he considers candidates for closure has thrown communities across the Nation into disarray and raised the specter of very damaging defense cuts being implemented without relation to strategy, policy and planning. What happens to our preparedness? Where is the ultimate focus on our national security? I do not see that leading light, Mr. Chairman. We are blundering headlong in the darkness of ignorance—ignorance of our final goals and our final base structure in the new world order.

It is astonishing, in my view, that the Department of Defense is attempting to close military posts within the United States before taking a hard look at our bases in Europe and in East Asia. It would seem to be indisputable that the defense of the United States should be our first priority, that the cost of bases abroad is far higher than at home, that the need for our current number of troops in Europe and in Korea is diminished and that the disruption caused by base closures abroad is insignificant relative to that felt at home. Yet, again, the Department is not only attempting to foist this specious list on the Congress, we are now asked to swallow hard and accept a permanent codification of this practice.

Let us show a little mettle here: We have seen the Martin amendment before, in the form of the administration's base closure list released last January; it does not comport with the real world. Moreover, and perhaps more important, the Cheney-Martin strategy would deprive the Congress of its constitutionally mandated responsibility to authorize the expenditure of funds for the disposition of military posts and defense civilian personnel.

In my own district, the Department of the Army has recommended the relocation of the 7th Light Infantry Division to Fort Lewis, WA, and the closure of Fort Ord. You remember the 7th Division, Mr. Chairman. That's the division that was developed pursuant to former President Carter's order to create a rapid de-

ployment force for contingencies much like Operation Desert Shield. That's the division that was deployed just last December to fight with great success and extraordinary skill in Panama. That's the division that has the best training facilities, best housing and one of the most flawless deployment records in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Yet, Office of the Secretary of Defense's September 1989 team decided that the division should be moved and that Fort Ord should be closed. I formed a community task force on Fort Ord, led by retired military experts, to conduct a study of the Defense Department's proposal. In March 1990, the task force issued its report on the military and budgetary issues of the relocation of the division. The defense report, the result of several weeks of painstaking analysis of all the issues involved, concludes that the Defense Secretary's proposal is completely unjustified in every respect. Having studied the issue carefully for 8 months now, I must tell you in all candor that I am at a loss to explain the Department's original recommendation to close Fort Ord.

The Committee on Armed Services, in consultation with many of our colleagues, has recommended a bill that clearly and wisely sets forth the requirements for a rational base closure process: first review our defense strategy and force structure needs, then develop a rational base closure process and, finally, institute necessary base closures along with a fair assistance program to smooth out the rough bumps dislocated defense personnel are sure to face.

The Martin amendment would not only harm our national security, it would represent another blow to the Constitution by wrenching yet another authority away from the Congress. Stand up for the congressional prerogative and a fair, American system. Vote against the Martin amendment.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill, the amendment that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] offers, is really the only way that we have to really close bases. It does it in a rational way, it does it in a bipartisan way.

The gentleman from Alabama has done a lot of work on this. He is absolutely right. If you were in favor of closing bases before, if you want to make sure your base is protected by a rational process before it, if you want to make sure your base is protected by a bipartisan system before it, vote for the Browder amendment.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I was interested in the comments of our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]. I thought we already had a base closing procedure in the law that we worked very hard to get a couple of years ago. I must say to me

this looks like a retreat from that procedure. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, no, this is the same procedure we had in the bill. This last procedure we had 2 years ago has run out. It was only a one-shot base closing process. What this would do would be to create the Commission again and to do it again.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does this amendment pertain to the group of bases that were cited last year pursuant to the law we passed 2 years ago?

Mr. ASPIN. No, it covers any bases.

Mr. PEASE. Including those?

Mr. ASPIN. No. Anything that was ordered closed by the Base Closing Commission, the Carlucci Commission of a couple of years ago, that is a done deal and that will continue.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

□ 1820

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). If there is no Member seeking time in opposition to the amendment, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 134, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—287

Ackerman	Carper	Engel
Alexander	Chandler	English
Anderson	Chapman	Erdreich
Andrews	Clarke	Espy
Annuizio	Clay	Evans
Anthony	Clement	Fascell
Applegate	Coble	Fazio
Aspin	Coleman (MO)	Feighan
Atkins	Coleman (TX)	Fish
Ballenger	Collins	Flake
Barnard	Condit	Flippo
Bates	Conyers	Foglietta
Bennett	Cooper	Ford (MI)
Bentley	Costello	Frank
Berman	Coughlin	Frost
Bevill	Coyne	Gallo
Bilbray	Crockett	Gejdenson
Bilirakis	Darden	Gekas
Boehlert	Davis	Geren
Boggs	de la Garza	Gilman
Bonior	DeFazio	Glickman
Borski	Dellums	Gonzalez
Bosco	Derrick	Gordon
Boucher	Dicks	Grant
Boxer	Dingell	Gray
Brennan	Dixon	Guarini
Brooks	Donnelly	Hall (OH)
Broomfield	Dorgan (ND)	Hall (TX)
Browder	Downey	Hamilton
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Harris
Bruce	Dwyer	Hatcher
Bryant	Dymally	Hawkins
Bustamante	Dyson	Hayes (IL)
Byron	Early	Hayes (LA)
Callahan	Eckart	Hefner
Campbell (CO)	Edwards (CA)	Henry
Cardin	Emerson	Hertel

Hoagland	Mollohan	Schuette
Hochbrueckner	Montgomery	Schulze
Holloway	Moody	Schumer
Horton	Morrison (WA)	Sharp
Hoyer	Mrazek	Shuster
Hubbard	Murphy	Sikorski
Huckaby	Murtha	Siskis
Hughes	Nagle	Skaggs
Hutto	Natcher	Skelton
Jacobs	Neal (MA)	Slaughter (NY)
Jenkins	Neal (NC)	Smith (FL)
Johnson (SD)	Nelson	Smith (IA)
Johnston	Nowak	Smith (NJ)
Jones (GA)	Oakar	Smith, Robert
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	(OR)
Jontz	Obey	Snowe
Kanjorski	Olin	Solarz
Kaptur	Ortiz	Spence
Kastenmeier	Owens (NY)	Spratt
Kennelly	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Kildee	Pallone	Stallings
Klecza	Panetta	Stark
Kolter	Parker	Stenholm
Kostmayer	Patterson	Stokes
LaFalce	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Lancaster	Payne (VA)	Sundquist
Lantos	Pelosi	Swift
Laughlin	Penny	Synar
Leath (TX)	Perkins	Tallon
Lehman (CA)	Pickett	Tanner
Lehman (FL)	Pickle	Tauzin
Levin (MI)	Poshard	Taylor
Levine (CA)	Price	Thomas (GA)
Lewis (FL)	Quillen	Torres
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Torricelli
Lipinski	Rangel	Towns
Lloyd	Ravenel	Trafiacant
Long	Ray	Traxler
Lowey (NY)	Richardson	Udall
Luken, Thomas	Rinaldo	Unsoeld
Machtley	Robinson	Valentine
Madigan	Roe	Vento
Manton	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
Markey	Rose	Volkmer
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Walgren
Matsui	Roukema	Walsh
Mavroules	Rowland (CT)	Washington
Mazzoli	Rowland (GA)	Waxman
McCloskey	Roybal	Weiss
McCurdy	Russo	Weldon
McDermott	Sabo	Wheat
McHugh	Sangmeister	Whitten
McMillan (NC)	Sarpallus	Williams
McMillan (MD)	Savage	Wise
McNulty	Sawyer	Wolpe
McNulty	Saxton	Wyden
Miller (CA)	Scheuer	Yates
Mineta	Schiff	Yatron
Moakley	Schroeder	Young (FL)

NOES—134

Archer	Galleghy	Lowery (CA)
Armey	Gibbons	Lukens, Donald
Baker	Gillmor	Marlenee
Bartlett	Gingrich	Martin (IL)
Barton	Goss	Martin (NY)
Bateman	Gradison	McCandless
Bellenson	Grandy	McCollum
Bereuter	Green	McCrery
Billiey	Gunderson	McDade
Brown (CO)	Hammerschmidt	McEwen
Buechner	Hancock	McGrath
Bunning	Hansen	Meyers
Burton	Hastert	Michel
Campbell (CA)	Hefley	Miller (WA)
Carr	Herger	Molinari
Clinger	Hiler	Moorhead
Combest	Hopkins	Morella
Conte	Houghton	Myers
Courter	Hunter	Nielson
Cox	Hyde	Oxley
Craig	Inhofe	Packard
Crane	Ireland	Parris
Dannemeyer	James	Pashayan
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Paxon
DeWine	Kasich	Pease
Dickinson	Kennedy	Petri
Dorman (CA)	Kolbe	Porter
Douglas	Kyl	Pursell
Dreier	Lagomarsino	Regula
Duncan	Leach (IA)	Rhodes
Edwards (OK)	Lent	Ridge
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Ritter
Fields	Lightfoot	Roberts
Frenzel	Livingston	Rogers

Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter (VA)	Thomas (WY)
Roth	Smith (NE)	Upton
Salki	Smith (TX)	Vander Jagt
Schaefer	Smith (VT)	Vucanovich
Schneider	Smith, Robert	Walker
Sensenbrenner	(NH)	Weber
Shaw	Solomon	Whittaker
Shays	Stearns	Wilson
Shumway	Stump	Wolf
Skeen	Tauke	Wylie
Slattery	Thomas (CA)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

AuCoin	Goodling	Smith, Denny
Ford (TN)	Miller (OH)	(OR)
Gaydos	Morrison (CT)	Stangeland
Gephardt	Serrano	Watkins

□ 1842

Messrs. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS, GUNDERSON, and KENNEDY, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BATES changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, there are several important developments related to chemical weapons and arms control that I would like to note for my colleagues during the debate today of the fiscal year 1991 Department of Defense authorization. I feel confident that these developments mark the beginning of the end for chemical weapons around the world.

The developments, simply put, are these: There are no production funds for new chemical weapons in this DOD authorization bill nor in the Senate version. The United States and U.S.S.R. have agreed to destroy all their chemical weapons and stop all future production of chemical weapons. Progress in Geneva brings closer to reality the opportunity to achieve a worldwide ban on chemical weapons.

The House of Representatives has played an active role in these developments. The House has opposed new production of chemical weapons by our country while promoting bilateral and multilateral negotiations to solve the chemical weapons problem.

An Iraqi sanctions bill was passed by the House 2 years ago due to Iraqi use of chemical weapons against Iran. Last year, the House passed a chemical weapons sanctions bill applicable to all countries, companies, and individuals using or proliferating chemical weapons. That bill had strong bipartisan support and was precedent setting because it had administration support. And, last month, another Iraqi sanctions bill passed the House.

Our colleague, MARTIN LANCASTER, is an observer to the chemical weapons negotiations in Geneva. He has visited those negotiations three times; the last time he organized an exchange there with Soviet legislators to discuss the destruction and nonproduction of CW agreement. He has made some excellent recommendations on policy and negotiating strategy to President Bush and to the Department of State. And other Members have given careful attention, exercised legislative oversight, and authorized increased funding for our chemical weapons destruction and defensive programs.

The total cuts in chemical weapons production amount to \$224 million—\$124 million for production of the 155mm artillery shell, \$67 million for the Bigeye bomb, \$28 million for the multiple-launch rocket system [MLRS], and \$5 million for development of a new binary munition.

The larger estimate of savings in past years and future years for termination of the Bigeye bomb is \$1.5 billion. This is a GAO estimate using the total projected production numbers for Bigeye adjusted to current-year dollars. Adding the 155mm artillery shell and MLRS program terminations, the grand total savings accrued by stopping this program amount to at least \$2 billion. The Senate bill also cuts out the binary chemical weapons production programs.

It has been a long, hard 8-year struggle for the House to finally convince the executive branch of the foreign policy logic, arms control rationale, and good common sense of its position opposing the production of new binary chemical weapons.

That struggle is over; we won; and this year I do not have to offer an amendment to the DOD bill to cut chemical weapons production funds. It seemed foolish to produce new chemical weapons designed to counter the Soviet chemical threat which could not be based in Europe where they were needed because the Europeans did not want them and saw no military need for them. New U.S. production of chemical weapons contradicted stated U.S. arms control policy of wanting to stop chemical weapons proliferation and achieve a worldwide ban.

It never made any practical sense to approve a multibillion-dollar purchase of these new "modern, safe" chemical weapons when the General Accounting Office [GAO] proved that the weapons had continually failed tests. The Pentagon could never convince enough people of the military utility of these weapons. Contrary to the Pentagon's contention that these chemical weapons would add to U.S. security, the only thing that they added to was the Federal deficit. Consequently, House actions stopped a new generation of these weapons and saved several billion dollars.

Because Vice President Bush broke two tie votes in the Senate in favor of new binary chemical weapons production and because the requests for new funding of the weapons continued from the Reagan to the Bush presidency, the sincerity of the U.S. support for a worldwide ban and for a halt to chemical weapons proliferation was always questioned. The United States-U.S.S.R. agreement to halt chemical weapons production and begin destruction staked out new credibility and leadership for the United States on this issue.

The United States-U.S.S.R. agreement is an historic arms control achievement. It signals the beginning of the end for chemical weapons. This arms control achievement is a great confidence-building measure both between the two superpowers and between the superpowers and the rest of the world. This is a great example of superpower cooperation at its best, cooperation which eliminates a major weapons system of mass destruction from the world.

Now, other world leaders must join the two superpowers to convince all states to commit themselves to a universal ban on chemical weapons as quickly as possible.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. Bonior's amendment which would require that Japan accept a greater share of the responsibility for the costs of United States forces stationed there.

Clearly, when the United States undertook, in the immediate post-World War II era, the burden of defending our allies, it was because these countries were unable to effectively do so by themselves. However, it is also clear that our allies have enjoyed military security from U.S. forces, while spending far less of their national wealth on defense than does the United States. At the same time, we continue to run massive budget deficits at home and a host of pressing domestic needs go unmet.

For these reasons, I have long supported initiatives to encourage our allies to match their prosperity with significant contributions to our common defense. And Mr. BONIOR's amendment, by requiring Japan to pay the costs for United States troops, would make an important step in this effort.

The United States has nearly 50,000 troops stationed in Japan at an annual cost of \$7.4 billion. Yet Japan pays only \$2.9 billion of that figure. The Bonior amendment gives the President 1 year to negotiate an agreement. If Japan refuses to pay all costs, troops would be gradually withdrawn beginning in fiscal year 1991.

In addition, the United States should not be subsidizing one of our toughest trade competitors. Last year, nearly half the United States trade deficit—\$45 billion—was with Japan alone. Japan has one of the world's strongest economies and can easily afford to make a larger contribution toward our collective defense. That defense is clearly as much in Japan's interest as it is our own.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is especially timely in light of the current crisis in the Middle East. It is outrageous that Japan is offering such a paltry contribution when the stakes are so large—not only for Japan, but for the entire international community. Though Japan has announced \$1 billion package of aid as its contribution to the multinational effort against Iraq, the United States is spending \$1 billion a month to defend the Persian Gulf. We cannot allow strong economic powers like Japan to shirk its responsibility to the international community, and we should send that message loud and clear.

I am hopeful that we can take advantage of the dramatic changes around the world to re-examine our definition of international security and, when appropriate, call upon our allies to accept a larger portion of the tab for their own defense. I strongly support the Bonior amendment.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Chairman, since we began deploying forces in the Middle East in response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, there has been mounting interest in the cost of those operations and what constitutes a fair share to be borne by our allies. I think it is important to put some of the cost figures being used into better perspective.

Toward that end, I asked the Congressional Research Service [CRS] for a short report comparing the costs of current Middle East deployments with historical data on our last major deployment—the Vietnam war.

I asked CRS to do this work for two reasons. First, I wanted to understand how those added costs will effect the budget; and second, I wanted a better understanding of the true cost of supporting modern day forces under wartime conditions.

CRS has prepared a report on "Costs of the Vietnam Conflict Compared to Costs of Current U.S. Military Deployments in and Around the Arabian Peninsula." It was written by Steve Daggett of the Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division and is dated September 10, 1990. It is based on information provided by the Department of Defense [DOD].

Mr. Daggett has done an excellent job. Admittedly, the information available today is preliminary and incomplete, but it constitutes a good start. I want CRS to continue to monitor the data and update the analysis as more meaningful and complete information becomes available.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to share the results of this work with my colleagues:

Table I provides a detailed breakdown of the best available information on the "Estimated Incremental Costs of Operation Desert Shield" for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 in terms of budget authority and outlays.

Table II provides the "Incremental Costs of the Southeast Asia Conflict, Fiscal Years 1965-75" in current and constant dollars along with associated troop levels.

Mr. Daggett concludes his report with a warning that comparisons between the cost of Desert Shield with Vietnam should be undertaken with caution. I accept that. I know the information we have is preliminary and incomplete. I fully appreciate the limitations of the data. Nonetheless, I believe that we can draw some credible conclusions from these data.

DOD now estimates that Desert Shield will cost \$11.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 1991 and will require \$15 billion in budget authority for that year. That figure, as I understand it, is associated with the deployment of 100,000 personnel. That, in turn, equates to a cost, in terms of outlays, of \$113,000 per man per year.

Because of the changing tempo of operations in Vietnam and the evolution of the buildup and build-down, the best approach for comparison with today's operation is to average the numbers for the peak years—fiscal years 1966-71. That analysis yields an average cost per man per year, when adjusted for today's dollars, of \$155,000 for personnel engaged in full-scale combat operations in South Vietnam.

When measured in these terms, the cost of massive combat operations in South Vietnam was only slightly higher than the cost of Desert Shield thus far—\$155,000 versus \$113,000—a difference of only \$42,000. To me, this is quite astounding. How could the unit cost of Desert Shield—in which not a single shot has been fired—approach the unit cost of combat operations in Vietnam?

Desert Shield is no peacetime operation for sure. It is an explosive situation in which we

are, for good reason, maintaining a high state of readiness. Still, while operating tempos must admittedly be high, we have not even begun expending ordnance and equipment as we did in Vietnam in 1969, nor are we having to pay for the massive logistics support apparatus needed to feed such operations. Some think a full-scale war in the Middle East could cost us \$1 billion a week.

I think there is another reason for the high cost of Desert Shield. During the 1970's and 1980's, as the modernization effort gained momentum, the military services predicted that the operating and support [O&S] costs for advanced weapons systems like the AH-64 helicopter, M-1 tank, F-15 fighter, and naval combatants—all of which are deployed in the Middle East—would decline. And yet, O&S costs appear in fact to be rising dramatically instead.

Mr. Daggett alludes to the importance of O&S costs at the end of his report. He says: "Operating costs of current weapons are relatively high compared to costs of Vietnam era weapons," citing a CBO study as his source.

When making decisions on the acquisition of new weapons systems, we need to realistically compare the operating and support costs of proposed modernizations with the O&S costs of the systems being replaced. We need to factor the differences in those costs into our decisionmaking process. I believe that our experiences with Desert Shield will clearly demonstrate the need to watch those costs closely.

Mr. Daggett also raises questions about the cost of the Reserve callup included in the DOD cost figures for fiscal year 1991—\$56,000 per reservist. Mr. Chairman, that figure is considered very high and needs to be explained.

Mr. Chairman, I place the CRS report in the RECORD so others can read it:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 1990.

To: Hon. Andy Ireland, Attention: Charles Murphy.

From: Stephen Daggett, Analyst in National Defense, Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division.

Subject: Costs of the Vietnam conflict compared to costs of current U.S. military deployments in and around the Arabian Peninsula.

This is in response to your request for a comparison of costs of the Vietnam conflict with estimated costs of current U.S. military deployments to the Middle East following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

On September 7, the Department of Defense provided a revised estimate of the additional expenses, over and above the normal operating costs of U.S. forces, incurred in deploying forces to the Persian Gulf region. From the beginning of Operation Desert Shield through September 30, DOD calculates, the action will cost a total of \$1.9 billion in outlays and \$2.7 billion in budget authority. If the currently planned deployment is maintained through Fiscal year 1991, DOD estimates costs of \$11.3 billion in outlays and \$15.0 billion in budget authority.

These estimates cover the incremental cost to DOD of deploying additional forces to the Persian Gulf—i.e., they exclude costs that would normally be incurred if forces

were deployed as usual and operating at a standard, peacetime tempo. Regular military pay, for example, is not counted, nor is the cost of operating naval forces that would normally be deployed in the region.

DOD officials emphasize that even this latest appraisal represents a preliminary analysis subject to further revision. The estimates assume that personnel are rotated every six months and that reserves called into service will be replaced with other reserves after six months but that no additional reserves will be mobilized. Fuel costs are based on a \$10 per barrel increase in the cost of oil over pre-invasion prices. The estimates do not include costs of returning forces to the United States. Nor do the estimates take account of offsetting contributions by allies—Saudi Arabia, for example, is reportedly providing fuel, food and other materiel to U.S. forces, and other allies have promised additional contributions, but the value of these provisions has not been credited against the cost of U.S. operations. And, finally, DOD has not offered any estimate of possible costs if hostilities should break out.

Table 1 provides a breakdown of estimated costs of Operation Desert Shield. DOD has provided detailed figures only in terms of budget authority, with an overall estimate available in terms of outlays as well.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED INCREMENTAL COSTS OF OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

(Budget authority in millions of current year dollars)

	Fiscal Year—	
	1990	1991
Airlift: Maintenance, fuel, contractual support.....	472	2,240
Sealift: Fuel, supplies, loading costs, merchant seamen.....	275	1,560
Other deployment: Civilian overtime at depots, activation costs, storage costs.....	271	430
Medical: Activate hospital ships, purchase additional medical supplies.....	42	50
Operating costs: Maintenance, fuel, etc. for added steaming and flying hours.....	873	2,520
Reserve callup: Pay and other costs of reservists called to active duty.....	178	2,800
In-Theater Support: Housing, water, refrigeration, sanitation.....	250	1,800
Other: Family separation pay, etc.....	20	60
Fuel cost increase: Excluding costs of fuel for the higher operating tempo.....	300	1,740
Military construction: Billeting, mess, supply, vehicle maintenance, etc.....	35	1,800
Total budget authority.....	2,716	15,000

Note.—Estimated total outlays: Fiscal year 1990, \$1,900,000,000; fiscal year 1991, \$11,300,000,000.

Source: Figures provided by Department of Defense Comptroller, Sept. 7, 1990.

By way of comparison, Table 2 shows annual incremental outlays for U.S. military operations associated with the conflict in Southeast Asia, with costs reestimated at today's prices. It also shows the number of military personnel deployed in South Vietnam at the end of each fiscal year. Currently planned deployments to the Persian Gulf region are estimated to total about 100,000.

TABLE 2.—INCREMENTAL COSTS OF THE SOUTHEAST ASIA CONFLICT, FISCAL YEARS 1965-75¹

(Outlays in millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Current year dollars	Constant fiscal year 1991 dollars	Military personnel in South Vietnam ²
1965.....	103	500	59,900
1966.....	5,812	26,466	267,500
1967.....	18,417	79,453	448,000
1968.....	29,012	122,388	534,700
1969.....	21,544	85,561	538,700

TABLE 2.—INCREMENTAL COSTS OF THE SOUTHEAST ASIA CONFLICT, FISCAL YEARS 1965-75¹—Continued

(Outlays in millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Current year dollars	Constant fiscal year 1991 dollars	Military personnel in South Vietnam ²
1970.....	17,373	64,274	414,900
1971.....	11,452	39,916	239,200
1972.....	7,228	23,250	47,000
1973.....	5,266	15,889	(^a)
1974.....	2,726	7,624	(^a)
1975.....	719	1,802	(^a)
Total.....	110,654	427,124	

¹ Includes direct costs of military personnel, operations and maintenance, procurement, RDT&E, and stock funds. Does not include military or economic assistance, veterans benefits or other costs.

² Personnel levels as of June 30 of each fiscal year.

^a Less than 250.

Sources: Data on costs in current year dollars provided by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), converted into constant fiscal year 1991 dollars by CRS using DOD deflators. Data on personnel in South Vietnam from Department of Defense, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports "Selected Manpower Statistics, Fiscal Year 1985" (Washington: DOD, 1986).

A comparison of costs of Operation Desert Shield with costs of the Vietnam conflict should be undertaken with some caution. For one thing, much of the cost associated with the deployment to the Persian Gulf represents the expense of a large airlift effort needed to deploy troops very quickly and one-time costs of activating sealift assets. Beyond that, operating costs of current weapons are relatively high compared to costs of Vietnam era weapons [for a discussion, see Congressional Budget Office "Operation and Support Costs for the Department of Defense" (Washington: CBO, July 1988)].

If CRS can be of any further assistance, please call me at 707-7642.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bonior amendment to H.R. 4739, Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 1991.

The logic behind this amendment is clear. We are spending billions a year to defend a friend, yes, but also a trading partner that hammers us economically. We allow the Japanese to invest in their economic and social wealth at the expense of American workers and families.

I think the time for that to stop is now.

This amendment requires Japan to pay for the luxury of having the United States of America defend it. If it refuses, we will begin to withdraw that military and financial support. A reasonable approach.

I fully understand the vital security interests we have in that region, and I believe the Japanese people are good friends of the United States. But even friendships have limits. And we have reached ours when it comes to defending Japan.

This amendment will have a positive effect on two fronts. First, it obviously frees money in our defense budget to be used for other military or perhaps more appropriately domestic uses. Second, it sends the message to Japan and other countries that we are serious about our role as a world leader for peace and freedom, but cannot continue to pick up the lion's share of that burden.

Burdensharing is a fair and reasonable request of our international friends and neighbors. I'm pleased to support my good friend from Michigan's amendment and urge its passage.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] in a colloquy with respect to the schedule.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the rules require that we have to give an hour's notice on an amendment to be called up.

So I would like at this point to discuss with the gentleman from Alabama the schedule as we see it at this point for tomorrow.

When we left off the debate, the general debate, we had not had the debate on the B-2. So it would be my suggestion that the first thing we do when we come back to this bill tomorrow is to have 20 minutes' debate, plan for 20 minutes' debate on the B-2 amendment.

Following that, what we have left are some particularly—some amendments to vote on. We have the SDI amendments. It would be my suggestion, I think, that we next go to votes on the SDI amendments.

Then there are two votes on economic conversion amendment, a Hopkins amendment and a Mavroules amendment. It would be my intention that we at that point go and vote on those two economic conversion amendments.

Following that, and as the schedule now stands we are going to, according to what I hear, we are going to be able to do this bill tomorrow all day. It would be my proposal we then go and continue the schedule as it was laid out under the second rule that was passed this morning. That is essentially to go on to the schedule which covers the Dickinson alternative, the en bloc amendments, the general amendments and the budget adjustment amendment, the motion to recommit, and the final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

I am trying to assimilate what I have just heard. I realize we have had several discussions, but I have got two pieces of paper, one which was just handed to me, different from the one I thought we were discussing.

We start off in the morning with 20 minutes of debate on the B-2, and no vote is expected or anticipated.

Mr. ASPIN. Correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. Next we have consideration of debates of 10 minutes each on SDI, and there are four of them.

Mr. ASPIN. Four amendments.

Mr. DICKINSON. Then there is an SDI policy issue that Mr. SPRAAT has debated today, but that will not be an amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. I understand there may not be an amendment at that point.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thought that was probably the case.

Mr. ASPIN. That is not for sure, but I think that is right.

Mr. DICKINSON. Next would be the economic conversion.

Mr. ASPIN. That is right.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. HOPKINS and Mr. MAVROULES having one amendment each.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. One is a substitute for the other.

Then it is my understanding that my amendment, the "Good Government" amendment will be in order next.

Mr. ASPIN. The bad guys—the black-hat amendment then is next in order for 20 minutes of debate.

Mr. DICKINSON. No, no, that follows.

Then general amendments.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. It is anticipated that perhaps they might be lumped.

Mr. ASPIN. We are looking for that, either dropped or not voted on.

Mr. DICKINSON. Those that are noncontroversial can be put together and adopted en mas.

Mr. ASPIN. That is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. And then those that are controversial, they would have 10 minutes apiece.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKINSON. Ten minutes' debate and a 15-minute vote, unless we can agree otherwise.

Mr. ASPIN. We have authority to cluster the votes on that one. I am advised that the authority to cluster the votes, which would mean a 5-minute vote—let us consult about this in the morning. We may be able to work out a process.

Mr. DICKINSON. But the controversial votes will not be lumped in.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Then we have the Aspin add-back.

Mr. ASPIN. That is the "Good Government" amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, I color the hat differently.

But anyway, this would be dependent, in the main, by what comes from the budget summit, assuming that we hear from the oracle.

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. And if we do not hear from them—that is what gets important here—if we do not hear from the Andrews summit group, then do we go forward or do we stop?

Mr. ASPIN. That is a good question. We will consult on it in the morning. I am not awfully anxious to keep going at that point if we do not know anything.

Mr. DICKINSON. All right. So that would normally be the last amendment that would be offered. If we can get some guidance and agreement from the leadership coming from the budget summit, then we can conclude at that point and there would be a

motion to recommit, which I intend to offer. But we do have an hour's debate on that rather than the normal 10 minutes. Then final passage.

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. All right. Then we have agreed on that.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD) having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4739) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal year 1991, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall No. 323, House Resolution 461, rollcall No. 325, the Bonior amendment on burdensharing, rollcall No. 326, the Mrazek amendment on burdensharing, and rollcall No. 327, the Aspin-Browder amendment on base closings. Had I been here, I would have cast the following votes: "aye," "aye," "aye," and "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I was participating in the budget summit negotiations at Andrews Air Force Base and was unable to cast my vote during House proceedings. Had I been present, I would have cast the following vote:

Rollcall No. 323—"yea," on the rule to allow consideration of the Defense authorization bill.

CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURES IN CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4739, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. ASPIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole resumes consideration of the bill H.R. 4739 on Thursday, September 13, 1990, it may entertain general debate on the subject of the B-2 bomber for not to exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4330, NATIONAL SERVICE ACT OF 1990

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-694) on the resolution (H. Res. 463) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4330) to establish school-based and higher education community service programs, to establish youth service programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1850

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1990 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2088, ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1990

Mr. SHARP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tomorrow night to file the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 2088) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to extend the authority for titles I and II, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I make this reservation for the purpose of allowing the gentleman to explain this important unanimous consent request which is necessary to facilitate action by the House on an extension of the law on the strategic petroleum reserve before current law expires this Saturday, September 15, 1990.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] under my reservation.

Mr. SHARP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Thanks in good measure to cooperative work, we have an agreement between the House and the Senate, by all parties concerned, about extending the authority to utilize the strategic petroleum reserve which, of course, is essential at this point in time with the crisis in the Middle East. We have some significant improvements we are making in that policy which will be relevant for future potential crises, and so I appreciate the gentleman's expeditious actions here.

The President's authority will expire on Saturday, and so it is naturally critical that we have no legal lapse in the authority necessary to utilize that for the good of our country.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Speaker, I urge the House to grant the unanimous consent request that has been

made, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2088, ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT OF 1990 ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1990 OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER

Mr. SHARP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on September 13, 1990 or any day thereafter, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 2088) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to extend the authority for titles I and II, and for other purposes, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TIPP CITY, OH, CELEBRATES SESQUICENTENNIAL

(Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Madam Speaker, Tippecanoe and Tyler, too. This historic political slogan of the 1840 William Henry Harrison Presidential campaign helped create the city of Tippecanoe by John Clark 150 years ago. Today, Mr. Speaker, I salute Tippi City in Miami County, OH, on their sesquicentennial. Settler John Clark founded Tippi City in 1839, at the intersection of the then Miami and Erie Canal. Clark's admiration of William Henry Harrison caused him to name his community Tippecanoe in 1840. Tippecanoe citizens added "city" to their town in 1850, and shortened that to Tippi City in 1938.

Tippi City has had a year-long celebration during 1990, and adopted the appropriate motto: "Our image is growing." Special tribute for the successful sesquicentennial should go to the following: Carl J. Suerdieck, mayor of Tippi City, and Dick Heberling, Larry Crowl, and Janice Lee of the Tippi City sesquicentennial celebration committee.

Tippi City is very proud of its heritage. It is an all-American place to live and raise a family. It is appropriate that Congress and America recognize the source of its vitality and its

values—our small towns like Tippi City, OH.

HISTORY OF TIPP CITY, TIPPECANOE CITY, BETHEL AND MONROE TOWNSHIPS OF MIAMI COUNTY, OH

The central part of what is now Tippi City was once a farm of 104 acres owned by Robert Evans, who had purchased it in 1828. After working diligently for eleven years, clearing the briery and heavily wooded tract for a farm home, he traded the land in 1839 with his brother-in-law, John Clark. (Born in Maryland in 1797, John Clark had moved to this township with his mother and several other families in 1810, settling in Cowlesville. In 1820 Clark constructed a flat boat at the mouth of Honey Creek—where the John Clark memorial bridge now stands—and loaded it with hides, flour and pork, which he took to Cincinnati to the markets. In 1817 he married Harriet Jenkins and to this union were born eight children.) Mr. Clark was able to visualize the success of a town located on this spot, at the intersection of the Miami and Erie Canal (completed through this area about 1837) and the state road from Springfield to Greenville, which had been established in 1813 and made a state road in 1817 (now State Route 571). Immediately he had the land surveyed for a town site.

The first plat was recorded in 1840 and contained seventeen lots; starting at the northeast corner of Main and First Streets and extending seven lots north to Plum Street; then south on the opposite side of First, for nine lots, to Main Street; and one lot west on Main Street. This extended the original plat to the alley on the west side of the present Union Building. These lots did not include the grist mill on the west bank of the canal. James and Uriah John had erected this mill in 1839.

John Clark named his new village "Tippecanoe." This was the year William Henry Harrison was campaigning for the presidency of the United States, and the rallying slogan was "Tippecanoe and Tyler, too." Mr. Clark was a great admirer of Mr. Harrison (legend says Mr. Clark erected a temporary miniature log cabin at Main and First Streets, 1840, in his honor) and so adopted the name of Tippecanoe and recorded it with his plat. A few years afterwards, about 1850, the citizens unofficially added "City," and the village became known as such. But it was not until 1938 that the legal name of the town was changed from Tippecanoe City to Tippi City.

In the selling of lots to the new townsmen, Clark asked that no log structure be erected with the result that Tippecanoe City originated with neat frame or brick buildings, many of which are standing today.

135 E. Main Street. The first lot purchased from Mr. Clark was in 1839 by Thomas Jay who built the first (general) store on the northwest corner of Main and First Streets. In 1848 it was sold to S.L. Chaffee, then to L.M. Booher, who in turn sold to Joseph Miller in 1854. He operated the Exchange Hotel until his death in 1870, when his son John took over. In 1877 John's brother-in-law, John Bolte, managed the business and followed by another brother-in-law, John Henn (when it became known as the Henn House). In 1903 the Henn family leased the hotel to C.S. Yoder who ran it for a short time. The Henn's resumed management, opening a dining room and lunch bar on the east side of the first floor. Butch Henn's tailor shop and Whip's barber shop were on the west side, while the rear

part was a recreational hall for social gatherings. The family had living quarters on the second floor. During prohibition Bernard Byrket won a five dollar bill for his suggestion of "The Chic" for a new name for the restaurant. A large mirrored globe that hung above the center of the dance floor, slowly turning and casting light reflections on the dancers in the ballroom and a quoits court behind the building are included on the leisure moment memories of many citizens. Ford Yount operated the business in 1925. During World War II Robert Dawson purchased it from the Henn estate and ran it for a short time; then other owners followed and another name—the "Melody Bar." Howard Wietzel bought the building in 1945 and was the owner of the "Sequoia" when it was destroyed by fire in 1971. Parker Behm Real Estate completed a new building there in 1979. Next occupied by Ernst Aggregates.

Andrew Cotral built a large brick hotel (22 rooms) east of the canal in early 1840. It soon became known as the Barenbrock hotel and entertained much of the canal trade. After the Miami Conservancy took over that area, following the 1913 flood, this building was demolished about 1918.

Henry Krise built his tavern, general store and home on the northeast corner of Main and First Streets, 1840. About twenty years later he sold to William Hergenrether who maintained a wet-grocery and his family residence in it. The Hergenrether family lived there for eighty years. James Huffman established a creamery there about 1943, which was later purchased by Thomas Timmer, who continued the creamery, finally selling to Sander's Dairy. The structure was destroyed around 1976 and the area paved for the Fraternal Order of Eagles' parking lot.

115 Main street. Erected in 1865 the sixth building west served as a grocery and saloon during its early years. In 1898 a saloon was here, in 1911 it was filled by a plumbing business. Eldon "Tracy" Leonard made paper novelties and sold them; ran a printing shop and for two years he published a weekly newspaper, "The Tippiite" (about 1912). Floyd Calicoat had a billiards and card room; Thomas Lane operated a business for fifteen years; Carter's ceramic business occupied the premises for a few years; then in 1976 the Pro-Strip Antique shop located there. At the present time Kitchen Distributing is in this building.

113 E. Main Street. The original building on the seventh location was moved in 1875 to South Fourth Street. In 1880 John Burwell designed and erected a building especially for his artist-photographer son, Ralph, whose studio was below the skylight located above the internal hallways. In 1898 a grocery was in the east room (known as Gibbon's Confectionary in 1908), and a millinery in the west room. In 1911 the grocery continued and a music store was in the west room; it was run by Preston Miller who also sold wallpaper. The young folks gathered around his player piano to sing songs or listen as he played the violin. M.B. Hines opened his grocery here in 1921; the Van Cleve Grocery was here at one time. For many years (1941 through 1956 at least) Ruby's Beauty Saloon occupied the west room, now taken over by the The Hair Designers and the address of this room is 111 E. Main Street. On the east, Miami Budget (a few years old) sold to City Loan and Savings Company about 1940. The address of the east room is 113 E. Main Street and is

now occupied by Underwood's Custom Electronics.

109 to 101 E. Main Street. Built in 1852 by Andrew Cotral as a hotel to serve canal patrons, the building had an addition to the west in 1850 extending to the northeast corner of Main and Second Streets. C.M. Kauffman later owned the hotel as did David Carles, who operated the Carles House as a hotel, tavern and billiard parlor. The property was purchased in 1877 by John Nunlist who continued the hotel business until 1925. (In 1889 through 1911 it was known as the City Hotel). The hotel lobby was to the east. In 1925 Charles Coble's optical and jewelry business was here, followed by Ralph Warner (Jeweler) in 1937. The Tee Time Golf Company, Inc. opened their shop in 1976. In 1911 a cigar store was just inside the hotel door. At one time a porch fronted the building and here the band performed on special occasions. The bar room and hotel dining room later housed Ford Yount's restaurant, "The Maple Restaurant" run first by Mary Neal, then Mr. and Mrs. George Schram; and barbershops, Bake Staup and Freddie Oakes. Various businesses have occupied two rooms which was filled by Angel Antique Emporium and Craft Stoves. In 1898 a barber shop was in the corner room of the hotel; in 1911 it was a billiards room; later Bill Deams automobile agency located here as did an A & P Grocery. In 1930 the building was purchased by Paul and Richard Stiles and Style's Shoe Store was located in that area. These rooms of the "Old Hotel" now houses from east to west, The Potters House; Hampton Hill Collectibles; Tipp Cyclery and Morning Sun Florist.

In the area behind the City Hotel on North Second Street stands a Carriage House that was moved from North Fourth Street to this location after the tragic fire of the Ahijah W. Miles home on the southwest corner of Fourth and Main Street in 1888. At the present time the building is unoccupied. 18 N. Second Street. P.H. Tracey had a livery stable in 1898 and the Tipp Steam Laundry was on the adjoining lot. In 1911 Trost Brothers Livery was there and a movie theatre (run by Gus Diehl, then Carl Belford). Chaffee's (Pat and Webb) Garage—advertised as "The Big Green Barn"—occupied the area from 1925 to 1933; Rice's Service Station replaced it until Ernest and Roy Macy started a like business in 1935. Eventually the building became known as Macy's Arcade. Roy Macy opened a key shop in 1940 and continued gas service until 1968. 20 N. Second Street. In 1969 Dick Cain acquired the building for his "Heating and Cooling" business with Macy's key shop remaining. 22 N. Second Street. For a while Burl Thuma ran an automobile agency to the north (from about 1947 to 1966); then in 1969 The Tipp Herald moved their printing business into the corner building at Second and Walnut Streets. At the present time this building is the home of H & R Block Co.

132 E. Main Street. In 1847 the brick building at the southwest corner of First and Main Streets was erected by D.M. Shellebarger for a warehouse. In 1854 through 1869 F. Hogendobler's Tippecanoe City Tin Shop, selling stoves and tin ware, was there. On the second floor A.B. Hartman lived for a while and in 1860 the Tippecanoe City Item (on one year's duration) was published by C.E. Crowell. A frame addition was made to the brick structure about 1880. Jacob and Lou Herr resided there, later selling to Emma Booher. In 1898 the front room was a

bakery; a tailor's shop was in the front room of the frame. In 1911 the bakery continued; it was Harve Herr's delicatessen/confectionery, then Ott and Met King's bake shop. "Blackie" and Nellie Smith's confectionery, known as the Blue Bird Tea Room, served as the "center-city" of the town in the 1920s and 1930s. (J.A. "Blackie" Smith, who was the Justice of the Peace, had the distinction of never having a ruling overturned). James Collins managed Ohio Cleaners (dry cleaners) located there. Mose Wray's Sandwich Shop opened in 1941. The Tipp City Laundromat operated in this building. The frame addition burned and was torn down. The original building was extended west and it became the "Memories Restaurant and Lounge." At the present time it is Wolfe Gang's at Memories Inn. The V.F.W. Post 4615 had headquarters on the second floor but it is now the Tipp Monroe Community Services Youth Center.

130 E. Main Street. The second structure to the west on the south side of Main Street, between First and Second Streets, was erected sometime between 1840 to 1850. In 1898 through 1911 a millinery shop occupied the premises. Frankie Jackson's millinery shop was very popular with the ladies of Tipp City. Hannah Mae Kessler lived in the building while The House of Lowell, a cosmetic firm known for its hand cream, located there in the 1940s. Fred's Bait and Tackle Shop was there in 1979. After that it became Rohr's Office Supply and now is Tower's Office Products.

106 E. Main Street. John Morrison and his twin brother Robert erected the first large business building on the southeast corner of Main and Second Streets in 1854. In 1869 The Tippecanoe Herald published their first edition on the second floor. Yount and Jay's General Store was located on the first floor. The editor, Joshua Horton, procured a container from the General Store and stood on the street corner selling yearly subscriptions for \$2.00 (Joshua Horton had met enthusiastic Tippecanoe City resident A.W. Miles, who had encouraged him to start a paper in the "boom town." Mr. Horton visited, was impressed, stayed and published his paper—the beginning of 111 years service.) Ten Eyck's Drug Store was there in 1906; later it was Grant and Cooper Drugs; then Fred Grant operated it alone; it was purchased by Joe Cramer in 1924.

In the late 1930s a restaurant was developed there to be owned by: the Prillers (who had purchased the building in 1920); Chuck Schlingman and Art Kirsch; Prillers again; and others including the Morans (there in 1963), the Donald Croces (in the early 1970s) and the Sanos. A dry goods store was in the east room in 1898 and 1911; then Opps grocery; Bill Dorsey's grocery (there in the early 1940s); a restaurant run by Charles Priller; finally it was incorporated into the other room when they were remodeled. Carl Frings had a meat market in the back of the building, with a Second Street entrance (about 1913 and 1920). It was purchased by Louis Priller who continued the business to the 1940s. J.H. Horton and Company had real estate offices on the second floor. The first Chamber of Commerce meetings took place here as The Businessmen's Club. The Armory was located on the third floor and the Tippecanoe Silver Band met there. At one time the building was owned by John Dugan of Sidney. Since 1975 Patrick Phelan has operated Paddy's Restaurant and Lounge there and has owned the building since 1980.

Adjoining the Morrison building on Second Street is attached a cement block

structure that was erected by Charles Priller in the mid 1940s to serve as a food locker—this covering the restaurant-affiliated beer garden site. Later a second-hand store, a used furniture store, then Kevin Cook's florist shop—The Village Green—occupied the building. It was a residence at one time but has been removed prior to 1990.

104 W. Main Street. At the southwest corner of Main and Fourth Streets stood the frame house that was erected by Captain Ahijah W. Miles in 1888. His daughter Mrs. George Brenizer inherited the house in 1933 and lived there for some time until the property was sold to Helen Dodds in 1944; it was sold to Philip Vanderhorst and then to Rex Spencer in November of 1975. The house and the carriage house in the rear had been restored by Mr. Spencer for Thornton's business offices and furniture display rooms and to be preserved as part of Tipp City's heritage. Born November 27, 1839, Ahijah W. Miles is remembered most for his military experiences and his civic influence. In 1861 he was the first one to enlist from this vicinity, becoming a member of the 11th Ohio Regiment of the Union Army; participating in the battles of Bull Run, South Mountain, Antietam, Chickamauga, Mission Ridge, Rocky Face Ridge and was with Sherman on his "March to the Sea." Honorably discharged in 1865, Captain Miles continued to head the Tippecanoe unit to help quell coal mine riots in eastern Ohio and courthouse riots in Cincinnati. In 1872 he was appointed postmaster and served for at least twelve years; he helped organize and became the first cashier of the Tipp National Bank holding the position for 37 years; for 40 years he was president of the Board of Education; for 33 years he was secretary of the Monroe Building and Loan Association; secretary of the Maple Hill Cemetery Association for many years; treasurer of the village and Monroe Township and also of the Baptist Church, his place of worship. Captain Miles had been a member of the Tipp City F. and A.M. Lodge for 66 consecutive years, was past president of D.M. Rouzer Post of the G.A.R. and its last member to answer the final roll call. He and his wife, Mary C. Wesler, had four surviving sons; Harry J., Herbert L., Earl and Joseph R. who operated under the name Miles Brothers and made a special shutter that produced no flutter for the first news reel presented to the public and established the first film exchange (in New York and San Francisco). Widower Captain Miles married Jennie Kittering in 1882 but she died two years later. In 1887 he married Ada Herman Dunhalter and they had a daughter Kathryn, who was married in her father's home in 1917. Following a fall and at the age of 94, Captain Miles died Dec. 3, 1933, and was buried in Maple Hill Cemetery. His compatriots honored him—in 1932 when the Women's Relief Corps planted the Captain A.W. Miles elm tree (presented by Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher Bohlender of Spring Hill Nursery) on the school campus—on Grand Army Day by the Women's Relief Corps as the only living Tipp Civil War veteran—and daily with their affectionate nickname for him, "Hijie." This Historic Home burned completely in 1988. The new building now on that lot is the home of "La Galerie Des Soeurs."

For about thirty years the residence at 300 West Main Street was the home for Sarah Feightly (1829-1906). Following her death, and according to the instructions in her will, it became a home to accommodate

ladies in their later years. Since the acceptance of Grandma Keziah Lindsay as the first resident in 1906, improvements made in the structure (1908, 1926 and 1936) had increased the capacity from six to fifteen persons. Administration of the home was through Lutheran Social Services of the Miami Valley. This structure has since been sold and is now apartments.

A few other early Tippecanoe businesses have become known though their location is not: 1855—Miss Mary Turner, Millinery; Wheeler and Shellabarger, iron wagon patterns, horse shoes, hardware; Morrison and Rouzer, loaned flax and seed for sowing; Fred Huber butcher (daily market in 1871); 1869—J.L. Norris and Brothers, grain merchants opposite railroad depot; D.R. Ebright, manufacture of saddles, harnesses (Main Street); 1870—Henry Max, fresh bread and cakes from Troy, oysters, fish (near depot); 1871—Mrs. Mary Wesler, millinery; Clark, Dye and Company (distillers of wines), Rue P. Hutchins agent; Oyler and Martin, plasterers; V. Pearson, gun and whitemith (one mile west); Tippecanoe City Tin Shop, J.F. Ebert; Brown and Cushwa became Cushwa and Snell; Messrs. Ford and Hamlet; Mrs. M.C. Driver, millinery and fancy goods (successor to Bradstreet and Darst near post office); 1873—J.A. Kerr, attorney; 1876—John H. Reichel, grocer; 1880—Ernest Koetitz, carpenter; Young G. McCool, shoemaker (for fifty-five years).

It was not long before many additions were made to the original plat. By 1851 the population had increased to the extent that the town was ready to be incorporated and maintain its own government. Receiving a charter from the state, an election was held on May 5, 1851, and the following officers elected: Mayor, Levi N. Booher, Councilmen, Henry Krise, Thomas Jay and Michael Shellenbarger; Treasurer, J.L. Wilcox; Recorder, E.T. Shields. On May 7th those gentlemen took the oath of office, administered by Dr. A.B. Hartman, Justice of the Peace, and the first meeting of the municipal government was conducted.

The boundaries named in the charter reached from quite a distance east of the canal; west of the village of Hyattsville; and from north of Plum Street to south of Elm Street.

The neighboring town of Hyattsville had been established by Henry J. Hyatt in 1833, at the intersection of the Dayton-Troy Road (established in 1808) and the Springfield-Greenville Road (established in 1813). It did not develop beyond its original twenty-seven lots, although it maintained a post office, two stores, tavern, blacksmith shop and a church. Most of the homes were of log structure. The east and west street (now Main) was called Canal Street and the north and south one (now Hyatt) was their Main Street. In 1874 the citizens asked to be incorporated into the village of Tippecanoe, so that they might have better schools and other advantages. The Commissioners of Miami County approved the annexation and also extensions of the village limits, including Hyattsville in the west.

In 1851 the first town improvement ordinance required property owners to provide sidewalks of brick or stone; these were replaced by cement walks in 1891.

The Calaboose. It was determined that there was need for a calaboose in 1860 and a frame building was erected on the west side of an alley between Main and Walnut Streets. Tippecanoe was a canal town and depended upon a very hardy human element to pro-

vide the service required for its operation and repair. These men were also bawdy and boisterous. Their recreation was mostly to be found in the taverns and bars in the town and inevitably they consumed too much liquor at times and became intoxicated. Whether they were arrested for that state or as a result of a brawl, they often found themselves incarcerated in the local jail. When they did not show up for work the next day, their friends simply brought the mules up from the canal, into the town and to the jail. Ropes were tied to windows or any available part of the structure that would allow it; and with the other end secure in the mules' harness, they urged the animals forward, taking with them a section of the jailhouse wall. The prisoners were freed and went with the others, back to the day's labor along the canal, leaving the damaged structure to be dealt with by a more responsible segment of society. Needless to say the calaboose was the best "kept-up" building in the town.

The streets of Tippecanoe were first lighted with gasoline lamps erected on Main Street in 1870. These were replaced with gas lights in 1890. After the completion of the local power plant, the lamp-lighter was discharged and electric lights illuminated the streets. (One newspaper described it as being bright enough to read a paper anywhere along the street!) Tippi City's light and power plant was established in 1897 at 325 East Main Street east of the canal. It furnished adequate power for the town and supplied other numerous advantages that would otherwise have been paid by taxes. After the conservancy system was organized in 1917, the power plant was moved to the new building at 230 North First Street. It was enlarged in 1952. By 1975 power needs for the community had multiplied and the generators could no longer supply even a part of it without considerable repair, so they were shut down. Dayton Power and Light Company now provides electricity for Tippi City.

In 1874 the City Hall was erected to function as a fire engine house, town hall, calaboose and to house city offices.

Twenty-six acres of land was acquired from Uriah Johns for a city park in 1884. The unusual wooden pavilion was designed and erected by Wilhelm Koetitz in 1887 and is unique in its architectural style as there are no center supports for the roof. Later picnic shelters were built; slides, swings and sand piles were provided for youngsters. Baseball diamonds were laid out on the east side, to be used by old and young baseball and softball groups. Soon after, the diamonds east of the canal were washed away by the 1913 flood. A football field was developed about 1947 and bleachers were built. A cooperative agreement between the city and school officials as to its maintenance and use. In 1955 a swimming pool and pool house were erected with enlargement following 1979 a swimming pool and pool house were erected with enlargement following 1979. Tennis courts were built in 1964. In 1978 additional land was purchased—the Moulton farm to the north. It contained buildings and two small shallow ponds and borders the river, containing much natural beauty. Plans are to keep it as a nature reserve with cooperative effort from the Miami River Corridor Committee. A smaller park with playground equipment was created by a stream in Hathaway Village in 1975.

The population of the town was modestly increased throughout its 150 years. The

Census Bureau, at Washington, DC., shows the following figures: 1860 949, 1870 1,204, 1880 1,401, 1890 1,465, 1900 1,703, 1910 2,038, 1920 2,426, 1930 2,559, 1940 2,879, 1950 3,304, 1960 4,267, 1970 5,090, and 1980 5,595.

The town expanded as follows: Westedge-1952; Roselyn-1956; Hathaway-1968; Tippecanoe Village-1972; the Indian Village-1973; Cotton Wood-1989; Spring Hill-1989; Tweed Woods-1990; Windmere-1990; and Woodlawn-1990.

In 1967 a Charter Commission was elected to write a charter for the village government. The fifteen members were these: Terry Lee—Chairman; Tom Kyle Sr.—Vice Chairman; Stephen White—Secretary; Alva Parsons—Assistant Secretary; Roy Baker, Michael Barnhart, Don Bridinger, Wayne Brownlee, Fred D. Evans, Dale Kinnison, John Kistler, Russell Lehman, Charles M. Poston, Richard Teller and Richard Wunderlich. The finished document, securing and exercising all powers and benefits of self-government, was presented. The Charter, adopting the Council-Manager form of government was approved by the electorate in 1968, with updated amendments making it more effective in 1977.

After receiving the 1970 census verifying that the village of Tippi City's population had exceeded 5,000, the village officially became a city in 1971.

A Planning Board has functioned since about 1954 to review and advise on matters of zoning, annexation and subdivision.

Organized in 1969 Tippi Monroe Community Services now fulfills a vital role, not only in coordinating social services for residents, but also in maintaining the reservation schedule for the city's facilities.

The Tippi City Community Schools were established in 1971—reorganized in 1976. The passage of a 5 mill township levy for administrative costs established the financial foundation for the organization.

The Old Tippecanoe City Restoration and Architectural District was established by City Council in 1974. The area, which originally included Main Street from the east edge of town to the C&O Railroad and one block north and south, was extended in 1979 west on Main Street to one property east of Hyatt Street. The purpose of the board being "to preserve and maintain that unique character of historical Tippi City which reflects the best elements of the age and era of the founding of the community and the American heritage created by its early residents."

The Council Members of 1990 are Eugene Mize, president; Carl Suerdieck, Mayor; Jesse Chamberlain, Thomas Dysinger, Richard Geels, Brenda Ketchum, and Jack Hounshell. The present City Manager is Greg Horn.

ANOTHER TAX BREAK FOR THE RICH

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, the majority leader yesterday in his response to the President focused on burden sharing.

I got back to my office today, and I found some of the burden sharing that the President has in store for us. The richest people in my State under the

President's proposal for a capital-gains cut will get a \$32,000 tax break, and the rest of the people of the State are going to get a tax increase.

The President wants to tax blue-collar six-packs of beer. He wants to tax their gasoline. And then what does he want to do for the rich, the richest people in the country who have had a decade of tax breaks, he wants to give them one more \$32,000 tax cut.

The Citizens for Tax Justice did an estimate in my State. The richest 6,800 people get a \$32,819 tax break. Even those with incomes of \$72,000 will only get a \$68 tax break on this deal, but will end up paying more taxes because beer and gasoline and everything else is going to go up.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the President: When are we going to decide the rich have had breaks enough in this game? When are we going to represent the rest of the people in the budget summit and the tax policies of this country?

We cannot afford to give \$32,000 of tax breaks to the richest 6,800 people in Connecticut and increase the taxes on everybody else.

BUSH CAPITAL GAINS LOOPHOLE: \$32,819 TAX BREAK FOR THE 6,846 RICHEST CONNECTICUTERS

CONNECTICUTERS WHO EARN UNDER \$72,000 GET ONLY \$68 FROM THE BUSH PLAN—AND WILL FACE HIGHER TAXES TO PAY FOR THE WEALTHY'S LOOPHOLE

Citizens for Tax Justice today released a study showing that President Bush's proposed capital gains tax cut would give the richest 6,846 Connecticut couples an average tax cut of \$32,819. In contrast, four-fifths of Connecticut's taxpaying families would get next to nothing from the Bush plan, but instead would face higher taxes to pay for the cost of this enormous new loophole for the very wealthy.

The average tax cut for the 6,846 richest Connecticut families—the top 1 percent in the state, with average 1990 incomes of \$1,127,000—would be 485 times the average tax relief afforded the 547,654 taxpaying families who make up the bottom 80 percent of Connecticut married taxpayers.

"The President and his allies promise that giving a handful of your rich neighbors another huge tax break will help everybody in Connecticut," said Robert S. McIntyre, director of Citizens for Tax Justice. "This is the same fairy tale that voters all across America heard all through the 1980's, and look what happened: taxes on middle-class families went up, middle-class incomes stagnated and the rich just got richer. And meanwhile, the federal deficit ballooned."

"This time, people shouldn't be fooled again," McIntyre said. "Right now, the President is actively seeking higher taxes in the budget summit negotiations in Washington, D.C. If an elite group of the very richest people in Connecticut and around the country get gigantic tax cuts, we all know that middle- and low-income families will end up paying the bill."

CTJ's study showed that, under the President's plan,

The four-fifths of Connecticut families whose incomes are below \$72,000 would receive an average capital gain tax benefit of only \$68. Since most Connecticut families

own no capital assets other than their homes, most actually would get no capital gains tax break at all.

TRIBUTE TO PHIL SOKOLOF, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL HEART SAVERS ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Madam Speaker, I am here today to celebrate the efforts of my constituent, Phil Sokolof, to prevent heart disease and to extend the life expectancy of Americans throughout the Nation.

Members will all remember that Phil not too long ago challenged American industry. He challenged McDonald's and the other fast-food chains to do what they could to reduce the bad fat content of fast food in America, and McDonald's responded, and other fast-food chains responded, much to their credit and much to Phil Sokolof's credit.

Today he is once again challenging Congress to do our part, and Phil is personally financing these full-page advertisements in papers here in Washington calling on the U.S. Senate to effectively move on a nutritional-labeling bill that we here in the House passed in July, a bill that will inform Americans, inform consumers of the fat content of all of these products that we consume, that we buy at the grocery store, so that we will be able in our private families and our private day-to-day activities avoid heart disease ourselves.

Madam Speaker, I am including this ad and asking that it be placed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Senate to respond to this ad, and I hope that we can get this bill, H.R. 3562, and the Senate bill, S. 1425, passed with alacrity by the full Congress and to the President's desk.

[Advertisement from the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1990]

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO SENATOR ORRIN HATCH OF UTAH

WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC? OBVIOUSLY NOTHING!

Senator Hatch: Please! Cease your attempts to alter and dilute the landmark Nutrition Labeling and Education Act H.R. 3562/S. 1425 passed by the 435 Member House of Representatives.

This vital food labeling bill is endorsed by leading U.S. health experts and organizations. It will require that food companies identify precise amounts of saturated fat, cholesterol, sodium, sugar, calories, and state other important information. The barrage of misleading nutrition and health claims on food labels is an abuse that will be stopped.

Consumers are entitled to proper identification of food ingredients. This legislation is a giant step forward and will help Ameri-

cans make the informed choices necessary to lead healthier lives.

The Senate stands ready to overwhelmingly pass this important and much needed legislation if you will only stop trying to change it.

Your endeavoring to rewrite the bill reflecting your personal interests will lead to its demise.

If the bill is not passed before Congress adjourns October 4, the Food and Drug Administration will soon enact weaker food labeling regulations. Court challenges will delay their implementation indefinitely.

The American public's opportunity to have a comprehensive food labeling bill may be gone forever.

Senator Hatch, if the Senate does not pass this bill, you will bear the responsibility. Allow this legislation to be enacted into law.

Sincerely,

PHIL SOKOLOF,

4601 South 76th Street, Omaha, NE.

INTRODUCTION OF INTELLIGENCE SEARCH PROCEDURES ACT

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

Mr. McHUGH. Madam Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 5588, the Intelligence Search Procedures Act, which for the first time would require a court order for physical searches conducted in the United States to obtain foreign intelligence information.

I believe it would surprise most Americans, including many Members of Congress, that such searches, including the surreptitious entry of the homes of American citizens, occur with some regularity—without a court order of any kind and without statutory authorization. Rather, these intrusive searches are approved on a case-by-case basis by the Attorney General pursuant to a Presidential authorization contained in Executive Order 12333, issued by President Reagan in 1981. The Executive order authorization is based on a claim by the executive branch that there is a national security exception to the fourth amendment. A U.S. court of appeals and a U.S. district court have held such searches to be within the President's constitutional powers, but there has been no Supreme Court decision on the issue.

Until 1978, a similar situation existed in the United States with respect to electronic surveillance conducted for foreign intelligence purposes. In 1978, a convergence of interests among the Congress, the executive branch, and civil liberties groups led to the enactment of FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. FISA authorized and regulated electronic surveillance conducted in the United States for foreign intelligence purposes, and required, in most cases, that a court order precede such a surveillance. Some in Congress at the time voted for FISA because they believed the fourth amendment required a court order for all wiretaps. Others voted for it because, whether or not a warrant was constitutionally required, they believed the court order process would provide the best assurance against a recurrence of the many abuses that had occurred. Still other Members voted for it be-

cause of a desire to provide legal protection to FBI officials involved in carrying out electronic surveillance in the foreign intelligence area.

These arguments apply with even greater force to physical searches. A warrantless search of one's home is, in my opinion, more of an intrusion than a wiretap of one's telephone. Such searches led directly to the adoption of the fourth amendment. Justice Powell noted in the Keith case that " * * * physical entry of the home is the chief evil against which the wording of the fourth amendment is directed. * * * " *United States v. United States District Court*, 407 U.S. 297, 311 (1972). And Circuit Judge Leventhal, in one of the Watergate cases, cast doubt on the national security rationale for warrantless searches:

Indeed the cases motivating adoption of the fourth amendment struck down governmental claims of unregulated power to search for evidence of treason and sedition. No American case since has sustained the right to search a home or office without a warrant merely in the name of national security. Although the precise issue at stake here has not previously been raised, those cases dealing with espionage prosecutions, where the national security implications were evident, refused to tolerate any deviation from standard fourth amendment requirements. In expanding the basic protections of the fourth amendment, the wiretap cases have not simultaneously eroded the fourth amendment's general protections already clearly in existence. *U.S. v. Ehrlichman*, 546 F.2d 910, 934, (D Cir. 1977). (footnotes omitted.)

When FISA was adopted, then Attorney General Griffin Bell said it:

sacrifices neither our security nor our civil liberties, and assures that the dedicated and patriotic men and women who serve this country in intelligence positions will have the affirmation of Congress that their activities are proper and necessary.

I believe the same thing can be said of this bill. I also believe that whether or not the President has the constitutional authority to approve warrantless physical searches, and I don't think he does, sound public policy is best served by a carefully drafted statute authorizing such physical searches for intelligence purposes and requiring a court order, under standards and procedures similar to FISA, before such searches may be carried out. That is what my bill seeks to achieve.

Except in cases where the search is of diplomatic premises, or other foreign government premises, or in circumstances where a warrant would not be required for law enforcement purposes, a court order would be required to conduct physical searches in the United States to collect foreign intelligence information. The application for such an order would be presented to one of the seven judges of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court which is made up of sitting district court judges designated for 7-year terms by the Chief Justice. The Government must show, among other things, that the purpose of the search is to acquire intelligence information and that the target of the search is an agent of foreign power or a foreign power as defined in FISA. Since the purpose of the search is intelligence collection, not prosecution, some of

the procedures and standards are different from those used to obtain a regular law enforcement search warrant. Thus, no notice is required to be given to the target, a criminal offense need not have occurred, and the proceedings are conducted in secrecy. However, if the agent of a foreign power whose property is to be searched is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien, there must be probable cause to believe that he is "engaged in clandestine intelligence gathering activities on behalf of a foreign power" and that such activities involve or "may involve" a criminal offense.

There are other, detailed provisions, all of which are based on 10 years of experience under FISA. When FISA was enacted the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence noted:

Although it may be desirable to develop legislative controls over physical search techniques, the committee has concluded that these practices are sufficiently different from electronic surveillance so as to require separate consideration by the Congress. The fact that the bill does not cover physical searches for intelligence purposes should not be viewed as congressional authorization for such activities. In any case, any requirement of the fourth amendment would, of course, continue to apply to this type of activity.

I believe it is time to address this important issue. For too long the intelligence committees, because of the complexity of the issue and lack of support from the executive branch, have avoided its consideration. At the same time, however, the committees have, for several years, received semiannual briefings on those physical searches conducted without a court order, and have stated no formal objection to the practice. If we do not approve of warrantless searches, we should enact appropriate legislation before our inaction is taken by the courts as a sign of support.

I, for one, do not approve. Continuing acquiescence in warrantless searches is unacceptable. Regardless of the honesty, legal skill, or good intentions of an Attorney General, he or she will always be part of the process with a stake in the outcome. As Justice Powell noted, the fourth amendment is predicated on a different principle:

The fourth amendment does not contemplate the executive officers of Government as neutral and disinterested magistrates. Their duty and responsibility are to enforce the laws, to investigate, and to prosecute. But those charged with this investigative and prosecutorial duty should not be the sole judges of when to utilize constitutionally sensitive means in pursuing their tasks. The historical judgment, which the fourth amendment accepts, is that unreviewed executive discretion may yield too readily to pressures to obtain incriminating evidence and overlook potential invasions of privacy and protected speech. *United States v. United States District Court*, 407 U.S. at 315 (citations and footnotes omitted).

I recognize, of course, that the bill I introduce today cannot be enacted in the few remaining days of the 101st Congress. I hope, however, that it will engender serious discussion, and that early in 1991, building on hearings conducted in May by the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Permanent Select Com-

mittee on Intelligence, which I chair, the new Congress, the administration, and civil liberties groups can agree on a measure that will once and for all end the practice of warrantless searches. Clearly, there are differences now among these groups, and within the Congress. However, I hope that they can be worked out.

The administration, apparently, would support a bill that would permit, not require, it to seek court orders for intelligence searches on the theory that such a practice would preserve its views on Presidential power. Interestingly, no security or operational objections have been raised.

Others, especially those in the civil liberties community, have problems with the notion that these searches, especially of the residences of American citizens, should proceed pursuant to standards and practices less rigorous than those applicable to law enforcement search warrants, even if there is a court order. I find merit in many of their arguments. However, I believe that the benefits of judicial scrutiny of the authorization of intelligence searches outweigh the need for the imposition of the full range of procedures now applicable in criminal proceedings.

In the next few months, it will be up to the Intelligence and Judiciary Committees, working closely with the administration and others, to fashion a bill that, building on the successful FISA model, will advance the cause of civil liberties while permitting the conduct of necessary intelligence activities. I think it can be done.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION FOR RESERVISTS' HOUSING ALLOWANCE

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will allow our Reservists to be paid housing allowances, something which they would be deprived of if we did not venture forth with this legislation.

As Members know, Madam Speaker, the President of the United States has called up some 25,000 Reservists in all branches of the service, yet he has called them up for only 90 days. Under the current legislation, those individuals cannot be accorded housing allowances, basic housing allowance, basic housing allowance for quarters or BAQ as it is called.

That is patently unfair. Our Reservists who leave our neighbors and their jobs, leave their families to go to serve in this exercise in Saudi Arabia, even if they are stateside, leave behind mortgages to pay, rents to pay, and all kinds of other obligations in the service of our country. It seems to me that we ought to, for at least the Saudi Arabian exercise, give the right to these Reservists to be able to be eligible for basic allowance for quarters, or housing allowances, even though they do not come in under the provision of

the regulation that says a Reservist cannot be eligible for these benefits unless he has served 140 days. I believe that the 90-day sacrifice that these Reservists are making should make them eligible for the housing allowances, and thus help their domestic situation, their home and family situation through the time they have to serve as Reservists.

Who knows, they may have their 90 days extended another 30 days or 60 days or 90 days beyond that. Therefore, we ought to put them in a stable condition so that they will know that their families will have this extra help that would come forth through the basic allowance for quarters, or housing allowances that now go to Reservists who are called up for a bigger period of time. This is a good first step in recognition of the fact that our Reservists are playing an important role in the Operation Desert Shield, and we ought to treat them just as valiantly as we are trying to treat the Armed Forces who are actually on the battlefield, which we hope never gets hot, hotter than the desert Sun itself.

Therefore, I am hoping for cosponsorship, and I invite the Members to join in to help our Reserves.

ON DEPOSIT INSURANCE REFORM

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

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Madam Speaker, today I join with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] in introducing comprehensive deposit insurance reform legislation. Known as the Deposit Insurance Modernization Act of 1990, this legislation is in response to the critical need to reduce the exposure of the Deposit Insurance Funds to further risk.

When Federal regulators took over NBW—the District of Columbia's oldest bank—on August 1, deposit coverage was not limited to \$100,000. Instead of shutting the institution down which would have wiped out depositor's funds in excess of that amount, the OCC kept the institution open giving big depositors and businesses adequate time to move their checking accounts elsewhere. The FDIC has taken the same rescue tactic in 174 of 206 cases during last year.

The three insurance funds BIF and SAIF managed by the FDIC and one by the National Credit Union Administration, protect \$2.9 trillion in insured deposits in about 30,000 banks, thrifts, and credit unions. This only includes accounts under \$100,000. If we continue to abide by the practice of protecting all deposits, that amount could extend to \$4 trillion.

As this chart shows, the three funds hold only \$15.1 billion in reserve, or

about one-half of 1 percent of total insured deposits. In 1988 and 1989 alone, FDIC reserves fell by \$4 billion as a result of the failure of more than 400 institutions. Clearly, the bank insurance funds is seriously threatened and it's possible one major bank failure could devastate the system.

That is why it is important to act soon. Today Congressman KLECZKA, and I introduced legislation reducing the potential liability of the Federal Government—and the taxpayer—for losses from the deposit insurance funds. Key to this proposal is a limitation on deposit insurance to \$100,000 per person beginning in 1992. In addition, a haircut—or reduction in coverage—is imposed on deposits between \$50,000 and \$100,000. Only by abandoning policies that protect uninsured accounts can we exert market discipline and limit risk-taking at financial institutions.

Other important elements of our legislation seek to restrict some of the practices which have made the insurance funds vulnerable. Pass-through deposit insurance protection (fund participants that have interests in BIC's—or bank insurance contracts threatens the stability of the funds—as do brokered deposits. Coverage for these activities is eliminated under our proposal.

Risk-based premiums are also called for in our proposal, as well as disclosure of an institution's CAMEL rating to any consumer who requests it. These two provisions will help to impose greater discipline on institutions likely to participate in risky activities. Finally, because foreign deposits are usually covered in bailouts, our bill seeks to include them in the assessment for premiums.

We were taught many lessons in our effort to resolve the thrift crisis last year. One of the most important was to be alert to the future and the potential for losses in the insurance system. FIRREA was one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be reported in recent history, but it was not enough. It was merely the first step in the long road to creating a safe, secure, and solvent financial system.

As a recent GAO report indicates, the bank insurance fund ended 1989 with a net loss of \$852 million, reducing its balance to \$13.2 billion; 35 additional banks are in severe jeopardy of failing resulting in an estimated cost to the fund of \$4 to 6 billion. GAO concludes that a severe recession could lead to another taxpayer bailout.

This proposal does not have all the answers. There are still several questions left unanswered. Primarily—can the “too big to fail” policy be effectively eliminated? We cannot begin to solve banking the problem instantaneously. Forthcoming hearings in the Banking Committee will help us to

better understand how to resolve this issue. I hope this proposal, in addition to others offered by different sources, can provide some a foundation for reform or our deposit insurance system.

As a member of the committee, I look forward to the upcoming debate and hope we can work as expeditiously as possible further erosion of the Deposit Insurance Funds.

□ 1900

Madam Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] who has worked so hard along with me to make this bill today possible.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank my friend, the chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, for yielding, and commend the gentleman for his work on this legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to limit liability in the Federal deposit insurance system, mainly by reducing the exposure of the Federal Government and its taxpayers to losses.

If the deposit insurance fund for banks collapses in the event of a recession, as the GAO suggested this week could happen, the billions we poured into the S&L crisis will seem like a small downpayment.

As my California colleague indicated, there are now \$2.9 trillion in federally insured accounts, with only a combined \$15.1 billion available in all of the various deposit insurance funds. Since the taxpayer picks up the difference in the event of a collapse, as we found with the S&L fund, we clearly ask the taxpayer to assume too much risk.

My colleague pointed out that our bill limits deposit insurance coverage to one \$100,000 account per person.

To many people who may be looking at this problem for the first time, this may sound like a restatement of current law. It most definitely is not. Contrary to popular understanding, the law now requires the Federal Government to provide deposit insurance up to \$100,000 per account, per individual, per institution, so if in fact you had \$1 million, you would divide that into 10 \$100,000 accounts and the taxpayers would pay for a billion dollar liability, instead of only \$100,000.

The actual effect of this limitation on individual savers around the country would be minimal.

As my chart shows, a recent survey by the Independent Bankers Association of America indicates that 76 percent of the population—three out of every four people—have accounts totaling \$50,000 or less. Roughly half the population has accounts of less than \$10,000.

There are indications that even fewer people may be affected. I would like to share with my colleagues some data on this matter provided today to the House Banking Committee by the Federal Reserve Board.

According to their 1983 Survey of Consumer Finances, only 1 to 1.5 percent of all U.S. households held account deposit balances in excess of \$100,000. That data is now being updated.

However, the chart and the figures by the Independent Bankers Association indicate that approximately 6 percent of savers have accounts of \$100,000.

This measure also requires Federal financial regulators to establish a risk-based deposit insurance system which sets insurance premiums based on the safety and soundness of the insured institution and the type of activities engaged in by that institution.

The current system assesses the same deposit insurance premium to well-run institutions as it does to those run by highfliers. The current system doesn't provide any incentive not to engage in risky activities. As the FSLIC catastrophe showed, often institutions which pay the highest yields are those which are candidates for collapse. Desperate for funds, they pay a higher than market rate for big-ticket, insured accounts.

A risk-based premium would measure the risk of assets, as well as liabilities, since the risk to the insurance funds clearly derive as much from the asset as they do to the liability. We must reform a system in which profits, in the form of very high yields, are privatized, while losses, which accrue to the taxpayer when an institution fails, are socialized.

Another key provision of this legislation provides for the assessment of foreign bank deposits, an action which I have strongly advocated as a member of the House Banking Committee.

In September 1989, foreign deposits of American banks, which are insured de facto under the "Too Large to Fail" doctrine now embraced by Federal regulators, totaled \$331 billion. Even though these deposits are effectively backed by our deposit insurance system, the banks which hold them—and most of them are very large—do not pay a nickel on these deposits to the FDIC insurance fund.

If these deposits were assessed at the current premium rate, FDIC receipts would increase by \$400 million a year. As the basic assessment rate rises, FDIC could expect an annual increase in income of half a billion or more every year.

To establish a new discipline in our system of deposit insurance, the financial condition of a bank must be made known to individual customers.

The Federal regulators have devised a system—popularly known as the

CAMEL system—which provides guidance in this area. The ratings which regulators currently use should be shared with those who pay the bills in the event of a failed institution—the taxpayer. In a major consumer protection provision, that is what this bill provides.

By adopting the reforms included in this bill, we can begin to limit the liability to taxpayers when it comes to deposit insurance, while protecting the interest of the overwhelming number of average depositors.

This legislation, in tandem with H.R. 1531, a bill I introduced earlier in this Congress to provide for a single, well-capitalized deposit insurance fund, would ensure the health of the deposit insurance system. In addition, it would provide greater protection to taxpayers from the type of losses we are experiencing in the savings and loan crisis.

Madam Speaker, today I am introducing, along with my good friend and Banking Committee colleague Representative RICK LEHMAN of California, legislation which will limit liability to the taxpayer in our deposit insurance system while guaranteeing the deposits of the average person.

This legislation will initiate debate on overdue changes in our taxpayer backed deposit insurance system which is now showing strains of collapsing under its own weight.

The bill would:

First, limit deposit insurance coverage to one \$100,000 account per person. Current Federal law provides deposit insurance coverage on multiple \$100,000 accounts for each individual.

Second, covered accounts would be 100 percent insured for the first \$50,000, and 90 percent of the next \$50,000, up to a maximum of \$100,000.

Third, Federal financial regulators would be required to establish a risk-based deposit insurance system, which sets insurance premiums based on the safety and soundness of the insured institution and the type of activities engaged in by that institution.

Fourth, Federal deposit insurance for bank investment contracts, or "BIC's" in amounts more than \$100,000 would be eliminated. Pension fund used of these financial instruments has resulted in deposit insurance coverage of accounts of \$1 million to \$100 million, on the premise that coverage "passes through" to each pension plan participant.

Fifth, federally insured institutions would be required to disclose to customers the rating used by Federal regulators in determining the soundness of an institution, or a similar rating compiled by a private company.

Sixth, to increase receipts to the deposit insurance funds, foreign as well as domestic deposits would be included for purposes of assessment for deposit insurance premiums.

Seventh, brokered deposits would not be allowed. Deposit brokers typically take multimillion dollar investments, break them up into chunks of \$100,000 or slightly less, and invest them in federally insured institutions paying the highest yield.

Let me describe in detail the various parts of this comprehensive proposal.

To limit losses to the taxpayer, the Federal Government should provide protection to savers only on one \$100,000 account.

While this may sound like a restatement of current law, it most definitely is not. Contrary to popular understanding, the law requires the Federal Government to provide deposit insurance up to \$100,000 per account, not per individual.

Frankly, we cannot afford to provide such extensive coverage. The Federal safety net was originally designed to protect the smaller savers.

The most eloquent rationale for this protection was included in the Committee Report on the New York Assembly bill which established the Nation's first deposit insurance system in 1928. It said:

The loss by insolvency of banks falls upon the farmer, the mechanic and the laborer, who are least acquainted with the condition of banks, and who, of all others, are most illy equipped either to guard against or sustain a loss by their failure.

Those ill-equipped to sustain a loss due to a bank failure should be our concern. Providing \$100,000 in deposit insurance coverage per person protects those interests. The interests of others, who are better equipped to provide their own protection, should not be a Federal priority, especially as the estimates of the long-term cost of the FSLIC crisis continue to rise.

While the FDIC is not now able to provide data on the number of persons who hold multiple accounts in excess of \$100,000, a recent survey by the Independent Bankers Association of America sheds light on the subject.

In a scientific nationwide survey, the IBAA asked 838 respondents this question: "In all your savings and checking accounts, including CDs, money market accounts and IRAs, approximately how much do you currently have in total?"

Of those who responded, 6 percent, or roughly 1 person out of 17, said they had accounts totaling more than \$100,000. Seventy-six percent had accounts totaling less than \$75,000.

For most persons with more than \$100,000 in deposits, private insurance—supplemental to the \$100,000 basic coverage—would be appropriate. While there are skeptics about the possibility of developing such insurance, I am convinced that congressional action to limit Federal coverage to \$100,000 per person would spur the development of a private deposit insurance industry.

It is worth noting that the respected private sector bank rating firm, Veribanc, has examined the actuarial basis for private sector coverage of non-federally insured funds at banks. The findings indicate that widespread "excess FDIC" coverage could be written quite economically, if based on financial indicators of an institution's risk. A break-even insurance premium for banks rated by Veribanc as "Green, Three Star Banks," or roughly four out of five banks, would be \$30 per year per \$100,000 deposits.

The development of a system of supplementary, private deposit insurance for

amounts over \$100,000 would have a singularly positive effect on our current system of deposit insurance.

As the FSLIC catastrophe showed, often institutions which pay the highest yields are those which are candidates for collapse. Desperate for funds, they pay a higher than market rate for big-ticket, insured accounts.

According to the April 27, 1990 American Banker, the highest retail, 6 month certificate of deposit yields offered on April 18, 1990 were as follows:

	Percent
Connecticut Bank and Trust, Hartford	9.00
Columbia S&L, Irvine, CA	8.87
Citytrust, Bridgeport, CT	8.84
Marine Savings Bank, Portland	8.78
Bank of New England, Boston	8.75

Of these five institutions, only Citytrust, of Bridgeport, CT, received other than the lowest rating by Veribanc, Inc.

What do we know about the low-rated institutions which pay such very high rates for funds, knowing full well that the taxpayer will pick up the tab on these CD's in the event of failure? And what do they have in common?

According to a computer analysis published in the May 30, 1990 USA Today, the three banks paying the highest yields were among the Nation's problem banks as of December 31, 1989.

Connecticut Bank and Trust, with \$4.4 billion in assets, had 49 percent of its loans tied up in real estate in a softening real estate market. The bank's problem real estate loans as a percentage of capital and loan loss reserves equaled 78.6 percent. Nationwide, the average percentage of problem real estate loans was 15.4 percent.

The Bank of New England, with \$14.3 billion in assets, has 32.4 percent of its loans in real estate. Its problem real estate loans as a percentage of capital and loan loss reserves equaled 103.5 percent.

The \$1.54 billion asset Maine Savings Bank, with an astounding 86.8 percent of its loans committed to real estate, has an even more astounding 438 percent in problem real estate loans when measured against capital and reserves.

Finally, the fourth institution paying a high yield on deposits, Columbia Savings and Loan, Irvine, CA, is also shaky. With \$9 billion in assets, it holds substantial amounts of junk bonds.

Under our current system, the Federal Government encourages deposits in these institutions, rather than more prudently run enterprises, through an open-ended system of deposit insurance. Limiting deposit insurance coverage to \$100,000 per person would be step toward curbing a system in which profits, in the form of very high yields, are privatized, while losses, which accrue to the taxpayer when an institution fails, are socialized. This measure also requires that Federal regulators institute a system of risk-based deposit insurance by the end of 1991. The current system assesses the same deposit insurance premium to well-run institutions as it does to those run by high-fliers. This provides a perverse incentive to engage in risky activities. A risk-based premium would measure the risk of assets, as well as liabilities, since the risk to

the insurance funds clearly derive as much from the asset as they do to the liability.

The numbers tell the story about why we must reduce taxpayer exposure in our deposit insurance system. At year end 1989, federally insured accounts in banks, savings and loans, and credit unions totaled \$2.9 trillion—a staggering amount of federal liability. To cover that exposure, the combined amount of funds available from the bank insurance fund, the savings association insurance fund and the National Credit Union Share Insurance fund was a paltry \$15.1 billion. That's \$2.9 trillion in exposure, with only \$15.1 billion in reserve.

To further limit losses to the taxpayer, we should take a step toward making our system of Federal deposit insurance look more like an actual system of insurance. Specifically, a 10-percent deductible for amounts insured above \$50,000, up to \$100,000, is part of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the president of a very well run Wisconsin savings and loan, who has long been an advocate of this "haircut" approach to the establishment of a financial discipline in Federal deposit insurance, reminded me of a quotation by financier Bernard Baruch. He noted that "the return of your money is more important than the return on your money." For larger depositors, this should be the operating principle, but under the current system, it is not.

Under our legislation, 76 percent of all depositors, according to the IBAA figures, would have accounts 100 percent insured. The individual who seeks insurance on a \$100,000 account would face a maximum deductible of \$5,000. The effect of this tiered approach for the largest insured depositor is an effective 5-percent deductible.

The bill would also rein in a runaway expansion of the system of Federal deposit insurance which has occurred as a result not of congressional policy, but through administrative action. I refer to the policy by the FDIC in recent years which extends Federal deposit insurance coverage in for large-scale deposits of pension plans of \$1 million to \$100 million.

Banks have argued that the deposit insurance coverage "passes through" to individual participants in the plan. These participants, of course, do not have immediate access to their money, nor have they chosen to open accounts at a particular federally insured institution. If that institution fails, however, the taxpayer must pick up the tab for millions upon millions—all from a single account. By extending blanket coverage to such accounts, the Federal Government relieves the pension fund from the necessity of conducting a diligent review of the safety and soundness of a particular institution. This legislation would end this unsafe and unsound practice.

To establish a new discipline in our system of deposit insurance, the financial condition of a bank must be made known to individual customers. The Federal regulators have devised a system which provides some guidance in this area. The ratings which regulators use should be shared with those who, ultimately, pay the bills in the event of a failure of an insured institution—the taxpayer.

Formally known as the Uniform Interagency Bank Rating System, the more common name for the ratings is CAMEL. Five factors make up the acronym: capital adequacy, asset qual-

ity, management, earnings and liquidity. Each factor is rated on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 being the most favorable. Combining the five factor ratings brings about a composite rating of 1 through 5, with 1 indicating an institution sound in nearly every aspect and 5 indicating an institution with a high probability of failure in the near term.

This legislation simply provides that, upon request of any consumer, any insured depository institution shall disclose the Federal safety and soundness rating. That disclosure shall include a description of the meaning of the CAMEL composite rating. In addition, the insured institution would be required to disclose the safety and soundness rating by any private organization which compiles such ratings, if approved by the appropriate Federal banking agency.

The effect of this very pro-consumer, marketplace oriented provision should be profoundly positive. I am certain those insured institutions which are rated highly by the regulators will make that known in their advertising, as well they should. Those which are not will have a powerful incentive to increase their soundness, and thereby their rating, an incentive which the deposit insurance system unaccountably lacks.

Finally, the legislation would ban brokered deposits.

High yield deposits in shaky financial institutions are not the sole cause of our deposit insurance crisis, but they certainly contribute to the overall cost. Consider the following examples of institutions which failed which made use of funds supplied by deposit brokers in search of high yields.

Alaska National Bank of the North, Fairbanks, AK, had \$200.2 million in deposits when it failed in October, 1987. Of this amount, \$66.8 million were in brokered deposits.

Resource Bank of Houston, which failed in December, 1988, had \$43.1 million in deposits. Thirteen million of these were in brokered deposits.

First Service Bank for Savings, Leominster, MA, had \$678.6 million in deposits when it failed in March 1989, of which \$315.2 million, or nearly half, were brokered deposits.

The law now requires the taxpayer to bail out these deposits just as it extends protections to the average depositor. A recent study found that of the 50 most expensive thrift resolutions in 1988, 36 had more than twice the industry average proportional holdings of brokered deposits.

As an article on the collapse of the savings and loans in the September, 1990 Washington Monthly notes:

Other evidence indicates that big investors accounted for an even greater share than that of the funds in collapsed S&L's. According to Tom Schlesinger of the Southern Finance Project, a group that is doing the hard work of sifting through the records of failed thrifts, "In many instances the biggest institutions that have been bailed out have deposits of \$80,000 or more accounting for 30, 40 or 50 percent of deposits. That money could have been brokered or it could have come in direct, but one thing's for sure: It didn't come from small savings. It came from investors hunting for high interest—interest that we're now

paying off through the bailout. According to Schlesinger, brokered deposits at these thrifts account for 25 to 40 percent of all funds.

Madam Speaker, by taking the steps included in this legislation, we can begin to limit the liability to the taxpayers when it comes to financial deposit insurance, while protecting the interest of the overwhelming number of average depositors.

This legislation, in tandem with a bill I introduced earlier in this Congress to provide for a single, well capitalized deposit insurance fund and a single, strong financial regulator (H.R. 1531) would ensure that those who pay the bills—the taxpayers—will be calling the shots and, in the short-term as well as the long, will be getting their money's worth.

I urge my colleagues to support the Deposit Insurance Modernization Act of 1990.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and look forward to the debate.

□ 1910

JAPAN REFUSES TO RECOGNIZE ITS RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McEWEN. Madam Speaker, moments ago, during the debate on whether or not we should precipitously withdraw troops from Japan and Korea, time was allotted to me, and due to obligations outside the Chamber I was unable to make the points that I would like to make at this time.

On behalf of those who are following this debate and, perhaps, reporting it, I would like to focus, first of all, on Japan.

Madam Speaker, currently it costs us about 50 cents out of every dollar that goes for defense to maintain our defense forces. That is the cost of housing, and retirement and wages. Half of it goes for military weaponry, as well as the fuel necessary to have the ships steam and to fly the aircraft. Currently the contribution by the Japanese to our troops being stationed there, whether it be the Marines, or whether it be the combined base in Masawi, or the Air Force base on Okinawa and the others, the current contribution by the Japanese is about 50 cents on every dollar that is spent.

In other words, Madam Speaker, the defense of the Northern Pacific is equally shared.

However, during the end of 1991, due to the result of the negotiations recently completed, it is expected that the Japanese will contribute about 60 cents out of every dollar that is spent by the American Armed Forces in Japan.

Now let us just walk through that again just for a moment. Sixty cents out of every dollar contributed by the

Japanese says that, not only are they contributing all of the necessary costs of housing and host nation maintenance of the facilities and the other burdens of maintaining a military force, but by moving beyond the 50-percent point, up into the 60-40 relationship, they are contributing funds that will be used for the actual salaries of America's defense forces.

Logical conclusion from that is this: That if we were to withdraw those personnel and remove them to the American shores, not only would we accept the burden and responsibility of maintaining the aircraft and the other facilities, which would increase costs, but also we would have an additional burden for their salaries.

In other words, America could not afford to maintain those personnel in the military force if they had to be stationed here.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is in Japanese interests, it is in world interests, it is in the interest of peace and in the interest of the United States that we maintain this relationship.

Now there is a great deal of hostility toward the Japanese because of their lack of cooperation in the Middle East, and I will talk about that next, but the follow-on amendment had to do with Korea.

As my colleagues remember, in Korea, in 1953, the 38th parallel, the demilitarized zone established north of that, is North Korea, which is Communist headed by Kim Il-song, who is well into his seventies, is the last of the Fidel-Stalin dictators that has a desire to use his military might to overrun his neighbor to the south, as he has attempted to do in the past and cost 35,000 American lives under the leadership of General MacArthur in order to keep the South free. Kim Il-song is of the ilk of Mr. Hussein. In fact, we know that there has been a great deal of communication between Mr. Hussein and Kim Il-song in the last 6 weeks. In fact, it was at some of the instigation of Mr. Hussein that troops were repositioned on the border over the last 3 weeks to simulate the potential for an attack into South Korea, and various defense measures had to be taken, which I need not go into except to say that to presume that the threat in these final waning death throes of communism under a dictator whose days on this Earth are numbered is unwise to presume that that threat has totally dissipated because it has not. I believe it will shortly, but in the moments presently before us it is important for us to stand with our friends in the south of Korea.

However, Madam Speaker, I do not believe that it is our responsibility to carry the burden alone, and, therefore, under Nunn-Warner 7,500 troops will be withdrawn over the next 24 months, and then we will go to phase

2, and we will make that decision then. It would be unwise for us now in the Congress at this moment, late in the evening, on a Wednesday night, during the course of budget negotiations, to renegotiate all of this so precipitously, and the Congress was wise, the House was wise, in refusing to do so by such overwhelming margins.

Final point: As I said, the Congress is distressed with Japan, and rightfully so. We are in a difficult time in which the United States is the only economic, military, and political power on the planet.

Has to lead: President Bush has done it in an unprecedented fashion. He has brought the Soviets, he has brought the Arab nations, he has brought the free nations of the world together to stand together against tyranny in Iraq.

We turn to our allies and ask for help. Korea responded within 24 hours. Said, "You need a lift? We'll give you 747's." Do you need assistance on the seas? We will give you access to our marine fleet." The Koreans said to the United States immediately, "You can have all that you request. Anything that you need is open to you," and so we were able to negotiate some flights, and I think it was a fair arrangement, and we are grateful to them.

The Japanese, however, chose not to participate. They immediately hide behind the 1-percent restriction that is established in the Constitution that was imposed upon them by General MacArthur, and they say, as my colleagues know, "We cannot engage in any military activity," but my colleagues and I know the fertile capacity of the Japanese to find opportunities to serve, if they choose, and they could have used their resources rapidly to send air-conditioners, to send military supplies, to send access to the massive marine lift fleet that the Japanese possess. They could have done something if they had chosen. For 32 days they have chosen to do nothing.

Finally, last week, while three of us were visiting with the various leadership in the Government, they agreed to a \$5 million package, a billion in cash, and then the various other credits, especially to Jordan and some others.

I believe they could and should do more, and, as I told the leadership last week, very simply the United States and the free world are watching. Japan will define its role in the world over these next 30 days.

We know that we have competitors in the Pacific. We know about Singapore, we know about Taiwan, we know about Hong Kong and Korea. We know about Japan. We know we have competitors.

We also like to have friends and allies. Britain is a friend and an ally. It

has no reason to send troops to the Middle East. It has North Sea oil. It is increasing return to Britain because of the increase in the price of oil. They are standing jointly with us because we are friends and allies, and we stand for a common cause. Korea stood with us because they stand for a common cause. The 26 Arab nations and other allies in the Middle East and the African region are with us because we have a common cause.

Japan is choosing for itself. Is it going to be viewed in the world as a vulture? Is it going to be viewed solely as a competitor? Is it going to sit back and let the rest of the world do what has to be done and then wait to swoop in for the pickings? Or will it be an economic and geopolitical leader in the future?

Madam Speaker, only Japan can conclude that, and I would say that even though there was great justification for opposing the amendment today, and I did, that I would say to our Japanese friends that they need to understand that all Americans, indeed all of us in the free world, are becoming increasingly frustrated at a great economic power that refuses to recognize its responsibilities for world leadership for peace and freedom. We have paid much for them, and they should contribute as well.

THE PATENT COMPETITIVENESS AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION ACT

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing an omnibus bill—entitled the "Patent Competitiveness and Technological Innovation Act of 1990"—the purpose of which is to benefit the American public by improving this country's patent law.

Congress, as the guardian of the rights of the people, has the constitutional responsibility to address the ethical, economic, social, environmental, and public health issues that are raised by technological changes in our society. My subcommittee—the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary—has jurisdiction over this Nation's intellectual property laws, including patent, copyright, and trademark law, a legislative means to promote, protect, and stimulate technological advances.

Earlier this year, we celebrated the 200th anniversary of our first patent law. As part of our tribute, we reviewed how our current patent laws are serving our country in the face of advanced and rapidly changing technologies. From the very beginning, patent law was designed not to serve the interests of inventors, but to serve the public interest. The U.S. Constitution confers broad authority on Congress to create, amend or expand this Nation's intellectual property laws: "The Congress shall have power * * * To promote the

Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." This constitutional provision does not grant any automatic right to inventors. Rather, it grants the responsibility and power to Congress to determine when and under what circumstances Congress should extend exclusive rights to inventors.

The framers envisioned that Congress would balance the public interest and the proprietary rights of creators. Congress struck that balance when it enacted the first patent and copyright laws in 1790 and in the interim when making changes in those laws. Our patent laws have been significantly updated three times, in 1793, 1836, and 1952, and have been sufficiently flexible to encompass new technologies of the 20th century.

If enacted, the Patent Competitiveness and Technological Innovation Act will significantly amend this Nation's patent law. The proposed legislation is composed of five titles, each containing distinct improvements to current law.

I would like to provide a brief description of each title. But first I would like to thank my colleagues who have cosponsored the measure: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. SANGMEISTER, who are members of my subcommittee; and Chairman ROE, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. SCHIFF of the House Committee on Science and Technology.

Here is a discussion of the five titles of the bill.

TITLE I—PATENTS IN SPACE.

Title I of the bill is the Patents in Space Act. Americans have made important gains and discoveries in space at great risk and cost to the American people, including the loss of American lives. Now we must act to assure that scientific advances in space are protected. Title I of this legislation is essential to protect American inventions in outer space.

I introduced slightly different versions of the Patents in Space Act in the 99th, 100th, and earlier in the 101st Congress. The Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice has held extensive hearings on the proposal. The bill passed the House in the 99th and 100th Congresses and passed the Senate for the first time in this 101st Congress under the leadership of Senator DECONCINI.

The Patents in Space Act is simple and noncontroversial. It has the support of the administration, through NASA and the Commerce and State Departments, and is supported by interested parties in the private sector.

This act states that inventive or other activities which occur in outer space on board U.S. space vehicles—including both shuttle and any space stations—shall be treated for patent purposes as though these activities occurred within the United States. Specifically, the bill amends the patent law by adding a new section 105 to title 35 of the United States Code, which provides that an invention made, used or sold on space vehicles under the jurisdiction or control of the United States shall be deemed to have been made or used within the United States.

This legislation provides a clear, definite and understandable set of rules for determining when and how U.S. patent law applies in

outer space. This clarification serves to enhance the commercialization of space and to encourage investors in the space shuttle and future space stations or platforms to commercially utilize space. This clarity has also become important in international agreements dealing with cooperative activities in outer space, such as the Intergovernmental Agreement for Space Station Freedom. The legislation is also necessary to implement certain intellectual property provisions in the Intergovernmental Agreement for Space Station Freedom.

TITLE II—TRANSGENIC ANIMAL PATENT IMPROVEMENTS

Title II of the bill is the Transgenic Animal Patent Improvement Act. It resolves the controversy that has raged in this country ever since the Patent and Trademark Office—an arm of the executive branch—decided in 1987 to grant a patent on a genetically engineered animal, the Harvard mouse.

Having its genesis in a measure passed by the House in the 100th Congress, on September 13, 1988, under suspension of the rules, it has been the subject of extensive hearings during the past two Congresses.

Title II has four basic purposes. First, it recognizes that genetically altered animals—transgenic animals—are patentable subject matter. Second, it clarifies that human beings are not patentable subject matter. Third, it authorizes the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to issue any regulations necessary to regulate the deposit of biological materials. Finally, and most importantly, title II limits the scope of patent protection for transgenic farm animals.

The concept of a patented life form, such as a genetically altered animal, poses unique legal questions about the scope of patent protection for downstream activities on the American farm. It becomes essential for the Congress to develop a fair, workable, and balanced exception for farmers in order to clarify the legality of ordinary, routine noncompetitive reproduction activities and to avoid unnecessary paperwork as well.

As a consequence, title II provides for a farmers' exception to potential patent liability. It shall not be an act of infringement for a person to reproduce a patented transgenic farm animal through conventional breeding in the farming operation, use the animal in the farming endeavor, sell the animal, or use or sell the reproductive material—including germ cells, sperm, eggs, or embryos—of such an animal in the farming operation.

In short, title II seeks to fairly address the conflicting interests of patent owners and end users, including the American farm community. It proceeds on the solid premise that Congress, and not the Patent and Trademark Office, should determine whether and under what conditions the law should allow genetically altered animals to be patented.

TITLE III—PATENT REMEDY CLARIFICATION

Title III of the proposed legislation is the Patent Remedy Clarification Act, abrogating State sovereign immunity in patent law. As State government agencies and universities become increasingly involved in commercial ventures, it is important that they follow the same rules as everyone else in the market place. To this end, Mr. MOORHEAD and I intro-

duced H.R. 3886 in January of this year, to assure that patent owners can recover damages from States that infringe their patents, notwithstanding the provisions of the 11th amendment.

Last year the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice processed and the House passed similar legislation in the copyright area and a similar version of the bill passed the Senate. That bill clarifies Congress' intent that States be subject to damage suits in Federal court for their violations of the Copyright Act. The Patent Remedy Clarification Act assures that the same principle applies in patent law. The Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice held hearings on the need for legislation abrogating State sovereign immunity in the patent area in February of this year.

U.S. patent law provides a variety of remedies for patent owners against whoever infringes a patent. In the past, the courts interpreted the patent remedy provisions to allow patent holders to recover damages against all infringers, including States. However, in 1985 the Supreme Court held in *Atascadero State Hospital versus Scanlon* that absent a clear expression of congressional intent to the contrary, the 11th amendment prohibits individuals from recovering damages against States in Federal court.

While *Atascadero* was not a patent case, earlier this year, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit relied on *Atascadero* in ruling, in *Chew versus California*, that Congress has not clearly abrogated State sovereign immunity in the patent law. Therefore, it held that States are immune from damage suits for patent infringement.

It is my belief that Congress never intended to exempt the States from damages for copyright or patent infringement. Now, however, Congress must amend the patent law and specifically declare that States are monetarily liable for patent infringement if patent holders are to recover damages.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, EXPERIMENTATION, AND COMPETITIVENESS

Title IV of the proposed legislation will create an incentive for the research and experimentation activities that fuel this country's inventive genius and our vibrant economy. It provides that the making or using of a patented invention solely for research or experimentation shall not be an act of patent infringement unless the patented invention has a primary purpose of research or experimentation. If the patented invention has a primary purpose of research or experimentation, such as a transgenic mouse used for cancer research or a laboratory implement, it shall not be an act of infringement to manufacture or use such invention to study, evaluate, or characterize such invention or to create a product outside the scope of the patent covering such invention.

Title IV is an attempt to codify current case law in the United States which excludes experimental use of research as an act of infringement. It is a central tenet of our patent law that there is a right to use scientific information to create new and better inventions in competition with the patented invention. Under an exception created by the Federal

courts, use of a patented invention for certain experimental or testing purposes is deemed to be free from patent infringement. However, once a decision is made to commercialize the fruits of the research or experimentation, the exemption applies no further.

Justice Story stated long ago that:

[T]he making of a patented machine to be an offense within the purview of [the patent law] must be the making with the intent to use for profit, and not for the mere purpose of philosophical experiment, or to ascertain the verity and exactness of the specification.

This proposition is still true today. As aptly observed by a respected patent lawyer, Harold C. Wegner:

A contrary result would be unthinkable. The farmers of the Constitution clearly could not have envisioned shutting the door to further research for the long period of the patent grant.

Confusion nonetheless exists. Unnecessary litigation is bred and research is chilled. More importantly, legitimate research is driven outside the United States because commercial—or any other kind of—testing of the invention outside the United States is exempt from the U.S. patent laws.

Furthermore, title IV places the United States on firm international footing in terms of the laws of foreign countries and multilateral agreements. Both Japan and Western European countries have codified experimental use doctrines. The Patent Harmonization Treaty excludes from infringement—on a nation-by-nation basis, if implemented by national law—the making or using of patented inventions for experimental purposes or for scientific research.

Business testing is clearly not an experimental use, and would not be authorized by title IV. Provisions in the Drug Price Competition Act (Public Law 98-417)—which authorize the making, using or selling of a patented drug or medical device solely for uses reasonably related to the development and submission of information under a Federal law which regulates the manufacture, use or sale of drugs—are unaffected by title IV.

TITLE V—CONTRACTOR INVENTION RIGHTS

Title V is an important step in assuring a consistent Government-wide policy regarding ownership of the title to patents arising from research performed under Government contract. Prior to 1980, the Federal Government generally held title to such patents and issued nonexclusive licenses to those expressing interest. This led to a huge Government portfolio of patents and a low level of licensing because companies desiring to advance the underlying technology to the point of use in commercial products were unable to prevent competitors from receiving licenses and capitalizing on the company's research by introducing competing products.

Through the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, Congress established a general policy of permitting Government contractors who are small businesses or nonprofit organizations to retain title to patents arising from research performed under Government contracts. President Reagan, through Executive Order 10096 in early 1983, extended this policy to all Government contractors to the extent permitted

by statute. The primary code sections that were not entirely consistent with the policy were the section 152 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2182) and section 9 of the Federal Non-nuclear Research and Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5901). This meant that the Department of Energy has maintained a patent policy at variance with the rest of the Federal Government when its contractors are neither small businesses or nonprofit organizations. Section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 continues to be viewed as consistent with the policy and NASA is expected to continue to use its organic act for Government patent policy.

In 1984, through Public Law 98-620, Congress amended the Bayh-Dole Act. One of the purposes of these amendments—jointly developed by the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Science and Technology—was to further the establishment of a uniform patent policy for patents arising from Federal research. The exemption for Government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories contained in the Bayh-Dole Act was repealed except for laboratories primarily serving the Department's defense and naval nuclear reactor programs. The act also required royalties from the contractor's licensing of these inventions to be used for specific governmental purposes.

The increased use of patents from Federal research is encouraging. Levels of licensing activity are up significantly both in universities and among the nonprofit operators of Government laboratories. However, the Department of Energy is left with a situation where laboratories doing similar work have different patent policies depending on whether the contractor running the laboratory is a university, a nonprofit organization, or a corporation. Defense-related research of the Department of Energy also falls under a patent policy which differs from the one used with contractors of the Department of Defense.

Title V of this bill advances the goal of a consistent patent policy for Government contractors by making three related statutory changes. First, the definition of "contractor" in the Bayh-Dole Act is expanded to include the "operator of a Government-owned, contractor-operated facility." Second, all Government contractors are brought within the provisions of the university-small business patent provisions of that act. And third, Department of Energy's defense programs exception is eliminated from the Bayh-Dole Act as amended. These changes will permit a consistent patent policy to be implemented by the Department of Energy. Nothing in these changes is intended to change the patent policy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This matter previously arose in the 101st Congress in the form of a nongermane Senate amendment to the Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1990. The amendment, which accomplished the same objective as title V, was deleted by the conference committee at my urging and based on a promise that my subcommittee would consider the matter.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, the Patent Competitiveness and Technological Innovation

Act is a very important piece of legislation. Its five titles—relating to patents in space, the patenting of transgenic animals, sovereign immunity and patents, research and experimentation, and Government contractor rights—considered collectively, are balanced, fair, and effective. The beneficiaries will be our space program, American farmers, universities, Government contractors, patentholders, inventors, but most importantly, the American public.

I invite comments on the proposed legislation. Interested parties may feel free to address questions or thoughts to the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice, 2137 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC 20515. Telephone (202) 225-3926.

I also urge my colleagues to examine the proposal and to support it.

THE BANK ACCOUNT SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS ACT: IT'S TIME TO PROTECT THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis facing the insurance fund protecting deposits at our Nation's banks.

For some time now, Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned with the deteriorating condition of the Bank Insurance Fund [BIF] operated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC].

For this reason, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance, which I chair, has devoted considerable resources to investigating this issue during the 101st Congress. In September 1989, I held hearings exploring the safety and soundness of the Bank Insurance Fund.

At that time, the subcommittee heard divergent testimony. Government regulators disagreed with outside analysts on exactly how strong was the BIF, with outside experts claiming that the regulator's figures were substantially exaggerated.

As a result of these hearings, and because of my increasing concerns about the strength of the Bank Insurance Fund, I ordered earlier this year that a study to be conducted on its health by three of the Nation's leading economists in this field: Dr. Robert Litan of the Brookings Institution, Dr. R. Dan Brumbaugh of Stanford University, and Dr. James Barth of Auburn University.

More recently, as part of my continuing investigation into the rationale behind Federal deposit insurance and the safety and soundness of the FDIC, I directed the subcommittee to prepare a report on the past, present and future of deposit insurance in the United States. Just late last month, the subcommittee released this in-depth study entitled "A Briefing Paper on Deposit Insurance: How It Originated and How It Works".

In spite of these efforts and increasingly ominous indications from the banking industry, this issue has widely escaped the public's attention up until now. But that is about to end, Mr. Speaker, and end quickly.

The ink was hardly dry on my subcommittee's briefing paper when the General Accounting Office released its report yesterday on the safety and soundness of the Bank Insurance Fund. I am sorry to report, Mr. Speaker, that the GAO report only confirmed many of my worst suspicions.

"Not since it was born in the Great Depression," the report concludes "has the Federal system of deposit insurance for commercial banks faced such a period of danger as it does today." The GAO's findings are chilling.

The GAO found that the fund is too thinly capitalized to deal with potential bank failures. In the event of a recession or the failure of only one major bank, the GAO predicts that the fund's capital would be quickly exhausted and would require a taxpayer bailout. Thus far in 1990, there have been 129 bank failures—15 of which banks were among the 200 largest in the Nation—which will result in a net loss to the BIF of \$2 billion. Ten percent of the Nation's 200 largest banks are likely to fail or will require assistance within the next 12 months, with a total cost of between \$4 and \$6 billion. FDIC has an \$8 billion contingent liability for troubled loans now held by the purchasers of already-failed banks.

Prior to the release of this report, I would have ventured a guess that very few people in this country were aware of the fact the FDIC's Bank Insurance Fund would need to increase by nearly 80 percent in order to reach its historical operating level of \$1.25 per \$100 insured.

Additionally, it was not widely known that FDIC/BIF suffered an incredible \$851 million loss in 1989, which is only exceeded by its \$4.3 billion loss in 1988. Since 1986, the reserve-to-insured deposits ratio of FDIC/BIF has declined by almost 40 percent, from a level of 1.12 percent to 0.70 percent in 1989.

To make matters even worse, even the FDIC predicts that this downward trend will continue this year and, as I stated earlier, independent analysts believe that FDIC is exaggerating what little money it has.

But now, Mr. Speaker, with the release of this GAO report, the days of blissful ignorance are over. Congress must face up to the facts, and respond to them quickly in order to maintain the public's confidence in our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis facing the Bank Insurance Fund protecting deposits at our Nation's banks is rapidly reaching the point of no return.

There are any number of striking similarities between the current financial condition of FDIC and our past experience with FSLIC. In the words of baseball's Yogi Berra, I believe this may very well be "deja vu all over again!"

The question is, Will Congress act quickly to resolve this crisis and nip it in the bud?

One lesson of this recent history is that Congress needs to act boldly and decisively to respond to such crises. Time is of the essence, and that is why I am introducing today, legislation to respond to the facts that have been laid before us.

Another lesson that we overlook only at our peril, is provided to us from the Nation's credit union community. It varies in one very significant respect: It is a good lesson, a story with a happy ending.

At the same time the BIF has been experiencing monumental trouble, the fund protecting the Nation's credit unions has experienced stability. How can this fund, named the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund [NCUSIF]—can operate in the same economy, perform the same function as FSLIC and FDIC, and meet such a divergent fate?

The answer is simple: The credit union's fund is structured in a dramatically different way. Not only is this structure different, but I am in complete agreement with both the General Accounting Office and the distinguished business journal, the Economist, that NCUSIF may well serve as a model deposit insurance fund.

Thus, today I am introducing the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act, which would follow the NCUSIF model and required every insured bank to place 1 percent of its total deposits into the BIF.

First, and I believe foremost, this system will protect the American taxpayer from another deposit insurance crisis.

Unlike FSLIC and FDIC, whose sole safety net is the U.S. Treasury, the banks would be required to expend all of their own money, if necessary, before turning to the Government for help. This is because the insured institution is required to give to the fund an amount equal to 1 percent of its insured deposits, and replenish these funds if they are expended by the Government. Thus, an industry would be the first and—in all likelihood—only line of defense to catastrophic insurance fund losses, not the U.S. Treasury.

Second, this legislation would result in an immediate inflow of \$25 billion into BIF—funds which the GAO indicates are desperately needed. In addition, this revenue would reduce the Federal budget deficit by an equal amount.

Third, this system creates a market discipline favoring strong regulation for safe and sound banking practices.

Because industry's money—not the taxpayers—is on the line, insured institutions share the interest of Government in minimizing industry losses. This results in industry self-policing, conservative lending and investment practices, and industrywide cooperation with regulators.

Fourth, this will more than double the size of the BIF in one fell swoop, increasing its reserve ratio from 0.7 percent to 1.7 percent. This increase would put BIF above its historical level of safety and soundness, and provide the badly needed cushion that GAO suggests is needed against losses caused by a recession. It will restore American's confidence in the American deposit insurance system.

Fifth, this system provides for an insurance fund which grows at the same rate as the institutions it insures. An institution must maintain the funds held by the insurer at a level equal to 1 percent of insured deposits at all times, and is required to make an annual adjustment to reflect deposit growth.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to lift the burden of potential bank failures from the shoulders of the American taxpayer, and place it where it belongs—on banks and their shareholders who stand to reap the rewards of ownership.

This is an issue that we cannot delay until next year. I have scheduled hearing on this

legislation for September 27 in the Financial Institutions Subcommittee which I chair. Immediately following the hearings, I plan to have the subcommittee markup the legislation. With the BIF under stress, and the economy facing a recession that the GAO estimates could bankrupt the fund and require a taxpayer bailout, Congress cannot simply hope the crisis goes away.

I urge my colleagues to return safety and soundness to the American deposit insurance system by cosponsoring the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act of 1990.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AuCOIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), from Tuesday, September 11 through the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mrs. PATTERSON (at her own request) for tomorrow, on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on September 14, 17, 18, and 19.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on September 24, 25, 26, and 30.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on October 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8.

Mr. McEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEHMAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McCURDY, for 60 minutes each day, on September 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. WASHINGTON, for 60 minutes, on September 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) and to include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.

Mr. BILIRAKIS in two instances.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. SCHAEFER.
Mr. McDADE.
Mr. DOUGLAS.
Mr. SCHUETTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. TORRES in two instances.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. PELOSI.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. COOPER.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McEWEN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 13, 1990 at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3872. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of September 1, 1990, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 101-236); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed September 12, 1990.

3873. A letter from the Director, Office of Dependents Schools, transmitting the annual test report for school year 1988-89 for the overseas dependents' schools administered by the Department, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 924; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3874. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Education Statistics, Department of Education, transmitting the second annual report on dropout and retention rates in the United States, pursuant to the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary-Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3875. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to the Netherlands for defense articles and services (Transmittal No.

90-65), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3876. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Development of Prospective Payment Methodology for Ambulatory Surgical Services", pursuant to Public Law 99-509, section 9343(f) (100 Stat. 2041); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3877. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of the results of an audit of the Bank Insurance Fund's financial statements for the years ended December 31, 1989 and 1988 (GAO/AFMD-90-100); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4330, a bill to establish school-based and higher education community service programs, to establish youth service programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 101-694). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McHUGH:

H.R. 5588. A bill to authorize physical searches in the United States to obtain foreign intelligence information; jointly, to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 5589. A bill to amend title XIV of the Social Security Act to provide mechanisms to control Medicaid drug prices, to assure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive quality medical care, and to protect the physician's right to prescribe; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 5590. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for recapitalization of the Bank Insurance Fund by requiring additional deposits in such fund by insured banks; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 5591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that, where there is distress termination of a pension plan, the tax on the failure to meet funding standards shall be waived in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 5592. A bill to establish a Commission on Energy Independence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5593. A bill to maintain the viability of the domestic oil industry by enhancing capital investment and ensuring future oil

and gas exploration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 5594. A bill to make Reserve members called or ordered to active duty in connection with Operation Desert Shield eligible for a variable housing allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 5595. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 1 Bowling Green in New York, NY, as the "Alexander Hamilton United States Custom House"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself,

Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. AU COIN, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 5596. A bill to help end unnecessary child illness, suffering, and death; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Education and Labor.

By Mr. INHOFE:

H.R. 5597. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to reform U.S. bilateral economic assistance programs, to promote the purchase of U.S. goods and services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself,

Mr. ROE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide certain improvements to the patent law; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN of California):

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to reduce the potential liability of the United States for losses from the deposit insurance funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 5600. A bill to authorize the use of the symbols and emblems of the 1993 Summer World University Games; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5601. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize State agencies to distribute surplus Federal property to small businesses, to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide lists and guidelines to assist the agencies in identifying small businesses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Small Business.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 5602. A bill to impose additional duties on the products of industrialized countries that do not adequately support the military mobilization and other international efforts being undertaken in response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 5603. A bill to provide for a revised biological opinion on the impact of the proposed Mt. Graham astrophysical observatory on the endangered Mt. Graham red squirrel; jointly, to the Committees on Mer-

chant Marine and Fisheries and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Georgia:

H.R. 5604. A bill to provide for the payment of special pay to members of the Armed Forces assigned to duty in the Persian Gulf area in connection with Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of insurance available under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 650. Joint resolution designating October 1 through 7, 1990, as "National Nursing Home Residents' Rights Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the desirability of promoting the safe and increased use of bicycling as a means of transportation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

493. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to patient access to needed prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NIELSON of Utah:

H.R. 5606. A bill to authorize and request the President to advance Maj. Ronald Tiffany on the retired list of the U.S. Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIELSON of Utah:

H.R. 5607. A bill for the relief of Debra Lange; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5608. A bill to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 200: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 201: Mr. APPLEGATE and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 214: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 560: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 586: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 747: Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HILER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia.

H.R. 1165: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1400: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RITTER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 1676: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2041: Mr. PARKER, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 2121: Mr. COBLE, Ms. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 2460: Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 2531: Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2643: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2902: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3121: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3243: Mr. ROE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 3251: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3355: Mrs. BOXER and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 3421: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 3732: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCOLLUM, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 3819: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 3906: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 3914: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3925: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 3979: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4181: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4287: Mr. CRANE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KYL, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4344: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 4369: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 4484: Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 4485: Mr. DYSON and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 4486: Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 4492: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 4761: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 4840: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 4948: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 4994: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.R. 5007: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 5088: Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 5129: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JACOBS, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 5225: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 5284: Mr. HYDE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 5302: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. STARK, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 5314: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 5315: Mr. ROE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 5338: Mr. JONTZ and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 5361: Mr. FRANK and Mr. BATES.

H.R. 5364: Mr. KYL and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 5368: Mr. FAUNTROY and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 5413: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5468: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. YATES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 5480: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5492: Mr. BATES and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 5586: Mr. ANNUNZIO and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5587: Mr. PETRI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.J. Res. 285: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. LONG, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 481: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. DeWINE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.J. Res. 521: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 538: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 568: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. LaFALCE.

H.J. Res. 570: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FISH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SKAGGS,

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LENT, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ROE, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. YATES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COX, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.J. Res. 602: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. PARKER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 646: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. BAL-LENGER.

H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SPRATT.

H. Con. Res. 269: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 390: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H. Res. 407: Mr. WOLPE and Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

H. Res. 438: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. STENHOLM.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

229. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners, County of Durham, NC, relative to reducing the Federal deficit; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5269

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

—On page 206, line 9 insert a new section 2134 as follows, renumber succeeding sections accordingly and adjust the table of contents:

SEC. 2134. CIVIL ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS

Section 951 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CIVIL ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.—A person may bring a civil action to assess a civil penalty for a violation referred to in subsection (c) in the same manner and subject to the same procedures as a person may bring an action under section 3730 of title 31, United States Code, for a violation of section 3729 of such title.”.