

Goodling	Longley	Sanford
Gordon	Lucas	Sawyer
Goss	Luther	Saxton
Graham	Manzullo	Scarborough
Greenwood	Markey	Schaefer
Gunderson	Martini	Schiff
Gutknecht	McCarthy	Schumer
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Scott
Hancock	McCrery	Seastrand
Hansen	McDade	Sensenbrenner
Harman	McHale	Shadegg
Hastert	McHugh	Shaw
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Shays
Hayes	McIntosh	Shuster
Hayworth	McKeon	Sisisky
Hefley	Menendez	Skeen
Heineman	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Henger	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Hilleary	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hoekstra	Minge	Solomon
Hoke	Molinari	Souder
Horn	Montgomery	Spence
Hostettler	Moorhead	Stearns
Houghton	Morella	Stenholm
Hunter	Murtha	Stockman
Hutchinson	Myers	Stump
Hyde	Myrick	Talent
Inglis	Nethercutt	Tanner
Istook	Neumann	Tate
Jacobs	Ney	Tauzin
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Johnston	Ortiz	Tejeda
Jones	Oxley	Thomas
Kasich	Packard	Thornberry
Kelly	Parker	Thornton
Kildee	Paxon	Tiahrt
Kim	Petri	Torkildsen
King	Pickett	Torricelli
Kingston	Pombo	Traficant
Klecza	Porter	Upton
Klug	Portman	Vucanovich
Knollenberg	Poshard	Waldholtz
Kolbe	Pryce	Walker
LaFalce	Quillen	Walsh
LaHood	Quinn	Wamp
Largent	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Latham	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Laughlin	Regula	Weller
Lazio	Riggs	White
Leach	Roberts	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Wilson
Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Lincoln	Rose	Woolsey
Linder	Roth	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Roukema	Young (FL)
Livingston	Royce	Zeliff
LoBiondo	Salmon	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Lantos	Rangel
Camp	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Kaptur	Meek	Williams

□ 1425

The motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 10, COMMON-SENSE LEGAL REFORM ACT, TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that title I, section 103 of H.R. 10, the Commonsense Legal Reform Act, be referred to the Committee on Commerce as an additional committee on jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 83 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House on the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

□ 1427

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are beginning general debate of a very important segment of the Contract With America, H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

H.R. 7 confronts issues of real concern to the American people.

Take for example the issue of foreign command of U.S. Armed Forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The Clinton administration broke new ground in this area. Indeed, few aspects of their foreign policy have been pursued with as much vigor as their efforts to promote U.N. peacekeeping operations in which U.S. forces have been placed under foreign command.

They did it in Somalia, they did it in the former Yugoslavia, and they were prepared to do it in Haiti.

H.R. 7 restores a proper balance with regard to foreign command of U.S. forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

H.R. 7 doesn't forbid foreign command in all cases; only in those cases where the President is unable to certify that the foreign command arrangement is necessary to protect U.S. national security interests and that the U.S. forces will not be required to comply with illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

The American people would be shocked to learn that the administration and its allies in Congress think the President should have a free hand to put U.S. forces under foreign command, even when it's not in our national interest and even when our forces could be compelled to obey illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

But that is the administration position, and today they will have time to defend it.

The exploding cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations is another matter

of concern to the American people that we address in H.R. 7. Last year, our total peacekeeping payment to the U.N. was almost \$1.1 billion. In addition, the Department of Defense incurred incremental costs of more than \$1.7 billion for U.S. support to or participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

That's a total of \$2.8 billion for peacekeeping.

H.R. 7 tries to get a handle on these spiraling costs. It insists that at least some of our unreimbursed Defense Department expenditures in support of peacekeeping be deducted from our U.N. assessment.

Critics of H.R. 7 say this is unreasonable. They accuse us of wanting to destroy U.N. peacekeeping.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Peacekeeping is an important tool that can serve our national interests. But because the U.S. taxpayer foots the largest share of the bill, we must ensure that it is only undertaken when it serves our interests and that it is carried out in a cost-effective way.

A final issue address by H.R. 7 is the expansion of NATO.

My efforts and those of my colleagues to facilitate the expansion of NATO—both in H.R. 7 and in the NATO Participation Act passed on the last day of the last Congress—are the final answer to those who claim that the Republican Party stands for a return to isolationism.

To the contrary, we favor continued American engagement in the world, and flexible policies in response to the changes brought about by the end of the cold war.

For these and other reasons, H.R. 7 is a good bill that deserves to be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are beginning today to debate a very important element of the Contract With America, H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

In all probability our consideration of H.R. 7 will occasion a lively debate.

For too long the Congress has avoided debating some of the toughest foreign policy issues confronting our country. Last year, for example, those of us who wanted to debate President Clinton's plan to invade Haiti were muzzled until it was too late.

We're not going to avoid the tough issues any longer.

That's what H.R. 7 is all about. We're going to confront issues of real concern to the American people.

And it's our intention to turn around administration policy where it has been misguided, inept, or simply out of step with the wishes of the American people.

Take for example the issue of foreign command of U.S. Armed Forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Before President Clinton took office, no President had ever put significant numbers of U.S. forces in a U.N. peacekeeping operation commanded by a foreign national.

The Clinton administration broke new ground in this area. Indeed, few aspects of their foreign policy have been

pursued with as much vigor as their efforts to promote U.N. peacekeeping operations in which U.S. forces have been placed under foreign command.

They did so in Somalia, they did it in the former Yugoslavia, and they were ready to do it in Haiti, until last November's election focused the attention of the U.N. bureaucracy and forced them to agree to put a U.S. commander in charge of the Haiti Operation.

H.R. 7 restores a proper balance with regard to foreign command of U.S. forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations. Notwithstanding the rhetoric of administration spokesmen, H.R. 7's approach could hardly be more moderate.

It doesn't forbid foreign command in all cases; only in those cases where the President is unable to certify that the foreign command arrangement is necessary to protect U.S. national security interests and that the U.S. forces will not be required to comply with illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

The American people would be shocked to learn that the Clinton administration and its allies in Congress think the President should have a free hand to put U.S. forces under foreign command, even when it's not in our national interest and even when our forces could be compelled to obey illegal or militarily imprudent orders.

But that is their position, and today they will have the opportunity to defend it.

The exploding cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations is another matter of concern to the American people that we address in H.R. 7. Last year, our total peacekeeping payment to the U.N. was almost \$1.1 billion. In addition, the Department of Defense incurred incremental costs of more than \$1.7 billion for U.S. support to or participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

That is an overall total of \$2.8 billion for peacekeeping.

And we all know that much of these funds are simply wasted. The billions of dollars we and the U.N. spent in Somalia accomplished precious little. And this month DoD expects to spend another \$15 million so that U.S. forces can cover the withdrawal of the last U.N. peacekeepers from the failed mission in Somalia.

H.R. 7 tries to enable the Congress to get a handle on these spiraling costs. It insists that at least some of our unreimbursed Defense Department expenditures in support of peacekeeping be deducted from our U.N. assessment.

Critics of H.R. 7 contend that this is unreasonable. They say, for instance, that we have no right to expect the U.N. to reimburse us for the \$15 million we're spending this month to evacuate the U.N. peacekeepers from Somalia. They accuse us of wanting to destroy U.N. peacekeeping.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Peacekeeping is an important tool that can and does serve our national interests. But because the U.S. taxpayer foots the largest share of the

bill, we must ensure that it is only undertaken when it serves our interests and that it is carried out in a cost-effective way.

The critics of H.R. 7 favor the status quo, where the U.S. taxpayer gets double billed for U.N. peacekeeping. We demand a better deal from the U.N.

We look forward to debating this issue here on the floor.

A final issue addressed by H.R. 7 is the expansion of NATO.

My efforts and those of my colleagues to facilitate the expansion of NATO—both in H.R. 7 and in the NATO Participation Act passed on the last day of the Congress—are the final answer to those who claim that the Republican Party stands for a return to isolationism.

To the contrary, we favor continued American engagement in the world, and flexible policies in response to the changes brought about by the end of the cold war. We seek to adopt NATO to the new security requirements in central and eastern Europe, and we are pleased that our efforts have received considerable support from the other side of the aisle.

Even the administration seems to be slowly coming around to our point of view.

We welcome that change, and we look forward to further debate on that issue here on the floor.

For these and other reasons, H.R. 7 is a good bill that deserves to be approved by our colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, of course, in opposition to H.R. 7. I think the key point is that H.R. 7 really strikes right at the heart of the President's authority to protect our national security and to conduct American foreign policy. It does that in several different ways, first of all with respect to peacekeeping.

This bill would end peacekeeping overnight. That may not be the intent, but it is the result of the language. That is the judgment of the Congressional Budget Office, it is the judgment of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and it is the judgment of the Deputy Secretary of State in the Reagan administration, Mr. Whitehead. It unilaterally abrogates our obligation to the United Nations to pay our share of peacekeeping expenses.

Mr. Chairman, these peacekeeping operations that are in effect across the country are important across the world, not just to other nations, but to the United States. If we come along and unilaterally deduct these expenses, it just cancels our assessment. If we cancel our assessment, other nations are going to cancel their assessments, and peacekeeping is going to be destroyed.

What does that mean? That means in Cyprus, in Jerusalem, in Angola and Kuwait and Rwanda peacekeeping comes to an end. It means the end of sanctions enforcement against Iraq, and it means the end of humanitarian relief in Bosnia.

If we pass H.R. 7, Mr. Chairman, we give the President of the United States a choice: Act alone or do nothing. Often we are going to choose to act alone, and we should, but every single President has wanted the option to act in this collective security system, and we ought not to cut that option off. It is a valuable tool in American foreign policy. All of us agree that the United Nations is not a perfect institution, that it needs all kinds of reform. However, our goal should be to strengthen the United Nations, not to weaken it.

My second concern, Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 7 is that it will lead to a major expansion of United States security and assistance commitments in Europe. Here again, Mr. Chairman, we all agree that NATO should expand. The question, however, is whether this Congress should try to dictate the details of that expansion. That is the question. We ought not to try to write that in the statute.

Mr. Chairman, we see going on in Central Europe today a very complex historical process to develop a security regime for Central Europe. It is complex, it is diplomatic. This bill would jeopardize U.S. national security by unilaterally, arbitrarily, prematurely designating certain countries for NATO membership.

This bill begins a vast new foreign aid program, but it does not provide any funding for it. It is an open-ended program of military and economic aid to four countries. It puts them at the top of the list. It makes winners and losers. We risk, then, discouraging the reformers in countries not named, and we risk fostering complacency in the countries that are named. We are trying to pick through legislation the winners and losers for NATO membership, and that will divide Europe into opposing camps.

Mr. Chairman, the bill creates a dangerous gulf between our commitments and our resources. One of the things we ought never to do in foreign policy is to make commitments when we do not have the resources to pick them up.

That is precisely what we do in H.R. 7. We expand our security commitments, or seek to. We provide no resources for it. We do it at a time when

we are cutting troop levels from 300,000 down to 100,000 in Europe. We are doing it at a time when every single country in Europe is reducing their NATO and their defense establishments.

How can we meet these new security commitments? Mr. Chairman, I urge Members here to think carefully before voting to set us on a course leading to a vast expansion of U.S. security commitments.

Mr. Chairman, the House today takes up H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. This is the most far reaching foreign policy legislation to come before the House in several years.

But titles are deceptive. This bill does not revitalize our national security—it weakens it.

It strikes at the heart of the President's authority to protect national security and conduct foreign policy.

It would end U.N. peacekeeping, a tool the President must have available to him in the conduct of foreign policy.

It would force the President to act alone, or do nothing.

It prematurely and unilaterally designates certain countries for NATO membership, picking winners and losers in a way that could actually slow down the process of NATO expansion.

It micromanages foreign policy and undercuts Presidential authority, limiting his ability to respond to crises and protect national security.

DESTROYING PEACEKEEPING

My first concern in peacekeeping. This bill would end peacekeeping overnight. It unilaterally abrogates our treaty obligation to the United Nations to pay our share of peacekeeping expenses.

It would require the United States to deduct from its peacekeeping assessment all costs incurred by the Department of Defense in support of U.N. operations, even when those operations are conducted unilaterally by the United States, with U.S. forces under U.S. command and control.

These expenses more than offset the annual U.S. peacekeeping assessment. If the United States unilaterally deducts these expenses, it cancels our assessment. Other countries would follow suit. U.N. peacekeeping would be destroyed.

That would mean the end of all U.N. peacekeeping missions: in Cyprus, Jerusalem, Angola, Kuwait, and Rwanda. It would mean the end of sanctions enforcement against Iraq, and the end of humanitarian relief in Bosnia.

If we pass H.R. 7, we leave the President with a choice: act alone or do nothing.

Collective security is a tool that has been available to every President since Harry Truman. We must have that option for this President.

The United Nations is not a perfect institution. It needs reform—plenty of it. Our goal should be to strengthen the United Nations to better serve U.S. interests—not weaken it.

PREMATURE NATO EXPANSION

My second concern is that H.R. 7 will lead to a major expansion of U.S. security and assistance commitments in Europe.

Title VI of the bill does two things: it states that it will be U.S. policy to extend NATO membership to Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and it mandates an assistance program to help these countries become NATO members.

We all agree that NATO should expand. The question is whether Congress should seek to dictate the details of that expansion.

NATO expansion is a complex diplomatic process involving 16 NATO members. H.R. 7 interferes with this process in ways that could be harmful both to the very goal the bill seeks—NATO expansion—and to other U.S. national interests:

First, this bill could jeopardize U.S. national security by unilaterally, arbitrarily, prematurely designating countries for NATO membership.

It short circuits the Partnership for Peace initiative, which aims to prepare countries for NATO membership.

Second, this bill mandates an open-ended program of military and economic aid for four countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia—without authorizing any funding. Let's be clear about this: if we pass this bill, we will be creating a new, costly, foreign aid program.

Third, if we arbitrarily lock in advantages for some countries, we risk discouraging reformers in countries not named and fostering complacency in countries that are.

By picking winners and losers for NATO membership, we are signaling to potential adversaries which countries we care about most.

We will once again divide Europe into two opposing camps.

Fourth, this bill will create a dangerous gulf between our commitments in Europe and the resources required to meet them. We have cut our military forces in Europe by two-thirds since 1990. Unless we are prepared to redeploy hundreds of thousands of troops, how can we meet new NATO security commitments by any means other than a nuclear commitment?

Finally, there is no threat to European security that warrants speeding up the pace of NATO expansion.

NATO membership involves a solemn treaty obligation. It means we will regard an attack on any member as an attack on the United States, and come to that nation's defense.

I would urge Members to think carefully before voting to set us on a course leading to a vast expansion of U.S. security commitments.

UNDERMINING THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY AUTHORITY

Finally, I am concerned that this bill undercuts the President's authority to conduct foreign policy and undermines his power as Commander in Chief.

As former Secretary of State James Baker told our committee, "Attempts at micromanagement were a bad idea when the Democrats were in control, and they remain a bad idea today."

Let me point out three examples of micromanagement:

This bill requires an act of Congress before the President could send a single U.S. military observer to join a U.N. force.

Yet we know that Congress has never voted to authorize a U.N. peacekeeping mission.

This bill dictates the terms and conditions for U.S. military command and control, telling our military how to do its job.

The bill prematurely picks winners and losers for future NATO membership. That's not our job. It's the job for the President, and other members of NATO. Passing this bill will only make it more difficult.

This bill also undermines the ability of the President to act as Commander in Chief.

It would prohibit the President from deploying a single U.S. soldier to a U.N.-authorized operation without an act of Congress.

It would prohibit the President from placing U.S. troops under foreign command without specific congressional authorization unless he first reports to Congress that such action is not unconstitutional, is necessary to protect U.S. national security—and then meets a series of other requirements, detailed in five pages in the bill.

This is an unprecedented assault on the President's authority as Commander in Chief.

Had this been law, it would have prohibited President Bush's deployment of U.S. troops and ships in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

It could have blocked President Clinton from deploying 30,000 United States troops to Kuwait in 1994 to counter Saddam Hussein's new threats of aggression against that country.

It would effectively prohibit the President from sending a single soldier to participate in a U.N. peacekeeping activity—even as part of a medical team to help in Cyprus—without specific congressional authorization.

CONCLUSION

I urge the House not to pass this bill today. We cannot solve all the problems of U.S. national security today. The wisest course we can follow is to defeat this bill.

I understand why Members are critical of some aspects of American foreign policy. I cannot remember a time when Members were not. And, of course, it is entirely appropriate that they voice those criticisms.

But it is one thing to criticize. It is quite another to restrict, to constrain, and to hamstring the chief architect of American foreign policy—the President of the United States.

This bill, if enacted, will not expire on the last day of Bill Clinton's Presidency, whenever that comes. It will restrict and constrain and undermine the authority of all future Presidents to protect the national security and conduct U.S. foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 7.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

[Mr. SPENCE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am shocked at this last comment. The beauty and the brilliance of this system is that we have different perspectives and different points of view. Is that not what we are saying to the entire world? Embrace the principles of democracy. Is that not why our colleagues challenge totalitarian governments because they said there should be competing ideas and competing principles? What is this? Liberal mind. We are all coequals here. We came here by the same process. We were elected by human beings who comprise America, ostensibly the greatest democracy in the world. This debate should not go forward with that kind of rancor.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my prerogative to challenge you, sir. It is my responsibility to challenge ideas. This is

about democracy. And what does this mean? If this is how the debate is to begin, my friends, it brings tears to my eyes to think about how it will end, because if this is the top of the mountain, where is the valley on this debate?

We should be about largeness, bigness, dignity, and respect for each other. I would have no problem challenging your ideas, challenging your politics. But let us not be condescending to each other. Let us not engage in this kind of folly with each other. I am prepared to deal with you intellectually. Let us see whether there is bankruptcy or currency in these ideas. But let us not characterize each other. The world is watching us. We should be large enough to be able to handle difference.

I came here in January 1971 from Berkeley, CA, opposing the Vietnam war as a simple human being who tried to raise my voice in the name of peace. I cannot tell the new Members of Congress the scars that I faced from that, the beatings that I took on the floor of Congress for simply being a human being who had the audacity to try in good faith to represent my constituency on these issues. We all have a right to be heard here. Whether one perceives oneself as a liberal or conservative or a moderate or a progressive or whatever, that is the beauty of this process.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to spend these moments talking about this bill, laying out the points, to engage. I beg of you, deal with each other with some kind of human dignity. I do not want to go back through 24 years ago, where we kept casting aspersions upon each other because you had the audacity to say peace, or challenge nuclear armaments, challenge war, challenge big military budgets, that in some way you are unAmerican or unpatriotic. How incredible.

How incredible, Mr. Chairman, when we can look out at the world and say we oppose totalitarianism and we cannot stand difference and handle and tolerate difference in this Chamber, considered the most deliberative body in the United States, in the world.

We have to respect each other's difference. But let us engage. I have supreme confidence in ideas, and so should you. So let us engage on ideas, not on who has got what mind and how that gets conjured up. That should be beyond us.

Mr. Chairman, it should be beyond all of us. I come to challenge your ideas. I did not come to challenge you. I did not come to challenge your label. But I will say this: In the context of a post-cold war world, let us take off old labels. They do not work anymore. Let us move beyond old paradigms. They do not work anymore. Let us get beyond old ideas. The human mind changes slowly, but the post-cold war world challenges us to a higher order of being, to an imaginative way of looking at the world.

Let us stop trotting out cold war ideas in the context of a post-cold-war world. Let us stop trotting out these ideas of liberal and conservative and moderate. At this point, I do not know what those things mean anymore when we start talking about national security. We have got sides talking about isolationism. A few years ago in my earlier tenure, they would have once wanted to engage in ventures all over the world. Interventionists, now isolationists. Peace advocates sound like hawks when we start talking about peacekeeping and peacemaking. We are standing the world on its head. What should that communicate to us? That the world has substantively and substantially changed and it dictates to us that we change, Mr. Chairman. That we think afresh and we think anew.

Let us stop engaging in the characterization. If you think we ought to have star wars, stand and defend that. If you think we ought to dictate to NATO, stand and defend that. If you think we should not be in the Somalias and the Haitis and the Rwandas and the Bosnias of the world as peacekeepers and peacemakers, stand and defend it. Then the debate can go forward rationally.

Why this mean-spiritedness? It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman. The issues that confront us dwarf us as human beings. Do we have to then add in the folly of characterization, the folly of challenge ideologically? This is no longer an ideological world. It requires imagination and brilliance and the highest and the best in us. Lay down that yesterday madness and let us stand up and face each other on an intellectually honest basis and try to shape this legislation so that it speaks to the reality of a changing world.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. COMBEST. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the Intelligence Committee held one hearing on title V of the National Security Revitalization Act, partly in open session. The subsequent markup was conducted entirely in open session. During the markup, the committee unanimously approved amendments to sections 502, 504 and 512.

Section 512 was the focus of the committee's interest. As introduced, the section required that the United States may provide intelligence to the United Nations only pursuant to a written agreement between the President and the Secretary General of the United Nations. The agreement must specify:

The types of intelligence to be provided to the U.N.;

The circumstances under which intelligence may be provided; and

The procedures to be observed by the U.N. concerning persons who shall have

access and the procedures to be observed by the U.N. to protect the intelligence against disclosure not authorized by the agreement.

As introduced, section 512 required that no agreement would have been effective for a period exceeding 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. policymakers working with the U.N. use intelligence information as part of their broader diplomatic efforts to advance U.S. foreign policy interests with other governments and U.N. agencies. A significant portion of intelligence sharing with the U.N. includes support to peacekeeping activities. However, intelligence sharing also involves humanitarian missions, sanctions enforcement, nonproliferation, opposition to ethnic cleansing, and other issues clearly of importance to U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Procedures have been developed by the intelligence community to provide intelligence information to the United Nations. Specific guidelines have been established for consideration on a case-by-case basis of what can be provided without compromising intelligence sources and methods.

The committee recognizes that there are valid concerns about the U.N.'s ability to protect sensitive information, and when intelligence information is provided, these considerations are taken into account. Each request is carefully reviewed to assess the agency or operation involved, and when the United States does provide intelligence information, the least sensitive information is used to satisfy each requirement, and it is provided to a limited number of individuals. Moreover, much of the Intelligence provided has been redacted to include only information that is unclassified.

The practical effect of section 512, as introduced, would have been to shut down intelligence sharing with the United Nations.

A formal agreement would probably not be achieved as the U.N. leadership could find such an agreement with the United States politically unacceptable for a variety of reasons. Flexibility and discretion are afforded the United States under the current intelligence sharing process. A formal agreement would hamper our ability to share intelligence with the U.N. when we want to and how we want to, and might indeed create an obligation on the part of the United States to provide intelligence to the U.N. upon request. Moreover, every year we would face the possibility that a Secretary General unwilling to sign an agreement acceptable to the United States could, by his refusal, prevent our Government from sharing intelligence when it is in our interests to do so. Finally, the United States would be reluctant to accept the possible public disclosure of the details that such an agreement would require.

Given these concerns and others, the committee adopted a substitute to section 512. The amendment sets out two

required responsibilities for the President.

First, before intelligence is provided by the United States to the United Nations, the President must ensure that the Director of Central Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, has established guidelines governing the provision of intelligence to the United Nations that protect sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

Second, the committee has strengthened its oversight of intelligence sharing arrangements with the U.N. The amendment requires periodic and special reports by the President regarding intelligence provided to the United Nations. These reports must be made not less frequently than semiannually to the Intelligence and International Relations Committees of the House and to the Intelligence and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate. The reports must specify the types of intelligence provided to the United Nations and the purposes for which the intelligence was provided. The President must also report to the two Intelligence Committees any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence provided to the U.N. within 15 days after the disclosure becomes known to the President.

The amendment further requires the Secretary of State, or the Secretary's designee, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, to work with the United Nations to improve its handling, processing, dissemination, and management of all intelligence information provided to it by its members.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment to section 512 will accommodate the valid need for intelligence sharing with the U.N. where important U.S. national interests are served, while at the same time establishing stronger oversight over these activities.

As amended, H.R. 7 is a good, workable approach to the need for intelligence sharing with the United Nations.

□ 1450

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my support for section 512 of the bill which will permit the continuation of intelligence-sharing with the United Nations. I think our history shows on certain occasions, the Cuban missile crisis for one, recently a situation in Iraq where sharing intelligence information, satellite imagery, has

been vitally important to United States security interests.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas. We were able to work out our bipartisan concerns and differences on this legislation. We are working to develop a compromise which I felt was in the best interest of the country. I only regret that this was not achievable in other aspects of the bill.

I think we have worked out most of the concerns that the intelligence community has. We have worked out a sharing relationship which will be on a case-by-case basis with the United Nations, which gives us the option of saying we do not want to share in certain instances, which I think is important.

There is one last concern that I have that I hope we can address in conference, and that is that part of the responsibility here is given only to the President, and it said he cannot delegate this. I understand the concerns of the majority, but I hope that we can work this out so that it will be more acceptable to the President and to the administration. And I hope we can look at that again in the conference committee. But, on section 512, I think we showed that we can have bipartisan support and cooperation.

There are many other reasons I will not be able to support the bill, but one of them clearly is not section 512.

I will include the remainder of my statement in the RECORD.

The statement referred to follows:

The imagery shared with the United Nations revealed to the world the threatening activities of the Soviet Union and forced the Kremlin to acknowledge its placement of offensive missiles in Cuba despite its previous denials.

More recently, it was the United States' contribution of intelligence to the United Nations which proved crucial in assessing Baghdad's post war disarmament activities and to the U.N.'s decision to maintain sanctions against Iraq.

The National Security Revitalization Act as introduced contained a provision which would have required the President and the United Nations Secretary General to enter into a written agreement prior to any U.S. intelligence being provided. The Intelligence Committee received testimony from witnesses representing the State Department, the CIA, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff who were adamant in their opposition to that provision, noting that it would remove the flexibility which currently permits U.S. intelligence to be provided on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, the Acting Director of Central Intelligence informed the committee by letter that the requirement for a written agreement meant that "the proposed legislation will make it difficult, if not impossible, to provide meaningful intelligence support to those U.N. activities which are supportive of U.S. foreign policy goals."

Based on the information it received, the Intelligence Committee rewrote the provision. In its current form, section 512 requires the President to ensure that the Director of Central Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense establishes guidelines governing the provision of intelligence to the United Nations which shall protect intelligence sources and methods from

unauthorized disclosure. The Director of Central Intelligence has already established such guidelines and is under a statutory duty to protect all intelligence sources and methods from compromise.

The Intelligence Committee is aware of no instance in which the current procedures governing the provision of intelligence to the U.N. has resulted in a compromise of any intelligence source or method. Nevertheless, the committee believes it is important that it be advised if a compromise of intelligence sources or methods should occur. To this end, section 512 requires the President to report to the congressional intelligence committees any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information provided to the United Nations within 15 days after the disclosure becomes known to the President. Additionally, periodic reports describing the types of intelligence provided to the United Nations and the purposes for which such intelligence was provided are required. These periodic reports must be submitted to the designated committees at least on a semi-annual basis.

While I support section 512, which is the product of a bipartisan effort of the Intelligence Committee, I want to note a separation of powers issue which the section raises, and which is of concern to the administration and several members of the committee. Section 512 establishes certain duties for the President which are made non-delegable. While I believe it is essential that the committee be assured that these duties are discharged in a manner which reflects their importance, I hope that we can agree on compromise language in conference which addresses the administration's constitutional concerns.

Mr. Chairman, section 512 represents a substantial improvement over the manner in which this issue was treated in the original version of the National Security Revitalization Act. Although the bill as a whole is still objectionable to me, at least in the narrow area of intelligence support to the United Nations, this legislation, if it passes, will do no harm to a system which is currently working well in support of the national interests of the United States.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of H.R. 7 as reported by the Committee on National Security.

Mr. Chairman, protecting the industrial base of strategic military programs is an issue that our Government must address in identifying a long-term strategy for defense procurement. There are three critical technology programs with an application that is dedicated exclusively to military procurement: conventional munitions, nuclear attack submarines, and long-range strategic bombers. Because these programs have no commercial benefit, it is of paramount importance that the Department of Defense act now to preserve these unique technologies.

As many of us know, the administration requested funding for a third *Seawolf* submarine, largely because of the need to preserve the submarine industrial base in the future. In the area

of bombers, however, the administration appears content to cap production of long-range bombers at 20 aircraft, even though there is no successor program in either the research or development stage. Because there is no substitute for the strategic elements of the bomber industrial base, it would cost billions to reestablish existing production lines if these capabilities are allowed to dissipate.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this issue is of extreme national importance and am pleased that H.R. 7 acknowledges the fact that the current bomber force falls woefully short of meeting the baseline established in the bottom-up review.

I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 7.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, later in the day I will support two amendments printed in the RECORD on this bill. One is by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] that supports ground missile development but strikes out the star wars in the bill.

H.R. 7 on missiles will cost a lot of money that we really do not have, Mr. Chairman, I worry about if you have to look at other programs; if you look at the National Guard and Reserve and you have this big missile cost, it could come from the National Guard and Reserve, and also it could come from readiness of our forces.

The other amendment that I will support and hope to get and make some remarks on is offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN]. Her amendment will eliminate title III of H.R. 7. Title III sets up a commission which would cost the taxpayers about \$1,500,000. It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman, to have a commission. We have the roles and mission commission which will have a report in May. Basically that does the same thing that is in the commission title III of the bill. So I will be supporting both of these amendments, one by the gentleman from Texas and one by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

□ 1500

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I think the American people would be shocked to find out how much money we were contributing last year to the U.N. peacekeeping mission. The last year, fiscal year 1995, our administration submitted to us \$533 million to support this U.N. peacekeeping effort. Halfway through, they asked for an additional \$627 million. Added together, we spent \$1.2 billion. That is our assessment, just for the U.N. peacekeeping mission alone.

This year they are asking for \$445 million. Come on, I know well that

they are going to come back midyear asking for another half billion later.

Why do they do this? They are trying to keep overall budget numbers low.

In addition to the \$1.2 billion, the U.S. Government contributed a voluntary gift last year alone of \$75 million. This year they are asking an additional \$100 million gift.

Our Government gets no credit for this voluntary gift contribution.

Let us talk about how much money other countries are contributing for U.N. peacekeeping. Ninety countries paid less than 0.01 percent, one-hundredth of 1 percent. Only 10 nations in the world pay more than 1 percent; 10 countries pay more than 1 percent. Guess how much we pay. Thirty-two percent. Is that fair? Almost one-third of U.N. peacekeeping we pay.

What are we getting back? I do not know.

It used to be 25 percent. Why it has gone up to 32 percent is because we have got to pick up the tab from Russia. Russia was dissolved. They have not been able to pay their share. We pick up the tab. That is why we end up paying 32 percent.

That is 2½ times more than the next highest contributor, which is Japan. They are paying 12½ percent.

The American people did not know this. I know this is shocking to you, not to mention a gift, not to mention an in-kind contribution.

Let me tell you about the in-kind contribution, by the way. We pay \$1.7 billion in in-kind contributions in addition to U.S. assessment. Do you know what they are? Transport of foreign military to Somalia, airlift of supplies to Bosnia, Rwandan airlift of supplies, on and on and on. Right now we have got 13 such missions around the world. We spend \$1.7 billion in in-kind contributions, which is absolutely no credit to us.

H.R. 7 will send a strong message to the United Nations to shape up. There is no more bottomless pit.

Second, we are asking to reduce to 25 percent from 32 percent. That is fair. Twenty-five percent, in my opinion, is still high. We will accept it.

Finally, we are asking the United Nations to reimburse us those in-kind contributions we made.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7. The authors of the bill claim it will revitalize national security. In fact, the bill does the opposite. This bill undermines the national security of the United States, by mandating extravagant spending on the star wars pipe-dream; by playing fast and loose with the NATO alliance and our role in the United Na-

tions; and by short-circuiting the bipartisan foreign policy review process.

The bill narrows, weakens, and confuses our national security by mandating huge expenditures for a national missile defense program. There is little justification for these expenditures in terms of our overall security strategy.

Republicans talked the star wars talk in the 1980's, throwing huge amounts of money away with little to show for it. As a famous Republican once said, "There you go again." Star wars II, the sequel, will not only waste money. It will take away from efforts to enhance military readiness.

H.R. 7 also trifles with the pursuit of our national interest through NATO. It trivializes the precious and trusted relations we share with our NATO partners by playing politics with the process of NATO expansion. It names four specific countries, rather than supporting membership for countries only if and when they adhere to the values and goals of the NATO alliance.

The bill also jeopardizes our leadership in the United Nations. The administration and Congress are working to reform the United Nations to improve its administration and peacekeeping operations. However, the bill cuts deeply into our U.N. contributions. It makes U.S. participation in U.N. peacekeeping activities practically impossible, even for small numbers of technical experts.

The way in which H.R. 7 has been pushed through committees also erodes the process of careful debate and bipartisan discussion which has long typified the review of foreign policy in the Congress.

The bill makes fundamental changes which will have potentially serious and dangerous consequences for national security and international peace and stability, but without adequate time for consideration.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 7.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this is a terrible bill, my colleagues. We are moving here toward a dangerous isolationism.

Some of my friends think, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, America need not remain engaged in the world. I believe America needs to remain more engaged now than ever before.

If we have quarrels with the United Nations, we ought to fix them. Certainly now, as Ambassador Albright said, we ought to use the United Nations for U.S. purposes. Is that not what President Bush did in the Persian Gulf war?

With this bill, the President has two choices: move alone, or do not move at all. I do not think that is the kind of era we ought to be in.

If we deduct the cost of our voluntary actions against U.N. dues, the United Nations would wind up owing us money, and other nations would surely do the same, leading to the collapse of the U.N.

I want to address the issue of American command of U.S. troops. My colleagues, the President never relinquishes command. The issue is operational control. This bill would not even allow someone from our NATO allies to command U.S. troops.

With that twisted thinking, D-day could not have been possible. Field Marshal Montgomery could not have commanded our troops.

Let us take down all the statutes of General Lafayette, because he could not have helped us fight the Revolutionary War. World War I and World War II could not have been possible, and Desert Storm, which I supported, remember when President Bush mobilized the U.N. and nations for Desert Storm; Desert Storm could not have been fought under the constraints of this bill.

Right now in Korea the Second Infantry Division is currently under operational control of a Korean commander. Should that not be allowed? No NATO commander of our troops at a time when we say we want to expand NATO? What is the sense of expanding the alliance if we are not going to trust the alliance?

Star wars, Mr. Chairman, we need defense dollars in the area of theater missile defense, not in the area of star wars.

We cannot retreat to a dangerous isolationism. The United States must remain engaged.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill passes, President Clinton ought to veto it the way Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry said they recommend him to veto it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Security Revitalization Act.

For too long we have been walking down the primrose path of complacency—allowing our military capabilities to deteriorate and our defense priorities to be misplaced. The legislation before us today moves to correct these deficiencies.

Figures from the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office show that between now and the end of the century, our defense establishment is underfunded by between \$65 and \$150 billion. H.R. 7 puts Congress on record that these shortfalls are unacceptable, and calls for U.S. forces to be provided with the means to successfully address two simultaneous regional conflicts.

H.R. 7 also calls on the President to move ahead with theater and national ballistic missile defenses. We saw in the Persian Gulf war how devastating even primitive theater ballistic missiles can be if they reach their target. With adversaries around the world increasingly able to obtain sophisticated

missiles, we must have viable defenses against these systems.

Although this administration has moved forward somewhat on theater systems, it has not sufficiently focused on the threat to our own homeland from ballistic missiles launched by accident or by a rogue commander. Today we have no effective defense whatsoever against such an attack. H.R. 7 establishes a clear policy on a national missile defense, directing that robust efforts be undertaken now.

H.R. 7 also establishes a clear policy on the involvement of U.S. forces in U.N. peacekeeping operations and the placement of U.S. forces under foreign command. While still giving the President authority to act unilaterally where a direct threat to U.S. national security exists, the bill establishes much needed Congressional oversight in these areas. It also sets prudent new limits on amounts that U.S. taxpayers provide for U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Moreover, the bill calls for the reestablishment of defense budget firewalls, ensuring that the vital funds budgeted for national defense needs are not redirected to non-defense functions.

Last, H.R. 7 reiterates the U.S. commitment to NATO, setting forth appropriate mechanisms for admitting new members.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 puts the defense policies of our Nation back on track. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

(Mr. SISISKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the dozen or so Democrats on the National Security Committee who voted in favor of this bill. That is one indication that I have a somewhat different perspective on this bill than some of my colleagues.

I do not want to get any of my Republican friends in trouble, but I have to confess that the committee leaders worked in the best bipartisan spirit to make this bill better than it was when it was first sent to the committee.

I must also confess that I continue to debate in my own mind whether this bill is good or bad—and at the moment, I lean toward thinking that it is not the best way to achieve what its sponsors want to achieve. Let me tell you why.

For years, one of my greatest concerns has been that legitimate debate about national security would become partisan and political. National security is one issue where I simply do not care about Republican or Democrat, I care about what is best for the country.

I was proud the Armed Services Committee was truly bipartisan. I hope that will be true of the new committee.

But bills like H.R. 872 threaten to destroy that bipartisan spirit.

Some say this bill is a partisan, political statement, cultivated like a mushroom in the basement of Republican campaign headquarters. It has been fertilized by sessions with pollsters and focus groups. We saw the results in campaign ads during the 1994 elections.

Focus groups should not determine what we do about national security, and we do not need a new commission to do our job. That is the responsibility of Congress and the National Security Committee.

Secretary of Defense Perry told the committee that if we lacked confidence in him, we should ask him to resign. But I do not see my friends on either side of the aisle calling for him to do so.

That is because most of us know our military is ready, willing, and able to do whatever mission they are given—because Democrats have always worked with Republicans to build a strong defense.

All of us can take pride in having built the strongest, most effective, most ready military in the world. Let us not tear down all we have been able to achieve in a frenzy of partisan politics.

We should not play games by arguing about which side is tougher on U.S. command and control—when there are no U.S. troops under foreign command anywhere in the world.

We should debate ballistic and theater missile defense where we have time to determine the real cost of what we want to achieve. We should not wreck our foreign policy by unilaterally changing U.N. assessment formulas or by forcing the admission of certain countries to NATO.

I was in Munich two weekends ago with Secretary Perry, and I can tell you from firsthand experience: Our attempt to unilaterally redefine the boundaries of NATO has our allies on edge—and maybe even questioning our foreign policy sanity.

When all is said and done, we will all have to go back to work together in the authorization and appropriations process. That is the appropriate forum for deciding these issues.

I ask all my colleagues to think carefully about the votes they cast today. Continue to make decisions in the bipartisan spirit that we have always seen previously. If you take pride in not playing politics with national security—do not start now.

□ 1510

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], a Member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, brave young American men and women volunteer in our Armed Forces in order to serve their

country and to protect her vital security interests.

But in recent years, those soldiers have increasingly been put under foreign command and operational control—Americans “peacekeeping”, or as it often becomes, defending themselves from attack—under the U.N. flag.

Mr. Chairman, not one American should die serving the United Nations.

When an American is sent in harm’s way, that American deserves—and we in Washington have a moral obligation to provide—a clear understanding of the vital interests of the United States that justify putting that American at risk.

No Utopian affection for the U.N. on the other side of the aisle should affect this solemn obligation.

And, Mr. Chairman, they say that “nature abhors a vacuum.” While that may be true, it is also true that our adversaries love a vacuum.

And now, where there was American leadership under Presidents Reagan and Bush, there is, in its place, a vacuum of leadership.

Presidents Reagan and Bush understood that the United Nations was an important body that we could work with to advance America’s vital interests.

This administration believes that America’s vital interests—and the safety of its fighting men and women—should take a back seat to the interests of the United Nations.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this administration has it backwards, and we promised the American people we would correct it.

This bill will restore our Nation’s interests to the top of the equation.

It does not, as our liberal critics contend, abandon the United Nations. But it does say—loud and clear—that our soldiers serve to protect the vital interests of the American people, not the interests of U.N. bureaucrats.

And as long as I have a vote in Congress, I will oppose Americans going to war, or serving in so-called peacekeeping operations, when America’s vital national interests are not present and clearly defined.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 7.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

I rise today to oppose H.R. 7. I believe it is penny-wise and pound-foolish and also very shortsighted, specifically on the U.N. peacekeeping.

It seems to me the issue has evolved into a question of whether we have legitimate U.S. interests in United Nations peacekeeping. I would submit we do. First, in terms of the global marketplace. We have committed ourselves to NAFTA, we have committed our-

selves to GATT. In the post-cold-war era we have hitched our wagon to the notion of a global marketplace. International instability, localized terrorism, all disrupt that global marketplace and those global markets. We have an interest in U.N. peacekeeping to the extent it helps us to maintain the global marketplace.

Second, we have a vital U.S. interest in fighting terrorism on a multilateral basis. Terrorism is perhaps the biggest threat of the coming century. We only have to look to New York City to see the potential.

Clearly, it is in our interest to have the ability to act multilaterally to combat terrorism.

And third, burden sharing: It used to be very much in vogue to suggest that our allies and other countries around the world ought to join with us in bearing some of this responsibility. It seems to the extent we undermine U.N. peacekeeping by reducing our own commitment, we undermine the ability to command a multilateral force to protect U.S. interests.

Now, I am not ignorant of the concern that we may be paying too much. As a matter of fact, this Congress last year reduced our commitment from 30 to 25 percent. But I think if we take the unilateral action suggested in this bill, we will certainly harm our interest because we will set a reverse, negative precedent. Russia will want to decrease its commitment because of the things it has done in the former Soviet Union. France would want to decrease its commitment because of Rwanda.

So the net effect will be that we will have an untenable choice: We will either have to act unilaterally or we will have to take no action at all. I suggest that is shortsighted.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the distinguished chairman of the Military Facilities Subcommittee and a key member of our national security team.

Mr. HEFLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, many of us feel that defense cuts proposed by the Clinton administration during these last couple of years are leading us to a hollow force again. That is the reason for this bill. We want to make a statement that we do not want a hollow force, that defense is an important part of our national security.

There is a perception that defense spending has not been reduced. But nothing could be further from the truth. In 1992, candidate Clinton called for \$60 billion in additional defense cuts beyond the cuts President Bush proposed. This year’s represents the 11th straight year that we have decreased defense spending.

What we are going to do with this bill, I think, is to make a statement that we are going to have a strong national defense in this country.

Now, it is not the end-all of bills. I would like for it to be much stronger. I would like for it to speak more to the force strength and that kind of thing. But the National Security Restoration Act is a down payment on the Republican promise to restore national security. It does not do all that is needed, but it does begin to add to the blueprint. I would urge support of this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. As the Representative of a district I call the aerospace center of the universe, I have consistently stood for a strong defense policy on a bipartisan basis, and I do so again today. I have supported the C-17; in fact, I coauthored the amendment to fund it fully; the F-18; the B-2; ballistic missile defense and defense reinvestment programs.

But I would make several points about this bill, which, unless it changes substantially, I will end up opposing. First of all, it is to my mind a campaign pamphlet, not a piece of legislation, and I think we must find more serious vehicles to legislate on defense issues.

□ 1520

Second and sadly, I think some of its advocates tend to label some of its opponents in wrong ways. I must say I was honored to listen to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], a few minutes ago in which he said that the labels are misguided. We are not here to attack each other. We are here to address serious policy, and I would reiterate his point, and make it again coming from a very different part of the political spectrum.

Finally let me say this: Some serious amendments will be offered during the course of this afternoon, this evening and tomorrow. I will speak for some of them and against some of them. But I urge all of us to approach this, not as part of a political campaign, but as part of our serious responsibilities to govern this country.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the first priority of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens by maintaining a military strong enough to fight and defeat any aggressor that threatens the United States. Since the end of the cold war the defense budget has been borrowed from to pay for social welfare programs and U.N. peacekeeping missions. As a result, our defense resources are at dangerously low levels. The Contract With America will put a stop to the practice of borrowing from the defense budget and reverse the past 2 years of neglect on this issue. H.R. 7

includes the strong sense of Congress to restore defense spending fire walls that prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds to pay for social programs unrelated to military readiness and restrict future defense cuts to deficit reduction purposes only.

The thing that stirred me up so much, Mr. Speaker, was the fact in last year's budget we allocated \$200 million for displaced Russian soldiers while our own Vietnam veterans are homeless in the streets of the United States of America. We cannot afford to become careless. The Federal Government has a duty to provide for the common defense of its citizens.

I say to my colleagues, "I urge your support of H.R. 7."

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in my 20 years of public service I have never witnessed anything like what is going on now in the world's greatest deliberate body, the U.S. House of Representatives. And if you love American democracy like I do, you better be worried.

I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not agree with the extremist and isolationist provisions of H.R. 7. Several Republicans voted for a Democratic amendment to this bill that was passed by the International Relations Committee. They then called for a new vote and they all switched their votes.

I know that some of them believe that the greatest and most powerful country in the world should lead, and not retreat, from the international community. I know that some of them do not believe that we need Star Wars II. And all of us know that we simply cannot afford it.

But none of this seems to matter to my Republican colleagues. They have decided that marching in lockstep is in and voting independently is out. For the sake of kneeling before the altar of soundbyte bills written by pollsters, my Republican colleagues have abandoned the great American tradition of independent parliamentary debate. We must put patriotism ahead of polls and be serious about what we bring to the House floor.

If this bill had passed the Democratic Congress of 1992, President Bush would not have been allowed to send a single American soldier to the Persian Gulf for Desert Shield or Desert Storm.

If this bill passes in its present form, America will be forced either to place thousands more of our young soldiers in the line of fire to protect our vital national interest abroad—or not to act at all. America will be forced to spend millions of dollars alone, instead of sharing the costs.

If this bill passes, we will create yet another unneeded commission that

wastes \$1.5 million for yet another study about military needs. Never mind that we already spend millions upon millions of taxpayer dollars every year to do just that.

That is why I have sponsored an amendment with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] to strike that, and we hope we will get support.

So, say yes to a strong and secure America, but say no to the national insecurity bill. Vote "no" on H.R. 7.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the statement we just heard regarding Desert Storm and other actions is absolutely, totally without merit and untrue. As a matter of fact, 45 minutes ago former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, a former Democrat turned Republican, just down the hallway totally endorsed this piece of legislation, and said it would have no impact on the President's ability to send our troops abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], one of the newest stars from our committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, after more than a year of visiting with folks in my district about where this country is headed, I can tell my colleagues that they are very concerned about what is happening to our military. We are asking our men and women to do more and more and giving them less and less to do it with. This bill does not solve all the problems, but it does make a good start, and there are three areas key to me:

One, establish an inspection commission to evaluate our needs and the resources to meet those needs because the administration has lost total credibility in being able to make that assessment; second, it is important to keep U.S. troops under the command of U.S. commanders, and this drift toward relinquishing control of our security to multinational organizations has got to stop; third, we have got to protect our people from missile attack, and it does not matter whether its short-range or long-range missiles. It is the fundamental purpose of this body to protect our people, and, if we do not make every effort to meet that threat, then we have not met our responsibilities to our constituents.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], another one of our bright stars on the Committee on National Security.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us agree that a strong military was a prime factor in the end of the cold war and won a stunning victory in the Persian Gulf, but events over the past few years have shown that though the cold war is over, we still live in a very dangerous world. It is not just our side of the aisle that recognizes our military is stretched too thin. We have cut too far, too fast.

And these massive cuts have been multiplied by our military being ordered to build nations in places where we have no vital national interest.

Places like Somalia and Haiti.

Meanwhile, even top Pentagon officials admit we need to commit more resources to training in places like Fort Knox in my district, facilities vital to keep our service men and women well prepared.

H.R. 7 allows a bipartisan panel to review our military in light of yesterday's mistakes and tomorrow's challenges.

And perhaps most important, H.R. 7 will keep our men and women in the armed services from being placed under command of another country. We are still the leaders of the free world, Mr. Chairman.

The men and women in our armed services have given their all to our country. H.R. 7 is an important step toward ensuring we do the same for them.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, does this debate sound like a time warp? I would not be surprised if I heard evil empire, iron curtain, and Berlin Wall. Let me just remind my colleagues that that was yesterday, and now we need to talk about today and tomorrow.

This bill is a prescription for disaster. The Republicans are rushing as a part of their contract to penalize the poor, discriminate against legal immigrants, pander to the rich, and now, through this national security part of their contract, they add insult to injury by also asking this House to invest scarce dollars in yesterday's boondoggle.

□ 1530

The Republicans have chosen to look through the rearview mirror as if blinded by the light of the future. Instead, they choose to look behind.

This is the same party that says that Government is too big. This is the same party that says that kids do not deserve to eat subsidized lunch in school, that pregnant women do not need to have subsidized nutrition so that they can give birth to healthy babies. This is the same party that said we do not have enough money to put 100,000 cops on the streets. But Government spending for an elaborate and controversial missile defense in space, well, that is all right.

Rather than asking for money for Star Wars, the Republicans could have asked for money to clean up the contaminated bases that coexist within our communities. And rather than railing on about foreign command and control, they could have focused instead on constructive engagement with the rest of the world through multilateralism and collective security. The specter of foreign command is not true. The President is and always

has been our Commander in Chief. Finally, they could have looked at promising weapons systems that bear more relation to the type of defense that we need in the future.

This bill does not provide for the forward looking vision of this country. It robs us of our peace dividend, and I say vote "no."

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 7.

Mr. Chairman, the results from the November 8 elections demonstrate the American voter's overall dissatisfaction with Congress. Recognizing this concern, many of us signed the Contract With America, to clearly illustrate our promise to eliminate weak leadership and destructive policies. Since January 4, we have been working very hard to bring 10 bills compromising the contract to the floor during the first 100 legislative days of the 104th Congress. We have passed several of these bills, however, and now we must address the next item, H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation which was successfully voted out of four committees of jurisdiction including the International Relations Committee, of which I am a member. The bill expresses many of my sentiments toward foreign policy, particularly regarding the current administration. Yes, the world of today differs tremendously from that of the 1980's, therefore our foreign policy must change and continue to change as we move into the next century. However, it is time we restore America's reputation as a superpower; we must repair our strength and credibility damaged by the policies of the Clinton Administration.

The Clinton administration's bottom-up review of the U.S. military has severely undermined our readiness by reducing defense funding and personnel. The question that needs to be asked now is: Can the United States defend itself against an attack, or more than one attack? H.R. 7 would address this inadequacy in several ways. First, it would renew the United States' commitment to an effective national missile defense by requiring the Department of Defense [DOD] to develop and deploy antiballistic missile and theater missile defense as early as practicable. Second, the bill would require the creation of the National Security Commission, a bipartisan panel of independent defense experts, to assess force structure, readiness, strategic vision, modernization, and personnel policies. In the end, these provisions would return our military to the level of force that is capable of protecting our shores and projecting our might anywhere in the world.

As we have all witnessed, costly multinational peacekeeping operations, under the auspices of the United Nation in both Somalia and Bosnia have failed to produce the desired outcomes, and support for these operations has declined across America. Currently, the United States pays the cost of these missions sponsored by the United Nations, as well as peacekeeping operations we initiate. The United

States is responsible for 25 percent of the U.N.'s normal operating budget and 31.7 percent of the cost of each U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping operation. Our funding of U.N.-sponsored peacekeeping missions is not counted toward our contribution to the U.N. operating budget. Furthermore, although Congress appropriated \$1.2 billion in 1994 to pay for peacekeeping, the State Department estimates that the United States could fall behind by another \$800 million by the end of fiscal 1995. This arrangement clearly cannot continue. Under H.R. 7, the United States, while continuing to fund peacekeeping mission, we would begin to count this cost as part of our overall contribution to the United Nations. However, under this legislation, the United States will write off the cost of unilateral peacekeeping missions like the one in Haiti, from its U.N. bills.

We have heard arguments that any provision requiring the U.S. Government to subtract costs incurred by the United States for participation in U.N. peacekeeping activities from the United States assessed U.N. contribution could be fatal to U.N. peacekeeping. However, according to a study conducted by the General Accounting Office [GAO], provisions to limit U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations will not completely eliminate U.S. funds.

Included in these U.N. provisions is a section that I find very intriguing. Section 511 requires the withholding of 20 percent of assessed U.S. contributions of the regular U.N. budget and 50 percent of all assessed and voluntary U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations each year until the President certifies: The creation of an independent office of the Inspector General chosen for his/her ability and integrity; the Inspector General has access to all records and officials at the United Nations; the United Nations will protect whistleblowers who cooperate with the Inspector General, and the reports of the Inspector General are made available to the General Assembly of the United Nations without change.

The United Nations has a record of wasting money and at times has acted in a corrupt manner. However, with an Inspector General's office, we can carefully check to ensure U.S. taxpayers' dollars are put to an honest and proper use, reflecting American perspectives. This section fits perfectly into current efforts by Congress to review all levels of government for efficiency and costs.

H.R. 7 would also make a fundamental change—one that has been advanced by former Joint Chief of Staff Colin Powell—that would restrict the ability of the President to place U.S. troops under foreign command. This step is taken because the American people do not trust nor have confidence in the United Nations. The lives of our young men and women should not be placed at risk somewhere in the world by a foreign commander. H.R. 7 would change this policy.

Lastly, the bill contains provisions to reemphasize the commitment of the United States to a strong and viable NATO alliance, urging that we assist the Eastern European democracies with the transition to full NATO membership. NATO must adapt to the reality of the post-cold-war Europe. Expansion would ultimately benefit these countries by encouraging integration into the West.

In the contract, we made promises—promises we plan to keep. In the post-cold-war period, the passage of the National Security Revitalization Act marks an improvement in our foreign policy by acknowledging the Clinton administration precipitated the decline in military readiness; by restricting future participation in U.N. programs; by developing defense against ballistic missile attack, and pledging American leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]. Join me in voting in favor of H.R. 7.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 10 years, U.S. troops have been deployed for more operations per year than ever before. Currently, the United States has over 48,000 military personnel involved in 13 ongoing operations in unstable areas like Bosnia, Haiti, and Iraq. In Somalia, for example, there was no clear objective, no clear timeframe, and no clear plan to bring our military personnel home. In 1993, Congress appropriated \$401.6 million for U.N. operations—President Clinton had requested \$597 million.

Mr. Chairman, we are reaching a troubling time in our defense policy. We are spending too much money in situations where we have very little control. The United States is responsible for 25 percent of the United Nations' normal operating budget. We pay 31.7 percent of the cost of missions sponsored by the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, this is a disturbing trend and patriotic Americans want to stop it. That is why we are asking our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with us in passing the National Security Restoration Act. Let's restrict U.S. troops to those missions that are in our national interests, reduce the cost of the United States of U.N. missions, and demand that U.S. troops be only deployed under U.S. commanders. Let us pass H.R. 7.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as relics of the cold war, when there was a serious nuclear threat, nuclear fallout shelters are being used to store garden tools. Yet the Republicans are suggesting we need to prioritize our national security interest and place greater emphasis on incoming ballistic missiles over the development of Scud defense, which poses certainly a considerably greater threat to U.S. lives. A nuclear warhead weighs about 270 pounds, is slightly larger than a water cooler bottle and does not need a missile for effective delivery. It can be brought across the Mexican border in a pickup truck. And if you doubt that ability, just check the incoming

from all over the world with cocaine as it arrives here every day.

So why are we proposing the development of a multibillion dollar national missile defense that will take away resources from very important readiness, modernization, and quality of life programs for our defense? We will spend massive amounts of funds on a system that can be countered by a 1970 El Camino.

What has happened to common sense? H.R. 7 is bad legislation. It directs our national defense priorities away from our troops. It restricts our peacekeeping participation and our capabilities there. It undermines the President's authority as commander-in-chief. It is a reckless expansion of U.S. defense commitments through our NATO participation.

This bill certainly does not represent common sense. The common sense vote is no on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7. This bill represents a very appropriate reordering of our priorities. I would like to reemphasize that although we do live in a post-cold-war world, it still is a very dangerous world. Within a decade, we expect some 27 countries will have nuclear weapons with increasing capabilities to deliver them. At this point in time, we have no meaningful defense against ballistic missiles. This bill very appropriately requires a reevaluation in this area. It is a good bill. I urge its support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1939, the leader of the isolationist wing of the Republican Party, continuing a tradition of 20 years of Republican isolationism that started after the end of World War I, Senator Arthur Vandenburg said:

We cannot be the world's protector or the world's policeman. The price of such assignment would be the jeopardy of our own democracy. Let us avoid entanglement in any chain of circumstances which may be too strong for us to break.

Seven years later, as the new leader of the internationalist wing of the Republican Party, the one that has dominated the Republican Party for the last 50 years, Senator Vandenburg said:

If World War III ever unhappily arrives, it will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. There are two ways to do it. One way is by exclusive individual action in which each of us tries to look out for himself. The other way is by joint action

in which we undertake to look out for each other. The first way is the old way, which has twice taken us to Europe's interminable battlefields within a quarter of a century. The second way is the new way in which our present fraternity of war becomes a new fraternity of peace.

The issue in sections 501 and 508 and title IV, of H.R. 872 no matter how many times it is denied, is do we continue with the internationalist perspective, or do we force ourselves into an isolationist, "either do it alone or don't do it at all" perspective.

The National Security Revitalization Act is a rash and reactive attempt by a Republican congressional majority to supersede presidential prerogatives in the conduct of U.S. foreign and defense policy. Though aimed at circumscribing President Clinton's authority, its unintended consequences will come back to haunt future presidents, regardless of their party.

It is Congress' role to question particular programs and policies of the executive branch, and it is imperative that the executive branch consult with Congress early and often on national security affairs. But the sort of partnership between the executive branch and the Congress necessary to the advance of American national interests cannot be based on hamstringing Presidential prerogatives.

Vote "no" on H.R. 872.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] a cosponsor of the bill.

(Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow we have the opportunity to correct today's defense policy problems by passing the National Security Revitalization Act. I think it is important that the American people know what is at stake here and what the current administration is actually fighting against. Very simply, H.R. 7 would prohibit placing our military troops under the command or control of a foreign commander without presidential or congressional approval.

□ 1540

The men and women of the largest fighting force in the world do not want to have their lives placed in the hand of a foreign commander and neither do their families. H.R. 7 would also allow the United States to count our military peacekeeping operations as a contribution to the United Nations.

It is just not right for someone in our districts to see their tax dollars spent on missions that currently are not allowed to be counted as a contribution to the United Nations.

Quite frankly, we can no longer afford to undertake 13 peacekeeping missions with the use of some 48,000 personnel in countries like Bosnia, Haiti and Iraq. I must say that many of the people back in Tennessee that I represent

do not agree with these questionable missions our military has been assigned, and they certainly do not believe that they should be paying for them.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 would strengthen our NATO alliance by bringing the countries of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia into the alliance. These countries are working toward democracy, and they deserve the opportunity to earn the protections that NATO could afford them.

I urge my colleagues to support this National Security Revitalization Act.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this unnecessary, irresponsible and dangerous bill. The Republican defense bill is unnecessary because it is based on the false premise that our military is ill-prepared. That is an insult to our troops and an invitation to would-be aggressors.

The truth is that we face no national security problem so urgent that it cannot be fixed through the much more thoughtful and much more bipartisan approach of the authorization process.

This bill is irresponsible because it completely rewrites our defense and foreign policies after just a few brief hearings and only a limited amount of debate in this Chamber. What is the rush?

The only rush is to check off another item on a political scorecard. Of all the issues, the national security policy of post-cold-war America demands more than that. Most of all, this bill is dangerous because it puts a higher priority on a boondoggle in the sky called star wars than on our troops on the ground. Star wars is going to cost billions of dollars and the people who are going to pay the highest price are our men and our women in uniform. The cost of Star Wars is going to come out of their training. It is going to come out of their salaries and their housing, and it is going to come out of the modern weapons that they need to reduce risk in battle.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the price of the Republican defense bill may very well be paid with the lives of our troops. With this bill, the Contract With America literally becomes a contract on the men and the women who serve in uniform. It does them a disservice.

Support our troops and vote no on H.R. 7.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on command and control. I have the feeling my argument will not change the minds here today, but as someone who

traveled to Somalia four times and sincerely cares about what happens there, I would like to provide some information for the historic record of this debate.

Since Somalia seems to be the genesis of the command and control issue, it would be helpful to review the events of the tragic loss of the 18 U.S. Army Rangers.

It is my understanding that the U.N. Commander in Somalia was Turkish General Bir who was in charge.

The operational commander was U.S. General Montgomery, who at the time reported solely to General Bir.

The United States combat forces in Somalia were under the command of General Garrison who reported to General Hoar, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command in Miami.

As the Washington Post brought out in their investigative reporting, U.S. General Montgomery assigned to the U.N. command did not encourage the assault on the building where Aideed was thought to be on the day the casualties occurred.

The Post reported U.S. unit commanders were saying "our boys have cabin fever". They want to get out where the action is. The U.S. Rangers force carried out this assault at the initiative of, and with the approval of the U.S. central command in Miami.

In no way should we make the U.N. the scapegoat for this tragic incident that killed 18 of our fine young men.

I would also remind Members that a larger number of Pakistani troops gave their lives in previous actions. Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria and Zimbabwe also lost troops in Somalia.

But they did not call for withdrawal.

I was impressed that at the beginning of the Gulf war when President Bush talked about a new world order in which the strong must protect the weak. Congress also approved similar words.

If these words are to have any meaning, then I feel our participation in peacekeeping and peacemaking is a responsibility the U.S. must bear.

And, in bearing this responsibility it makes sense to share the burden with other countries through the United Nations.

What are we doing here today is to dismantle the peacekeeping capability of the United Nations which has served with distinction for 50 years.

Surely, this is not the intention of America.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] have 11¾ minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 11¼ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 16¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, men and women do not join the Armed Forces to fight and die for the United Nations. They join to serve their own country, the United States. In the past 2 years, the United States has been involved in more peacekeeping missions under the U.N. flag than ever before. Many of these missions are not in our best national interest, they put our men and women in danger and inflate our budget. Typically, we contribute 32 percent of the total funds of each U.N. operation.

H.R. 7 would force the President to receive the authorization of Congress before a peacekeeping mission and notify them of the expenditures. It would also not allow for U.S. troops to be placed under U.N. command. Mr. Chairman, we need to maintain our autonomy throughout the world. We need to be responsible for securing our national interests. H.R. 7 is a positive step toward a positive goal—keeping our defenses strong. Let us pass H.R. 7.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill might be better known as the National Security Retribution Act instead of the National Security Revitalization Act.

It is a travesty of sound defense policy, wasting tens of billions of dollars on a revived star wars effort while shorting funds for readiness or truly needed procurement.

This legislation is a travesty of sound budget policy, proposing to borrow tens of billions of dollars just after we have passed a balanced budget amendment.

And this legislation is a travesty of sound international security policy, undermining START II Treaty ratification and the ABM Treaty, while jeopardizing our ongoing efforts to achieve further arms limitations.

But even more fundamental, this legislation is a constitutional tragedy, putting a power grab, driven by mindless bumper-sticker politics, ahead of the historic and critical authority of the President of the United States to manage our foreign relations and to command our Nation's Armed Forces.

If the Democrats had been so unprincipled as to try a stunt like this when a Republican was in the White House, the Republicans would have been absolutely and rightly outraged. Yet they have no shame in perpetrating this today.

This bill is so deeply flawed that, if adopted, it would deprive this President, any President, of his ability to protect and promote our national interests. It should be defeated.

This legislation should better be titled the National Security Retribution Act.

This legislation is a travesty of sound defense policy, wasting tens of billions of dollars on a revived star wars effort while shorting funds for readiness or truly needed procurement.

This legislation is a travesty of sound budget policy, proposing to borrow tens of billions for star wars when we just passed a balanced budget amendment.

This legislation is a travesty of sound international security policy, undermining START II treaty ratification and Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty compliance while jeopardizing our ability to achieve further arms limitations agreements.

But even more fundamental, this legislation is a constitutional tragedy, putting a power grab, driven by mindless bumper-sticker politics, ahead of historic and critical authority of the President to manage the Nation's foreign relations and to command its armed forces. If the Democrats had been so unprincipled as to try a stunt like this against a Republican President, the Republicans would properly have been outraged. Now, they show no shame.

This measure is deeply flawed and, if adopted, would unwisely deprive the President—any President—of the ability and flexibility to protect and promote our national interests. Like so much of the Republican's Contract With America, this bill would shackle the Government and shred the Constitution.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states that the "President shall be Commander in Chief" of the U.S. Armed Forces. The bill ignores the Constitution by placing severe limits on the President's ability to carry out his central national security duties. It should be defeated for this reason, if no other.

The bill's prohibition on the placing of U.S. troops under foreign command plays to the frustration many citizens feel about increasing U.S. participation in United Nations, but it ignores the real world requirements of dealing with threats to international security. In most of the conflicts we've been involved in since—and even during—the Revolution, we have conducted joint military operations with allies, and these arrangements have to work in both directions. We can't expect to work effectively with our allies without sharing operational control in appropriate cases.

Most recently in Operation Desert Storm, General Swartzkopf placed a United States brigade under the operational control of the French, just as other allied forces were under the operational control of United States forces. By restricting the President's authority to share operational command, this bill would have greatly hampered President Bush's effort to bring the international community along with us in meeting Saddam Hussein's challenge. Members should also be aware that right now a United States Army division serves under the U.N. flag in Korea under operational control of a South Korean general. If this bill passes, this sort of arrangement, and the essential international cooperation on security matters it facilitates, would be history.

A second huge problem is what the bill would do to U.N. peacekeeping operations. The bill says we must count against our peacekeeping contribution the cost of any separate U.S. military effort pursuant to U.N. Security Council resolutions. The costs of these operations—supporting humanitarian relief and deterring aggression in places like Bosnia and

Iraq—far exceed our annual peacekeeping assessment. So this means we would no longer pay any of the peacekeeping costs we have agreed by treaty to pay.

If we take this step, the other nations like France, the United Kingdom, and Japan, who also make major separate expenditures, would almost certainly follow our lead in canceling their peacekeeping payments. And U.N. peacekeeping would end. We would then face the option of doing nothing in the face of serious threats to international peace and security, or going it alone. America would be forced to play global cop alone, or nobody would.

A third flaw in H.R. 7 is its attempt to legislate a timetable for new states to obtain membership in NATO. The bill would attempt to take away from America's most important national defense alliance the ability to decide, through the agreement of the members of the alliance, who can and should join the alliance. The legislative timetable would also prevent the President from acting through normal foreign policy channels to set standards for membership. All this is a patently unconstitutional intrusion of Congress into the foreign policy jurisdiction of the President. Reformers in countries not named would be discouraged, and the governments of those named might become complacent. Finally, by bringing NATO up against Russia's borders too rapidly the bill could have serious unintentional consequences.

A final, and significant failing in this bill is its return to a crash deployment of a national missile defense. More than \$30 billion has already been spent on the star wars initiative, and it is estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that at least \$30 billion more—probably \$50 to \$100 billion more—would have to be spent to deploy the system. Although star wars is claimed to promise a defense against missile attacks for rogue states, it could be outflanked by an enemy using any number of alternative delivery systems. The massive cost would divert scarce defense dollars and other resources from more pressing needs such as a theater-missile defense or military-readiness programs. And both the bill and votes in committee, make it clear the Republicans are willing to be cavalier about violations of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in their rush to test and deploy such a system. That attitude would surely be the undoing of START II, and other pending efforts to restrain weapons of mass destruction.

The National Security Revitalization Act is a hastily constructed attempt to legislate a change in our national security strategy. Rather than revitalize U.S. national security, it would undermine it. If enacted, this bill will politicize national security and destroy the Presidency's ability to make effective foreign policy decisions. If the United States is to remain a leader on the world stage, Congress must continue to allow the President—every President—the constitutionally mandated authority in deciding how to deploy American forces, manage alliances, and set strategic priorities.

This bill goes in precisely the wrong direction on almost all counts. It deserves defeat.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, has, on this date, received a letter from five former members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In their correspondence they state, and I

quote, "This legislation will impose onerous and unnecessary restrictions on the President's ability to place U.S. forces under the operational control of the Nation's military leaders for U.N. operations."

It continues, "Throughout our history, presidents have found it advantageous and prudent for forces to participate in coalition operations. During the Gulf War, Korea, and during 50 years of the NATO alliance and in multilateral peacekeeping operations, our armed forces have successfully worked side by side with those of other nations."

□ 1550

The letter concludes "Mr. Chairman, this would force the administration to choose between acting unilaterally and doing nothing. Accordingly, we urge rejection of the restrictions on the President's command and control," and his military authority, in this legislation. It is signed by David C. Jones, General, U.S. Air Force; David E. Jeremiah, U.S. Navy; Glen Otis, General, U.S. Army; W.E. Boomer, General, U.S. Marine Corps; B.E. Trainor, Lieutenant General, U.S. Marine Corps.

For the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, I include this letter in its entirety:

FEBRUARY 15, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As retired flag and general officers, we are writing to express our serious reservations about HR 872, which is now under consideration by the House of Representatives. We are especially concerned about provisions in the bill that would impose onerous and unnecessary restrictions on the President's ability to place U.S. forces under the operational control of other nations' military leaders for UN operations.

As you know, throughout our nation's history Presidents have found it advantageous and prudent for U.S. military forces to participate in coalition operations. During the Gulf War, in the U.S.-led UN operation in Korea, throughout the nearly 50 years of the NATO alliance, and in multilateral peacekeeping operations, our armed forces have successfully worked side-by-side with those of other nations to advance our national security.

In the post-Cold War world, it will remain essential that the President retain the authority to establish command arrangements best suited to the needs of future operations. As commander-in-chief, he will never relinquish command of U.S. military forces. However, from time to time it will be necessary and appropriate to temporarily subordinate elements of our forces to the operational control of competent commanders from allied or other foreign countries. As retired military officers, we can personally attest that it is essential to the effective operation of future coalitions that the President retain this authority. Just as we will frequently have foreign forces serving under the operational control of American commanders, so must we be able to negotiate reciprocal arrangements freely.

HR 872 would place unprecedented and, in our view, burdensome limitations on this authority. By narrowing the President's options and complicating the process of building a coalition during a crisis, the bill could, in effect, force the Administration to choose between acting unilaterally and doing nothing.

Accordingly, we urge rejection of the restrictions on the President's command and control authority contained in this portion of HR 872 as unnecessary, unwise, and militarily unsound.

DAVID C. JONES,
General, US Air Force (Ret).
DAVID E. JEREMIAH,
Admiral, US Navy (Ret).
GLENN K. OTIS,
General, US Army (Ret).
W.E. BOOMER,
General, USMC (Ret).
B.E. TRAINOR,
LtGen, USMC (Ret).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

(Mr. HILLEARY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, under the current administration, the defense of this country has declined greatly. Defense spending has been dramatically reduced to its lowest level since World War II and modernization programs cut to a 45-year low. These defense cuts have put our military forces at their lowest levels of readiness in over a decade, cut 15,000 reserve and civilian personnel every month and in addition, 1.2 million defense-related private sector jobs will be eliminated. These cuts will be used to fund wasteful social programs. The Republican Congress plans to change all that.

Our Nation's security must not be neglected as it has been the past 2 years. Americans should have faith that their Armed Forces are ready and equipped with the most modern defense systems. We need to keep our promise to the American people. We need to keep our defenses strong. We need to maintain our credibility around the world. We need to pass this bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my colleague who just preceded me in the well.

Mr. Chairman, with the end of the cold war, with the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the evisceration of the Soviet Union, what drove 70 percent of the budget is now no longer a major threat. Yet, in fiscal year 1996 we are contemplating spending 75 percent of what we spent in 1990.

Stated a different way, Mr. Chairman, in fiscal year 1996 we will be spending almost as much as the entire world military budget combined in 1 year. If we add what we spend, what our allies in Asia and Europe spend, we will be spending in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget allocation, so even those persons who potentially could be adversaries to us are spending less than 20 percent of their dollars. Where is the threat? To talk about some weak nation, we are the No. 1 superpower in the world with the greatest military capability in the

world, with the greatest readiness in the world, and we are spending exorbitant amounts of money on our military budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Chairman, title I of this bill professes alarm at the downward spiral of defense spending. It raises the specter of hollow forces. However, when we turn to title II of the bill, to see what it would do, we find what it wants to do is sink billions of dollars into a new national defense missile defense system.

Mr. Chairman, one sure way of fulfilling the dire prophecies in title I, the preamble of this bill, is to sink huge sums into a national defense, system especially if it deploys space-based interceptors at the earliest practical date.

That is why, when the bill comes up for amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and I will offer three related amendments.

We support a strong defense. I support and believe in ballistic missile defense. However, I first want to make sure that our forces, although downsized smaller, are ready to fight. I want to make sure that the equipment they fight with is second to none. I want to ensure quality of life to our troops and their families.

Mr. Chairman, we offer these three amendments, because if title II becomes law without them, it could be taken to mean that deployment of a national missile defense system made up of space-based interceptors, such a system could easily cost \$25 billion, and that \$25 billion can only be funded at the expense of other priorities, like readiness and theater missile defense.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to make sure that a national missile defense system is not put ahead of other priorities. I do not mean to preclude it, I simply mean to put it in its right order. My amendment will require that readiness and modernization should be funded first and should take priority over national missile defense; second, that theater missile defense should take priority over national missile defense, because it deals with a threat here and now; third and finally, that any national missile defense system should start with a ground-based system and not a space-based interceptor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has a disproportionate amount of time remaining. The Chair would ask if the gentleman would like to yield some time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7. The President has charged this bill will unfairly inhibit the country's ability to respond to international crises, that it will hamper his constitutional responsibility. However, I am not aware of any clause in the Constitution that states that when the U.N. decides that peacekeeping troops are needed, that it is America that responds. We are not the world's 911 emergency hotline.

Unfortunately, the President has bought into this thinking at grave expense. U.S. troops should not be placed under foreign command. We are not at war. U.S. taxpayers should not be expected to keep paying more than our fair share of U.N. peacekeeping expenses. This bill takes a huge step in curtailing both those misguided policies.

Passage of the National Security Revitalization Act is a good step toward redefining our relationship with the United Nations, redirecting precious U.S. tax dollars toward legitimate national security concerns, and regaining the confidence of the American people. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 7.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN].

(Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 7, I rise today in strong support of its provision to urge the United States to do everything possible to help Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and other Eastern European nations, become members of NATO.

I think it is important to remember NATO's history while considering this necessary resolution. On April 4, 1949, 10 European governments, the United States, and Canada signed the North Atlantic Treaty, creating NATO. The Organization was established to deter potential Soviet aggression in Europe and to provide for the collective self-defense of the alliance.

It is widely recognized that East Central European Nations, particularly Poland, have often been caught between a hammer and an anvil. This was seen not only in the historic expansion of the former Prussian, Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires, but also during World War II when Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union divided the nations between themselves. More recently, Russia's actions in Chechnya, and its prior reluctance in withdrawing from the Baltic States, show the need for NATO's expansion.

The inclusion of Eastern European Countries in NATO is a crucial step toward creating stability in an important region of the world. Further, it will provide the emerging democracies of those Eastern European countries with an opportunity to flourish.

NATO was a stabilizing influence on Western Europe during the cold war. The expansion of NATO to include Eastern European nations will provide the same stabilizing influence during the post cold war era.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 7's provision to help Poland, Hungary, and other Eastern European nations gain membership in NATO, while cooperating closely with Russia.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], a new member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7.

First, let me commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for his leadership during the International Relations Committee's leadership during the International Relations Committee's consideration of H.R. 7. Our committee put considerable effort into the crafting of this legislation and I believe we've produced a sensible, responsible and much-needed effort to strengthen our national defense and set a clear, new national security policy.

The America people have grave concerns about both the Clinton administration's weakening of our military and its haphazard foreign policy. The National Security Revitalization Act seeks to reverse the dangerous trend of the last two years and refocuses U.S. defense and foreign policy priorities.

Mr. Chairman, when we pass H.R. 7, we will be keeping another promise we made to the American people. And it will serve as further notice that this Congress is serious about revitalizing and strengthening U.S. security policy.

I urge support of H.R. 7.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, what we are about today is at the very heart of the freedoms we have enjoyed for over 200 years—our Nation's defense.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that our military has been cut too deeply and too quickly. With U.S. troops being deployed more often and to more locations, it is wrong to expect our military men and women to do more with less.

In September, 1993, the administration released its recommendations within the Bottom-Up Review and called for cuts of an additional 10 percent from the defense budget. I question the conclusions of the Bottom-Up Review based on inconsistencies between the administration's strategy, recommended force structure, and projected budgets. The discrepancies have become increasingly evident as readiness problems mount and as reports come in from military leaders in the field.

It is time to call this administration to task for its inadequate efforts to provide for this Nation's defense. Support H.R. 7, support the creation of a review commission, and send a message to the White House.

□ 1600

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a Democrat who has worked very hard for the last 4 years to balance the budget and continue to make that one of my highest priorities in this body. So oftentimes over the last 4 years, balancing the budget has been like trying to take a sip out of a fire hydrant, you are pushed back every time you think you are making some progress.

We have made some progress in the last month. We have passed a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and a line-item veto, both of which I have voted for. But H.R. 7 firmly plants down now additional fire hydrants, opening the gates to spend more money that we do not have and spends this money in ways which is not in the best interests of the taxpayer nor in the best interests of our national defense.

Title II of this bill, the strategic defense initiative says, "It shall be the policy of the United States to deploy at the earliest practicable date." Not evaluate, not analyze, deploy and spend the money. That is \$29 to \$30 billion, \$10 billion more than we currently have in this bill. Where are we getting that \$10 billion? Where did it say in the Contract for America to spend \$10 billion that you did not have?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I will not yield at this time.

Second, title VI of the bill says that we want to expand NATO to the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, provide additional economic support assistance, nonproliferation and disarmament assistance. Where does it say that in the Contract for America, to increase foreign assistance?

You have some good provisions in here that I might be able to support. But if we are going to work on a balanced budget amendment, if we are going to work to take away the fire hydrants of spending more and more money in this place, H.R. 7 is not moving us in that direction.

Let it be clear to Members on both sides of this aisle, this says we are going to spend the money.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, the folks from the other side of the aisle always knew we were different. But they could always put up with it because we could not do anything about it.

The difference in this debate and previous years is that we think our defense policy needs direction, and we think it needs a new direction. Let me tell you why we think it needs direction.

Let me quote from the President's speech of January 25, 1994.

He said, "The budget I send to Congress draws the line against further defense cuts. It protects the readiness and quality of forces. We must not cut defense further."

Republicans on this side of the aisle stood and applauded that night. Now, just 12 short months later, Congress received the President's proposed budget which seeks to cut defense spending by 5.3 percent, to the lowest level since 1950.

At the core of the Clinton national security strategy is a policy which is in conflict with itself. That is why we need to set a new direction.

On the one hand, the President has ordered our military engaged in more peacekeeping missions around the world than any other President in history. On the other hand, he has cut defense spending to the historic and dangerous low.

We need to take care of our armed services, we need to take care of our people, we need to provide for the national security of our country. We note that a 12.8-percent gap exists between military pay and comparable civilian pay. We note that last year the Clinton administration did not request a military pay raise. We note that it is estimated that 17,000 junior enlisted personnel have to rely on food stamps.

How can we provide for the defense of our country and our national security with facts like those emerging?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us cut through all of the rhetoric we have heard here today. Why is H.R. 7 before us in this body today? Is it only because of Republicans?

I think back to last summer when this bill was first drafted. It was not drafted in January of this year. It was drafted because Members of both sides of the aisle said the President made a fundamental mistake. He cut defense spending by \$128 billion over 5 years which Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledged was not achievable, and we said we had to do something about that. In fact, here we are today with the General Accounting Office saying we are \$150 billion short over 5 years, the Congressional Budget Office saying we are \$67 billion short over 5 years and our good colleague and friend IKE SKELTON saying we are \$44 billion short over 5 years.

That is why we empower a commission. Because the leadership does not know what shortcomings we have in terms of spending. No one can agree. So we have to have an independent assessment look at that.

The President was wrong in the cuts that he made. While cutting our defense spending over 5 years by 25 percent, he has increased nondefense spending in the defense budget by 361 percent. Can you believe that? The biggest increase in defense spending are non-defense items. We could go through as our good friend suggested just a moment ago who would not yield to me, our good friend from Indiana, we could certainly free up \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year more just by cutting the waste and the garbage out of the defense bill without adding one dime more money in, and that is where we want to start.

This President also made a fundamental mistake when he abandoned national missile defense. He is shortchanging the American people. They think they are being protected from some kind of a rogue missile attack. They are not. There is no protection.

Lest we misstate what has been said here, no one on our side is talking about star wars. Our colleagues on the minority regret the labeling that is occurring. I am announcing today as we go through this debate, I am donating \$1 to the Science Fiction Writers Foundation for every time our colleagues on this side mention the term "star wars." It has nothing to do with this debate.

We are talking about deploying a program that Secretary Perry has said he could deploy over 5 years at a cost not to exceed \$5 billion. It is deployable and even the Secretary's own tiger term recommended to him last week that it is doable. It will provide a layer of defense that we do not now have for the entire Nation. We think we should move forward on that.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is not and should not be a partisan debate. This debate should be bipartisan as it was in the committee. Because the reasons why this bill is before us, the reasons are that Members of both sides feel that this administration has been shortchanging our military, has been shortchanging our national defense in terms of missile defense, has been shortchanging us in terms of an isolationist defense budget trying to fund an internationalist foreign policy. It just does not work.

I urge passage of H.R. 7.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, America just cannot afford H.R. 7 and it certainly cannot afford star wars 2. Star wars 2 sounds like a movie sequel but unfortunately

it is a living nightmare. This is a program—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FURSE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Can the gentlewoman point to me where in H.R. 7 the term star wars is?

Ms. FURSE. Reclaiming my time. This program, this star wars program really makes me go ballistic. It is the biggest waste of taxpayers' money around. We have already spent \$30 billion and we have nothing to show for it. What is even worse is, we are not the least bit safe with it, nor safer than we were.

I am sure that all the new Members who put themselves out as security experts would like to tell us why they need star wars.

□ 1610

But I want to tell you what a real expert has said. Former CIA Director William Colby said, "The most likely way a nuclear warhead will enter the United States in the next 10 to 20 years is in the hold of a tramp freighter."

Instead of wasting billions that the SDI will require, some tough augmentation of antiterrorist intelligence would be a much more direct defense.

Mr. Chairman, throwing money at star wars is like putting 10 locks on the front door when the back door is left open.

Now, if we honestly want to revitalize national security, let us look at some places where we could make our own armed services feel more secure. We could pay them a living wage, for one thing, keep them off food stamps. We could live up to the contract that we signed with our veterans. We could live up to that contract. We could invest in things like college loans; 6½ million students would invest back into this country, make it more secure economically.

Star wars, star wars is a bill of goods. It is a bill of goods I am not willing to pass on to the American people.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], a distinguished member of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that while rooted in a quasi-party platform, the contract, the issues in this bill must not be considered partisan. There is a great Republican as well as Democratic tradition of internationalism.

As a Republican I would stress that my party should take great care not to weaken the Presidency just because we have a weak President; not to eviscerate the United Nations just because of one or another mistaken U.N. policies; and above all, not ignore the Constitution's separation of power doc-

trine just because we now control the legislature.

For three quarters of a century, the United States has exercised preeminent world leadership in cooperative efforts to build a civilized international policy based on the rule of law. American leadership conceived the League of Nations to replace a shattered European balance-of-power system after World War I. American leadership was crucial to the establishment of the United Nations system in the aftermath of World War II.

Yet there is an ambivalence, if not tension, in the American psyche between isolationism and internationalism, between hubristic go-it-aloneism and the sharing of global responsibilities. Thus an isolationist America rejected the League in the 1920s. And in this bill this Congress is contemplating the placement of profound roadblocks in multilateral peacekeeping.

Conservatives, in particular, should support the United Nations because it implies burdensharing in security relations as well as development activities, thus shielding the United States from disproportionately being accountable for global woes.

At issue with the philosophical debate covering this bill is whether we want to be the policemen for the world or the leading member of an international highway patrol. The second option is more realistic and, I might add, cheaper.

In America today there should be no dominant place in either party for self-centered isolationism. With a sense of sadness, I accordingly urge the defeat of this legislative vehicle, which not only hamstring the constitutional prerogatives of the Presidency, but undercuts serious prospects of expanding the rule of law.

In any regard, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman GILMAN for his efforts to ameliorate some of the extraordinary counter-productivity of earlier drafts of this bill, and to accommodate some of this Member's concerns.

For example, I am appreciative that the Chairman was willing to accept this Member's modest suggestion that the findings section of the bill underscore that credible and effective collective security mechanisms are profoundly in the national interest of the United States. After all, the principle of collective security has been a linchpin of the U.S. national security policy of every administration since 1945.

Nevertheless, I would stress as strongly as I can that the legislation in its current form is in sharp contrast to the philosophical precepts that shape this Member's view of responsible internationalism and the conduct of American foreign policy.

There should be no misunderstanding. The intent of this bill is to constrain U.S. involvement in multilateral military operations under U.N. auspices. The effect of this bill, if left substantially unamended, is to diminish U.S. leadership in the U.N. and elsewhere and force Presidents in emergency settings to either do nothing or rely exclusively on unilateral actions.

Let me just summarize my major disagreements with this bill:

It unnecessarily returns the United States to rapid development and deployment of a costly strategic missile defense system that is not justified by any exigent national security threat and in so doing, gives a false impression that the nuclear beast can be constrained by one technique of defending against one kind of delivery system;

It would cripple, if not destroy, financing for U.N. peacekeeping operations, thus having the effect of requiring the United States either to adopt an isolationist posture of doing nothing or bearing a singular unilateral burden of maintaining international peace and security;

It would impose unprecedented, unconstitutional, unnecessary and capricious restrictions on the office of the presidency and the President's authority to place U.S. troops under the operational control of another country—even a NATO ally—for U.N. operations; and

By mistaking belligerent naysaying for genuine leadership and U.N. reform it risks repudiating our own heritage, undercutting our own self-interest, and tragically rending a half-century of bipartisan consensus that has sustained a generally successful and effective U.S. approach to multilateral diplomacy.

While the United States and other nations have increasingly turned to multilateral institutions to deal with certain of the most intractable problems of our time, the resulting costs and occasional policy failures—such as Somalia—have renewed doubts at home and abroad about the future of the United Nations.

While we may not like all that the United Nations or its individual members do, we no longer have the capacity, even if we so desired, to successfully go it alone. The manifest limits of American power and the contrasting global reach of American interests; they make U.S. leadership in an effective United Nations essential.

The realist critique of the American tradition of responsible internationalism—the suggestion that multilateral diplomacy is doomed to failure, that the United Nations is not a viable global body—offers a profoundly unrealistic prescription for the advancement of American interests. Members must understand that for the United States to default leadership in the world's principal arena of multilateral diplomacy amounts to nothing less than strategic retreat.

In the twilight of the 20th century nothing is more naive than to suggest that the U.S. national interest should rely on the advancement of a narrow, nationalistic foreign policy that shuns cooperative problem solving, pooh-poohs peaceful resolution of disputes, pillories attempts at political and economic institution-building and scorns collective enforcement of the peace based on the rule of law.

With the health of the American and world economy dependent on open markets and free trade, with the potential proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and with ethnic, religious, and racial divisions rising in the geographic cockpits of historical conflict, U.S. national purpose cannot afford to be diverted by uncertain leadership or ideological posturing.

An unbridled nationalist might contend that expanding international law and building international institutions of conflict resolution is unacceptable because it implies the ceding of slivers of sovereignty by nation-states. Yet the

reverse—the refusal to allow law to be established with third-party arbitration and enforcement—entails jeopardizing that very sovereignty because of the greater likelihood that disputes will be resolved only through force. Just as peoples within nation-states have come to understand the need for laws that impinge on individual discretion so that basic liberties can be better safeguarded, governments the world over must come to accept an obligation on behalf of their citizens to accelerate rather than retard the development of civilizing institutions of international polity.

This is not to suggest that the United Nations has an unblemished track record, or that criticism of the world body and its individual members should be stifled.

Yet the U.N. system is more than bricks and mortar in New York, more than General Assembly debate and Secretariat bureaucracy-building. The United Nations is a system based on the assumption that states and peoples can work together to solve transnational problems. In one sense, the United Nations symbolizes as much an idea and ideal as a structure. Nevertheless, institutional arrangements are the crux of governance, and just as shortcomings abound within the system, U.N. institutional achievements stand out.

There is a profound debate in this country and abroad about the nature of the unfolding post-cold-war world: Will it be hallmarked by a strengthening of the bonds of international society or a disintegration of those bonds within and between nation-states? Will forces of localism, nationalism and regionalism abet or curb trends in favor of an international society sharing common values? While the two great "isms" of hate of the century—fascism and communism—have been defeated, a civilized international polity still begs establishment.

Any neutral assessment of the United Nations to date must record the impressive strides that have been taken toward the development of a framework in which international law is advanced and global problems are addressed.

Writing in 1950, the theologian Reinhold Niebuhr noted that the price of our survival was the ability to give leadership to the free world. Today, the price of the prosperity of the free world still depends on the willingness and ability of the United States to lead. No other society has the capacity or inclination to light freedom's lamp in quite the same way; is any other as capable of combining self-interest with a genuine historically-rooted concern for others. For the United States to deny its transnational responsibilities and thwart the development of internationalist approaches to problem-solving is to jeopardize a future of peace and prosperity for the planet.

In a country in which process is our most important product, the challenge is to lead in expanding international law, economic as well as political, to advance new approaches to conflict resolution and to help institutionalize a civil international society capable of peacefully managing change in such a way that all countries derive benefit.

Never in the course of human events has it been more important for individuals in public life to appeal to the highest rather than the lowest instincts of the body politic. Whether the issues be social or economic, domestic or international, the temptation to appeal to the darker side of human nature must be avoided. The stakes are too high. When it comes to na-

tional security the realist is always right to prepare for the worst, but a policy rooted in cynicism too easily leads to nihilism. With morality anchored in faith, man's destiny must be understood to be in man's hands. The implicit duty of public officials is to inspire hope rather than to manipulate fear. The health of nations is directly related to the temperance of statecraft.

In the final measure the debate surrounding this bill involves issues of vision, of internationalism, of leadership. This Congress has an obligation, above all else, to understand the past and prepare for the future. This legislation fails on both counts.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

(Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, one of the prime functions of the Federal Government of the United States is to maintain a strong national defense. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise to voice my wholehearted support for this measure.

Passage of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, is a vital step toward maintaining our Nation's military status in the world. Its passage will assure that U.S. troops are only deployed to support missions in the United States national security interests. It also would reinvigorate the national missile defense system, and ensure that there be no threat to our military readiness as we move toward the next century.

U.S. defense spending—as a percentage of GDP—is at its lowest since the end of World War II. Despite severe personnel reductions and shortfalls in funding, U.S. troops are being deployed more often and are taking part in more operations than ever before. This legislation will ensure that our forces will be deployed under American command and not under the flag of the United Nations or any other political entity.

We have the finest and most professional military force in the world, and our country's security depends on their readiness. However, study after study is beginning to describe our forces as "hollow". Enactment of this measure is a good first step toward restoring our national defense back to its proper levels.

As I went door-to-door in Oklahoma's Sixth District last fall, I heard at every corner concerns about this Administration's defense policies. I am sure most of my colleagues heard the same thoughts. I would urge my colleagues to heed their calls for passage of this measure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Security Revitalization Act.

This bill is an important first step in the Congress reasserting its constitutional prerogative to control the Nation's purse.

Currently, the American taxpayer is footing over half of the United Nations peacekeeping bill. Last year alone, the American taxpayer paid \$2.9 billion to U.N. peacekeeping—\$1.2 billion in di-

rect payments, and \$1.7 billion in donations through the Defense Department.

Well, Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. The United States can no longer afford to be so generous. We want, and demand more equitable burdensharing at the United Nations. This bill does just that, and I applaud my colleagues, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. GILMAN, for their leadership on this important issue. But, we must go further.

Some people believe peacekeeping is an entitlement, and are treating it as such. The administration obligates us to a new mission, and sends the Congress the bill, with no concern over whether the funding is available.

Just last week, at the same time the United States was voting for yet another peacekeeping mission, the administration requested that Congress provide a \$672 million emergency supplemental for U.N. peacekeeping, without any offsets, because it had run out of money.

Well, peacekeeping is not an entitlement. Peacekeeping, like any other program, must be based on the availability of funds to pay for the program. If the Congress has not already provided funds for the mission, please understand that there can be no assurance that the United States will be able to pay the bill.

In 1945, the Congress passed the U.N. Participation Act on the understanding that we would be a full partner in financing decisions for the United Nations, as our Constitution provides.

This bill represents an important first step in Congress exercising its constitutional prerogative to control the Nation's purse. And, I can assure my colleagues, that, as the subcommittee chairman responsible for U.N. peacekeeping assessments, we will not treat peacekeeping as an entitlement. And, we will continue to exercise our power over the purse as we proceed with the difficult task of matching domestic and international priorities with shrinking budgetary resources.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

I want to emphasize the point that H.R. 7 undercuts the President's authority to conduct foreign policy, undercuts his ability as Commander in Chief.

Trying to micromanage command-and-control policies as we do in this bill is a bad idea whether it is under a Democrat President or a Republican President. This bill, for example, requires an act of Congress before the President can send a single military observer to join a U.N. force, and the Congress has never, ever authorized a U.N. peacekeeping mission. The bill dictates the terms and conditions for U.S. military command and control.

We try to tell the United States military in this bill how to do their job,

and that is why the flag and general officers that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] cited a moment ago say that H.R. 872 is unnecessary, unwise, and militarily unsound.

Now, we ought not to try to substitute our judgment about military command and write the details into this bill. That is a very unwise thing to do. It is one thing to criticize the policy of the U.S. Government on foreign policies. We all do that. We should do it. It is part of our responsibility.

But it is quite another thing to enact into law constraints, restrictions on the President of the United States to act as Commander in Chief, and that is what we are doing here. Under sections 401 and 402, it prohibits any U.S. troops from serving under U.N. command, even if the U.N. commander is an American, without prior congressional approval. We have got to give them congressional approval before a President can move one soldier into U.N. peacekeeping.

If this were in effect, we would have to pull out our people from Korea, from the Western Sahara, from Georgia, from Kuwait, from Jerusalem. We would have said President Bush could not carry out Desert Storm and Desert Shield. I think we are right about that, because one of the things that happened there is we had the 82d Airborne Brigade which served under French command. That is a judgment our military commanders in the field and in Washington made was in our national interest to let that happen.

Now, I do not know, militarily, whether that was the right or the wrong decision. But the point is let us not restrict our commanders to the point where they do not have these options. I think this bill greatly constrains and restrains the President in the exercise of Commander in Chief powers.

□ 1620

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, in 1992, when this administration took office, they commissioned a study of the military and our defense needs from the bottom up. The Bottom-Up Review sought to identify specifically the objectives that the administration wanted to protect this country against in order that we might have an adequate defense strategy.

Now, 2 years later. Independent studies are showing that that strategy has been unfunded to the tune of anywhere between \$65 and \$150 billion over the prospective budgets.

At the same time, we were just presented with a defense budget which, for the 11th consecutive year, presented real cuts in defense spending, or \$10.6 billion below the current year's fiscal authorization.

That is a real cut in defense spending of almost 40 percent over the last 10 years, at the very same time that vital installations and programs are being threatened because of drastic underfunding. This administration has committed at the end of the last year over 70,000 U.S. personnel in places like Iraq, Kuwait, Bosnia, Macedonia, the Adriatic Sea, Rwanda, Haiti, Cuba; and if the press is to be believed, shortly we will have Americans back on a temporary mission in Somalia.

Mr. President, you cannot have it both ways. If there is a deep concern about defense, let us see that it is adequately funded, and if it is not going to be adequately funded, then let us not send American forces hither and yon all over the world. One way or the other, our defense spending and our needs should be consistent with our resources, or our resources need to be consistent with our commitment. You cannot have one without the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to admonish any Member to keep from making statements instructing the President or making similar references to the President.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is in fact a very strange debate, and I can fully understand why 62 percent of the American people did not bother to vote in November and why millions and millions of Americans have so little respect for this situation.

Mr. Chairman, as we discuss today spending ten's and ten's of billion dollars more on star wars and other military gadgetry, there are congressional leaders in this building today who are talking about major cutbacks in nutritional programs for hungry children, who are talking about cutbacks in Medicare for the elderly, in Medicaid for the sick, who are talking about cutbacks in veterans programs.

I sincerely hope that my friends who are proposing billions more for star wars tell the veterans of this country why they want to cut back on their programs so that the quality of service in the VA hospitals will deteriorate. Have the courage, get up here and tell the parents of kids who are attending the Head Start Program that we do not have enough money for them but we have more money for military spending.

Mr. Chairman, I have a startling revelation to make which will clearly change the nature of this debate. I am hereby announcing to my friends who have not yet heard about it, the cold war is over. I know you did not know that. The Soviet Union does not exist. China is now our trading ally.

Mr. Chairman, we are now spending 17 times more than all of our enemies—

so called enemies—combined. Enough is enough. Let us defeat this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

(Mr. BONILLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONILLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old adage that politics stops at the border. My colleagues, we would all be wise to remember that adage at this time. Do not consider this bill as a Republican bill or as a Democrat bill, but as an American bill.

This bill, in a dramatic and fundamental way, affects American independence and liberty. It puts a stop to the U.N. commanding America's fighting men and women.

Recently, some of our leaders have been lost, they have abandoned the lessons of our past and allegiance to our traditions, and they have forgotten or ignored America's chosen role as freedom's leader in this world. Instead they have made America a follower, much like a dog following its master, always loyal to every whim and command. So have our leaders abandoned our independence and answered the call and the demands of the United Nations, an organization unsuited to military command and unable to take a firm position of principle.

Mr. Chairman, America's pride and tradition demand we assert our independence. America's fallen heroes demand that America no longer serve the whims of foreign tyrannies and dictators. America's destiny to lead must never be compromised.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there is a reality check that needs to occur. The original draft to the bill included, frankly, NATO; could not operate American forces under anybody else's command. But then they figured NATO could cause us some trouble, so they restricted it to United Nations. The U.N., where the United States has veto power, where the United States designs most of the major actions of the last 4 decades, and where today American soldiers operate under General Chang. When General Luck is out of the country, American soldiers operating in the Korean Peninsula are under the control operationally of a non-American. You had better come forward and offer an amendment to exempt Korea, or else, if this becomes law, you will find yourself in the position of undercutting our military security on the Korean Peninsula.

If you read the language as you have drafted it from line 9 on page 34 to line

5 on page 36, it clearly states that if the American soldiers are not controlled in every way by American commanders, it is illegal under this act. This act, if it becomes law, is not simply a statement of principles, it says the United States could no longer operate the way we have operated since the Truman administration on the peninsula of Korea.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a senior member of our committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act. The facts and figures set forth in the legislative findings to H.R. 872 make it clear that the United States may well be on its way back to the hollow forces of the 1970's. But this is not the whole story. Even as we have committed less to the national defense, we have spent more and more of these precious resources on operations which are at best peripheral to the mission of the U.S. Armed Forces. During the first 100 days of this Congress we can change this course and put America back on the road to peace through strength—the successful strategy of the Reagan years, which made the world both more peaceful and more free.

Mr. Chairman, we need the things this bill will provide and encourages. We need to seriously pursue an antiballistic missile system, which is not only more practical but also more moral than a system of mutual assured destruction. Most Americans are woefully unaware of the fact that we have no defense against incoming missile attacks. We need to adapt NATO, which Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick has described as the most successful collective security arrangement in modern history, to provide for the security of European nations which are newly free. We need a relationship with the United Nations that allows that organization to do the things it does best while also preserving the sovereignty and effectiveness of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this world is perfect. Many Americans would say that things designed by Congress are even more imperfect than other things. Members of the International Relations Committee, including this member, made suggestions for improving this bill. Our distinguished Chairman, BEN GILMAN and members of the Committee staff encouraged these suggestions and worked hard to accommodate them. We amended the bill to meet many of the objections that are now being reiterated on the floor. Mr. Chairman, the National Security Revitalization Act as amended will go a long way toward the restoration of a strong America. This, in turn, will make for a safer and freer world. I hope we can move quickly to final enactment.

□ 1630

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], our top gun on the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, why do many of us object to the stringent control of our forces under the U.N.? First of all, I take a look at Bosnia. We have men and women committed to war, and committed and executed that war, and the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Vice President did not know that we had troops at war until after the fact. That was in Bosnia, and that is a fact.

Second, in Somalia. I resent the gentleman that suggested and characterized our rangers as just wanting to get into action in Somalia. A democratic majority extended Somalia. That cost us billions of dollars. The administration changed that policy from humanitarian to go after Aideed. That was wrong. The administration then reduced our troops levels, making us very vulnerable. That was wrong.

Three times the commanders asked for help. Why? For armored help. Because on two different occasions we had our troops captured, and cut and quartered, and their quartered bodies drug through the streets of Somalia. That was wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we had 100 rangers pinned down, that it took us 7 hours to get to, and why? It is a 20-minute car ride to where they are. Take a look at it. Why? Because the U.N. tanks that were there would not commit. The U.N. troops had never used night goggles. Many of them were not English-proficient. It cost us 22 dead rangers and 77 wounded. That is wrong, my colleagues and Mr. Speaker.

I take a look at Haiti. Although a U.S. operation, the great multinational force that we were supposed to have, not a single multinational force was there when we hit Haiti, only U.S. troops. And, Mr. Speaker, there are many of us that feel very strongly about not having U.S. control, and it is logical it is not partisan.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, this legislation makes a loud and clear statement to the world. As we have heard earlier, the cold war is over. The United States bore the burden for decades. Our troops were put in harm's way to save the peoples of the world from fascism and then communism. In the postcold war world we will no longer require our people to carry an unfair burden for the sake of the rest of humanity.

This is not isolationism. This is America comes first as policy. This is not anti-United Nations. This is pro our national interests. Americans have sacrificed their lives and well-being for an ungrateful world for far too long.

Our troops should not be put under U.N. command because the United Nations does not care as much about them as American commanders will care about them. If our President does put them under U.N. command, we should be informed.

That is what this legislation says, and, if our troops are sent on long-term, costly operations, Congress should be in on the decisionmaking. We will no longer be making military commitments like we did in Somalia, or Rwanda, or Haiti unless Congress approves.

This administration has been depleting our limited defense resources on United Nations and other missions that have little to do with our country's security. The cold war is over. The American people deserve a break. Our military personnel deserve our total support if they are put in harm's way. We will not see the funds for their weapons or their training drained for altruistic international adventurism of a liberal elite.

This is our way of saying that we care about others, but our loyalty is first to the American people, then to our defenders, and the United Nations and international benevolence comes in a distant third.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, before we end this road race to the finish line of H.R. 7, let us stop, look, and listen.

This bill takes something that is not broken and breaks it. This bill moves from peacekeeping to war making. Where peace exists, this bill creates conflict. Where order reigns, this bill creates chaos. This bill makes false assumptions. It says where we have troops under foreign command, and we all know that the President never relinquishes his command. Where Congress has eliminated spending for star wars, billions of dollars, this bill reinstates it. The Republicans say, "Spend it."

The worst part of this bill is to undermine the constitutional role of the President of the United States to conduct foreign policy. It says, "If you don't like the President, cripple his powers."

I say to my colleagues, Don't cripple our country. Don't retreat from leadership. Reject this isolationist bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill the Republicans bring before the House today destroys the underpinnings of our country's dedication to peace around the world.

By slashing the U.S. commitment to the United Nations, this bill says to the world community: we don't care about maintaining peace. Got a war? That's your problem.

The role of the United States in peacekeeping around the globe, unilaterally and in concert with the United Nations, is far from an exact science, but it is a system that works well and has worked well within the construct

of an international community dedicated to conflict resolution.

But in a perverse twist on an old cliché, the Republicans today ask us in H.R. 7 to take something that ain't broken, and break it.

Where peace exists, this bill creates conflict.

Where order reigns, this bill creates chaos.

This bill begins with a premise that is wholly false, then creates solutions to problems that do not exist. For example:

Though we don't have troops under foreign command, this Republican bill says: stop putting our troops under foreign command.

Though we don't have problems sharing in peacekeeping responsibilities, this Republican bill says: no more peacekeeping—it causes too many problems.

H.R. 7 ignores the Republicans' own plea to reduce the deficit by calling for unnecessary and wasteful spending. For example:

Now that we have eliminated spending billions and billions on star wars weapons system, this Republican bill says: spend it.

The gist of this bill is supposed to be to restore America's leadership role in the world. But it does just the opposite. For example:

Where we have played a leadership role in the United Nations—as we should, given our status as the remaining global power—this Republican bill says: no more United Nations involvement.

The worst part of this bill is that its real purpose is to undermine the constitutional role of the President to conduct foreign policy. In essence, if you don't like the person who is the Command in Chief, this Republican bill says: cripple his powers.

Mr. Chairman, what are we doing here? What in the world is going on? Has this body stooped so low that in order to flex its partisan political muscle it will destroy the framework of peace that this Nation has dedicated itself to for years and years?

This bill makes a mockery of the tenets of peace and accommodation that men and women have died to enforce.

Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill is to bring shame on this House. To pass this bill is to move from disarmament and peace and return to cold war hostilities. To pass this bill is to leave the global community without the benefit of American input to resolving international conflict. To pass this bill is to snub the world community and retreat into our own isolationist shell.

Mr. Chairman, this world has grown too small to ignore our neighbor's problems, for surely if we do, they will spill over into our backyard. America deserves better than what H.R. 7 offers. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, through the myriad of provisions of this legislation there is one common thread, one unmistakable common purpose, and that is to reverse nearly one-half century of U.S. leadership, abdicating a leadership that through some of the most dangerous times in history has kept the peace, kept the peace through a system of international security.

This is not, Mr. Chairman, a new debate in this Chamber. Democrats and Republicans through our history exchanged the mantle of isolationist leadership many times. But his legisla-

tion makes clear that that unfortunate title of leadership now strongly belongs to the Republican Party.

Our Republican colleagues have every reason to be proud of the international leadership of Presidents Eisenhower, Nixon, Reagan, and Bush. But there was another republican Party of Lodge who argued against a League of Nations and brought it to its death, of Burrow who argued against rearmament before the Second World War, and Vandenberg, to the very day of Pearl Harbor, argued against American involvement in the great international conflict. There is now no other interpretation of H.R. 7 available than that this Republican Party, having abandoned the traditions of the last generation, has returned to that earlier age.

Mr. Chairman, there is no other interpretation because, when the United States refuses to have our forces under international command, not simply the nations of the Third World, with which I could identify and sympathize, but even of our NATO allies, meaning the great struggle in Korea and the Persian Gulf would no longer be possible.

Mr. Chairman in this great Chamber we reserve the honor of a portrait to only two men in the history of our country, George Washington, our first President, and General Lafayette, a French General who came to these shores to secure our independence, but who by this legislation would no longer be allowed to command our forces.

Mr. Chairman, ironically, as we debate this legislation, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Field Marshal Montgomery who led British and American forces across the Rhine to defeat Nazi Germany. He would be prohibited from leading those forces today under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as we speak we celebrate the fourth anniversary of the Persian Gulf war, when Italian and French and British Generals of war led our forces to victory in combined command, but would be prohibited under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there is no other interpretation than that we are losing our leadership to isolationism, because under this legislation our U.N. contributions would virtually end for peacekeeping, ending our ability to appeal to the Security Council to undertake peacekeeping in our own national interests, and forgetting that the best defense for the United States is no weapon system, but in the nuclear age it is the ability to preserve the peace.

It is a great irony, Mr. Chairman, that the same people who would spend anything on any weapons system would now propose to spend nothing to keep the peace, even though a generation has proven that the international system of peacekeeping through the United Nations works. Just as we proved with the death of millions, the failure of the League of Nations could consume as many lives.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great tradition in this country that partisanship ends at the water's edge. With this legislation the Atlantic and Pacific are merged, and this Nation is awash in a new partisanship that consumes our foreign policy.

□ 1740

Defeat H.R. 7.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of the procurement subcommittee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me respond to my friend from New Jersey, who mentioned a number of great Americans and characterized the Republicans as isolationists in some way. Let me just respond that I can think of another great American, and I think that his opposition, those who opposed his idea, were in some way analogous to the Democrat Party today.

That gentleman was Gen. Billy Mitchell. And Gen. Billy Mitchell dragged us kicking and screaming into the age of air power. And he did that by proving that aircraft could sink ships. And when he did that, it totally frustrated the thinking inside the Beltway, so-to-speak, in Washington, DC, in the power establishment, when he sunk 4 ships, including a major German battleship, with air power. It was greatly resisted by the politicians of his time. They did not want to hear that. They did not want to hear that they had entered the age of air power.

Now, my friends, we have entered the age of missiles. And I understand that it was the political position of the other side of the aisle, of the Democrat Party, to refer to shooting down incoming ballistic missiles as star wars, as if it was some kind of a divorced contact and conflict that in no way defended people on this Earth. I can remember Walter Mondale standing in the San Francisco convention declaring he would have no part in what he called war in the heavens. But I think that Walter Mondale, great Democrat that he was, if he was watching CNN and watched those American Patriot missiles shooting down ballistic missiles, very slow, but ballistic nonetheless, Scud missiles, incoming to American troops, and he saw those destroyed in midair by our Patriot missiles, would have said instead of saying I will not participate in war in the heavens, he would have said thank heavens.

H.R. 7 pulls the United States squarely into a reality that we live in an age of missiles. And it is just as much a matter of readiness, which a number of the Members on the other side have talked about, clothing for our troops, quality of life for our troops, pay for our troops, fuel and training exercises for our troops, I would offer to my friends that it is just as important to our troops to be defended against incoming ballistic missiles as it is to be

well paid, well fed, and have good quarters for their families.

Now, for those who said it would cost tens and tens of billions of dollars to defend against incoming ballistic missiles, let me just refer my friends to the statement made by the Secretary of Defense, William Perry, a few days ago. He said we can have a national missile defense for a relatively small cost, probably about \$5 billion, in very round figures; by the end of the decade, he said a few sentences later.

The fact is we are in the age of missiles, H.R. 7 recognizes that, and I would call on all of my friends to support this bill, Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is more nostalgia from the same people who in the eighties gave us the skyrocketing Federal deficit.

The Soviet threat is long gone. The Russian military debacle in Chechnya should be a clear reminder of this. Yet, this blueprint for more defense spending would have us waste tens of billions of dollars on cold war weapon systems that make no sense in this new era.

Billions on a star wars missile defense system that is not needed and will never work. Billions on exotic cold war programs, and billions on unnecessary operations funding when our forces are first rate and combat ready. Billions that we all know we just don't have.

The Republican majority would like to have it both ways. They can promise all the money in the world on a shopping spree of unneeded programs and weapons. The hard part is coming up with the funds to do it or a threat to justify spending it.

We have been down this road before. Let's not make the same mistake. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say to my distinguished colleague from California, each of the last 2 years we have spent nearly \$3 billion per year on ballistic missile defense, \$400 million on national missile defense, \$120 million on Brilliant Eyes, a space-based sensor program, and all of the remaining of that nearly \$3 billion has gone to theater ballistic missile defense. The point of the statement is it is presently now the policy that theater ballistic missiles is the priority. So that is my response to the gentleman.

In the remaining comments I would say, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a national security bill, foreign policy bill and national intelligence bill, with enormous budgetary implications, treaty implications, constitutional implications and foreign policy implications. Yet we have been reduced to the absurdity of yielding 1 and 2 minutes to each of our coequal colleagues on the floor of Congress on a bill of this

gravity and a bill of this magnitude. I would continue to assert that 2 hours of general debate on a bill of this magnitude with such enormous implications is wholly and totally inadequate, and 10 hours of debate on substantive and critical issues that challenge our budget, challenge our form of government, challenge our Constitution and our relationships with the world, is totally inadequate to deal with these issues. If you could break the crime bill down into six pieces, giving them 10 hours apiece, how can you cram all of this together and give 10 hours of debate apiece and call that maintaining the fiduciary responsibility to the American people. We are not doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a senior member of our Committee on International Relations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question: Do you feel, do you think, that the American people, the people that have placed their trust and confidence in us, are treated fairly under the current system of United Nations funding?

We have today \$150 billion trade deficits. Other countries are ravaging us. Other countries are very rich. Yet are you satisfied that last year 80 percent, 80 percent of the U.N. peacekeeping costs, according to your own General Accounting Office, 80 percent was paid by your voters?

It is not only that the people you represent are paying the lion's share of the bills. Their sons and daughters are doing most of the fighting and most of the work, too. The Americans at the behest of this Congress, you have the control, the American taxpayer and the American soldier are doing all of the heavy lifting.

Do you think it is right that the American soldier carries the burden in most of these operations? Do you really believe that all of these peacekeeping activities have anything to do with national security? If you really believe that the current system is fair to America, that it is fair to your voters, that it is fair to your people, then vote for this bill and bring in amendments on this legislation.

□ 1650

But if you believe, as I do, as most of the American people do, that we Americans are carrying just too much of the burden, that we have too much of the cost, that we have too much of the risk, then you should support this bill because this bill is only restoring basic fairness to our role in the United Nations.

The criticisms you have heard here today are totally off the mark. Jeane Kirkpatrick just had a news conference

an hour and a half ago where she said in no way does this legislation inhibit the President.

This bill, far from ending our peacekeeping role, merely sets a fair distribution. We will still be paying 25 percent, yes, 25 percent of all of the U.N. peacekeeping under this legislation. We are not hamstringing the President of the United States. He has discretion in every portion of this bill.

But there are some, I fear, in this body who would have our taxpayers pay everything, who would have our soldiers do everything. Short of that, nothing will satisfy the liberal elitists and the American people said there is time for a change.

I and a vast majority of the American people say, yes, it is time for a change. Vote for basic fairness. Vote for our taxpayers. Vote for our troops. Vote for common sense. Vote for this bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the Bereuter amendments which passed tonight. I think these amendments remove a significant flaw in an otherwise sensible and balanced approach to enhance the national security of this country. I commend Chairman SPENCE and Chairman GILMAN for their good work on this legislation. As others have eloquently stated, the Bereuter amendments are needed to ensure we do not cross the line—encroaching on the President's constitutional power as Commander in Chief.

Having worked as a lawyer in the White House counsel's office at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I may have a different perspective on this issue than some of my colleagues. I have serious questions about the War Powers Act, and section 508 of this bill seems to go even further by requiring congressional approval of deployment of U.S. troops without any grace period.

As a practical matter, I think this may even create a perverse incentive on the part of the administration not to turn over U.S. operations to the U.N. where such a transfer may well be in our national interest. I give you 2 examples—one recent, one on-going.

In Somalia, I believe it was in our interest to move from unilateral United States occupation to a U.N. operation. More immediately, at the end of this month, it is my understanding that in Haiti the United States command will become a U.N. peacekeeping operation. We don't want to continue to occupy Haiti. The shift to the U.N. is in our national interest and gives us a way out. Yet, were section 508 to be enacted into law, I believe any administration would have every incentive not to discontinue the unilateral U.S. mission in favor of U.N. cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an inadvertent and very realistic effect of section 508. I commend my colleagues for correcting this problem tonight improving an otherwise good bill by passing the Bereuter amendments.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7, as it is written, is bad legislation. It should be defeated. If America insists on spending countless billions on Star Wars at the expense of our troops, if America retreats from global economic and military cooperation, if America refuses to feed, educate, and house her own

troops and citizens at risk—the children, the sick, and the elderly—a bankrupt America will fall into economic and social ruin.

For years, respected Members of Congress, such as former Congressman Charles Bennett who represented some of my district, have opposed funding for star wars. Instead, these members believed that troop readiness was a top priority.

Currently, many of our troops live in substandard housing, they are forced to use food stamps, because they cannot stretch their pay to cover even the most basic needs for their families. This does not contribute to our readiness.

Let's reassure America that we in Congress are an intelligent group because we are interested in funding military programs that benefit our troops and our military families. We want our military dollars spent to keep our troops ready in every way.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has deployed U.S. forces on more humanitarian missions per year than any other administration in history. At the end of last year, over 70,000 U.S. personnel were serving in unstable regions such as Iraq, Bosnia, and Haiti—48,000 military men and women remain in these areas today.

The United States is supposed to be the world's only Super Power, when in fact we are becoming nothing more than a paper tiger. H.R. 7 reverses the Clinton administration's drastic reduction of our Nation's defense and revitalizes the United States military might.

Our military personnel are being stretched to the limit. They are being sent to areas that are not in the United States national security interests. Since Desert Storm, U.S. forces have been cut by 27 percent, which means there are less people to do more jobs.

Some of the finest men and women serve in the Armed Forces in North Carolina from Fort Bragg to Camp Lejeune, and numerous other facilities across the state. U.S. defense spending is at its lowest level since World War II and the President wants to cut \$10.6 billion more from defense. Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, Republicans are working hard to keep our Contract With America on track. We continue to keep our promises. We passed our crime package to take back our streets. Now we will work to restore our military.

The best defense is a strong defense. H.R. 7, the National Restoration Act, ensures that our Armed Forces will be strong enough to fight and win. Republicans pledge that our defenses will be prepared to protect our country and national interests.

Providing for common defense is the first duty of the Federal Government. The decline in military readiness over the past years must stop. We must act now to prevent our military from becoming a hollow force.

Military readiness funds should be used for just that—to keep our American soldiers ready for military action. Dipping our hand into the cookie jar for dollars to send our troops here, there, and everywhere undermines American security and peace of mind. We cannot be the world's peacekeepers.

Our Armed Forces are the best in the world. Our Republican defense package makes sure that we remain that way. Defense spending has been cut too far and too quickly in order to pay for expensive social programs and frivolous international policing expeditions.

Republicans will set priorities and restore the vital elements our defenses need to maintain our credibility around the world. We are keeping our promise. American troops should not be used as a substitute for sound foreign policy.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 872, the National Security Revitalization Act. This bill serves to curtail the cost and scope of U.N. missions, provide a framework for congressional consultation, and discipline the seemingly haphazard deployment of American troops.

If enacted, this legislation will allow the United Nations to focus on missions and roles it is capable of fulfilling. Recently, the United Nations has expanded its role, perhaps in response to prodding from the Clinton administration, to include peacemaking, nationbuilding, and even chasing warlords. This action does the United Nations and the United States a disservice, as public confidence in international operations declines and questions arise concerning the focus and intent of U.S. foreign policy.

Members supporting H.R. 872 are not opposed to all U.N. operations, because we do believe the United Nations is capable of achieving limited missions on a reduced scale. The United Nations is quite capable of delivering humanitarian aid and acting as a moderator when all sides in a dispute request the U.N.'s presence. The United Nations gets into trouble when it has attempted to expand its mission.

This bill will ensure that we receive credit for our expenditures on behalf of U.N. operations, guarantee that U.S. troops are placed under foreign command only in emergencies or when a pressing U.S. security interest merits such a deployment, and should result in a reassessment of the U.N.'s capabilities and limitations and U.S. involvement with that organization. Throughout the process, we have attempted to compromise on certain details to improve the legislation, but we have refused to compromise on principle issues.

Fundamentally, the administration wants to enhance the power of the United Nations and our participation in that organization. We want to restrict our participation, temper our costs and involvement, and discipline our foreign policy. If you support the aggrandizement of the United Nations at the literal expense of United States, then you should oppose this bill. But if you support a limitation on U.N. missions and our participation in them, and desire the United Nations to focus on missions it is capable of achieving, you should support the bill. I urge all Members to approve this important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 872 is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 872

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "National Security Revitalization Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—FINDINGS, POLICY, AND PURPOSES

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Policy.

Sec. 103. Purposes.

TITLE II—MISSILE DEFENSE

Sec. 201. Policy.

Sec. 202. Actions of the Secretary of Defense.

Sec. 203. Report to Congress.

TITLE III—ADVISORY COMMISSION ON REVITALIZATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Sec. 301. Establishment.

Sec. 302. Composition.

Sec. 303. Duties.

Sec. 304. Reports.

Sec. 305. Powers.

Sec. 306. Commission procedures.

Sec. 307. Personnel matters.

Sec. 308. Termination of the Commission.

Sec. 309. Funding.

TITLE IV—COMMAND OF UNITED STATES FORCES

Sec. 401. Limitation on expenditure of Department of Defense funds for United States forces placed under United Nations command or control.

Sec. 402. Limitation on placement of United States Armed Forces under foreign control for a United Nations peacekeeping activity.

TITLE V—UNITED NATIONS

Sec. 501. Credit against assessment for United States expenditures in support of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Sec. 502. Codification of required notice to Congress of proposed United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 503. Notice to Congress regarding United States contributions for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 504. Revised notice to Congress regarding United States assistance for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 505. United States contributions to United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 506. Reimbursement to the United States for in-kind contributions to United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 507. Limitation on payment of United States assessed or voluntary contributions for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 508. Limitation on use of Department of Defense funds for United States share of costs of United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Sec. 509. Codification of limitation on amount of United States assessed contributions for United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Sec. 510. Buy American requirement.

Sec. 511. United Nations budgetary and management reform.

Sec. 512. Conditions on provision of intelligence to the United Nations.

TITLE VI—REVITALIZATION AND EXPANSION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Findings.
 Sec. 603. United States policy.
 Sec. 604. Revisions to program to facilitate transition to NATO membership.

TITLE VII—BUDGET FIREWALLS

Sec. 701. Restoration of budget firewalls for defense spending.

TITLE I—FINDINGS, POLICY, AND PURPOSES

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Dramatic changes in the geo-political and military landscape during the last decade have had significant impacts on United States security.

(2) Those changes include the breakup of the Warsaw Pact alliance, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, and an increase in regional instability and conflict.

(3) While the magnitude and implications of these and other changes continues to evolve, the world remains an unstable and dangerous place. This uncertainty mandates the need for an on-going process to establish an appropriate national security strategy and the forces needed to implement that strategy.

(4) The centerpiece of the defense strategy of the Administration, the review of the Department of Defense conducted by the Secretary of Defense in 1993 known as the "Bottom Up Review", determined that United States forces must be—

(A) prepared to fight and win two nearly simultaneous Major Regional Conflicts;

(B) able to sustain robust overseas presence in peacetime;

(C) prepared for a variety of regional contingencies; and

(D) able to deter and prevent attacks with weapons of mass destruction against United States territory and forces and the territory and forces of our allies.

(5) The Bottom Up Review also recommended significant reductions in military forces, including reduction in the number of Navy ships by one-third, the number of Air Force wings by almost one-half, and the level of funding for missile defenses by over 50 percent.

(6) The General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have estimated that the mismatch between even the restrictive Bottom Up Review force and the Administration defense budget may be up to anywhere from \$65,000,000,000 to \$150,000,000,000.

(7) Since January 1993, presidential budgets and budget plans have set forth a reduction in defense spending of \$156,000,000,000 through fiscal year 1999.

(8) The fiscal year 1995 budget is the 10th consecutive year of reductions in real defense spending and, with the exception of fiscal year 1948, represents the lowest percentage of gross domestic product for any defense budget since World War II.

(9) During fiscal year 1995, the number of active duty, reserve component, and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense will be reduced by 182,000, a rate of over 15,000 per month or over 500 per day. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that 1,200,000 defense-related private sector jobs will be lost by 1997.

(10) Despite severe reductions and shortfalls in defense funding and force structure, since 1993 United States military forces have been deployed more often and committed to more peacetime missions per year than ever before. Most of these missions involve United Nations peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts. At the end of fiscal year 1994, over 70,000 United States personnel were serving in such regions as Iraq, Bosnia, Macedonia, the Adriatic Sea, Rwanda, and the Caribbean Sea for missions involving Haiti and Cuba.

(11) Despite the dramatic increase in the pace of operations and the diversion of training and exercise funds to cover the costs of unbudgeted contingency operations, the Armed Forces of the United States remain the most capable, motivated, and effective military force in the world. The ability to successfully deploy and maintain support for the range of on-going contingency operations demonstrates the continued quality and professionalism of our troops.

(12) However, persistent indications of declining readiness demonstrate that military units are entering the early stage of a long-term systemic readiness problem. This downward readiness trend risks a return to the "hollow forces" of the 1970s.

(13) At the end of fiscal year 1994, one-third of the units in the Army contingency force and all of the forward-deployed and follow-on Army divisions were reporting a reduced state of military readiness. During fiscal year 1994, training readiness declined for the Navy's Atlantic and Pacific fleets. Training funding shortfalls also resulted in a grounding of Navy and Marine Corps aircraft squadrons and cancellation and curtailment of Army training exercises. Marine and naval personnel are not maintaining the standard 12- to 18-month respite between six-month deployments away from home.

(14) The significant increase in deployments in support of peacekeeping, humanitarian, and contingency operations has placed great personnel tempo stress on many critical operational units.

(15) A real commitment to equitable compensation and protection of quality-of-life programs for servicemembers and their families is an essential component to ensuring high personnel morale and sustaining force readiness. However, as of January 1, 1995, military pay is approximately 12.8 percent below comparable civilian levels. As a result, it is estimated that close to 17,000 junior enlisted personnel have to rely on food stamps and the Department of Defense will soon begin providing supplementary food benefits to an estimated 11,000 military personnel and dependents living overseas.

(16) Critical long-term modernization programs continue to be delayed or cancelled as resources are diverted to cover short-term personnel and readiness shortfalls resulting from an underfunded defense budget and an overextended force, threatening the technological superiority of future United States forces.

(17) The fiscal year 1995 defense budget failed to meet the current force structure goal of 184 modern long-range bombers, as established in the Bottom-Up Review. Unless this long-range bomber capability shortfall is addressed promptly, the Nation's ability to project force will be undermined and the existing bomber industrial base may be placed at risk.

(18) The Administration has initially agreed to or proposed treaty limitations, or has unilaterally adopted positions, that prohibit the United States from testing or deploying effective missile defense systems.

(19) United Nations assessments to the United States for peacekeeping missions totaled over \$1,000,000,000 in 1994. The United States is assessed 31.7 percent of annual United Nations costs for peacekeeping. The next highest contributor, Japan, only pays 12.5 percent of such costs. The Department of Defense also incurs hundreds of millions of dollars in costs every year for United States military participation in United Nations peacekeeping or humanitarian missions, most of which are not reimbursed by the United Nations. For fiscal year 1994, these Department of Defense costs totaled over \$1,721,000,000.

(20) Credible and effective collective action on international security concerns through the United Nations and regional organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can, in appropriate cases, advance world peace, strengthen the national security of the United States, and foster more equitable burden-sharing with friends and allies of the United States in military, political, and financial terms.

SEC. 102. POLICY.

The Congress is committed to providing adequate resources to protect the national security interests of the United States, including the resources necessary—

(1) to provide for sufficient forces to meet the national security strategy of being able to fight and win two nearly simultaneously major regional conflicts;

(2) to provide pay and benefits necessary for members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserve as well as active duty members) to begin closing the gap between rates of civilian pay and rates of military pay;

(3) to maintain a high quality-of-life for military personnel and their dependents;

(4) to maintain a high level of military readiness and take all necessary steps to avoid a return to the "hollow forces" of the 1970s;

(5) to fully provide for the necessary modernization of United States military forces in order to ensure their technological superiority over any adversary; and

(6) to develop and deploy at the earliest practical date highly effective national and theater missile defense systems.

SEC. 103. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish an advisory commission to assess United States military needs and address the problems posed by the continuing downward spiral of defense spending;

(2) to commit the United States to accelerate the development and deployment of theater and national ballistic missile defense capabilities;

(3) to restrict deployment of United States forces to missions that are in the national security interest of the United States;

(4) to maintain adequate command and control by United States personnel of United States forces participating in United Nations peacekeeping operations;

(5) to reduce the cost to the United States of United Nations peacekeeping activities and to press for reforms in United Nations management practices; and

(6) to reemphasize the commitment of the United States to a strong and viable North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TITLE II—MISSILE DEFENSE

SEC. 201. POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) deploy at the earliest practical date an antiballistic missile system that is capable of providing a highly effective defense of the United States against ballistic missile attacks; and

(2) provide at the earliest practical date highly effective theater missile defenses (TMDs) to forward-deployed and expeditionary elements of the Armed Forces of the United States and to friendly forces and allies of the United States.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

(a) ABM SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop for deployment at the earliest practical date a cost-effective, operationally effective antiballistic missile system designed to protect the United States against ballistic missile attacks.

(b) **ADVANCED THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop for deployment at the earliest practical date advanced theater missile defense systems.

SEC. 203. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system pursuant to section 202(a) and for the deployment of theater missile defense systems pursuant to section 202(b).

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.**—For purposes of this section, the term "congressional defense committees" means—

(1) the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

TITLE III—ADVISORY COMMISSION ON REVITALIZATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY
SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is hereby established an advisory commission to be known as the "Revitalization of National Security Commission" (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 302. COMPOSITION.

(a) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, appointed as follows:

(1) Four members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) Four members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) Four members shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate, three of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate and one of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The members of the Commission shall be appointed from among persons having knowledge and experience in defense and foreign policy.

(c) **TERM OF MEMBERS; VACANCIES.**—Members of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. A vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(d) **COMMENCEMENT.**—The members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 21 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Commission shall convene its first meeting to carry out its duties under this section 14 days after seven members of the Commission have been appointed.

(e) **CHAIRMAN.**—The chairman of the Commission shall be designated jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate (after consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate) from among members of the Commission appointed under subsection (a)(2) or (a)(3).

SEC. 303. DUTIES.

(a) **COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.**—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of the long-term national security needs of the United States. The review shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the need for a new national security strategy and, if it is determined that such a new strategy is needed, identification of such a strategy.

(2) An assessment of the need for a new national military strategy and, if it is deter-

mined that such a new strategy is needed, identification of such a strategy.

(3) An assessment of the military force structure necessary to support the new strategies identified under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) An assessment of force modernization requirements necessary to support the new strategies identified under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(5) An assessment of military infrastructure requirements necessary to support the new strategies identified under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(6) An assessment of the funding needs of the Department of Defense necessary to support the long-term national security requirements of the United States.

(7) An assessment of the adequacy of the force structure recommended in the 1993 Bottom-Up Review in executing the national military strategy.

(8) An assessment of the adequacy of the current future-years defense plan in fully funding the Bottom-Up Review force structure while maintaining adequate force modernization and military readiness objectives.

(9) An assessment of the level of defense funds expended on non-defense programs.

(10) An assessment of the costs to the United States of expanding the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(11) An assessment of the elements of military pay and allowances constituting the regular military compensation of members of the Armed Forces and the development of recommendations for changes in those elements in order to end the dependence of some members of the Armed Forces and their families on Federal and local assistance programs.

(12) An assessment of the need to revise the command and control structure of the Army Reserve.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.**—In carrying out the review, the Commission shall develop specific recommendations to accomplish each of the following:

(1) Provide members of the Armed Forces with annual pay raises and other compensation at levels sufficient to begin closing the gap with comparable civilian pay levels.

(2) Fully fund cost-effective missile defense systems that are deployable at the earliest practical date following enactment of this Act.

(3) Maintain adequate funding for military readiness accounts without sacrificing modernization programs.

(4) Maintain a strong role for Guard and Reserve forces.

(5) Provide a new funding system to avoid diversions from military readiness accounts to pay for peacekeeping and humanitarian deployments such as Haiti and Rwanda.

(6) Support security enhancing measures in the Asia-Pacific region, including support for the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum.

(7) Reduce the level of defense expenditures for non-defense programs.

SEC. 304. REPORTS.

(a) **FINAL REPORT.**—The Commission shall submit to the President and the designated congressional committees a report on the assessments and recommendations referred to in section 303 not later than January 1, 1996. The report shall be submitted in unclassified and classified versions.

(b) **INTERIM REPORT.**—The Commission shall submit to the President and the designated congressional committees an interim report describing the Commission's progress in fulfilling its duties under section 303. The interim report shall include any preliminary recommendations the Commission may have reached and shall be submitted not later than October 1, 1995.

(c) **DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—For purposes of this section, the term "designated congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on National Security, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(d) **LIMITATION PENDING SUBMISSION OF INTERIM REPORT.**—The Secretary of the Army may not, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the interim report under subsection (b) is submitted, take any action to implement the plan to reorganize the Army Reserve's continental United States headquarters structures that was announced by the Secretary on January 4, 1995.

SEC. 305. POWERS.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, conduct such hearings, sit and act at such times, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b) **ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the Federal Government such information, relevant to its duties under this title, as may be necessary to carry out such duties. Upon request of the chairman of the Commission, the head of the department or agency shall, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) **MAIL.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) **ASSISTANCE FROM SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Commission such reasonable administrative and support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 306. COMMISSION PROCEDURES.

(a) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet on a regular basis (as determined by the chairman) and at the call of the chairman or a majority of its members.

(b) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 307. PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **COMPENSATION.**—Each member of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be allowed travel expenses including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the performance of Commission duties.

(b) **STAFF.**—The Commission shall appoint a staff director, who shall be paid at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, and such professional and clerical personnel as may be reasonable and necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties under this title without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, or any other provision of law, relating to the number, classification, and General Schedule rates. No employee appointed under this subsection (other than the staff director) may be compensated at a rate to exceed the maximum rate applicable to level 15 of the General Schedule.

(c) **DETAILED PERSONNEL.**—Upon request of the chairman of the Commission, the head of any department or agency of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, without

reimbursement, any personnel of such department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section. The detail of any such personnel may not result in the interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege of such personnel.

SEC. 308. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate upon submission of the final report required by section 303.

SEC. 309. FUNDING.

Of the funds available to the Department of Defense, \$1,500,000 shall be made available to the Commission to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE IV—COMMAND OF UNITED STATES FORCES

SEC. 401. LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES FORCES PLACED UNDER UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OR CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new section:

“§405. Placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control: limitation

“(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for activities of any element of the armed forces that after the date of the enactment of this section is placed under United Nations command or control, as defined in subsection (f).

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION.—(1) Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of an element of the armed forces under United Nations command or control if the President, not less than 15 days before the date on which such United Nations command or control is to become effective (or as provided in paragraph (2)), meets the requirements of subsection (d).

“(2) If the President certifies to Congress that an emergency exists that precludes the President from meeting the requirements of subsection (d) 15 days before placing an element of the armed forces under United Nations command or control, the President may place such forces under such command or control and meet the requirements of subsection (d) in a timely manner, but in no event later than 48 hours after such command or control becomes effective.

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the armed forces under United Nations command or control if the Congress specifically authorizes by law that particular placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control.

“(d) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The requirements referred to in subsection (b)(1) are that the President submit to Congress the following:

“(1) Certification by the President that—

“(A) such a United Nations command or control arrangement is necessary to protect national security interests of the United States;

“(B) the commander of any unit of the armed forces proposed for placement under United Nations command or control will at all times retain the right—

“(i) to report independently to superior United States military authorities; and

“(ii) to decline to comply with orders judged by the commander to be illegal, militarily imprudent, or beyond the mandate of the mission to which the United States agreed with the United Nations, until such time as that commander receives direction

from superior United States military authorities with respect to the orders that the commander has declined to comply with;

“(C) any element of the armed forces proposed for placement under United Nations command or control will at all times remain under United States administrative command for such purposes as discipline and evaluation; and

“(D) the United States will retain the authority to withdraw any element of the armed forces from the proposed operation at any time and to take any action it considers necessary to protect those forces if they are engaged.

“(2) A report setting forth the following:

“(A) A description of the national security interests that require the placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control.

“(B) The mission of the United States forces involved.

“(C) The expected size and composition of the United States forces involved.

“(D) The incremental cost to the United States of participation in the United Nations operation by the United States forces which are proposed to be placed under United Nations command or control.

“(E) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the United Nations command structure.

“(F) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the commander of the United States unified command for the region in which those United States forces are to operate.

“(G) The extent to which the United States forces involved will rely on non-United States forces for security and self-defense and an assessment on the ability of those non-United States forces to provide adequate security to the United States forces involved.

“(H) The timetable for complete withdrawal of the United States forces involved.

“(e) CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT.—A report under subsection (d) shall be submitted in unclassified form and, if necessary, in classified form.

“(f) UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OR CONTROL.—For purposes of this section, an element of the armed forces shall be considered to be placed under United Nations command or control if—

“(1) that element is under the command or operational control of an individual acting on behalf of the United Nations for the purpose of international peacekeeping, peace-making, peace-enforcing, or similar activity that is authorized by the Security Council under chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations; and

“(2) the senior military commander of the United Nations force or operation—

“(A) is a foreign national or is a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty; or

“(B) is a United States military officer serving on active duty but—

“(i) that element of the armed forces is under the command or operational control of subordinate commander who is a foreign national or a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty; and

“(ii) that senior military commander does not have the authority—

“(I) to dismiss any subordinate officer in the chain of command who is exercising command or operational control over United States forces and who is a foreign national or a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty;

“(II) to establish rules of engagement for United States forces involved; and

“(III) to establish criteria governing the operational employment of United States forces involved.

“(g) INTERPRETATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

“(1) as authority for the President to use any element of the armed forces in any operation;

“(2) as authority for the President to place any element of the armed forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national; or

“(3) as an unconstitutional infringement on the authority of the President as commander-in-chief.”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“405. Placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control: limitation.”

(b) REPORT RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONALITY.—No certification may be submitted by the President under section 405(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), until the President has submitted to the Congress (after the date of the enactment of this Act) a memorandum of legal points and authorities explaining why the placement of elements of United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations does not violate the Constitution.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR ONGOING OPERATIONS IN MACEDONIA AND CROATIA.—Section 405 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), does not apply in the case of activities of the Armed Forces as part of the United Nations force designated as the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) that are carried out—

(1) in Macedonia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 795, adopted December 11, 1992, and subsequent reauthorization Resolutions; or

(2) in Croatia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 743, adopted February 21, 1992, and subsequent reauthorization Resolutions.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON PLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES UNDER FOREIGN CONTROL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287d) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. (a) AGREEMENTS WITH SECURITY COUNCIL.—(1) Any special agreement described in paragraph (2) that is concluded by the President with the Security Council shall not be effective unless approved by the Congress by law.

“(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is an agreement providing for the numbers and types of United States Armed Forces, their degree of readiness and general locations, or the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations.

“(b) LIMITATION.—(1) Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), the President may not place any element of the Armed Forces under United Nations command or control, as defined in subsection (g).

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION.—(1) Subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of an element of the armed forces under United Nations command or control if the President, not less than 15 days before the date on which such United Nations command or control is to become effective (or as provided in

paragraph (2), meets the requirements of subsection (e).

"(2) If the President certifies to Congress that an emergency exists that precludes the President from meeting the requirements of subsection (e) 15 days before placing an element of the armed forces under United Nations command or control, the President may place such forces under such command or control and meet the requirements of subsection (e) in a timely manner, but in no event later than 48 hours after such command or control becomes effective.

"(d) EXCEPTION FOR AUTHORIZATION BY LAW.—Subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of a proposed placement of any element of the Armed Forces under United Nations command or control if the Congress specifically authorizes by law that particular placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control.

"(e) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The requirements referred to in subsection (c)(1) are that the President submit to Congress the following:

"(1) Certification by the President that—

"(A) such a United Nations command or control arrangement is necessary to protect national security interests of the United States;

"(B) the commander of any unit of the Armed Forces proposed for placement under United Nations command or control will at all times retain the right—

"(i) to report independently to superior United States military authorities; and

"(ii) to decline to comply with orders judged by the commander to be illegal, militarily imprudent, or beyond the mandate of the mission to which the United States agreed with the United Nations, until such time as that commander receives direction from superior United States military authorities with respect to the orders that the commander has declined to comply with;

"(C) any element of the Armed Forces proposed for placement under United Nations command or control will at all times remain under United States administrative command for such purposes as discipline and evaluation; and

"(D) the United States will retain the authority to withdraw any element of the Armed Forces from the proposed operation at any time and to take any action it considers necessary to protect those forces if they are engaged.

"(2) A report setting forth the following:

"(A) A description of the national security interests that require the placement of United States forces under United Nations command or control.

"(B) The mission of the United States forces involved.

"(C) The expected size and composition of the United States forces involved.

"(D) The incremental cost to the United States of participation in the United Nations operation by the United States forces which are proposed to be placed under United Nations command or control.

"(E) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the United Nations command structure.

"(F) The precise command and control relationship between the United States forces involved and the commander of the United States unified command for the region in which those United States forces are to operate.

"(G) The extent to which the United States forces involved will rely on non-United States forces for security and self-defense and an assessment on the ability of those

non-United States forces to provide adequate security to the United States forces involved.

"(H) The timetable for complete withdrawal of the United States forces involved.

"(f) CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT.—A report under subsection (e) shall be submitted in unclassified form and, if necessary, in classified form.

"(g) UNITED NATIONS COMMAND OR CONTROL.—For purposes of this section, an element of the armed forces shall be considered to be placed under United Nations command or control if—

"(1) that element is under the command or operational control of an individual acting on behalf of the United Nations for the purpose of international peacekeeping, peace-making, peace-enforcing, or similar activity that is authorized by the Security Council under chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations; and

"(2) the senior military commander of the United Nations force or operation—

"(A) is a foreign national or is a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty; or

"(B) is a United States military officer serving on active duty but—

"(i) that element of the armed forces is under the command or operational control of subordinate commander who is a foreign national or a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty; and

"(ii) that senior military commander does not have the authority—

"(I) to dismiss any subordinate officer in the chain of command who is exercising command or operational control over United States forces and who is a foreign national or a citizen of the United States who is not a United States military officer serving on active duty;

"(II) to establish rules of engagement for United States forces involved; and

"(III) to establish criteria governing the operational employment of United States forces involved.

"(h) INTERPRETATION.—Except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council United States Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance."

(b) REPORT RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONALITY.—No certification may be submitted by the President under section 6(e)(1) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by subsection (a), until the President has submitted to the Congress (after the date of the enactment of this Act) a memorandum of legal points and authorities explaining why the placement of elements of United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national acting on behalf of the United Nations does not violate the Constitution.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR ONGOING OPERATION IN MACEDONIA AND CROATIA.—Section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by subsection (a), does not apply in the case of activities of the Armed Forces as part of the United Nations force designated as the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) that are carried out—

(1) in Macedonia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 795, adopted December 11, 1992, and subsequent reauthorization Resolutions; or

(2) in Croatia pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 743, adopted February 21, 1992, and subsequent reauthorization Resolutions.

TITLE V—UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 501. CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR UNITED STATES EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 10. (a) CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENT FOR EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—

"(1) LIMITATION.—Funds may be obligated for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of peacekeeping operations for a fiscal year only to the extent that—

"(A) the amount of such assessed share exceeds—

"(B) the amount equal to—

"(i) the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (2) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by

"(ii) the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States by the United Nations for the costs of United States support for, or participation in, United Nations peacekeeping activities for that preceding fiscal year.

"(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall, at the time of submission of the budget to the Congress for any fiscal year, submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the total amount of incremental costs incurred by the Department of Defense during the preceding fiscal year to support or participate in, directly or indirectly, United Nations peacekeeping activities. Such report shall include a separate listing by United Nations peacekeeping operation of the amount of incremental costs incurred to support or participate in each such operation.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.—The term 'United Nations peacekeeping activities' means any international peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace-enforcing, or similar activity that is authorized by the United Nations Security Council under chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations, except that such term does not include any such activity authorized under chapter VII of such Charter with respect to which the President has certified to the Congress that the activity is of such importance to the national security of the United States that the United States would undertake the activity unilaterally if it were not authorized by the United Nations Security Council.

"(B) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'designated congressional committees' includes the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The limitation contained in section 10(a)(1) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a), shall apply only with respect to United Nations assessments for peacekeeping operations after fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 502. CODIFICATION OF REQUIRED NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) REQUIRED NOTICE.—Section 4 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b) is amended—

(1) by striking the second sentence of subsection (a);

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) a new subsection (e) consisting of the text of subsection (a) of section 407 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), revised—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “in written form not later than the 10th day of” after “shall be provided”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by inserting “(including facilities, training, transportation, communication, and logistical support, but not including intelligence activities reportable under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.))” after “covered by the resolution”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) A description of any other United States assistance to or support for the operation (including facilities, training, transportation, communication, and logistical support, but not including intelligence activities reportable under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.)), and an estimate of the cost to the United States of such assistance or support.”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3) and in the last sentence of subparagraph (A) of that paragraph by striking “and (ii)” and inserting “through (iv)”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

“(4) NEW UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATION DEFINED.—As used in paragraphs (2) (B) and (3), the term ‘new United Nations peacekeeping operation’ includes any existing or otherwise ongoing United Nations peacekeeping operation—

“(A) that is to be expanded by more than 25 percent during the period covered by the Security Council resolution, as measured by either the number of personnel participating (or authorized to participate) in the operation or the budget of the operation; or

“(B) that is to be authorized to operate in a country in which it was not previously authorized to operate.”; and

(E) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “(5) NOTIFICATION” and all that follows through “(B) The President” and inserting “(5) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The President”; and

(ii) by striking “section 4(d)” and all that follows through “of this section)” and inserting “subsection (d)”.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Subsection (a) of section 407 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), is repealed.

(c) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Subsection (f) of section 4 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(f)), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

“(f) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—As used in this section, the term ‘designated congressional committees’ has the meaning given such term in section 10(f).”.

SEC. 503. NOTICE TO CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

Section 10 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding after subsection (a), as added by section 501, the following new subsection:

“(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS REGARDING CONTRIBUTIONS FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) NOTICE REGARDING UNITED NATIONS BILLING REQUEST.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the United States receives from the United Nations a billing requesting a payment by the United States of any contribution for United Nations peace-

keeping activities, the President shall so notify the designated congressional committees.

“(2) NOTICE REGARDING PROPOSED OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—The President shall notify the designated congressional committees at least 15 days before the United States obligates funds for any assessed or voluntary contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities, except that if the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents compliance with the requirement that such notification be provided 15 days in advance and that such contribution is in the national security interests of the United States, such notification shall be provided in a timely manner but no later than 48 hours after such obligation.”.

SEC. 504. REVISED NOTICE TO CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

Section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287d-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “other than subsection (e)(1)” after “any other law”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), at least 15 days before any agency or entity of the United States Government makes available to the United Nations any assistance or facility to support or facilitate United Nations peacekeeping activities, the President shall so notify the designated congressional committees.

“(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to—

“(A) assistance having a value of less than \$1,000,000 in the case of nonreimbursable assistance or less than \$5,000,000 in the case of reimbursable assistance; or

“(B) assistance provided under the emergency drawdown authority contained in sections 506(a)(1) and 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1), 2348a(c)(2)).

“(3) If the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents compliance with the requirement in paragraph (1) that notification be provided 15 days in advance and that the contribution of any such assistance or facility is in the national security interests of the United States, such notification shall be provided in a timely manner but not later than 48 hours after such assistance or facility is made available to the United Nations.

“(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘assistance’—

“(A) means assistance of any kind, including logistical support, supplies, goods, or services (including command, control or communications assistance and training), and the grant of rights of passage; and

“(B) includes assistance provided through in-kind contributions or through the provision of support, supplies, goods, or services on any terms, including on a grant, lease, loan, or reimbursable basis; but

“(C) does not include the payment of assessed or voluntary contributions or intelligence activities reportable under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.).”.

SEC. 505. UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

Section 4(d)(1) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287b(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) A description of the anticipated budget for the next fiscal year for United States

participation in United Nations peacekeeping activities, including a statement of—

“(i) the aggregate amount of funds available to the United Nations for that fiscal year, including assessed and voluntary contributions, which may be made available for United Nations peacekeeping activities; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount of funds (from all accounts) and the aggregate costs of in-kind contributions that the United States proposes to make available to the United Nations for that fiscal year for United Nations peacekeeping activities.”.

SEC. 506. REIMBURSEMENT TO THE UNITED STATES FOR IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287d-1), as amended by section 504, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(b)”;

(B) by striking “United States: *Provided*,” through “*Provided further*, That when” and inserting “United States. When”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement for reimbursement under paragraph (1) if the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, determines that an emergency exists which justifies waiver of that requirement. Any such waiver shall be submitted to the designated congressional committees, as defined in section 10(a)(3)(B), at least 15 days before it takes effect, except that if the President determines that an emergency exists which prevents compliance with the requirement that the notification be provided 15 days in advance and that the provision under subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) of personnel or assistance on a nonreimbursable basis is in the national security interests of the United States, such notification shall be provided in a timely manner but no later than 48 hours after such waiver takes effect.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) The Secretary of State shall ensure that goods and services provided on a reimbursable basis by the Department of Defense to the United Nations for United Nations peacekeeping operations under this section or any other provision of law are reimbursed at the appropriate value, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.”.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Representative of the United States to the United Nations shall submit to the designated congressional committees a report on all actions taken by the United States mission to the United Nations to achieve the objective described in section 7(f) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a)(2).

(2) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—As used in this subsection, the term “designated congressional committees” has the meaning given such term in section 10(a)(3)(B) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by section 501.

SEC. 507. LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF UNITED STATES ASSESSED OR VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding after subsection (b), as added by section 503, the following new subsection:

“(c) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF ASSESSED OR VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—Appropriated funds may not be used to pay any United States assessed or voluntary contribution during any fiscal year for United Nations peacekeeping activities until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the designated congressional committees that the United Nations has reimbursed the Department of Defense directly for all goods and services—

“(A) that were provided to the United Nations by the Department of Defense on a reimbursable basis during a previous fiscal year after fiscal year 1994 for United Nations peacekeeping activities, including personnel and assistance provided under section 7 (except to the extent that the authority of subsection (b)(2) of such section to waive the reimbursement requirement was exercised with respect to such personnel or assistance); and

“(B) for which a request for reimbursement has been submitted to the United Nations in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT.—The President shall establish procedures for the submission to the United Nations of requests for reimbursement for goods and services provided to the United Nations by the Department of Defense on a reimbursable basis for United Nations peacekeeping activities. Such procedures shall ensure that each such request for reimbursement is submitted in a timely manner.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The limitation in section 10(c)(1) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a), shall apply only with respect to fiscal years after fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 508. LIMITATION ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES SHARE OF COSTS OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 405, as added by section 401 of this Act, the following new section:

“§406. Use of Department of Defense funds for United States share of costs of United Nations peacekeeping activities: limitation

“(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF ASSESSMENTS AND VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—(1) Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to make a financial contribution (directly or through another department or agency of the United States) to the United Nations—

“(A) for the costs of a United Nations peacekeeping activity; or

“(B) for any United States arrearage to the United Nations.

“(2) The prohibition in paragraph (1)(A) applies to voluntary contributions, as well as to contributions pursuant to assessment by the United Nations for the United States share of the costs of a peacekeeping activity.

“(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.—Funds available to the Department of Defense may be used for payment of the incremental costs associated with the participation of elements of the armed forces in a United Nations peacekeeping activity only to the extent that Congress has by law specifically authorized the use of those funds for that purpose.

“(c) COVERED PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.—In this section, the term ‘United Nations peacekeeping activity’ means a peacekeeping activity carried out pursuant to a resolution of the United Nations Security Council for which costs are met (in whole or in part) through assessments by the United Nations to its member nations.”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“406. Use of Department of Defense funds for United States share of costs of United Nations peacekeeping activities: limitation.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 406 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

SEC. 509. CODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF UNITED STATES ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding after subsection (c), as added by section 507, the following new subsection:

“(d) LIMITATION ON ASSESSED CONTRIBUTION WITH RESPECT TO A PEACEKEEPING OPERATION.—Funds authorized to be appropriated for ‘Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities’ for any fiscal year shall not be available for the payment of the United States assessed contribution for a United Nations peacekeeping operation in an amount which is greater than 25 percent of the total amount of all assessed contributions for that operation, and any arrearages that accumulate as a result of assessments in excess of 25 percent of the total amount of all assessed contributions for any United Nations peacekeeping operation shall not be recognized or paid by the United States.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The limitation contained in section 10(d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a), shall apply only with respect to funds authorized to be appropriated for ‘Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities’ for fiscal years after fiscal year 1995.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 404(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

SEC. 510. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.

Section 10 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding after subsection (d), as added by section 509, the following new subsections:

“(e) BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—No funds may be obligated or expended to pay any United States assessed or voluntary contribution for United Nations peacekeeping activities unless the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the designated congressional committees that United States manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services, and material for such activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers.

“(f) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term ‘designated congressional committees’ means—

“(1) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.”

SEC. 511. UNITED NATIONS BUDGETARY AND MANAGEMENT REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 11. (a) WITHHOLDING OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—

“(1) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS FOR REGULAR UNITED NATIONS BUDGET.—At the beginning of each fiscal year, 20 percent of the amount of funds made available for that fiscal year for United States assessed contributions for the regular United Nations budget shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure unless a certification for that fiscal year has been made under subsection (b).

“(2) ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING.—At the beginning of each fiscal year, 50 percent of the amount of funds made available for that fiscal year for United States assessed contributions for United Nations peacekeeping activities shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure unless a certification for that fiscal year has been made under subsection (b).

“(3) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING.—The United States may not during any fiscal year pay any voluntary contribution to the United Nations for international peacekeeping activities unless a certification for that fiscal year has been made under subsection (b).

“(b) CERTIFICATION.—The certification referred to in subsection (a) for any fiscal year is a certification by the President to the Congress, submitted on or after the beginning of that fiscal year, of each of the following:

(1) The United Nations has an independent office of Inspector General to conduct and supervise objective audits, inspections, and investigations relating to programs and operations of the United Nations.

(2) The United Nations has an Inspector General who was appointed by the Secretary General with the approval of the General Assembly and whose appointment was made principally on the basis of the appointee’s integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigation.

“(3) The Inspector General is authorized to—

“(A) make investigations and reports relating to the administration of the programs and operations of the United Nations;

“(B) have access to all records, documents, and other available materials relating to those programs and operations;

“(C) have direct and prompt access to any official of the United Nations; and

“(D) have access to all records and officials of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

“(4) The United Nations has fully implemented, and made available to all member states, procedures that effectively protect the identity of, and prevent reprisals against, any staff member of the United Nations making a complaint or disclosing information to, or cooperating in any investigation or inspection by, the United Nations Inspector General.

“(5) The United Nations has fully implemented procedures that ensure compliance with recommendations of the United Nations Inspector General.

“(6) The United Nations has required the United Nations Inspector General to issue an annual report and has ensured that the annual report and all other reports of the Inspector General are made available to the General Assembly without modification.

“(7) The United Nations has provided, and is committed to providing, sufficient budgetary resources to ensure the effective operation of the United Nations Inspector General.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 11 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as added by subsection (a), shall apply only with respect to fiscal years after fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 512. CONDITIONS ON PROVISION OF INTELLIGENCE TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 12. (a) PROVISION OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS.—Before

intelligence information is provided by the United States to the United Nations, the President shall ensure that the Director of Central Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, has established guidelines governing the provision of intelligence information to the United Nations which shall protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure in accordance with section 103(c)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(5)).

“(b) PERIODIC AND SPECIAL REPORTS.—(1) The President shall periodically report, but not less frequently than semiannually, to the Committee on International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on the types of intelligence provided to the United Nations and the purposes for which it was provided during the period covered by the report. The President shall also report to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, within 15 days after it becomes known to him, any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence provided to the United Nations.

“(2) The requirement for periodic reports under the first sentence of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to the provision of intelligence that is provided only to, and for the use of, United States Government personnel serving with the United Nations.

“(c) DELEGATION OF DUTIES.—The President may not delegate or assign the duties of the President under this section.

“(d) IMPROVED HANDLING OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS.—The Secretary of State (or the designee of the Secretary), in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, shall work with the United Nations to improve the handling, processing, dissemination, and management of all intelligence information provided to it by its members.

“(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

“(1) impair or otherwise affect the authority of the Director of Central Intelligence to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure pursuant to section 103(c)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(5)); or

“(2) supersede or otherwise affect the provisions of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “NATO Expansion Act of 1995”.

SEC. 602. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has helped to guarantee the security, freedom, and prosperity of the United States and its partners in the alliance.

(2) NATO has expanded its membership on three different occasions since its founding in 1949.

(3) The steadfast and sustained commitment of the member countries of NATO to mutual defense against the threat of communist domination played a significant role

in precipitating the collapse of the Iron Curtain and the demise of the Soviet Union.

(4) Although new threats are more geographically and functionally diverse and less predictable, they still imperil shared interests of the United States and its NATO allies.

(5) Western interests must be protected on a cooperative basis without an undue burden falling upon the United States.

(6) NATO is the only multilateral organization that is capable of conducting effective military operations to protect Western interests.

(7) The valuable experience gained from ongoing military cooperation within NATO was critical to the success of joint military operations in the 1991 liberation of Kuwait.

(8) NATO is an important diplomatic forum for discussion of issues of concern to its member states and for the peaceful resolution of disputes.

(9) Admission of Central and East European countries that have recently been freed from Communist domination to NATO could contribute to international peace and enhance the security of those countries.

(10) By joining the Partnership for Peace, a number of countries have expressed interest in NATO membership.

(11) The Partnership for Peace program is creating new political and military ties with countries in Central and Eastern Europe and provides the basis for joint action to deal with common security problems. Active participation in the Partnership for Peace will also play an important role in the evolutionary process of NATO expansion.

(12) In particular, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia have made significant progress toward establishing democratic institutions, free market economies, civilian control of their armed forces, police, and intelligence services, and the rule of law since the fall of their previous Communist governments.

SEC. 603. UNITED STATES POLICY.

It should be the policy of the United States—

(1) to continue the Nation's commitment to an active leadership role in NATO;

(2) to join with the Nation's NATO allies to redefine the role of the alliance in the post-Cold War world, taking into account—

(A) the fundamentally changed security environment of Central and Eastern Europe;

(B) the need to assure all countries of the defensive nature of the alliance and the desire of its members to work cooperatively with all former adversaries;

(C) the emerging security threats posed by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them;

(D) the continuing challenges to the interests of all NATO member countries posed by unstable and undemocratic regimes harboring hostile intentions; and

(E) the dependence of the global economy on a stable energy supply and the free flow of commerce;

(3) to affirm that NATO military planning should include joint military operations beyond the geographic bounds of the alliance under Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty when the shared interests of the United States and other member countries require such action to defend vital interests;

(4) to expeditiously pursue joint cooperation agreements for the acquisition of essential systems to significantly increase the crisis management capability of NATO;

(5) that Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia should be in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area in the near future, and, in accordance with Article 10 of such

Treaty, should be invited to become full NATO members, provided these countries—

(A) meet appropriate standards, including—

(i) shared values and interests;

(ii) democratic governments;

(iii) free market economies;

(iv) civilian control of the military, of the police, and of the intelligence and other security services, so that these organizations do not pose a threat to democratic institutions, neighboring countries, or the security of NATO or the United States;

(v) adherence to the rule of law and to the values, principles, and political commitments set forth in the Helsinki Final Act and other declarations by the members of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

(vi) commitment to further the principles of NATO and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area;

(vii) commitment and ability to accept the obligations, responsibilities, and costs of NATO membership; and

(viii) commitment and ability to implement infrastructure development activities that will facilitate participation in and support for NATO military activities; and

(B) remain committed to protecting the rights of all their citizens and respecting the territorial integrity of their neighbors;

(6) that the United States, other NATO member nations, and NATO itself should furnish appropriate assistance to facilitate the transition of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia to full NATO membership;

(7) to reaffirm article X of the North Atlantic Treaty and the policy decision of the North Atlantic Council on December 1, 1994, that—

(A) each new member nation may be admitted to NATO only by amendment to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

(B) each current NATO member nation will have to complete the treaty amendment ratification process for the admission of each new member nation to NATO, subject to the internal legal processes of each current NATO member nation, and that in the case of the United States, the treaty amendment ratification process will require advice and consent of two-thirds of the members of the United States Senate present and voting;

(8) that the expansion of NATO should be defensive in nature and should occur in a manner that increases stability for all nations of Europe, including both NATO member nations and non-NATO member nations;

(9) that NATO and its member nations should cooperate closely with Russia on security issues and work to strengthen other structures of security cooperation in Europe, including the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and

(10) that other European countries emerging from communist domination may be in a position at a future date to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area, and at the appropriate time they should receive assistance to facilitate their transition to full NATO membership and should be invited to become full NATO members.

SEC. 604. REVISIONS TO PROGRAM TO FACILITATE TRANSITION TO NATO MEMBERSHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Subsection (a) of section 203 of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The President shall establish a program to assist in the transition to full NATO membership

of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia and any other European country emerging from communist domination that is designated by the President under subsection (d)(2)."

(b) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—

(1) DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d) DESIGNATION OF ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—

"(1) SPECIFIED COUNTRIES.—The following countries are hereby designated for purposes of this title: Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia.

"(2) AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDENT TO DESIGNATE OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES EMERGING FROM COMMUNIST DOMINATION.—The President may designate other European countries emerging from communist domination (as defined in section 206) to receive assistance under the program established under subsection (a). The President may make such a designation in the case of any such country only if the President determines, and reports to the designated congressional committees, that such country—

"(A) has made significant progress toward establishing—

"(i) shared values and interests;

"(ii) democratic governments;

"(iii) free market economies;

"(iv) civilian control of the military, of the police, and of the intelligence and other security services, so that these organizations do not pose a threat to democratic institutions, neighboring countries, or the security of NATO or the United States;

"(v) adherence to the rule of law and to the values, principles, and political commitments set forth in the Helsinki Final Act and other declarations by the members of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

"(vi) commitment to further the principles of NATO and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area;

"(vii) commitment and ability to accept the obligations, responsibilities, and costs of NATO membership; and

"(viii) commitment and ability to implement infrastructure development activities that will facilitate participation in and support for NATO military activities; and

"(B) is likely, within five years of such determination, to be in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section are amended by striking "countries described in such subsection" and inserting "countries designated under subsection (d)".

(B) Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(i) by striking "subsection (d)" and inserting "subsection (d)(2)"; and

(ii) by inserting "(22 U.S.C. 2394)" before the period at the end.

(C) Section 204(c) of such Act is amended by striking "any other Partnership for Peace country designated under section 203(d) of this title" and inserting "any country designated under section 203(d)(2)".

(c) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) ECONOMIC SUPPORT ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) Assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the Economic Support Fund)."

(2) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(f) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the program established under sub-

section (a), the President may, in addition to the security assistance authorized to be provided under subsection (c), provide assistance to countries designated under subsection (d) from funds appropriated under the 'Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund' account."

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to funds appropriated before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DISQUALIFICATION FROM ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORT OF TERRORISM.—Section 203 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES THAT PROVIDE DEFENSE ARTICLES TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—The President may not provide assistance to a country under the program established under subsection (a) if such country is selling or transferring defense articles to a state that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979."

(e) REPORT PRIOR TO OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Section 203 of such Act (as amended by subsection (d)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) REPORT PRIOR TO OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Prior to providing assistance to a country for the first time through the program established under subsection (a), the President shall transmit to the designated congressional committees a report with respect to that country that contains a description of the following:

"(1) The cost of membership in NATO for the country and the amount that the country is prepared to contribute to NATO to pay for such cost of membership.

"(2) The amount that the United States will contribute to facilitate transition to full NATO membership for the country.

"(3) The extent to which the admission to NATO of the country would contribute to the security of the United States.

"(4) The views of other NATO member nations regarding the admission to NATO of the country and the amounts that such other NATO member nations will contribute to facilitate transition to full NATO membership for the country."

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 205 of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting "ANNUAL" in the section heading before the first word;

(2) by inserting "annual" after "include in the" in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

(3) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking "and other" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "and any country designated by the President pursuant to section 203(d)(2)".

(g) DEFINITIONS.—The NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 206. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title:

"(1) NATO.—The term 'NATO' means the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"(2) OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES EMERGING FROM COMMUNIST DOMINATION.—The term 'other European countries emerging from communist domination' means any full and active participant in the Partnership for Peace that—

"(A) is located—

"(i) in the territory of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; or

"(ii) in the territory of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; or

"(B) is among the following countries: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, or Albania.

"(3) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'designated congressional committees' means—

"(A) the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

"(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

TITLE VII—BUDGET FIREWALLS

SEC. 701. RESTORATION OF BUDGET FIREWALLS FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Congress that, in order to protect against the diversion of defense funding to domestic discretionary accounts, so-called "budget firewalls" between defense and domestic discretionary spending should be established for each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 10 hours.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The time for the 10-hour debate is beginning at 4:50 p.m., and we will keep track of that.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 39, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: At the end of title II (page 12, after line 25), add the following new section.

SEC. 204. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE AND THE ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE (ARM) TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies face existing and expanding threats from ballistic missiles capable of being used as theater weapon systems that are presently possessed by, being developed by, or being acquired by a number of countries, including Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, and North Korea.

(2) Some theater ballistic missiles that are currently deployed or are being developed (such as the Chinese CSS-2 missile and the North Korean Taepo Dong-2 missile) have capabilities equal to or greater than the capabilities of missiles that were determined to be strategic missiles more than 20 years ago under the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement I (SALT I) Interim Agreement of 1972 entered into between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(3) The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty was not intended to, and does not, apply to or limit research, development, testing or deployment of missile defense systems, system upgrades, or system components that are designed to counter modern theater ballistic missiles, regardless of the capabilities

of such missiles, unless those systems, system upgrades, or system components are tested against or have demonstrated capabilities to counter modern strategic ballistic missiles.

(4) It is a national security priority of the United States to develop and deploy highly effective theater missile defense systems capable of countering the existing and expanding threats posed by modern theater ballistic missiles at the earliest practical date.

(5) Current United States proposal in the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) would multilateralize the ABM Treaty, making future amendments or changes to the Treaty more difficult, and would impose specific design limitations on United States theater missile defense (TMD) systems that would significantly compromise the United States TMD capability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that further formal negotiations in the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) and any informal discussions or negotiations on either the demarcation between theater missile defense (TMD) systems and anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems, or any other effort that bears on the viability of the ABM Treaty, including multilateralization of the treaty, should be suspended until the One Hundred Fourth Congress has had the opportunity to review those matters.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title II of H.R. 872.

One of the highest priority defense capabilities currently under development by the Department of Defense is theater missile defense. The U.S. theater missile defense systems are designed to defend our U.S. military forces deployed overseas, along with friendly forces and allies, from ballistic missile attack.

The threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles is expanding. Several countries, including North Korea, are developing missiles of increasing range and accuracy. Others, such as Iran, have purchased missiles and production technology from North Korea. Such proliferation underscores the importance of fielding, at the earliest practical date, advanced TMD systems, as advocated in title II of this bill.

Unfortunately, our ability to field high-effective TMD systems is in jeopardy. Specifically, under the guise of "clarifying" the terms of the 1972 anti-ballistic treaty, this administration has proposed in talks with Russia and others to impose specific design limitations on two theater missile defense systems that will significantly compromise our United States capability.

They have also proposed to multilateralize the ABM Treaty, making future amendments or changes to the treaty, such as those to deploy an effective missile defense of our country, more difficult.

Based on these concerns, I cosigned a letter to President Clinton on January 4, along with the entire House Republican leadership, suggesting that further negotiations be suspended until the new Congress had an opportunity to examine those issues in detail. Unfortunately, the President's reply rejected our suggestion and stated his in-

tention to continue negotiating such an agreement.

I would note that, according to a February 13, 1995, Washington Times article, Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch also has grave misgivings about the current U.S. negotiating approach, as does our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili. According to the Times, Mr. Deutch in a February 6 memorandum, affirmed that countering missile proliferation was "an urgent defense requirement." But he also suggested that in light of Russian intransigence in these negotiations, we should "shift our proposal to a more principled demarcation position." I strongly agree with Secretary Deutch's alleged statements.

It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to more explicitly communicate our deep concerns about the administration's position in these negotiations and the adverse impact they would have on our missile defense programs.

My amendment does just that. Specifically, the amendment expresses the sense of Congress that further formal negotiations in the standing consultative commission and any informal discussions or negotiations on either the demarcation between the theater missile defense systems and ABM systems or any other effort that bears on the viability of the ABM Treaty, including multilateralization of the ABM Treaty, should be suspended until the 104th Congress has had the opportunity to review those matters. It is a statement of principle and not binding language. Nevertheless, my hope is that the President will listen more carefully this time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by our committee chairman.

This is a sense-of-the-Congress amendment so it is not binding, but it is a very important one because it gets at the heart of what is now going on between our administration and Russia in terms of the ABM Treaty.

As our chairman pointed out, both the Deputy Secretary of Defense, in a memo that I will include for the RECORD, as well as the comments by General Shalikashvili that we are concerned about the administration policymakers not adopting treaty changes which would prohibit the Defense Department from deploying new theater defense systems that meet U.S. requirements.

What is important for our colleagues on the minority side is that one of their basic contentions is that theater missile defense is of the highest priority.

Now, your Deputy Secretary of Defense, or, I should say, ours and our

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs are both raising a red flag saying, let us not let those negotiators move too fast. So this is an extremely important amendment.

I want to get at the heart of why I think it is so important. My first amendment on the floor of this House in 1987, when many of the more liberal Members of our Congress were saying that we should adhere to the strictest possible interpretation of the ABM Treaty, I offered an amendment that acknowledged that the Krasnowarsk radar system in Siberia was in fact a direct violation of the ABM Treaty.

Guess what we have found out, Mr. Chairman, after in fact the Russian military leaders have retired and reported what their intent was with that radar?

In a recent article in the Russian military historical journal, written by retired General Votintsev, who said the ABM and space defense troops of the National Air Defense Forces, from 1967 until 1985, he states that it was clearly the Soviet Union's intent to break out and violate the ABM Treaty.

Many of the more liberal Members in this body, during that debate, were saying, oh, this is wrong. It is just an accident. It is just being used for radar. It is not being used for defensive operations. In fact, here is the general, who was in charge of that system at the time, not publicly stating what we said on this House floor.

He said, furthermore, that he was ordered to do this by the Chief of Staff, Marshall Ogarkov and was told that if he did not locate this radar in Krasnowarsk that General Ustinov, the Minister of Defense, directed that anyone who continued to object would be removed of his duties.

Mr. Chairman, all of us want to work with the Russians. I cochair the Russian Energy Caucus. I am working with them on their nuclear waste problem.

But as Ronald Reagan said, we must trust but verify.

□ 1700

What we are saying is that should be the hallmark of our negotiations with the Russians now. We should not let our negotiators bargain away the ability for us to develop a continued theater defense system which the minority side feels so strongly about. This amendment protects that. I applaud my chairman for the amendment, and I would be happy to support it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his hard work and leadership on this issue.

I think it is important for Members to realize what we are doing here. The administration, according to our own senior military officials, is trying to

negotiate into the ABM Treaty, which is between the United States and the Soviet Union, some limitations on our ability to put out systems that will defend our troops, like those that were in Iran or in Iraq, against incoming theater ballistic missiles.

There are two parties to the ABM Treaty, us and the Soviet Union, yet there are countries like Libya, North Korea, China, and others that are developing theater ballistic missiles that could be targeted on our troops. They are not signatories to the ABM agreement and they do not care what kind of restrictions we must put on. In fact, they would like us to put restrictions on our defensive systems.

What the gentleman is talking about, Mr. Chairman, is a total curtailment of theater ballistic missile defense systems that Democrats and Republicans agree are very, very important to the survivability of our troops. That means that when we have a troop concentration, whether it is Marines or Army units in the Middle East, in Europe, in Southeast Asia, and we need to put a footprint, a defensive footprint around them, whether it is the THAAD system or a Patriot system, upgraded Patriot, or the Navy lower tier system, all those systems are little theater missile defense systems that can shoot down incoming missiles. When we try to put those up, we are now going to be facing limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has expired.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we are trying to figure out exactly what this amendment does. We are kind of worried, when the gentleman is taking a lot of time here, and we really do not have a chance to do that.

Mr. HUNTER. I will be happy to strike the requisite number of words on my own.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I appreciate very much the gentleman doing that.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD these articles and this information.

The information referred to is as follows:

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, February 7, 1995.

Memorandum for: Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology; Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy; Director, Ballistic Missile Defense; Senior Deputy General Counsel, International Affairs and Intelligence.

Subject: BMD program logic.

Here is a revised outline based on your inputs and pulled together by Ash Carter. As always, your suggestions have been helpful. Attachment.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

I. BMD Program is determined by:
A. The threat—present and anticipated.
B. Technical and Program Options.
C. Cost and affordability—more resources for BMD means some other modernization opportunities must be forgone.

D. ABM (and other) treaty implications.
II. The Threat
A. Present threat against CONUS (AK and HI slightly different)

1. Russian ICBM and SLBM threat.
2. China—CSS4.
3. No Rest of World (ROW) BM threat to CONUS expected before 2005 at the earliest. (Clapper testimony)

4. Vulnerability to surreptitiously delivered or air-delivered nuclear device.

B. Future threat against CONUS
1. Russia and China.
2. ROW Proliferator indigenous development, e.g., North Korea, Iran, Libya.
3. Delivery by BM or air breathers, e.g., cruise missile.

C. Effective CONUS defense against determined Russian attack (several thousand RVs) problematic. Responses to this threat are vigorous deterrent (NPR) plus priority on preventing reemergence of threat (CTR) against accidental or small attack (< 50 RVs without sophisticated penails) possible.

D. Theater Ballistic Missile Threat
1. Here today—for US and Allies; SCUDs NO DONG, CSS-2, etc.

2. TBM can carry nuclear or unitary/submission CW/BW warheads.

3. If unchecked, significant problem for U.S. forward operations, esp. SWA, ROK.

4. ROW by purchase or SLV conversion.

5. Urgent defense requirements for US and Allies.

III. TBM Defense first priority (\$2 billion/year)

A. Core Program (deployment planned):

1. PAC-3 First Unit Equipped (FUE) 1998

2. THAAD FUE 2002

3. Navy Lower Tier FUE 2000

B. Enhanced Program (technology development):

1. Navy Upper Tier

2. Boost Phase Intercept

3. Corps SAM (MEADS)

C. International cooperation emphasized.

D. Depending upon performance, any effective TBM system (especially with the over-the-horizon threat cueing) will have some marginal capabilities against faster strategic incoming BM targets in one-on-one engagement.

E. U.S. will not accept limitations on TMD capabilities that pose no threat to the basic principles of the ABM Treaty.

IV. Technical and Program Options for National Missile Defense (NMD)

A. System components include:

1. Early warning/Surveillance

2. Target acquisition and track—mix of ground based multifunction radars, early-warning radars, space based EO/IR sensors.

3. Interceptors—number, location, and performance.

4. Battle Management C3

B. An NMD system requires significant RDT&E before deployment and the system may be either compliant or not compliant with the ABM (and other) treaties.

C. The DoD NMD program consists of two elements

1. BMD Technology. R&D on BMD components that could eventually be part of an advanced NMD or TMD system and growth of TMD system for limited NMD capabilities.

a. Technology; Kinetic energy Boost Phase Interceptors, advanced sensors, high powered lasers, advanced lightweight projectile (LEAP), small business innovative research, and innovative science and technology

b. Expenditures: \$170M/year.

2. The Baseline Program. A treaty compliant three year R&D program that will provide the option for deployment over an additional three years, of an initial NMD system which might or might not be treaty compliant. There is room for further growth in system capabilities.

a. The system consists of a ground-based radar (GBR), ground-based interceptor (GBI), and space based sensors (SBIR-LEO) for cueing.

b. Expenditure: \$520M/year (including \$120M for SBIR-LEO).

D. The DoD budget does not fund an emergency response NMD program that could be more rapidly deployed in case an unanticipated threat emerges or capability was desired, against accidental or inadvertent launch.

1. Such a system consists of 20-50 exo-kill vehicles (EKVs) on MINUTEMAN II or III boosters with DSP, early warning radar, and multifunction radar cueing.

2. This Emergency Response System would take two years to develop (at a cost of \$1 billion to the baseline) and two years to deploy (at an additional cost of \$2-4 billion to the baseline)

3. The Emergency Response System would not be compliant with either the ABM or START treaty.

4. ERS would be more effective to degree we know what threat it would meet; therefore not wise to commit to deployment until threat is clearer.

E. Summary Chart

NMD PROGRAM OPTIONS¹

	R&D phase	Deployment phase
1. BMD technology: Advanced sensors ... KE boost phase DE boost phase Innovative science and technology.	Ongoing \$170M/year Treaty compliant	Not defined.
2. Baseline NMD: Ground-based KE interceptors with ground and space-based cueing.	3 year; \$520M/year; treaty compliant	3 years; not funded; possibly treaty compliant.
3. Emergency response: Ground-based KE interceptors with early warning radar cueing.	2 years; not funded; possibly not treaty compliant	2 years; not funded; not treaty compliant.

¹Treaty issues subject to review by Compliance Review Group.

F. Choices include:

1. Adding funds for NMD technology, to create more choices for the future, such as strategic application of Navy uppertier technology.

2. Adding funds for baseline system—risk reduction and, schedule acceleration.

3. Adding funds for R&D phase of Emergency Response System.

V. Treaty Compliance

A. Purpose of ABM Treaty was to assure strategic stability by prohibiting ABM deployment that had significant capabilities against a retaliatory strategic missile attack. The US stands by this purpose.

B. The 1972 ABM Treaty does not reflect either the changed geopolitical circumstances or the new technological opportunities of today. We should not be reluctant to negotiate treaty modifications that acknowledge the new realities provided we retain the essential stabilizing purpose of the treaty.

1. The ABM Treaty permits one primary "thin" system—100 interceptors at Grand Forks ND with GBR and space based sensor adjuncts. May be possible to deploy a satisfactory NMD within these limits.

2. Other NMD configurations or TMD systems that do not meet specific prohibitions of the treaty but are comparable to the permitted "thin" system, e.g., the Emergency Response system, would not undermine, the Treaty and should be permitted.

C. TMD Demarcation—TMD is an essential defense capability and we should pursue these programs diligently; we cannot let Russian foot dragging on TMD demarcation issue slow TMD programs.

1. Present US position proposes limits on demonstrated capability of components (no testing against targets with velocity 5 KM/sec or range 3500 km) and interceptor velocity. This approach aimed at negotiability and prompt Russian acceptance.

2. If Russians do not accept essential elements of US TMD demarcation proposal soon, we should consider shifting our proposal to a more technically straight forward position based on the actual capability of a deployed TMD system to defend against a substantial Russian retaliatory missile strike.

Background.—The Spence amendment would modify Title II by adding a new section that expresses the Sense of Congress that negotiations with Russia and others to extend the ABM Treaty to theater missile defense (TMD) systems be suspended until the 104th Congress has had an opportunity to review this matter.

Talking Points.—The U.S. ability to field effective TMD systems is being jeopardized by the Clinton Administration.

In negotiations with Russia, the Administration has proposed turning the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty into an "ABM-TMD Treaty".

Additionally, they seek to "multilateralize" the Treaty, so that instead of just two parties to the Treaty, there could be ten or more. This would give Belarus or Uzbekistan a veto or modifications/amendments to the Treaty, making it more difficult to amend the Treaty were the U.S. to request such changes.

They have also proposed to impose specific design limitations on U.S. TMD systems (e.g., setting "speed limits" on how fast U.S. TMD systems can fly). Such self-imposed design limitations would have the effect of "dumbing down" U.S. TMD systems and compromising the effectiveness of U.S. TMD systems.

Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch in a recent memorandum warned against the dangers of the Administration's current approach to these negotiations.

Secretary Deutch suggested that, in light of Russian intransigence in these negotiations, the U.S. should "shift our proposal to a more principled [demarcation] position". This clearly underscores the folly of the Administration's current approach.

In a January 4 letter to the President, Mr. Spence, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Gilman and the Republican Leadership in the House suggested that these negotiations be suspended temporarily. Unfortunately, the President has thus far refused to budge.

The Spence amendment once again puts the Congress on record as having deep concerns about the Administration plans and

the adverse impact they would have on national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote YES on the Spence amendment.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 15, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: One of the highest priority defense capabilities currently under development and being fielded by the Department of Defense (DoD) is theater missile defense (TMD). U.S. TMD systems are designed to defend U.S. military forces deployed overseas, along with friendly forces and allies, from ballistic missile attack.

The threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles is expanding. Several countries, including North Korea, are developing missiles of increasing range and accuracy. Others, such as Iran, have purchased missiles and production technology from North Korea. Such proliferation underscores the importance of fielding, at the earliest practical date, advanced TMD systems—as advocated in Title II of H.R. 872, the National Security Revitalization Act.

Unfortunately, the U.S. ability to field highly-effective TMD systems is being jeopardized by the Clinton Administration. Specifically, under the guise of "clarifying" the terms of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, U.S. negotiators have proposed in talks with Russia and others to impose specific design limitations on U.S. TMD systems that will significantly compromise U.S. TMD capability. They have also proposed to "multilateralize" the ABM Treaty, making future amendments or changes to the Treaty, such as those to deploy an effective ABM defense of the United States, more difficult.

Based on these concerns, we sent a letter to the President on January 4 suggesting that further negotiations be suspended until the new Congress has had an opportunity to examine these issues in detail. The President's reply rejected our suggestion and stated his intention to continue negotiating such an agreement. (The January 4 letter and the President's response are attached for your information.)

It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to again communicate our deep concerns about the Administration's position in these negotiations and the adverse impact they would have on U.S. missile defense programs. The amendment offered by Rep. Floyd Spence, Chairman of the National Security Committee, does just that. (A copy of the Spence amendment is printed below.)

We strongly urge your support of both the Spence amendment and Title II of H.R. 872 regarding missile defense.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.
FLOYD SPENCE.
BOB LIVINGSTON.
DICK ARMEY.
BEN GILMAN.
BILL YOUNG.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE
SPENCE

At the end of Title II (page 12, after line 25), add the following new section:

SEC. 204. Sense of Congress on Theater Missile Defense and the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies face existing and expanding threats from ballistic missiles capable of being used as theater weapon systems that are presently possessed by, being developed by, or being acquired by a number of countries, including Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, and North Korea.

(2) Some theater ballistic missiles currently deployed or are being developed (such

as the Chinese CSS-2 missile and the North Korean Taepo Dong-2 missile) have capabilities equal to or greater than the capabilities of missiles that were determined to be strategic missiles more than 20 years ago under the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement I (SALT I) Interim Agreement of 1972 entered into between the United States and the Soviet Union.

(3) The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty was not intended to, and does not, apply to or limit research, development, testing, or deployment of missile defense systems, system upgrades, or system components that are designed to counter modern theater ballistic missiles, regardless of the capabilities of such missiles, unless those systems, system upgrades, or system components are tested against or have demonstrated capabilities to counter modern strategic ballistic missiles.

(4) It is a national security priority of the United States to develop and deploy highly effective theater missile defense systems capable of countering the existing and expanding threats posed by modern theater ballistic missiles at the earliest practical date.

(5) Current United States proposals in the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) would multilateralize the ABM Treaty, making future amendments or changes to the Treaty more difficult, and would impose specific design limitations on United States theater missile defense (TMD) systems that will significantly compromise United States TMD capability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that further formal negotiations in the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) and any informal discussions or negotiations on either the demarcation between theater missile defense (TMD) systems and anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems, or any other efforts that bear on the viability of the ABM Treaty, including multilateralization of the ABM Treaty, should be suspended until the One Hundred Fourth Congress has had the opportunity to review those matters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 1995.

HON. BILL CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We appreciate your letter of October 22, 1994 responding to the letter of September 19, 1994 signed by a bipartisan group of legislators regarding the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and constraints on theatre missile defenses.

We welcome your assurances that your Administration is "not going to rush" the process of negotiating changes to the 1972 ABM Treaty. It is our expectation that the new Congress and relevant Congressional committees will want, as an early order of business, to examine the wisdom of expanding the ABM Treaty's limitations in the name of "demarcating" strategic and theatre missile defenses and multilateralization this agreement. We also anticipate that there will be considerable interest in reviewing the more fundamental issue whether a treaty that is intended to prohibit an effective defense of the United States against missile attack is consistent with our Nation's vital security interests and emerging threats.

Therefore, we respectfully suggest that further negotiations on either the demarcation or multilateralization efforts, or any other efforts that bear on the viability of the ABM Treaty, be suspended until the new Congress has had an opportunity to examine these questions with care.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. ARMEY.

FLOYD SPENCE.
 NEWT GINGRICH.
 C.W. BILL YOUNG.
 HENRY J. HYDE.
 BENJAMIN A. GILMAN.
 CHRISTOPHER COX.
 LARRY COMBEST.
 TOM DELAY.
 SUSAN MOLINARI.
 JOHN A. BOEHNER.
 BOB LIVINGSTON.
 JERRY LEWIS.
 JOE SKEEN.
 BILL PAXON.
 JOE BARTON.
 JOSEPH M. MCDADE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
 Washington, DC, January 26, 1995.

DEAR MR. LEADER: Thank you for your recent letter concerning theater missile defenses and the ABM Treaty. I believe it is important for the Administration and the new Congress to continue our dialogue on these important issues.

The Administration is firmly committed to two fundamental objectives in the area of missile defenses. First, we believe it is critical to preserve the viability and integrity of the ABM Treaty. This important Treaty remains a cornerstone of U.S. security policy and our new relationship with Russia. It is also essential if we are to continue implementing the dramatic reductions in strategic nuclear forces negotiated during the Reagan and Bush Administrations (START I and START II). Second, we are committed to deploying highly effective theater missile defense systems (TMDs).

The key to preserving both the ABM Treaty and a robust TMD program is the successful conclusion of ongoing negotiations in the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC). These negotiations seek to clarify the distinction in the ABM Treaty between TMDs (which are not limited by the Treaty) and strategic ABMs (which are limited by the Treaty). This is not a question of "expanding" the ABM Treaty's limitations. Rather, we are acting in consonance with the sense of Congress, as clearly expressed in the Missile Defense Act of 1991 (P.L. 102-190) and recently reaffirmed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, that we pursue negotiations to clarify the boundary between TMDs and ABMs. The U.S. position in these negotiations is intended to ensure that advanced U.S. TMD systems can proceed, even though some of them may have a theoretical capability under certain scenarios to intercept certain ballistic missiles.

Over the past year, we have made considerable progress in the SCC towards achieving these objectives. All parties to the negotiations agree on the need to clarify the TMD/ABM boundary, and there appears to be an emerging consensus that such important TMD systems as THAAD, CORPS SAM, Navy Lower Tier and PAC-3 do not cross this boundary. There are, however, still a number of substantive issues that need to be resolved, including our commitment to secure specific deployment options related to air-based TMD and Navy Upper Tier. As I said in my letter of October 22, we will not rush this process or enter into any agreement that does not meet our national security requirements for highly effective TMDs. This commitment was underscored by my recent decision to proceed with demonstration/validation testing of the THAAD TMD system.

I look forward to working closely with Congress as we pursue our common objectives in this area.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise first of all, along with a number of other Members on this side, to make inquiries as to exactly what the purpose of this particular proposal is.

First of all, could I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the particular objection we have, other than the fact that we are multilateralizing the ABM Treaty, and I do not think we multilateralized it, they did, when they splintered into a number of different countries.

The former Soviet Union is no more, so countries which have missile weapons, that missile defense system is still there.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the administration, by the President's own admission, because he has sent a letter back to the Republican leadership after they initiated a letter essentially asking the President, having heard reports from the Pentagon that senior arms negotiators were attempting to expand or were discussing with the Soviet Union, with their negotiation team, the expansion of the ABM Treaty to include limitations on theater defenses, and concerns with that negotiation position were expressed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili.

They were expressed at the hearing in which the gentleman sat in with me when the Secretary of Defense appeared before us. My understanding of his words, the transcript speaks for itself, is that he, too, was concerned with negotiating limitations on theater defenses.

The Republican leadership sent a letter to the President and asked him not to engage in negotiations that would limit theater defensive systems. Let me say that the President responded with a letter, and I can get the letter and we will have it before me, but as I recall, the letter did not say or did not alleviate the concerns of the Republican leadership.

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify the question, the gentleman's real concern is not multilateralizing it, because that is sort of a fact accomplished by the breakup of the Soviet Union, but it is the fact that this administration seems to have expressed concerns about the THAD in particular.

Mr. HUNTER. No, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman will continue to yield, there were two concerns expressed by the Republican leadership. One is multilateralization, bringing in the former Soviet States, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine and others, but it was also the limitations that are projected to be placed on the development of theater defensive systems that has upset both our own military people, who are concerned about protecting American military contingents in thea-

ter, and a number of people, I think, on both sides of the aisle.

Therefore, the Chairman's resolution, as I understand, is a sense of the Congress resolution advising the President that we do not wish him to place constraints on theater ballistic missile systems through the ABM Treaty.

Mr. SPRATT. The provision that is printed in the RECORD ends by saying "These negotiations should be suspended until the 104th Congress has had the opportunity to review these matters."

I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, does he have in mind simply a hearing? What is the opportunity of review?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, since I am the world's greatest expert on my own opinion and my own perception, I think it is a terrible mistake to enter in, when Navy upper tier, I think the best theater defense system that the Navy is developing, is possibly going to be constrained under what the President's negotiators have proposed, I think it is a mistake to impose limitations on theater defensive systems when we have a rapidly evolving threat coming from China, from North Korea, from other sources.

My own opinion is I think we should not constrain theater defensive systems. I think we need to have our intelligence personnel appear before us. I think we need to see if Secretary Perry is going to prevail, and if General Shalikashvili is going to prevail.

Mr. SPRATT. What the gentleman is seeking is just a hearing with the relevant parties and interests before the committee so we could better understand what is going on and express our opinion?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would advise my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, also to work with the administration and try to change their opinion.

What I would like to do and what others would like to do is change the position of the administration and not constrain theater missile defense. I think it is a very difficult thing to do right now when the threat is evolving rapidly, and I think also the multilateralization is a problem.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for expressing some clarification of what it is they seek. I have no particular problem with it. I propose simply that we accept it and move on.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. I believe it is important to send a clear message to President Clinton that a majority of Members in this Chamber do not agree with the administration's position with respect to the ABM Treaty.

Along with a number of other senior Republicans, including Members of the Republican leadership, I requested the President to suspend ongoing negotiations with regard to the ABM Treaty until he consulted with the 104th Congress.

The President respectfully declined to do that. That's because the administration is in the midst of negotiating changes to the treaty that could undercut our ability to deploy highly effective TMD's.

The administration is also seeking to add other countries as signatories to the ABM Treaty. That could pose an obstacle to deployment of effective missile defenses for our national territory.

This amendment is a shot across the bow to the administration, sending a clear signal that we are serious about this issue.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. SPENCE's amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us move on. This is about hearings. We ought to have them. We are on the record saying we ought to explore these insignificant questions.

Let us not debate this matter. Let us accept it, and move on to other more substantial and substantive amendments. We are prepared to deal with it. I would have hoped that my colleague would have alerted me earlier about this amendment and we could have talked about it in committee, we could have looked at it thoroughly in committee.

Notwithstanding that, let us get beyond this, accept the amendment, and let us move on to other items.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this is an important policy decision that the administration is undertaking right now with respect to theater defense limitations.

□ 1710

I think it is an extremely important issue. I would like to get a vote on it because I think it is important to have a sense of the House, regardless of the final outcome of the bill, on this issue. I think it is a very important arms control limitation amendment. And I would like to have a vote.

Mr. SPRATT. We accept the amendment. Is that not sufficient?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has the time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Let me first respond to my colleague by saying, look, we all know there are very significant amendments here. Take the amendment. Every time you call for a vote, you take out of the debate much more significant amendments that we need to debate here. You are going to win

today. We thought you had written the bill the way you wanted to write it in the first place. You have got the votes to do it. Why now trample upon the little bit of time that we have to try to make up for it here? You could have written this bill any way you wanted to. We accept the amendment, and let us go forward.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Is the distinguished and esteemed gentleman acknowledging, or am I hearing something incorrectly, that the policy is flawed as stands and should be changed?

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman knows that both of us are very articulate people. We need not put words in each other's mouth. I am saying very specifically, you have got the votes. Go on and accept the amendment. Let's not filibuster this issue. Let's get on to other amendments that are very important. That is exactly what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say to him that if this were a motion to adjourn or some kind of a delaying motion, I would agree with him completely. I am just saying to my friend, and I hope he will accept this, I think this is a very important part of arms limitation. It got a lot of us riled up when we saw it happening. You and I know the difference between having a vote in which you have real numbers on the scorecard instead of an acceptance where we say, "Well, we accepted it to get it off the table and under the carpet."

I do intend to call a vote on it because I think it is important to have a vote. I guarantee my friend I will be short of words for the rest of the day.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I might reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman, then let's get on with it. Call for the vote and let's do it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the need to move on when both sides are in agreement about who is going to win today here on an important amendment. I have not criticized anybody on the other side of the aisle for raising a little ruckus around here about the Republican Contract With America and having the most unusual 100-day period we have ever had here. The reason I have not objected to the passion of anybody on the other side, from the new conscience of the minority, HAROLD VOLKMER, or to any other passion is that I spent one-third of my adult life, no, one-third of my entire 60 years in the minority on this side and I feel your pain, and I mean it. But this is a

moment I have waited for, for a long time.

Look, Mr. Chairman. We all know that over 1 million Americans are following this debate on C-SPAN. That is the Rose Bowl filled 100 times, or 10 times. That is the Coliseum filled 10 times. And they don't have close-up cameras all the time.

I want to make a few points as the self-appointed historian of this body, and I don't know who takes that role in the Senate.

Fifty years ago today, the Nazi empire of Hitler's Fortress Europe was pushing buttons and launching in this month of February, 50 years ago, hundreds of ballistic missiles. Their guidance systems were rudimentary, but they were good enough to kill innocent men, women, and children all over southern England. And those that did not make the route killed innocent people as they fell on the Netherlands or Belgium working their way to wreak havoc. Hitler's V-1, a cruise missile in today's terminology, and his V-2, a ballistic missile, were not named V for victory, they were named V for vengeance. Believe me, we can, God forbid, have in the future what one of the great liberal papers of America calls a "rogue missile" coming at us.

Listen to what one of America's 3 major newspapers says in closing in an editorial that I found much exception to on technological points, but listen to this closely. And I will tell who it is afterward:

"While it remains a global power and within the limits of technological and financial sense," and this is what we will debate with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in his forceful and articulate manner in hearings later in the year, "the United States must be able to protect forces that it sends on distant missions. And also to protect our allies. There lies the irreducible rationale for an effective theater missile defense."

That is the liberal great Washington Post.

Now, while we possess the technology to defeat a threat, certainly at the level of Hitler's vengeance weapons, we now have the ability to detect, to intercept, and to destroy incoming missiles, but we still do not have the ability to protect one single American city, not a village, hamlet, or town, not an innocent man or woman anywhere in the continental United States or our possessions from Guam, where our day begins, to the Virgin Islands, from Alaska to Hawaii, nowhere can we defend ourselves from missiles. And we still hear voices in this Chamber defending the ABM treaty signed with an evil empire, an entity that is gone. It does not exist anymore.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DORNAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORNAN. We must later in the year address this ghastly problem of us failing the Preamble to our great Constitution, the original contract, to provide for the common defense.

There are lots of statements people make around here out of polling, from all sorts of great pollers on both sides of the aisle, and we say it is true that most Americans are opposed to most abortions, then we debate that ad nauseam.

Then we have all sorts of things, we say do Americans want this, do they want that?

Here is a statement that I say that I know cannot be refuted. Not 0.1, not 1 percent of this Nation knows that with the trillions of dollars spent under Reagan-Bush or a quarter of a trillion that we are going to spend every year into the future, that is \$1 trillion during the Clinton years, that we are unable to defend ourselves from some rogue missile sent by some terrorist group.

I know the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] carefully talks—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has again expired.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, with all due respect, we are operating here with a very tight time constraint. We do appreciate your historical perspectives. But I think we do have to move on and get to the substance of this bill. We have real concrete concerns that we have got to view here with the American public and with our colleagues and we have got to move on. We would ask that we call for a vote on this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, I would ask my colleagues since we are going to call for a vote, I think a vote is important to send a message to the President. I would ask my colleagues to refrain from making more speeches so there is time left for the other side to offer the amendments that they have planned in the next several hours.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, with the caveat that this would be the last 30 seconds, that we are going to restrain ourselves from the unanimous consent and ask for the vote immediately following this 30 seconds, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN. The gentleman is so gracious, I will cut it to 15 seconds to finish my point.

I look forward to a debate with one of the fairest former chairmen ever, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] on the danger of suitcase bombs being dumped out of old freighters into the mud of our harbors. That is equally

as dangerous as a rogue missile. We will discuss that later. But we must fulfill this part of the contract on theater missile defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 320, noes 110, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—320

Allard	Deutsch	Hoyer
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Archer	Dickey	Hutchinson
Armey	Dooley	Hyde
Bachus	Doolittle	Inglis
Baesler	Dornan	Istook
Baker (CA)	Doyle	Jacobs
Baker (LA)	Dreier	Jefferson
Baldacci	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Ballenger	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Barcia	Edwards	Jones
Barr	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	Kaptur
Bartlett	Emerson	Kasich
Barton	English	Kelly
Bass	Ensign	Kennedy (RI)
Bateman	Eshoo	Kildee
Bereuter	Everett	Kim
Berman	Ewing	King
Bevill	Fawell	Kingston
Bilbray	Fazio	Klaczka
Bilirakis	Fields (LA)	Klink
Bishop	Fields (TX)	Klug
Bliley	Flanagan	Knollenberg
Blute	Foley	Kolbe
Boehlert	Forbes	LaHood
Boehner	Fowler	Largent
Bonilla	Fox	Latham
Bono	Franks (CT)	LaTourette
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Laughlin
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Brewster	Frisa	Levin
Browder	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Brownback	Funderburk	Lewis (KY)
Bryant (TN)	Galleghy	Lightfoot
Bunn	Ganske	Lincoln
Bunning	Gekas	Linder
Burr	Geren	Lipinski
Burton	Gibbons	Livingston
Buyer	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Callahan	Gillmor	Longley
Calvert	Gilman	Lucas
Camp	Gonzalez	Manton
Canady	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Castle	Goodling	Martini
Chabot	Gordon	Mascara
Chambliss	Goss	McCarthy
Chapman	Graham	McCollum
Chenoweth	Green	McCrary
Christensen	Greenwood	McDade
Chrysler	Gunderson	McHale
Clement	Gutknecht	McHugh
Clinger	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McIntosh
Coble	Hancock	McKeon
Coburn	Hansen	McNulty
Collins (GA)	Harman	Menendez
Combest	Hastert	Metcalfe
Condit	Hastings (WA)	Meyers
Cooley	Hayes	Mica
Costello	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hefley	Molinari
Cramer	Hefner	Mollohan
Crane	Heineman	Montgomery
Crapo	Herger	Moorhead
Creameans	Hillery	Moran
Cubin	Hobson	Morella
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Murtha
Danner	Hoke	Myers
Davis	Holden	Myrick
de la Garza	Horn	Nethercutt
Deal	Hostettler	Neumann
DeLay	Houghton	Ney

Norwood	Salmon	Tauzin
Nussle	Sanford	Taylor (MS)
Ortiz	Sawyer	Taylor (NC)
Orton	Saxton	Tejeda
Oxley	Scarborough	Thomas
Packard	Schaefer	Thornberry
Parker	Schiff	Thornton
Paxon	Scott	Thurman
Payne (VA)	Seastrand	Tiahrt
Peterson (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Torkildsen
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Torricelli
Petri	Shaw	Trafficant
Pickett	Shays	Upton
Pombo	Shuster	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Vucanovich
Porter	Skaggs	Waldholtz
Portman	Skeen	Walker
Poshard	Skelton	Walsh
Pryce	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Weldon (FL)
Ramstad	Solomon	Weldon (PA)
Reed	Souder	Weller
Regula	Spence	White
Riggs	Spratt	Whitfield
Roberts	Stearns	Wicker
Roemer	Stenholm	Wilson
Rogers	Stockman	Wise
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Young (FL)
Roth	Talent	Zeliff
Roukema	Tanner	Zimmer
Royce	Tate	

NOES—110

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Pallone
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hilliard	Rahall
Bonior	Hinchee	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rose
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kennelly	Rush
Clayton	LaFalce	Sabo
Coleman	Leach	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Lofgren	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lowe	Schumer
Conyers	Luther	Serrano
Coyne	Maloney	Slaughter
DeFazio	Markey	Stark
DeLauro	Martinez	Stokes
Dellums	Matsui	Studds
Dicks	McDermott	Thompson
Dingell	McKinney	Torres
Dixon	Meehan	Towns
Doggett	Meek	Tucker
Durbin	Mfume	Velazquez
Engel	Miller (CA)	Vento
Evans	Mineta	Volkmer
Farr	Minge	Ward
Fattah	Mink	Waters
Filner	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Flake	Nadler	Williams
Foglietta	Neal	Woolsey
Ford	Oberstar	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Obey	Wynn
Furse	Olver	Yates
Gejdenson	Owens	

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra Lewis (GA)
Lantos Young (AK)

□ 1738

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Lewis of Georgia, against.

Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Messrs. ROSE, PALLONE, LAFALCE, FOGLIETTA, DOGGETT, MATSUI, LUTHER, MOAKLEY, WARD, and EVANS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. WILSON, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. LINCOLN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1740

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 41.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike out title II (page 11, line 12 through page 12, line 25) and insert the following:

TITLE II—POLICY REGARDING PRIORITY FOR MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. POLICY.

The following, in the order listed, shall be the policy of the United States with respect to the priority for development and deployment of missile defense programs:

(1) First, ensuring operational readiness of the Armed Forces and accomplishing programmed modernization of weapons systems.

(2) Second, as part of such modernization, completing the development and deployment at the earliest practicable date of more effective theater missile defense (TMD) systems by adequately funding essential theater missile defense programs.

(3) Third, developing as soon as practicable, subject to the availability of funding, a ground-based interceptor system capable of destroying ballistic missiles launched against the United States.

Mr. SPRATT. As I said earlier, one sure way of fulfilling the dire prophecies set out in the preamble of this bill in title I is to do what is called for in title II of the bill and sink huge sums of money into a so-called national missile defense system, especially if this missile defense system employs space-based interceptors at the earliest practical date. That is why I am offering this amendment to title II of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I support a strong defense, I believe in and support ballistic missile defense, but I think we need to get our priorities in order. I first want to make sure that our forces—and they are going to be downsized and smaller—are ready to fight. I want to make sure the equipment they take to battle is the best we can possibly give them and I want to assure them off the battlefield, they and their families, a quality of life.

Title II can be read to mean many things. If it means a missile defense system that envelops the whole Nation and employs space-based interceptors, the cost will put at risk all of our other priorities.

During markup of this bill, I tried to clarify title II with an amendment which I filed in the RECORD, an amendment stating exactly what sort of system it calls for, and specifying a system with a ground-based interceptor.

What happened? The amendment that I offered was rejected by every Republican member of the committee.

I filed that same amendment in the RECORD for consideration on the floor, but rather than offering it, I have taken it and boiled it down. I am offer-

ing instead the boiled-down version that really tries to set straight the priorities set forth in title II.

I offer this amendment because I think if title II becomes law without it, it could be taken to mean deployment of a national defense system made up of space-based interceptors. Such a system could easily cost \$25 billion to deploy, and that \$25 billion can only be funded at the expense of other priorities, like readiness and theater missile defense, with which we are all concerned. My amendment is to make sure that a national missile defense system is not put ahead of other, higher priorities. It requires, very simply, this: One, that readiness and modernization should be funded first and should take priority over national missile defense. Second, that theater missile defense should take priority over national missile defense because it deals with a threat that is here and now, one our forces will face if deployed to almost any theater in the world today.

The third priority my amendment states is that any national missile defense system developed should start with a ground-based, and not space-based, interceptor.

I am not opposed to space-based interceptors, but if they are to be used for ballistic missile defense, they should come later rather than sooner. The right place to start with missile defense technically and in terms of cost is on the ground.

So I offer this amendment to correct several concerns I have about title II of the bill.

First, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about national defense and about national defense spending. I would like to see more money be spent on national defense, but I also think that \$250 billion a year is real money and that it will fund our requirements, provided we spend it wisely.

In the 1980's we spent \$25 billion on the strategic defense initiative without fielding a single system. In the 1970's we spent \$115 billion, in today's money, fielding the Spartan and Sprint, only to stand them down once they had been deployed. We cannot afford such excesses in the 1990's. That is why we have to be sensible, prudent and cost-effective and amend title II and set our priorities straight.

Readiness first and foremost, that is the first priority; theater missile defense over national missile and national missile defense must start with ground-based interceptors rather than space-based interceptors.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about ballistic missile defense. I believe in it, and I think we should perfect a ground-based missile defense system. The amendment I offered in committee would call for just such a system. But the system I called for would be complied with the ABM Treaty. I think the time is coming when we will want to change the ABM Treaty, amend it by agreement with the Russians. But now since START-II sits in the Russian

Duma waiting to be ratified, now is not the time to talk of abandoning or scrapping the ABM Treaty. We believe that we can develop the capability of intercepting incoming missiles, but we cannot be certain. We can be certain of this: If START-II is ratified, 4,000 to 5,000 warheads aimed at us will be intercepted, taken down, their delivery systems destroyed, their silos filled up. Why risk ratification of START-II by even obliquely proposing, as title II does, that we scrap the ABM Treaty?

My amendment does not preclude national missile defense; far from it, it simply puts funding for missile defense in the right order, and I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. First of all, I have the highest respect for our colleague on the other side who has offered this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps few in this body have spent as much time on missile defense as our colleague from South Carolina. I want to acknowledge that up front, and his leadership role.

I do have a clarifying question I would like to ask of our colleague who offers this amendment, because there has been a lot of rhetoric spoken on the House floor in terms of what we are talking about.

□ 1750

If my colleagues listen to our gentleman speak, he never once used the words "star wars" during his eloquent statements on the House floor. Now I have counted at least over 60 times the Members on the other side have used that term, which means I am donating \$60 to the Science Fiction Writers Foundation to help them in their activities, but our distinguished colleague never used that because he understands what we are talking about here, I think, as well as anyone. But what he does not mention in his amendment when he talks about a ground-based interceptor system is whether or not that includes or even allows for space-based sensors.

Would the gentleman qualify that for me, please?

My question is, as we have heard all this rhetoric about space-based and all, the gentleman knows well what we talk about when we say space-based sensors which are not actual weapons, but is a method of detecting when missiles are actually launched.

Does the gentleman's motion, for the record, his amendment—in fact does he intend to acknowledge it even though he does not say it?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. As the gentleman knows, when I offered an amendment in committee, it was very specific as to what the system I would propose would be, and it is in the record. It includes a ground-based system, and it includes sensors, either ground-launched, pop-up systems, or space-based systems, so-called—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I think—

Mr. SPRATT. Those two are necessary to this. I voted for the last particular amendment because I think that probably the theater missile defense, to reach its optimal efficiency, will need some satellite assistance to cue the missiles.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that point, and I think that is a very important point for us to begin on, that the gentleman from the other side offering this amendment agrees that space-based sensors are important for what the Minority side wants to pursue, and that is a theater missile defense system.

I say to my colleagues, "So, when you hear rhetoric on the floor, people talking about space-based weapons, even this amendment calls for space-based sensors, which I think our colleague would also acknowledge the Russians already have, and in fact have been using, as a part of their operational ABM system around Moscow."

Let me say the reasons why I have to—my added point would be:

"Why did not the gentleman include that in the text of the amendment?"

Mr. SPRATT. I was simply trying to simplify. In my opinion, if the gentleman will read the other amendment which I filed in the RECORD, a ground-based system includes by definitions space-based sensors. It could have ground pop-up sensors, as the gentleman knows. At one time the ground-based system had pop-up sensors that would have been launched only at a time of threatened attack.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for that, and I take back my time.

The key problem that I have with this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that it does not get at the heart of what this debate is all about, and that is asking the Secretary to report back to us within 60 days for as soon as practicable deployment of the beginning of a national ballistic missile system.

Now we have it on the RECORD, the tiger team that did the research for Secretary Perry looked at three options and, in fact, reported to the Secretary last week that they can begin to deploy a limited national defense system for approximately \$5 billion over 5 years. It is not 10, it is not 20, it is not 25; \$5 billion.

Furthermore, they have stated that technology will give us a 90-percent effective rate for the kinds of targets that it would focus on, namely the SS-

25 and a conglomeration of three missiles with three warheads.

But we do not want to specifically limit what the Secretary can go back and recommend to us, which is one of the further reasons why I have to object to this. We do not want to tell him what he should, in fact, be looking at. We want to leave that up to him, and we have confidence in the Secretary that within 60 days he will come back and tell us what the parameters of that system should look like.

Mr. SPRATT. Excuse me; will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman is saying that title 2 should be read to be *carte blanche* to the Secretary of Defense. Waiting on him to write the check and say what is needed?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, what we are saying is we want the Secretary to come back to us within 60 days to tell us as soon as practicable when he can deploy the national missile defense system, and he acknowledges publicly he can deploy for not \$10 billion, not \$20 billion, but \$5 billion over 5 years.

Now, in terms of the first title of this, readiness, we are all for readiness. As a matter of fact, we were extremely critical of the Secretary when we acknowledged in the committee when he came before us that his defense budget for this year is \$5 billion less than the acquisition accounts, than what he told us it would be last year. So we acknowledge that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weldon] has expired.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and hope I can add some clarity to this debate.

I think that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has shown great leadership on this subject, and what he offers today is intended to take the inexact language of H.R. 7 and help us go in a much more constructive direction.

I am an unabashed supporter of ballistic missile defense which I know is in our national security. In fact, last year I joined with our former colleague, Now Senator KYL, to add money to the BMD account. We were successful in committee, but lost on the House floor.

The Spratt amendment does the sensible thing, particularly because it makes clear that our priority for the short term is theater missile defense and not national missile defense. I would urge that we deploy at the soonest practicable day TMD, not NMD, and I worry that if and when this Contract passes, we will skew our priorities and spend our money on the wrong thing first.

Missile proliferation is here. One only has to go to the country of Israel to realize how vulnerable that ally is.

A missile launched from Syria can land anywhere on the continental soil of Israel in 1 minute. A missile launched from Iran takes 5 minutes. Our ballistic missile defense capability is not adequate, not adequate. But what we must do first is protect against short- and medium-term launches, and we are proceeding to do that.

I also believe I heard my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], say—I hope he said—that space-based interceptors, interceptors, should come later. I am not against space-based interceptors in our future, but I am against them right now as a priority.

□ 1800

I believe that that is the intent of the gentleman's amendment, and I will oppose any amendment that would ban space-based interceptors for the future.

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is now running his interesting contest here, that the "S" word I intend to use here is space-based, and not star wars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues I would like to comment on this. I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] when he talked about the seriousness of what we are debating. We are debating really a change in policy in this country. So I was disturbed as I was sitting in my office and kept hearing all the comments about Star Wars, Star Wars, Star Wars.

I was not around. I was not here in the Congress when Star Wars came up, and I know there is some political gamesmanship being used with regard to a national missile ballistic defense. I can only share with you from personal experience. The gentlewoman cited Israel. All of you know I served in the Gulf war, and the first Scud that came in in Dhahran was exploded by a Patriot interceptor above our head, and the fuselage landed in a John Deere implement plant. So I understand what theater missile ballistic defense is about, and I congratulate the gentleman for his sincerity in his effort to move in further development of theater ballistic defense. But I also share a concern about national ballistic defense, and the present vulnerability that we have and the present policy that this President has undertaken.

So I think that there is a major shift in policy, and one which this Congress should debate about and one which we should in fact change.

To the reference to Star Wars, I do have to add this though to my colleagues, that science fiction becomes science fact. Think of that. Science fiction does become science fact. So when you use the word "Star Wars" and you throw that out there as if you are trying to say we are going to throw some money down some rat hole and we

never know what is going to happen, I want you to think about a couple of things.

Those that say that a national missile ballistic defense is some flight into fantasy, think of this: The use of a submarine I am sure was a flight into fantasy for John Paul Jones; and I am sure that the use of air power in the land battle was a flight into fantasy for General Sherman, to utilize balloons in the Civil War; and I am sure the use of an atomic weapon would have been a flight into fantasy for General Pershing and General Summerall in World War I. And I am sure that the use of satellites and unmanned aerial vehicles was a flight into fantasy, that we used in the Persian Gulf war, to in fact General Eisenhower.

Mr. Chairman, Jules Verne turned science fiction into science fact when he foresaw man walking on the bottom of the ocean, for which we have today. My gosh, even those of us that grew up in the George Jetson era saw teleconferencing in the early 1960's on TV.

But the reason I bring that up is when you use star wars out there, I think you are complementing America. You really are. You think you are trying to tear down something. But when you refer to star wars, you are buying into something. You are buying into the saying yes, America has the innovation and the initiative and the drive to develop new technologies.

So you can use star wars. Some people get offended by it. I think it is a compliment. You are complimenting those of us that want to pursue the development of technology. So use it. I am not offended.

I know what it is like to be there on the ground floor, under a missile attack, and have it intercepted by a Patriot. Thank God there were people here in this body that had the willingness to develop such technologies. And if any of you were here that made those decisions, God bless you, and I am thankful to you.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], requiring that readiness, modernization of equipment and quality of life for military personnel and their families are adequately funded and given priority over national missile defense.

The cold war is over, and the threat of a large-scale nuclear war has been greatly diminished. While I agree with my colleagues that there is a need for missile defense programs, I do not believe that additional funding should be placed in a space-based interceptor system at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in the two previous administrations, we poured over \$30 billion into programs like Brilliant Pebbles, gamma ray lasers, neutral particle beams, and more, and all we have to show for it are the engineering

view graphs. After spending \$30 billion we do not have one weapons system to show for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

I have four military installations either in or on the edge of my district. Moody Air Force Base, Albany Marine Logistics Base, Fort Benning, the Army's premier infantry center, and Robins Air Force Base. Most importantly, the military personnel, these young men and women, are the first to deploy and leave their families in time of conflict. They always stand ready to go on the call of the Commander-in-Chief, professionals, trained to execute their military orders, and, if necessary, they are willing to pay the ultimate price.

When visiting these installations, my conversations with the troops focus around the issues of readiness, of modernization of equipment, and the quality of life for their families. Many of them are concerned about sufficient support for our military effectiveness. They question whether we will truly be able to adequately fight two major conflicts anywhere in the world at one time. They further question me about the commitment of this Congress to replace outdated equipment, weapons systems, computer systems, software and hardware, and, last but not least, they express concern about the lack of adequate housing and the other support for the welfare of their young military dependent families.

Let there be no misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman. These young men and women are not complaining about serving their country. In fact, they serve this country with great pride, dignity, and honor. At a time when we pledge to balance the budget and to be more responsible in our spending, let us be responsible to the readiness and the welfare of our troops and their families.

Support the amendment that invests in readiness, in modernization, and quality of life for our military personnel and their military dependent families. Support the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment offered by the gentlemen from South Carolina requiring that readiness, modernization of equipment, and quality of life for military personnel and their families are adequately funded and given priority over national missile defense.

The cold war is over and the threat of a large scale nuclear war has been diminished. While I agree with my colleagues that there is a need for a Missile Defense Program, I do not believe that additional funding should be placed in a space-based interceptor system at this time. Mr. Speaker, in the two previous Administrations we poured over \$30 billion dollars into programs like Brilliant Pebbles, Gamma Ray Lasers, Neutral Particle Beams, and more, and all we have to show for it are the engineering view graphs. After spending \$30 billion, we do not have one weapon system to show for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

I have four major installations in or on the edge of my District: Moody Air Force Base, Albany Marine Logistics Base, Fort Benning, the Army's premier Infantry training facility, and Robins Air Force Base. Most importantly, the military personnel, these young men and women, are the first to deploy and leave their families during a time of conflict. They always stand ready to go on the call of the Commander in Chief. Professionals, trained to execute their military orders and if necessary pay the ultimate price.

When visiting these installations, my conversations with the troops focus around the issues of readiness, modernization of equipment, and the quality of life for their families. Many of them are concerned about sufficient support for military effectiveness. They question whether we will truly be able to adequately fight two major conflicts anywhere in the world at one time. They further question me about the commitment of Congress to the replacement of outdated equipment, computer systems, software, and hardware; and, last but not least, they express concern about the lack of adequate housing and support for the welfare of their young military dependent families. Let there be no misunderstanding, these young men and women are not complaining about serving their country. In fact, they serve this country with great pride, dignity, and honor.

At a time when we've pledged to balance the budget and be more responsible in our spending, let's be responsible to the readiness and welfare of our troops and their families. Support the amendment that invests in readiness, modernization, and quality of life.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, like all members of our Committee on National Security, I have the greatest respect for my friend from South Carolina, and I want to thank him for all of his efforts and work with respect to missile defense.

I want to also thank Members on the Republican side, and I know I am looking at Mr. WELDON, and I think of him and Mr. HEFLEY and HAL ROGERS and others that signed a letter to Israel in 1987 saying that although you have great fighter aircraft and you have great armor and great ground troops, if a missile was launched, a Russian missile from a neighboring Arab country, you would have no defense against it, and we asked them to drop the LAVI fighter system and start developing a theater ballistic missile defense system.

I want to thank them for that letter to our SDI leaders and to Israel, because it had an effect in turning Israel away from building fighter aircraft and doing what they knew they had to do for national survival, and that is defend against incoming missiles. And I might say to my colleagues that that projection turned out to be an accurate projection. While we projected Russian missiles might come from Syria, they came from another Arab country. The truth of the matter that we have to be able to stop incoming ballistic missiles was not lost on them.

Let me go straight to what I think are the fatal defects in the Spratt

amendment. First, it competes readiness and missile defense, and readiness and missile defense should not be competed. I can tell the gentleman that under this Republican House, and I think with the gentleman's help, the readiness budget that the President submitted will be increased this year. I can say as the chairman of the procurement subcommittee that the procurement budget that Secretary Perry cut again, just 12 months ago, from \$48 billion to \$39 billion, will be increased this year. I think I can tell the gentleman that with some confidence. This is not an either/or situation. In competing these systems, it is like telling an infantry commander, you cannot have any defense against mortars until you can certify to me you have a total defense against machine guns. The point is that missile defense does contribute to readiness because your soldiers in the rear area, if it is theater defense, know they have some knowledge they are going to be defended against incoming missiles. I would submit there also is an increase in morale if they know their communities back home have some defense against a Libya or against an Iraq or against another adversarial country.

So the point is we are not going to decrease readiness, we are not shopping readiness versus theater defense, we are not going to decrease procurement, shopping procurement against theater defense. And, lastly, the gentleman leaves out the word "deploy." The Republican policy is to deploy a national missile defense.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk about the cost. This is a statement that Secretary Perry made, and I have tried to give it a couple of times. But he said:

We have a national missile defense program. That is the program the Secretary is funding, which will lead I think in a timely way to a deployed system. It will be at a relatively small cost, probably \$5 billion in very round figures for the cost of the system.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending 10 times that amount in environmental costs in the defense budget. So if the gentleman put up something that said maybe we should shop environmental costs off in favor of national missile defense, I might be inclined to accept the Spratt amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1810

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I just want to add that in that assessment done for the Secretary, General O'Neill tells us that we can get a 90 percent effective rate against three SS-25s that would be the likely scenario of a third world nation getting SS-25 capability. Some would argue that is not possible.

I would remind my colleagues, as I know my colleague in the well knows, that it was just a few short months ago that the Russians offered to Brazil to take an SS-25 and use it for a space launch effort. So they in fact are looking at the availability of making the SS-25 architecture available for other countries.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me tell my colleagues also that two representatives from two of our national nuclear laboratories were here last week stating that they can build a space system for about 50 percent more. That is about \$7.5 billion. And that, once again, is roughly less than 1/100th of the defense budget on an annual basis and less than half of what we spend on environmental matters in the defense budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. I just wanted to have the gentleman clarify, as he just did, that the chart does not refer to star wars. It is a ground-based missile defense system and that some estimates for a star wars space-based system go from \$11 billion to \$50 billion and even Gen. Colin Powell has said that the national missile defense system would take away funds from other important defense programs.

Mr. HUNTER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me just answer the gentleman by saying that two of the most prestigious scientists in this country, one from Livermore National Laboratory, one from Los Alamos, said that a space-based system could be achieved for \$7.5 billion.

Let me just say further to the gentleman that the term "star wars," at least as used by a lot of people who have used it for the last 20 years, means anything that shoots down an incoming ballistic missile. If they have a problem with that, I do not understand it. But certainly this system that Dr. Perry talked about is a system that engages incoming missiles in space.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I want to clarify what Dr. Evers, the Deputy Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Office with the administration said yesterday in my office. The maximum amount for a full-blown ballistic missile defense system for our Nation would be \$20 billion. So where these numbers are coming from, I do not know. But using the estimates of your officials in your administration, Dr. Evers, he said the maximum amount would be \$20 billion, Dr. Evers, in my office.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just say to my friend, we have people with varying

ideas. Our point to the gentleman from South Carolina is, doggone it, let us have some hearings. Let us bring the Secretary in. Let us bring our experts from the national labs in. And let us make a decision. But let us not go with the gentleman from South Carolina's own choice, his own favorite choice, a ground-based system.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Does the gentleman know the cost of the Patriot system, all of them, from 1967 forward? He is not here to tell the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] that it was LBJ's program.

Mr. HUNTER. I would answer my friend that the Patriot system probably cost us a fortune. Almost everything that we did under our procurement regulations did.

Mr. SPRATT. Over \$16 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Listening to all this, I was wondering, about where these missiles come from, I was wondering if the gentleman from California has even seen the movie "The Russians are Coming, The Russians are Coming"?

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just answer my friend and tell him that when our troops were in Desert Storm, had incoming ballistic missiles, although those were not Russians, those were Russian-made missiles. And according to our best estimates of our intelligence officers, the weapon of choice of these Third World terrorist nations is missiles. And the Russians have let the technology out of the box.

There are Middle Eastern nations shopping in the Soviet Union right now for scientists who will sell anything, including fissile materials for a few bucks. If you believe your own Director of the CIA, Mr. Woolsey, it is time for us to move forward. Mr. Woolsey, it is time for us to move forward. Mr. Woolsey said that a number of these terrorist nations will have some ICBM capability. That means the ability to reach American cities a little bit after the beginning of this next decade. That means within 6 or 7 years.

As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] just pointed out, it took us 20 years to develop the Patriot missile. So I think the message for us is, let us get started. That is what the Republican contract does. It says, "shall deploy." And the fatal flaw of the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is it does not say shall deploy. It simply says "develop."

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it appears to me that this whole agenda that I am seeing here and all these scare tactics and everything reminds me that perhaps I am right in the conclusion that the John Birch Society now controls the Republican agenda on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. I just wanted to ask the gentleman, who had generously offered to reduce environmental funding in order to fund ballistic missile defense, if he had seen the letter from his Governor of California, Governor Wilson, chastising the Secretary of Defense for not fully funding environmental restoration in this budget and for rescinding some environmental money and saying that he would pursue the Secretary of Defense to the full extent of the law. I do not want to pit the gentleman against his own Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from South Carolina, I think when Governor Wilson looks at what this member of the committee has done with defense funding and in the defense bill, he is going to be very disappointed on an environmental basis. He is going to be very happy on a strategic defense basis.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from California made a very important statement. He said that there are a number of figures floating around here, so let us hold hearings. Let us talk about that for a moment.

When the Secretary of Defense came before the House Committee on Armed Services at this gentleman's request, the Secretary of Defense said that to put in place a limited ground-based system would cost between \$5 and \$10 billion. That is one figure. My distinguished colleague in the well from southern California said \$20 billion for a space-based system. Some of our staff came to the conclusion that it would be in excess of \$25 billion.

The Pentagon said that to go into space, a system could cost anywhere between \$30 and \$40 billion. The point is that we do not know.

But what does this bill say? This bill says, Mr. Chairman, it "shall" be the policy. We are able to handle the English language. It does not say it "may be" the policy. It says it "shall be" the policy of the United States to deploy at the earliest practicable date a national missile defense system, and it says that within 60 days the Secretary of Defense shall report back to Congress on a plan to implement such a policy.

But when asked, are you embracing the present administration's policy with respect to ballistic missile defense, they say no. We want to go beyond that.

So let us not be disingenuous with each other. Let us be candid.

Now, if we are saying that we want the present administration's limited ground-based ballistic missile defense system for \$5 or \$10 billion, then say that and not quote it out of context. If we want a space-based system, then say that as well. But my colleagues said, let us hold hearings.

This gentleman's entire argument on the committee and on the floor has been, when we move from campaign promise to legislative initiative, allow the process to be deliberative and substantive and thoughtful.

This is not a deliberative and substantive process, Mr. Chairman. We only had one half-day hearing on this issue at this gentleman's request and calling of the Secretary of Defense. We got another half-day hearing that, in part, dealt with this and the entire range of the bill, H.R. 7, which was the original vehicle, for 2 half-days of hearings. That is not a substantive deliberative process.

□ 1820

Mr. Chairman, this gentleman knows, and so does this gentleman, a more deliberative process would be to raise these issues in the context of the DOD authorization bill allowing the gentleman's subcommittee and others in a deliberative, substantive, thoughtful way to hold detailed hearings, to look at the implications, and arrive at a more intelligent view as to what it is we want and how much it is going to cost.

We are sitting here today, Mr. Chairman, in the afternoon looking at \$5 or \$10 billion on the low end and \$40 billion on the high end. We are just throwing figures around. I would want to underscore what my colleague, the gentleman from California, said. Why not slow down this process and let us hold hearings, and let us carry out our fiduciary responsibilities to the voters and the taxpayers that we quote so regularly around here, and do something responsible.

Mr. Chairman, what this bill does is place the policy before the budget consideration. That just flies in the face of logic and rationality. It makes no sense.

In a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, on the next amendment, there is going to be a motion to prohibit funds for a space-based interceptor. That is either a laser system or Brilliant Pebbles. That is something that shoots down weapons systems. We all know that, if we go to space-based interceptors, we are talking about tens of billions of dollars. The Secretary of Defense said that and so did the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. That is a verbatim quote in the transcript that we all know, because we were all there and we all heard it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should we be rushing to judgment, putting the cart before the horse? This can be dealt with in the normal course of things, and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and I can deliberate intelligently, rationally, and substantively.

Why do we have to rush to judgment in the context of this contract with a 10-hour debate on the substantive initiative?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the one place where I disagree with the gentleman in his statement is this. It was a judgment, a political judgment, I think of this Nation, I think it is the will of this Nation, and it was I think a major referendum in the election.

It is the will of the Republican Party in putting the contract together and I think the will of Republicans and Democrats across the country to do one thing that does not require hundreds of hearings and does not require our participation in the process, and that is this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HUNTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the one thing is manifested in two words, "shall deploy." I would say to the gentleman, once we have made the policy decision to deploy, at that point we then go through the process of what type of deployment will take place. I think that is reasonable and logical.

I would offer to my friend that when President Kennedy said "We are going to go to the moon," he did not first try to decide what kind of rocket it was going to take, he did not have the analysts come in and try to cost the thing out for 20 years. He set that as a policy, and we fleshed the policy out. I do think it is relevant that the Secretary of Defense said "You can fulfill this thing for \$5 billion if you do it against a thin attack," so once we have made the policy judgment to deploy, and this is a very important amendment, because the Republican bill, the House bill, the Armed Services bill, does say "shall deploy," and we then flesh that out.

Mr. DELLUMS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I have given the gentleman the opportunity to fully discuss this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a colloquy here.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not react adversely to the assertion that this gentleman made that we are throwing figures around here and we ought to have a hearing, but the gentleman said it was a political judgment. Let me speak to that for a moment.

If they walk into a room of people and say to them "Did you know we do not have a defense against a ballistic missile system," I would bet my last dollar they would say, "Wow, no." Then they would say, "And we don't have one." They would say, "Gee, we don't? Maybe we should."

However, if I were able to enter the room, I could say several things: One, "Folks, we are spending \$3 billion a year on theater and national ballistic missile defense, \$400 million on national missile defense, \$120 to \$130 million on Brilliant Eyes, a space-based sensor program that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania alluded to earlier, and over \$2 billion on theater ballistic missile defense."

The last time I looked that was not chump change. That was a significant commitment of billions of taxpayer dollars.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, if I entered that room and said to the American people assembled "Look, folks, what makes you think that some third world country, even if they had the capacity to spend billions of dollars to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile capacity, would launch a missile toward the United States?"

We could see it on radar. Within seconds we could pinpoint who it is and render them a hole in the planet Earth, within seconds. Do you know what they could do? The easiest thing they could do? Hide a nuclear bomb in a bale of marijuana. We have not been able to catch that very well. It is easy to sneak it into the country.

You can backpack a nuclear missile into this country. You can bring a nuclear weapon into the coast of the United States with a commercial carrier. You can bring a nuclear weapon into the United States piece by piece, put it in the Empire State Building, and explode it.

What makes anyone think that spending billions of dollars on some absurd program with dubious value is going to deal with the terrorist effort? If we do, and heaven forbid if we ever do, if we do experience a nuclear bomb, it is not going to come from some international effort, it is going to come from a terrorist attack. This program does not address that issue whatsoever.

When Mr. Perle, one of their witnesses, came before the committee, I asked Mr. Perle "Wouldn't it be easy to bring a nuclear weapon in a bale of marijuana," and his exact response was

"That would be the safest way to bring it into the United States."

They can go into these kaffeeklatsches and scare people, but our responsibility, once you have knowledge, you have the burden of your knowledge. There are people in this room who know what the facts are and who have knowledge.

We have the burden of the responsibility not to exploit ignorance, but to communicate education.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman, I think, supports theater defenses. That is the capability in theater to shoot down slow-moving ballistic missiles, Scud type ballistic missiles that are coming into troop concentrations.

Mr. DELLUMS. We have theater ballistic missile programs coming out of the ears. The gentleman knows it, and so do I.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just ask my friend, if he relies on a policy of deterrence based on the idea that we are going to destroy anyone who launches a ballistic missile against the United States, why wouldn't he use the same rationale and rely on the policy of deterrence against anyone who would shoot a slow-moving missile, and say to Iraq, "If you shoot a slow-moving missile at Riyadh, we are going to use a nuclear weapon against you?"

Mr. DELLUMS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating, because the gentleman is shifting ground.

Mr. HUNTER. No, I am asking a question.

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman is now talking about theater ballistic missiles, and Mr. Chairman we already just pointed out that we are spending in excess of \$2 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROEMER. Reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROEMER. Is this debate taken off the 10-hour time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, it is carving into the 10 hours.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the Chair, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I again ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman now raises a question about theater ballistic missiles. The proponent of the amendment before the body at this point has squarely put that issue before us, saying that that is a significant priority.

However, the gentleman's discussion in this bill is about national missile defense systems, and we are saying that is tens of billions of dollars, and it is going in the wrong direction, because it does not speak to the likelihood of what might be a provocation. That is a terrorist provocation, not an over the horizon missile.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, would my friend yield for one brief question?

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

Mr. HUNTER. My question was, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to rely on deterrence, as the gentleman has suggested with national missile defense, and not have a national missile defense, why does not that same reliance on deterrence, why is it not being used in the theater, and why does the gentleman not endorse it in the theater?

Instead of having a theater ability to shoot down an incoming missile, why not just say "We are going to launch on Baghdad when you send a Scud at us?" I think that is a legitimate question.

Mr. DELLUMS. My quick response to the gentleman is that deterrence has worked. We have not thrown nuclear weapons at each other, but we are fighting out there in regions of the world. We fought in Desert Storm. That is a reality.

This missile exchange between us and some other person is a serious flaw. There has been no nuclear exchange.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because I believe it embraces the policy of vulnerability. We have heard over and over that the cold war is over, that the threat is gone, but Mr. Chairman, the public does not believe that.

They realize that the former countries within the U.S.S.R. still have developed and deployed threats, missiles out there, to the tune of tens of thousands. How many of those have been taken out of service since the breakup of the U.S.S.R.? Dozens, or perhaps hundreds?

No, Mr. Chairman, they have not. They are still out there, they are still deployed. We are still vulnerable to those missiles.

□ 1830

Not only that, their technology is now for sale. We know that it has been sold. There is enough evidence that it has been sold to Third World countries and that it has been deployed. We saw it during Desert Storm. So we have a deployed threat in Third World countries.

Over the last couple of years, Mr. Chairman, even this country has sold high-speed processors, computers capable of designing better and better guidance systems, once again increasing the vulnerability of this country. This does not cover all the threats that are out there. We know how quickly the mood can change internationally. We know that this is a big problem.

But one of the problems with this amendment is that it addresses only the development and not the deployment. We know that the threat is deployed, not only in the former U.S.S.R. but in Third World countries.

So knowing that the threat is deployed and that we are vulnerable, I think it makes a very simple choice. If you favor this, you favor a continued policy of vulnerability. So if you vote for this amendment, then you continue to vote for this policy of vulnerability.

It is time to vote "no" on this amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is an awful lot of debate, hot debate on the House floor these days about where our priorities should be, and what the threats to this country are, both domestic and internationally.

One of the major concerns of the American people is our national security. I do not question that their concerns are going to be addressed fully in this bill. But the fact is that this country can never be completely secure. There are always going to be threats.

The question before the committee that has to make these decisions is whether or not the threat that is being posed by missile attacks is going to be suitably addressed by the \$2.9 billion that is currently in the bill. You have got \$400 million that is going to be spent on national missile defense. What this legislation will do if the Spratt amendment is not included will be to uncontrollably add to the cost of the national missile defense program.

You talk about deploying a system. Nobody has any problem, it seems to me, with suggesting that if there is a real threat to the United States that can come either from a Third World country or it can come from another nation that happens to have thousands of nuclear missiles that can attack this country, that we ought not to take every step possible to deter that attack. But if in fact the cost of that deterrence rises so quickly that it cannot actually be achieved by any reasonable level of defense spending, and if second to that there is no technology that exists in the Nation or in the world today to be able to offset that threat, then are we not just playing pie in the sky with the emotions of the American people? That is ultimately what goes on here.

I voted with many Republicans for a balanced budget amendment. But I did not do that to see this kind of irrespon-

sible spending take place in this Chamber. We have got to be reasonable about what our priorities are and stop suggesting that we are going to be able to pay for the kinds of additional costs that this bill will have if we do not contain both the Spratt amendment and the Edwards amendment that is going to be coming up that say, yes, we ought to have a national defense against nuclear missiles that can attack this country, but we ought to do it with smarts, we ought to do it assessing what the existing technologies are, and we ought to do it with the costs in mind that are going to cripple this economy and cripple the people of this country, if we do not in fact keep in mind the escalating costs of national defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

What this bill simply says, we do not put a dollar amount. We simply say to the Secretary, come back to us within 60 days and tell us what is doable in terms of implementing national missile defense. We then have to take his recommendations and put them into the context of all of our other priorities and there is an authorization process that allows us to go through that. We are not saying spend any amount of money. All we are saying is come back and tell us, that's all.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, if that is what this bill said, I think you would get a lot more support.

What this bill says is that you are going to deploy the system.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. No, it does not.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes, it does say that you are going to deploy the system.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. It does not say "we."

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And you do not have a system, there is not a system that is designed in this country that can be deployed today that will in fact in any way deter the Russians or the Brazilians or anybody else for attacking America if they so desire through a nuclear missile system.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Let me introduce an objective source. We passed in 1991 the Missile Defense Act calling for the deployment of a limited defense system by 1996. It originated in the Senate. It also called for a study by the Strategic Defense Initiative Office and by the Secretary of Defense to be submitted to Congress in 6 months, and I have that study here. It came in 1992 from the Bush administration.

On page 41, here is the conclusion: For a limited defense system, according to SDIO estimates, acquiring six limited defense sites in brilliant eyes is expected to raise the total cost of the limited defense system, they recommended six sites, on the order of \$35 billion, 1991 money.

This is a limited defense system, Bush administration, \$35 billion, and they say this is a preliminary estimate.

What happens if you add brilliant pebbles, which was not included, next page?

The anticipated incremental cost of acquiring such a space-based interceptor system involving 1,000 brilliant pebbles as part of the overall architecture would be about \$11 billion in 1991 money, including associated technology-based activities. That is \$46 billion. This came from the Bush Defense Department, officially submitted to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HUNTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just respond to my friend, if you accepted his numbers, and once again we have representatives from the two laboratories saying we can now do a brilliant pebbles deployment for about \$7.5 billion. But if you accept that, we spend more money in the defense budget for the environment, for environmental compliance, than the total number that the gentleman just put together.

I would say to you that I think this is a Republican position that has been manifested ultimately in this contract that the American people consider putting a missile defense up being more important than spending environmental money in the Department of Defense bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, the fact of the matter is, and the gentleman makes a good argument in terms of what the priorities of the national defense of the country are. But the reality is, there simply is not a technology available that can actually deter the kind of threat that the gentleman is suggesting that we deploy a system to combat. It just does not make any sense.

I do not have any problem, and I do not think that even people in as liberal a district as mine have a problem with defending the United States of America. We have to have the research done that this bill calls for to end up designing a system that can actually accomplish the threat.

What you are walking around doing is talking to everybody in the American public about this threat that is going to occur to this country and that

you want to go ahead and deploy a system and you have not even thought through what your system is. That is the problem that you have got to end up solving.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I just say to my friend, Secretary Perry just appeared before us with the words I just showed him that said we can defend against an attack for \$5 billion—

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. A theater.

Mr. HUNTER. Not theater. National missile attack.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Against 20 missiles.

Are you telling me for \$5 billion you can defend an all-out attack from the Russians?

Mr. HUNTER. No. But Secretary Perry did not say a theater missile attack. He said a national missile attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. ROSE and by unanimous consent, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROSE. I would like to ask the freshman Republicans to answer a question for me. Did you all not meet with Edward Teller? Did you not meet with Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb, and did Edward Teller not tell you freshman Republicans, "You have got to build star wars"? Is that not what this is all about?

Edward Teller knows tonight that the physics has not even been discovered, ladies and gentlemen, to build this thing you are asking the American taxpayer to deploy.

What in the world is this you are trying to sell to the American people? I would like to be a subcontractor in this part of the Contract With America. My God, it would be a great contract, ladies and gentlemen.

Let us be careful here. Star wars is not what this country needs right now.

□ 1840

It is cops on the street, it is education for our children, it is the other things that we know are on this planet that we need.

Please, support the amendment of my colleague from South Carolina and my colleague from Texas.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a couple of points. Mr. Chairman, in spite of all of the rhetoric and the issues that have been discussed here in terms of dollars and all of these Star Wars pronouncements and redirecting priorities and all of these things, this

debate really I think boils down to two subjects. The gentleman from Massachusetts just suggested I think, as the gentleman from Missouri did earlier, that there is no threat, and, therefore, we do not have to worry, and we should be doing other things.

I would just like to remind the Members on the other side who may not even be aware of this that on January 18 of this year the acting Director of the Central Intelligence Agency said these words. He said:

The proliferation relates to the nonproprietary nature of technology. This means that what will be proliferated will be new and more diverse forms of lethality, increasing threat reach, that is longer ranges including ultimately ranges from problem states that can reach the United States, toward the end of this decade.

That is an appointment by President Clinton, the head of our Central Intelligence Agency.

So, for the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts to say we should not worry about this threat flies in the face of the statement made by the chief intelligence officer of the United States.

There is a threat. We all know there is a threat. Dick Cheney said there would be a threat in 1991 when he predicted that the Soviet Union was going to go away and we would have a whole new set of problems to face, one of which is the proliferation of nuclear technology and intercontinental ballistic missile technology.

The other issue that I would like to address has to do with the misrepresentation of what this bill does. It is true that the bill currently says it shall be the policy of the United States to deploy at the earlier practical date an antiballistic missile system. I would say to the gentlemen on the other side and the gentlewomen on the other side that it is the unofficial policy of the United States today to ignore this whole subject. And then the bill gets to saying what the requirement is. That is the policy.

Now what is the requirement? It says the Secretary of State shall be required to, in not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress, to the congressional defense committees, a plan for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system. And when we receive that system, that recommendation, Mr. Chairman, it will be our duty to decide whether we want to move forward with it, whether we want to accept it, whether we want to authorize it, whether we want to fund it, and the representatives of the American people will have that choice.

So, as my colleagues talk about \$5 billion to \$60 billion and all of the numbers in between, we do not know what those numbers might be because we are asking the Secretary of Defense to use his best judgment to suggest to us the most appropriate path to take.

So, this bill does not spend any money for these things. It does change

the policy of the country from one that leaves us vulnerable to a threat that your chief of the intelligence agency says exists, to a policy to protect our country. And along the path to getting there we will have many decisions to make, like the ones my colleagues talked about today.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this debate, I know we are probably reaching a point where we are going to have a vote on this, but I want to say those things just from at least my point of view to clarify these issues.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know that when we talk about these different technologies that this debate at times can be extremely confusing and very complicated. But I think that these two approaches that we take, one in the bill and one in the Spratt amendment, can be described, I think, pretty easily and pretty simply.

The bill can be described as a blank check policy. It can be described as saying putting the contract and everything else before the horse and saying we are not sure how much this is going to cost, it might be \$5 billion, it might be \$8 billion, it might be \$15 billion or \$20 billion, but we shall deploy this system at the earliest possible date.

You might even guess from the debate so far that we are not spending a dime on this system, and I would remind everybody in the Chamber that we are currently spending \$2.9 billion each year, already, on these systems. So we are spending money on pursuing these different systems and giving a blank check to go forward with a system that is unproven, extremely costly and untested.

Now what the Spratt amendment simply does is it says we are not going to give you a blank check, we are going to have some checks and balances to this system. It says two things: that the system should be based on a ground-based interceptor, and second, that if this ends up costing \$5 or \$10 or \$15 billion, with a deficit of \$180 billion, we should not take this money out of defense and threaten modernization, force structure, training to land fighters on aircraft carriers and so forth and so on. This is the reasonable approach.

I look over at this side of the aisle and many of the Members over there on the Science Committee with me, and we have just finished marking up legislation on risk assessment.

The gentleman from California was talking about environmental problems in this country. I voted for legislation that will begin to assess how much it is going to cost us to clean up the environment and what the risks are. But now in this legislation, when it comes to this very sophisticated technology, we are talking absolutely the opposite approach, saying we are not really sure what it is going to cost, we are not

really sure if it is \$5 billion or \$15 billion but we shall deploy this system.

And I have heard the argument from the gentleman over there too that this does not really spend the money. How often have we heard that over the last 4 or 5 years, this does not really spend the money? This tells the authorizers and the appropriators what to do with a brand new policy on a national missile defense system.

So I would encourage my colleagues, this is the commonsense approach. This is the checks-and-balances approach to make sure we do not waste precious taxpayers' money to make sure we balance our budget by the year 2002, to make sure we do cost effectiveness and risk analysis study on some of these things, that we do not bring a blank check. We are spending billions each year on this already.

I would encourage from the commonsense point of view, from a practical point of view, from a point of view where we make sure that our fighting forces are ready and that if it is, that this \$10 billion or \$15 billion not come out of their hide, that we take our time in analyzing this and do not throw more money at the billions we are already spending.

□ 1850

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when, some years ago, Henry David Thoreau was lamenting what he thought was harm being done to the environment by mankind, he said that if they could fly they would lay waste to the skies. It was inconceivable to Henry David Thoreau that at one time mankind could fly.

I submit that we are about in the position of Henry David Thoreau relative to what is potentially available in terms of a defense against ballistic missiles.

I think that it is just not credible to stand here today in the midst of an exploding technology to say there is no way we could ever protect ourselves against the threat of the second, third, and fourth largest nuclear powers in the world.

I just think that this threat is so potentially real that the consequences to our country are so overwhelmingly great that it is incumbent upon us to do what we can, and I would submit that there is no way that we should stand here today to say that there is no way we can protect ourselves, therefore, we should not do anything, that we should not do anything to study, to plan, to look at what technology is available so that we can protect ourselves against this.

You know, the No. 1 requirement, I think most people agree, that we have in representing our people is to protect them. If you look at the Constitution, article I, section 8, you see there is probably more space taken up with this requirement on the part of this Congress than any other requirement in

the Constitution, and I think it is absolutely incumbent on us to take advantage of the opportunities that this exploding technology provides, and that is all that this says.

It does not say as soon as we can do it. It says practicable. That word is in there. What it means is we are not going to go off half cocked. We are not going to do something totally irresponsible. I think the totally irresponsible thing is to deny this threat exists.

That is in this bill.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BATEMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I will be very brief.

This bill has elicited a great deal of rather passionate and emotional debate. As important as the subject matter is, I think there has been more passion and more emotion than the bill, by its terms, certainly warrants. It is a bill that says we perceive there are certain threats to the national security of the United States, and it is a policy consideration that they should be addressed by the deployment of a system as soon as practicable.

I can assure my friends throughout the Chamber, as the chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I am not going to preside over the sacrifice of our readiness to a ballistic missile system, theater or national, that is not ready for deployment, is not proven, and demonstrated to be practical and affordable in the context of our other national security needs.

There is nothing in H.R. 7 that indicates otherwise. Were that not the case, I would be joining you in opposition to this provision of H.R. 7. But there is nothing in this bill that dictates any requirement that we sacrifice other programs of priorities as we separate them out as we go through the authorizing and appropriations process. This you need not fear.

The language in this bill, whatever it started off to do, speaks in terms of a practical deployment of a theater and a national missile system. And in fact, with reference to the national missile system, defensive system, it speaks in terms of its being cost-effective and operationally effective. Now if it does not meet those standards, if that does not come back to us as something that is doable, you do not have anything to worry about. It will not go forward, because it will be proven it is not practical.

So I would suggest that we calm down a little bit, deal with the bill in terms of what it, in fact, says and contemplates and what the hearing record and what the debates in committee made clear, that we are talking about practical systems being deployed, only practical systems, being deployed, and practical is in the context that includes whether or not we are stripping other defense priorities of what they should receive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 212, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—218

Abercrombie	Green	Ortiz
Ackerman	Greenwood	Orton
Baesler	Gutierrez	Owens
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Parker
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pastor
Bass	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hayes	Pelosi
Berman	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hinches	Petri
Bonior	Hoekstra	Pickett
Borski	Holden	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hoyer	Porter
Brewster	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Ramstad
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Bryant (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Cardin	Johnston	Regula
Chapman	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Clay	Kaptur	Richardson
Clayton	Kasich	Rivers
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Clinger	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Clyburn	Kennelly	Roukema
Coble	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Klecicka	Rush
Collins (IL)	Klink	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Klug	Sanders
Condit	LaFalce	Sawyer
Conyers	Laughlin	Schumer
Costello	Leach	Scott
Coyne	Levin	Serrano
Danner	Lincoln	Shays
de la Garza	Lipinski	Sisisky
Deal	LoBiondo	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lofgren	Skelton
Dellums	Lowey	Slaughter
Deutsch	Luther	Spratt
Dicks	Maloney	Stark
Dingell	Manton	Stenholm
Dixon	Markey	Stokes
Doggett	Martinez	Studds
Dooley	Martini	Stupak
Doyle	Mascara	Tanner
Durbin	Matsui	Tauzin
Edwards	McCarthy	Taylor (MS)
Ehlers	McDermott	Tejeda
Engel	McHale	Thompson
Eshoo	McKinney	Thornton
Evans	McNulty	Thurman
Farr	Meehan	Torkildsen
Fattah	Meek	Torres
Fawell	Menendez	Torrice
Fazio	Meyers	Towns
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Traficant
Filner	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Flake	Mineta	Upton
Foglietta	Minge	Vento
Ford	Mink	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Volkmer
Franks (NJ)	Mollohan	Ward
Frost	Montgomery	Waters
Furse	Moran	Watt (NC)
Ganske	Morella	Waxman
Gejdenson	Murtha	Wise
Gephardt	Nadler	Woolsey
Geren	Neal	Wyden
Gibbons	Oberstar	Wynn
Gonzalez	Obey	Yates
Gordon	Olver	

NOES—212

Allard	Armye	Baker (LA)
Andrews	Bachus	Ballenger
Archer	Baker (CA)	Barr

Barrett (NE)	Galleghy	Ney
Bartlett	Gekas	Norwood
Barton	Gilchrest	Nussle
Bateman	Gillmor	Oxley
Bereuter	Gilman	Packard
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Paxon
Bilirakis	Goodling	Pombo
Bliley	Goss	Portman
Blute	Graham	Pryce
Boehlert	Gunderson	Quillen
Boehner	Gutknecht	Quinn
Bonilla	Hancock	Radanovich
Bono	Hansen	Riggs
Browder	Hastert	Roberts
Brownback	Hastings (WA)	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hefley	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Heineman	Roth
Burr	Herger	Royce
Burton	Hilleary	Salmon
Buyer	Hobson	Sanford
Callahan	Hoke	Saxton
Calvert	Horn	Scarborough
Camp	Hostettler	Schaefer
Canady	Houghton	Schiff
Castle	Hunter	Schroeder
Chabot	Hutchinson	Seastrand
Chambliss	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Inglis	Shadegg
Christensen	Istook	Shaw
Chrysler	Johnson (CT)	Shuster
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Jones	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kelly	Smith (NJ)
Cooley	Kim	Smith (TX)
Cox	King	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Kingston	Solomon
Crane	Knollenberg	Souder
Crapo	Kolbe	Spence
Cremeans	LaHood	Stearns
Cubin	Largent	Stockman
Cunningham	Latham	Stump
Davis	LaTourette	Talent
DeFazio	Lazio	Tate
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Doolittle	Linder	Tiahrt
Dornan	Livingston	Velazquez
Dreier	Longley	Vucanovich
Duncan	Lucas	Waldholtz
Dunn	Manzullo	Walker
Ehrlich	McCollum	Walsh
Emerson	McCrery	Wamp
English	McDade	Watts (OK)
Ensign	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McInnis	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	McIntosh	Weller
Fields (TX)	McKeon	White
Flanagan	Metcalf	Whitfield
Foley	Mica	Wicker
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Williams
Fowler	Molinari	Wolf
Fox	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Myers	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Zeliff
Frisa	Nethercutt	Zimmer
Funderburk	Neumann	

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Lantos

Lewis (GA)
Wilson

□ 1912

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. FURSE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, in order to facilitate the debate on title 2, to assure that all of the amendments are considered in consecutive fashion so that we have a rational debate on the issue, I ask unanimous consent

that my amendments numbered 10 and 12 be considered en bloc and passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BEREUTER: At the end of title V (page 60, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 513. REPORT REGARDING REIMBURSEMENT LEVELS PAID BY UNITED NATIONS FOR COSTS INCURRED BY NATIONS AND CONTRACTORS FURNISHING PERSONNEL FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES.

(a) INFORMATION RELATING TO NATIONS FURNISHING FORCES.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the Congress a report on the amounts paid by the United Nations during 1994 as compensation for expenses incurred by nations which have provided forces for United Nations peacekeeping activities. The report shall set forth—

(1) the total amount paid to each such nation by the United Nations during 1994 for such purpose; and

(2) with respect to each such nation, the total amount that such nation spent for peacekeeping activities for which it received a payment from the United Nations during 1994, with separate displays for the portion of that amount spent for pay and allowances for personnel of that nation's armed forces (including credit for longevity and retirement), for other perquisites relating to the duty of such personnel as part of such peacekeeping activities, and to the extent possible for related incremental costs incurred by such nation as part of such peacekeeping activities.

(b) INFORMATION RELATING TO CONTRACTORS.—

(1) COMPENSATION LEVELS.—The Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) a separate report on amounts paid by the United Nations during 1994 under contracts entered into by the United Nations for the provision of civilian management services relating to United Nations peacekeeping activities. The report shall include information as the level of individual compensation received by those contractors, or employees of those contractors, with respect to those peacekeeping activities, including the level of salary, benefits, and allowance.

(2) CONTRACTING PROCESS.—The Secretary shall include in the report a review of the process by which the United Nations selects contractors for the provision of civilian management services relating to United Nations peacekeeping activities. That review shall describe the extent to which that process permits competitive bidding.

(c) PLAN FOR REFORM.—The Secretary shall include in the report under subsection (a) a plan for actions the United States can take to encourage the United Nations to reform the existing system for reimbursement to nations which provide forces for United Nations peacekeeping activities. The plan shall include recommended steps leading to a reimbursement system in which nations contributing forces to a United Nations peacekeeping activity are compensated by the United Nations in a manner that more accurately reflects their actual costs incurred in participating in that activity.

(d) DEADLINE FOR REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 51, beginning on line 16, strike "FOR PAYMENT" and all that follows through "CONTRIBUTIONS".

Page 51, line 18, strike "(1)".

Page 51, line 22, strike "(A)" and insert "(1)".

Page 51, line 24, strike "(B)" insert "(2)".

Page 52, line 1, strike "(2)" The prohibition in paragraph (1)(A)" and insert "(b) APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition in subsection (a)".

Page 52, line 4, strike "activity." and insert "activity.'".

Page 52, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has asked unanimous consent that his two amendments be considered en bloc.

Is there objection to that request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has also asked unanimous consent that the two amendments be passed.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS: Page 11, line 18, after "missile attacks" insert the following: "and that is deployed without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

Page 12, line 6, after "missile attacks" insert the following: "without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am a defense hawk, and I believe national defense should be a nonpartisan issue.

□ 1920

Even though defense should be a nonpartisan issue, I am disappointed that the Republican rule has resulted in 204 Democrats only having 15 minutes to present our side on the issue of star wars, a multibillion-dollar defense program. I think that is unfair, and I think it is wrong.

But the good news is, Mr. Chairman, that some programs and some ideas are so bad, they should not take that long to defeat, and star wars is right at the top of that list.

My friend who spoke awhile ago, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], suggested that Republicans are not interested in building star wars. If that is correct, then every Republican should vote for my amendment. My amendment does not stop a ground-based missile defense system to protect the United States. It does not even stop space based sensors. All my amendment does is say no to the deployment of a space-based missile system known as star wars.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that our military leaders in this Nation do not even want star wars, and our taxpayers cannot afford it. American taxpayers have already spent \$30 billion on this pie-in-the-sky boondoggle, and we do not even have one brilliant pebble to show for it. Thirty billion dollars, and 12 years later we do not even know if star wars will work.

Let me put this in perspective. A blue collar worker paying \$10,000 in taxes a year would have to work for 3 million years to pay for what we have already wasted in star wars. The original cost estimates for Brilliant Pebbles have been increased 200 fold. That is not twofold, that is not 20 percent, but 200 fold. So nobody knows the ultimate cost of the star wars deployment.

A star wars cost of \$25 billion, a generally accepted estimate by many experts, would basically fund the direct operating costs of the United States Armored Army Division for some 200 years.

To put that \$25 billion figure in perspective, Mr. Chairman, all the talk about welfare reform, the AFDC program at the Federal level, if reformers were to save 20 percent of that welfare program's cost, it would take 10 to 15 years to pay for that star wars cost program.

Mr. Chairman, to promise a balanced budget, to reduce taxes, and to say you are going to build star wars in space, is nothing but voodoo economics, Part II. It does not add up, it does not make sense, and it certainly will not work.

Star wars is not just fiscally irresponsible though. It presents a false sense of security. It is like putting a \$5,000 burglar alarm on the front door of your house, and yet keeping the front windows of your house open and the back door of your house locked. Now, surely some thug or some terrorist smart enough to put a nuclear warhead on the top of an ICBM missile, would have the intelligence to take that warhead, rent a U-Haul truck, and deliver it to any city within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, star wars will suck billions of dollars away from theater missile defense, desperately needed dollars, from military pay raises and weapons modernization, the reasons why so many military leaders oppose star wars.

Republicans on the one hand are saying cut child nutrition, yes, even cut education funding for the children of military families, but yet let us write a blank check for star wars.

Mr. Chairman, that is wrong, and it is wrong-headed. Even Adm. William Crowe, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under President Reagan from 1985 to 1989, said star wars does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, star wars is a budget buster, star wars is bad for defense, star wars is an idea whose time has come and gone. It is time to say no to star wars, and that is what this amendment does.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, is there a time limit on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say to the gentleman he is not aware of a time limit.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard several times we are cutting children's nutrition. That is in my subcommittee on education. I have kept children's nutrition out of the welfare block grant so we will not cut it, and I have protected it. If I hear it one more time, I am going to include it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, once again I rise unfortunately to object to this amendment offered by my good friend and colleague.

Mr. Chairman, what we are asked to vote on right now is an amendment that in fact would specifically detail to the Secretary what type of plan he would bring back to us. We have heard from the other side that the Congress should not be micro-managing what our defense posture should be. What this amendment does is specifically state what kinds of architecture in fact can be recommended by the appropriate people in the Clinton administration.

Mr. Chairman, there is no one on the floor of the House tonight advocating star wars, as we said earlier. What we are advocating is a logical, systematic approach to ballistic missile defense technologies that are recommended by those appropriate officials within the Clinton defense establishment. That is in fact what we are asking for.

To say that we are somehow turning around and asking for some pie-in-the-sky thing, with no dollar assessments, is absolutely wrong. And as our good friend and colleague knows, whatever comes back in the form of a recommendation has to go through an authorization process and an appropriations process. As we heard from our colleague from Virginia, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, state, none of us on this side, who fought to get the pay raise put in when the President did not include it, who fought to up the acquisition accounts, none of us are going to jeopardize raises. We are going to fight to make sure funds are put back in for those cuts that were made by the President in this year's budget. What we are saying is allow the Secretary to come back and tell us what he would recommend in terms of time and dollars and an architecture to allow us to move toward a missile defense system. That is it. What this amendment does is it limits it.

Let me just say for the RECORD, while I have been as critical as any on the spending of dollars for SDI and programs in the past, we cannot say there

has been nothing achieved. That is really a misstatement that I think all of our colleagues should acknowledge.

Any soldier who fought in Desert Storm and saw the benefit of the Patriot system knows that was paid for. One of our colleagues earlier said it was only a small amount of money. Well, let us talk about the two upgrades to the Patriot. There is one of which is being announced this week and another will be announced in a short period of time that will quadruple the effectiveness of the Patriot system. That money was obtained through the programs that the gentleman says nothing happened.

The Aegis system upgrades that are currently under way with our Navy were all funded through these programs in the past.

A program called Talon Shield, many of our colleagues perhaps do not realize that during Desert Storm the command officers had to keep in touch with the theater by telephone. They had to stay on a telephone line 24 hours a day. But because we have employed Talon Shield, we now have the system in place that will avoid that in the future. Talon Shield was directly developed by the dollars invested over the past several years in ballistic missile defense. The Joint Tactical Air Ground System will give us one further capability. So there have been improvements, and these improvements are technologies that have in fact given us dividends.

□ 1930

But we are not saying that we should have a bottomless pit. All we are saying is, allow the administration to come back to us and give us their best recommendations. That is all. If they tell us that they do not want to deploy in outer space, fine. That will be their recommendation.

What the gentleman's amendment does is limits them even to the point that if the Russians would break out and immediately pose a threat, under the gentleman's amendment, we could not respond.

I think that is shortsighted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is agreeing with me in his earlier comments when he says he is not really interested in deploying in the near term a star wars space-based interceptor system. If that is correct and if that is the view of the majority side, the Republicans in this body, then let us simply accept this amendment and move on. My amendment simply stops star wars. It does not affect space-based sensors. It does not stop the deployment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if in a year or two the Russians proceed to develop the capability of space-based

interceptors, would the gentleman still be supportive of his amendment?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in a year or two we will be debating the next year's authorization bill. In a year or two, I will be happy, in the authorization bill, to debate changes in it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's amendment further ties the hand of the gentleman's administration and the Defense Department. What we are saying is, let Secretary Perry come back and tell us what he wants and then we can respond.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would just like to know, genuinely, whether the gentleman is either interested in keeping open and wanting to build and deploy Star Wars or not interested? If he does not want to build star wars, then accept the amendment. If he does want to build it, then admit that and let us continue the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WELDON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, what I would say to the gentleman is, I do not know what the future holds. If I could somehow have a crystal ball, perhaps I could predict that. What I am saying is I am not the defense expert. The people in the Pentagon and our joint chiefs are. If they come back and tell us that they want to have a system that within 5 years we should deploy some kind of system in space, that is something we will have to debate then. But we should not handicap them. We should not tie their hands. That decision should be left for another day.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so the gentleman is saying he wants to keep open the option of star wars, that is what I am trying to—

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. What I said is what I said. Do not put words in my mouth. What I said is I want the Secretary of Defense to come back within 60 days and make recommendations to us that we can act on.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering whether we go back to the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this SDI research. I represent the Los Alamos Laboratories. But today we do not need SDI. There is no justifiable threat. The technology is not there. And we cannot afford it. And we cannot afford readiness.

So the decision today is do we proceed with a system that we cannot afford and we do not need? The answer is no.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the Edwards amendment. The point I want to make to the gentleman in the well and to my colleagues is that I am worried about where will we get the billions of dollars to pay for this new weapons system. I know where you are going to get it. We are going to take part of the money from the National Guard and Reserve. We are going to take it from the readiness of active forces.

We need the Edwards amendment. It will pin it down. It will be ground-based missiles, and it will not be interceptors. And I am worried again about taking the money away from the Reserves and from the active forces on readiness.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the Edwards amendment.

This amendment precludes the deployment of space-based interceptors as part of a national missile defense system such as Brilliant Pebbles.

This does not preclude the development of a national ballistic missile system, it just limits it to ground-based missiles.

We don't need to return to the old so-called star wars concept of past years. To do so would cost billions on a system that has a very high-risk technology and limited potential.

I am told whatever elaborate star wars system you have, the engineers cannot guarantee that an enemy ABM will not get through the screen.

We cannot afford to pour billions into space-based interceptors when readiness of forces is being stretched to the limit, when modernization of equipment is being delayed, and the quality of life of our personnel is not up to even minimum standards.

What type of missile systems might be developed by Iran or Iraq? The Chinese already have missile technology. Let's prevent the costly mistakes of the past and vote yes on the Edwards amendment.

When you move billions of dollars into a new weapons system, you have to take it from something else. I worry now about the National Guard and Reserve getting enough funds to be in a category of readiness. Listen to the figures: 38 percent of our military forces in 1996 will be in the National Guard and Reserve, and the Reserve budget for 1996 is 7.6 percent of the defense budget.

The Guard and Reserve is a terrific buy for the taxpayer, but there is a tendency when the active forces might need equipment or additional funding you look at reducing the Reserve. Talking about this star wars add-on in H.R. 7 could directly or indirectly affect the Reserve forces.³

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, those of us who support the Edwards amendment take a back seat to no one in supporting a strong national defense. But we believe that setting the wrong pri-

orities diverts needed funding in a deleterious way for necessary technology and equipment for our front-line men and women. Effective theater missile defense systems are being built to protect our people here at home and our U.S. and allied forces abroad.

Research and development must continue so we will be able to deploy a national missile defense system whenever a threat to our shore emerges. I strongly support that, research and development.

But this Contract With America provision will risk national security when deployment of space-based interceptors diverts billions of scarce defense dollars and resources from acquisition funds that provide our soldiers and sailors protection from Scuds and other theater missile attacks.

That is what our military leaders will tell us and that is what is real national security.

Those of us who support the Edwards amendment take a back seat to no one in supporting a strong national defense but we believe that setting the wrong priorities diverts needed funding in a deleterious way from necessary technology and equipment for our frontline men and women.

Effective theater missile defense systems are being built to protect our people here at home, U.S. and allied forces abroad.

Research and development must continue so we will be able to deploy a national missile defense system whenever a threat to our shores emerges and I strongly support that—research and development.

But, this Contract With America provision will risk national security when deployment of space-based interceptors diverts billions of scarce defense dollars and resources from acquisition funds that provide our soldiers and sailors protection from Scuds, and other theater missile attacks. That's what our military leaders will tell you and that is what is real national security.

I urge support for the Edwards amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill clearly changes the direction of national defense. We do not need star wars. Readiness is subordinate to star wars in this bill. Modernization is held hostage to star wars. Troop and military family quality of life programs are held hostage. And we think we need to make the message clear.

Troops are our responsibility. We absolutely must ensure their readiness.

Now, the threat does not support deployment of a national missile defense, but do not take my word for it.

The former Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell said, "at the moment the threat does not warrant a national missile defense. Political, budget and security factors have combined to make national missile defense a thing of the past."

Let us not live in the past. Let us live in the future in the military strategy of this Nation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is not bad enough that H.R. 7 represents a radical assault on the ability of the President of the United States to conduct foreign policy. But here we are, after all these years, revisiting the issue of star wars when there is no appetite across this land for taking up the star wars mechanism at this particular time.

I find it astounding that the Joint Chiefs of Staff could suggest that this proposal is ill-conceived, and ill-timed and at the same time we are bringing it up here tonight.

I am proud to stand here tonight in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. He has spoken time and again in support of a strong national defense system in this country, as have other speakers tonight. At the same time, they both have suggested that this proposal is unwise and unwarranted.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The amendment that is being offered is to a section that is no longer in existence because of the passage of the previous resolution. So what in fact are we amending?

Maybe I should address that to the parliamentarian. What are we amending?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Texas has prepared a modification of his amendment to conform with the Spratt amendment's adoption.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Where is that amendment? May I see it? I have not seen it.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been presented yet. This amendment is pending and no point of order was raised against it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman: Is it the correct understanding that the Chair is ruling that this amendment is amending a section that is no longer in existence and that is allowable?

The CHAIRMAN. At this point the Chair is not ruling on the consistency or form of the amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. What section are we amending with this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The modification may correct that amendment, but no point of order was raised against the amendment when it was offered.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. It is allowable now to waive a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No point of order was raised at the time the amendment was offered. It is not appropriate to raise one now.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Can a point of order be raised when a changed amendment is offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not appropriate to raise one now.

□ 1940

Mr. EDWARDS. If the gentleman will yield, I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to say this to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. To answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] about the passage of the previous amendment, in good faith, Mr. Chairman, I approached the Parliamentarians and asked them if it would be necessary to have a perfecting amendment, so my amendment would be in order.

At one point, I can say in good faith, the interpretation I received was that would not be necessary. It is presently my intent to ask for consent to have simply a technical, conforming amendment to see that the exact same language we had had in my previous amendment would apply correctly to this language.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman also apply to the majority side for that technical change?

Mr. EDWARDS. In the 30 or 40 seconds I had, I simply went to the Parliamentarian to see if technically, because of the passage of the previous amendment, any changes needed to be made.

I was told, I believe in good faith, at one point it might not be necessary.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have no idea what the gentleman is amending. That is our problem.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, today, we consider going back to the cold war. Today, we consider spending billions on a system to defend against a threat that no longer exists.

WHAT IS THE USE OF A SPACE-BASED SYSTEM?

Who are we defending against? What is the threat that demands a space-based missile defense system?

The last time star wars was considered in 1983 the Reagan administration estimated its cost at \$120 billion.

The threat to our security at home and abroad is not an ICBM attack; it is tactical missiles. Our experience in the Persian Gulf war proves the point.

A star wars system would have been useless to defend our troops against Scud attacks in the gulf.

This political proposal has no legs. The Joint Chiefs do not consider star wars a priority.

BUDGET QUESTIONS

We are talking about building a system that would cost billions without having a hearing on it and with more glaring defense needs.

Ensuring funding for training, development, pay raises, and housing will be impossible if we force feed this political program down DOD's throat.

Since 1983, we have spent \$30 billion on a space-based defense system and there are few tangible results.

This is fiscal irresponsibility. This is jeopardizing troop readiness and force modernization.

I would like to remind my colleagues what Gen. Colin Powell recently stated about this issue: "A national missile defense system would be too expensive and impractical * * *". He went on to say that " * * * at the moment the threat does not warrant a national missile defense."

Today, we are considering a political proposal that puts both U.S. security and global interests at risk. There have been no hearings. There will not even be time to discuss the issues properly.

STAR WARS VS. READINESS

H.R. 7 threatens the readiness of our service women and men and gambles on a star wars space based defense system. Star wars was an idea born out of cold war concerns about an intercontinental missile attack. Today, the risk of an all-out nuclear blitz is significantly reduced but smaller threats have proliferated. This bill requires us to make a blind wager on star wars. How much will it cost? What does it mean to readiness? Will we have money to handle the real threats?

U.N. PEACEKEEPING

This bill will needlessly put American soldiers at risk. By tying the executives hands this political proposal would hinder U.S. involvement in conflicts like the Persian Gulf war. This political proposal forces the U.S. to act unilaterally when a global crisis erupts. It puts more American lives at stake and, in the end, the U.S. will bear the entire financial burden of any military actions.

EXPANDING NATO

This bill will force the U.S. to create an unspecified military assistance program for former East European countries. How much will it cost? Which countries will we allow into NATO? NATO should be expanded in concert with our European allies. We must ensure collective security and that the U.S. is not unilaterally committed to ensuring a secure Europe.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to know precisely what we are dealing with in terms of the parliamentary questions and responses just made.

However, leaving aside those problems, and I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] has proceeded in nothing but good faith, and I would say also that the gentleman from Texas is one of the most steadfast supporters of a strong national defense for this Nation, and I commend him for it. I am grateful to him for that reason.

I cannot, however, Mr. Chairman, support his amendment. The reason I cannot support the gentleman's amendment is it seeks to bar something that no one has proposed to do.

I would support his amendment, Mr. Chairman, if all that he says as a rationale for it is demonstrated to be correct at a point when someone says "We propose to go forward and deploy a space-based system." However, there is nothing in this bill that says "Deploy a space-based system." It says "Deploy a practical system that is cost-effective."

If a space-based system fits that criteria, I will be for it. If it does not, and I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that it does not, then I will be against it, and I will support the gentleman's effort not to authorize or fund it at that point.

However, at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, we are simply saying to the Department of Defense "We want you to come back to us with recommendations for the deployment at the earliest practical time of a cost-effective, functional anti-ballistic missile system."

There is nothing in it that says space-based or not space-based. If space based is impractical, if that is not cost-effective, if that is not the best technology and the most economical, then the heck with it. We do not do it.

I support the gentleman in that. However, we are not at that point. I would suggest that the amendment is actually not necessary.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. He and I have worked together on many issues. I respect the gentleman's leadership on our committee.

I would just say in this particular case, Mr. Chairman, I happen to believe that after having spent already \$30 billion and some 12 years on star wars, enough is enough. Finally here is a time to say no. I understand the gentleman's comments, but I would say to the Members, I just think that after 12 years and \$30 billion, and not one brilliant pebble in space, it is time to end the program.

Mr. BATEMAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, if this little bill proposed a nickel's worth further right now for star wars, I could see the gentleman's point. However, it does not expend anything. It does not put us at risk of expending anything.

I think genuinely the amendment, however well conceived and supportable it may be at another time, really is unsupportable at this time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, of all the dubious proposals that are contained in this particular bill, perhaps the most dubious is the space-based star wars system which we are debating. I learned at West Point and in 8 years as an infantry officer in the Army that you build a strategy around a realistic assessment of the threat and then you use that strategy to allocate scarce resources. This proposal does neither.

They do not have to take just my word for it. This is what the Defense Budget Project has said about this particular proposal. I think most Members are conversant with the fact that this is one of the most well-respected, non-partisan, analytical military think tanks operating today in the United States.

Here is what they said, Mr. Chairman. Point 1, "There is no significant long-range ballistic missile threat to the United States, nor is there likely to be such a threat over the foreseeable future."

Point 2, "A military revolution is underway. Information technologies that are critical to the ballistic missile defense activities, such as sensing, discrimination, and battle management, are progressing rapidly. There is a danger that if we buy into national missile defense too soon, it may rapidly obsolesce, leaving us with another huge capital investment to make if and when a long-range missile threat does emerge."

Point 3, "Perhaps nowhere is this danger greater than in the case of space-based interceptors. A national missile defense system that included space-based interceptors could cost tens of billions of dollars to acquire and deploy. This is clearly not a commitment that the United States should consider entering into in the foreseeable future."

Mr. Chairman, the final point, "With deficit and tax reductions a priority, funds for defense will almost certainly remain tight. A national military defense system is an expensive proposition, and defense systems often end up costing substantially more than projected by initial estimates. This mix could, over time, have the effect of presenting the Defense Department with an unfunded mandate; that is, with a program requirement that cannot be fully offset with additional resources necessitating substantial cuts from worthy DOD programs already under considerable stress."

Mr. Chairman, this is a nonpartisan group that thinks closely and well about defense issues. Their conclusions are very dramatic. I urge that they be considered and this amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] be supported.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The question I want to ask is, why in the world would the Republicans want to revive star wars? They'll use any euphemism to fool the American people, but the bottom line is that among the other foolish ideas presented in this bill, probably the most foolish idea is that we need to knee-jerk ourselves all the way back to star wars.

Aside from totally upsetting all of the arms control agreements that both Democratic and Republican Presidents have been able to hammer out with nuclear nations, this bill might just encourage those missiles that no longer are aimed at us, to make an about face.

The subject matter of national security policy is much too serious to be cooked up by a few pollsters and spinmeisters.

Remember star wars. For the \$36 billion already spent did we get our invisible, global, protective shield against missiles? No.

For the \$36 billion already spent, did we protect ourselves from terrorist acts like the World Trade Center bombing? No.

And do we really want to go back to space-based ballistic missile defense when there are other critical domestic needs that are tearing at our own social fabric?

It was Dwight D. Eisenhower who said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone; it is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, and the hopes of its children.

This group of Republicans that came up with this bill make Dwight D. Eisenhower look like a flaming liberal. The fact of the matter is, however, that:

When we choose star wars over feeding the hungry; and

When we choose star wars over housing the homeless; and

When we choose star wars over even our own children.

We surely make a grave mistake. Let us support the Edwards amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY
MR. EDWARDS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified by the form at the desk to conform to the adoption of the Spratt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to the amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS: At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 203. DEPLOYMENT WITHOUT SPACE-BASED INTERCEPTORS.

The national missile defense system developed for deployment shall be developed and deployed without the inclusion of any space-based interceptor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if I might inquire of the author of the amendment, is it his intent that that inclusion of "any space-based interceptor" also includes the development and deployment of a ballistic missile system?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman say of a ballistic missile system?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. A theater ballistic missile system.

□ 1950

Mr. EDWARDS. In no way is this amendment intended to affect either a national missile, continental ground-based national missile defense system or—in fact, if anything it is intended to help save more money to put into theater missile defense instead of putting it into star wars.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. In other words, the gentleman is saying that if it is determined that the theater ballistic missile system should have space-based interceptors, it is OK?

Mr. EDWARDS. If the theater missile defense system would require space-based interceptors, on that issue I am not aware of a particular program that is recommending that.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I am asking if that is in fact—

Mr. EDWARDS. Rather than deal with hypotheticals, let me let the words speak for themselves. They basically would prohibit space-based interceptors for a ballistic missile defense system.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Including theater ballistic missiles?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. So it would apply across the board to theater and ballistic. So the amendment is actually going further than what we originally thought?

Mr. EDWARDS. No. In this perfecting amendment, as I mentioned a few minutes ago based on the gentleman's request, this amendment does not change the intent or the content in any way of my original amendment. The only purpose of this change is to adapt my language to the Spratt amendment that had been recently adopted.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object because I respect the collegiality and the past cooperation of the gentleman with

whom we have worked. Even though I may disagree with his amendment, I want him to have the right to amend it. But I think it further shows that there is confusion about what the intent of the language is, not in the gentleman's mind but the application of the language of this amendment which I think comes about when you try to micromanage what it is that is going to come back in the form of a recommendation to us, but I will not object.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment as modified, offered by Mr. EDWARDS: Page 11, line 18, after "missile attacks" insert the following: "and that is deployed without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

Page 12, line 6, after "missile attacks" insert the following: "without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors".

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 203. DEPLOYMENT WITHOUT SPACE-BASED INTERCEPTORS

The national missile defense system developed for deployment shall be developed and deployed without the inclusion of any space-based interceptors.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Perry came before us a few weeks ago and he asked us not to micromanage his programs and he asked us to give him a chance to bring forth his programs and explain them, explain the options, and then we would make some decisions on exactly what we would do with our spending authority.

We are cutting out options with this amendment by the gentleman from Texas. What he is saying is this: It is okay to shoot down an incoming ballistic missile with a missile that is launched from the ground.

I want everybody to understand the collision takes place in space. So you do not stay out of space. So if your objection is doing something in space, you cannot do that with any system. Because the collision between the incoming ballistic missile and the defensive missile takes place in space. It is above the Earth's atmosphere.

So if you believe, like Walter Mondale, that there should be "war in the heavens," then nothing fits your pistol on this particular amendment.

Let me just say this to the gentleman from Texas, whom I respect greatly. We are on the cutting edge of technology in many areas, miniaturization of electronics, capability of our systems in space.

We had several experts from two of our national laboratories come and tell us about a week ago that they could make space-based interceptors very inexpensively.

What the gentleman from Texas is saying is, "I don't even want to hear

your arguments. I don't even want to have a scientist come up and testify to me as to what he can do with technology today."

That is like President Kennedy saying, "We are going to shoot a missile to the Moon, we're going to land people on the Moon, but I don't think we should use solid rocket fuel. I've been told that's very expensive so I'm going to put in a prohibition against using solid rocket fuel to go to the Moon."

It does not make any sense. It does not make any sense to limit our options.

We are asking Secretary Perry to come out and testify to us. We are also going to ask people from our national laboratories. We are going to ask these very intelligent people, who are a national resource, "What's new in technology? How can you shoot down an incoming missile better and cheaper than the guy who just testified?"

What the gentleman from Texas is saying is, "I've seen it all. I don't want to have anything in space because I heard that 'War in the Heavens' speech and it makes sense to me, and the only thing that I'll go with is the old 6-gun shot from the ground. That's the only thing I believe in."

He is asking 435 of us to accept his judgment and not even allow testimony on any other system before we make a decision.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not asking this House to accept my judgment. I can pull out all the experts you would like:

Gen. Colin Powell who said a national missile defense system is a waste and would take money away from important defense priorities.

I could quote Admiral Crowe who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for 4 years under President Reagan who said that this would be a dangerous program.

This is not CHET EDWARDS' idea on February 15, 1995. This was debated for 12 years, \$30 billion was spent. This program was stopped. And now in a short debate it is trying to be revived.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me take back my time and remind the gentleman, you can buy about a million times as much computing power today as you could in the 1960's for the same amount of money.

Now, when we have experts from our national laboratories that we put there to come up with ideas on defending the country and they come to us and say we would at least like to be heard on the issue of how we have made it a lot more effective and a lot less expensive to shoot down this incoming missile with a different idea, I think we should listen to them. And I would just say to the gentleman, I go back to my Billy Mitchell argument. You had a lot of people saying you cannot sink ships with planes and we do not even want to

hear General Mitchell. They tried to scrub the test.

This is a democracy. These Members who are representatives want to hear the evidence. I say let's let the evidence be put out there. And if the gentleman sits with me in Armed Services hearings and hears the evidence and then says, "I'm not going to change my mind," then fair is fair.

But let's hear the evidence. This amendment precludes us from even hearing the evidence.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman makes a great point. Had we had adequate hearings in committee, we could have gone through all of these details. That is exactly the point here. We are rushing to conclusion as opposed to examination we could have done in committee. We are doing committee work on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me take back my time one more time and say the gentleman is wrong.

When President Kennedy said, "We're going to put somebody on the Moon," he did not go through all the hearings first. He said, "That's our goal, that's our policy." Then he convened his scientists to tell him how to most effectively do that.

We are saying let's defend against incoming ballistic missiles and let's convene our scientists in the Capitol in these hearings and decide the most effective way to do it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to approach this from a different perspective. You cannot have it all. We just passed a balanced budget amendment in this House that was part of the contract. We are coming with a supplemental very soon now that violates the balanced budget amendment. We do not pay for it. The Speaker of this House said, even though the balanced budget constitutional amendment will not be passed we are going to operate just as if it were passed.

I have been chairman of Military Construction for many, many years, up until this year. I also sit on the Subcommittee on National Security Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. I have been all over this country. We need to talk about readiness here. Star Wars is an idea whose time has passed and is not appropriate to be talked about.

If you want to talk about some of the things that are affecting our people and our readiness and our retention, you start talking about quality of life.

As you talk with the people, the commanders of all of these bases across the country, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and I were in Fort Bragg a couple of weeks ago and we talked to the wives and the husbands who are living in conditions that

people were living in in World War II, in barracks they were living in in World War II. We are talking about retention and we are talking about asking our troops to go out and operate the most sophisticated weapons that man has ever invented and we are asking them to live in conditions that prevailed in World War II.

If you buy something like Star Wars, it is going to come from someplace, and it is going to come from the unsexy sector, like barracks. You can go to any base in this country and have a ribbon-cutting for barracks and you cannot even get the press to come out and cover it. But if you talk about Star Wars and B-1's and B-2's, and they are sexy items, but they do not get the job done.

Several years ago I went to Fort Hood, TX, and we had some ladies there at Fort Hood that were trying to clean up an old cafeteria to put in a day-care center for our children that belonged to the parents of our armed services people.

We need to concentrate on quality of life and retention for our armed forces and we need to stress all of our efforts on readiness. To spend \$40 billion on Star Wars, that is going to be taken out of the hides of readiness, and our military quality of life is going to be affected drastically. I think it is the wrong-headed way to go.

I strongly support the Edwards amendment.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

□ 2000

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up on Mr. Hefner's quality of life admonitions to us and I want to speak to Members like my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], with whom I have worked on these issues. I do not think on this issue there ought to be a hawk or a dove or those kind of designations. We are all responsible members of the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Armed Services and we operate on the basis of that responsibility.

And in this particular instance, no matter what designation I might come under to suit the convenience of the newspaper, Members know that we work together on these issues like the theater missile defense. I am fully in accord with that.

But at the same time, I take no second place to those who want to see a quality of life. I have a special responsibility to all of the Members in the House of Representatives, I almost said in our congregation because that is the way I feel about it on the armed services and the National Security Committee; that is the way we work with one another.

Out in Hawaii it is not my constituents that are being housed in these barracks and in these housing projects that the gentleman from North Caro-

lina [Mr. HEFNER] is referring to, it is your constituents, it is our friends, our neighbors all around the country. And I have had to struggle year in and year out and I have had the support of the people, no matter what kind of convenient designations are used, to try to upgrade this housing, to try to upgrade the quality. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] is correct and if we are being honest with one another we know if we move into what has been called Star Wars, into this missile defense in the heavens kind of system, we are going to be cutting the ground out from underneath those men and women now serving and their families who serve with them throughout our country.

So, my plea is let us be sane and sensible about what we are doing with missile defense.

Mr. HEFNER. Make no mistake about it, with the limited resources that we have, if we embark on Star Wars, it is going to impact drastically on quality of life and readiness for our troops and readiness for our military.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to point out we are not in disagreement. And in fact if we look as we have cut defense spending over the past 5 years by 25 percent, we have increased nondefense discretionary spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HEFNER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for a chart show.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I am making a statement.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, let me remind the gentleman that when his administration was on Pennsylvania Avenue, on quality of life we had a pause. We have lost money, we have lost money in military construction for our quality of life and for our barracks and for living conditions for our military folks, and it has not been a priority because our priorities was B-1s and B-2s and we did not stress military construction. We have lost in the quality of life, and today we are reaping the benefits because retention is suffering among our services and we have had testimony to that effect. And if we spend \$40 billion for Star Wars we are going to suffer further and we are going to suffer quality of life and we are going to suffer in readiness.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I do not disagree with the gentleman. In fact I applaud his leadership on the issue of military installations and facilities.

My point is we are taking a bigger and bigger chunk out of the defense

budget for nondefense items, up 361 percent over 40 years.

Mr. HEFNER. I take my time back. We are debating priorities except in quality of life and Star Wars and readiness. The argument is are we going to stress readiness in this country and are we going to look after quality of life of our troops and get them off of food stamps, or are we going to spend \$40 billion in space for Star Wars where there is not one person in this House that knows whether it will even begin to work or not?

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have come here through long, national discussion. It began in our time, in 1981, when T.K. Jones, who was the Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of strategic and theater nuclear forces made a statement. He said that we would be able to protect our country against nuclear war if everyone dug a hole 6 feet deep, we put a door over that hole, and with enough shovels and enough dirt, everyone would be able to make it. That was the assistant Secretary of Defense for theater and strategic nuclear weapons in 1981.

Now, as you can imagine, that caused quite a controversy in this country, but that was the civil defense plan for our Nation in the event of a nuclear war.

Now it took 2 years to come up with an alternative plan; it was called star wars. We were Luke Skywalker, they were Darth Vader, and we were going to go to the heavens to knock down their intercontinental ballistic missiles. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, there were cartoon versions of what that system would do. There was a moonbeams and stardust vision of what it would do, but in reality there was never even the remotest approximation of a working model of it, \$30 billion later.

What we have before us today is the latter day version of it, but this is no longer moonbeams and stardust, this is the giant pork barrel in the sky for defense contractors. This is just a follow-on to all of those contractors that want to continue on the gravy train without having produced anything yet.

Even as we know it is going to put tremendous pressure on the resolution the rest of our budgets, we have to make very tough decisions in this Congress and the next. We are going to have very tough ceilings placed on us, we are not going to continue to support the things that do not work.

I was not paying that close attention, but I am not aware of an amendment that passed on the floor earlier today that put the Soviet Union back together again. We won, Darth Vader lost, he is gone, he is not in the heavens, he is in Chechnya, and he is losing on the ground to a Third World power. We cannot afford an additional \$40 billion in order to continue to pursue a

defense strategy that might have made some sense at the height of the cold war but in the aftermath of the cold war and the present condition of Russia no longer makes sense, given the other constraints upon our limited fiscal resources.

So, my argument to you would be this: that just as a practical fact of the matter, this system does not work, from Brilliant Pebbles to smart rocks to the nuclear bomb that was going to go off over our heads and stop the incoming missiles, none of this ever worked. If we want to continue to flow money into it, and the gentleman from North Carolina and many other Members out here on the floor made the point over and over, we are going to have to cut other things and cut them dramatically. It might be military readiness, it might be Medicare, it might be student loans, it might be Meals on Wheels.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. I will get time for 1 more minute.

I just wanted to see if we could get on the historical record something very important from the book of the former minister from the old Soviet Union in its dying days, from Shevardnadze, Edward, nice man. I will get an autographed copy for you. He says in his book that Ronald Reagan pushing SDI broke the will, along with Afghanistan, of the Evil Empire, and when they realized that they could not combat, this is Shevardnadze again, the unraveling of the Soviet Union, whatever the technological merits are about star wars, moonbeam, Darth Vader, it did accomplish a 30 million dollars' worth of the freedom for all of the so-called 15 Soviet Republics.

Mr. MARKEY. If I may reclaim my time, it is only to make one point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. DORNAN and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARKEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DORNAN. I yield back to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much. Notwithstanding the arguments which the gentleman makes, and we can debate over whether that was an accurate assessment or not, but just for the sake of the discussion let us say it was accurate and let us say that the Soviets did panic, and let us say that the Soviets did go to the table and we were able to gain those strategic nuclear weapons, treat all of that as being conceded for the sake of this discussion, what possible gain would it offer us now to spend an additional \$40 billion? We have won the concessions which are necessary in order to have these treaties put in place.

We now have an inexorable and inevitable decline on both side's missiles, we

have no technological proof that this system works. If they went for the bluff, so be it. But for the future, we have to now make our decisions based upon the technological capacity of this, of the technology.

Mr. DORNAN. Will the gentleman yield for one short question?

Mr. MARKEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 2010

Mr. DORNAN. Where are you getting this \$40 billion, off the planet Glatu Barato Niktu? Nobody is suggesting that kind of money expenditure. We are talking about rogue missiles. I am conceding we have got a bigger problem with suitcase missiles in the mud of our harbors. Where does this \$40 billion come from?

Mr. MARKEY. I am only using the Bush administration numbers that there would be \$35 billion that would need to be spent in order to finish this project, and additional tens of billions of dollars if an alternative Brilliant Pebbles project was adopted as well. We are only using the Republican administration numbers in this debate. The only question we have now is whether or not, given our success in basically destroying the Soviet Union, there is an identifiable enemy in the world that can justify this kind of expenditure.

I would argue not, given the other tremendous pressures on our military and on our civilian budget that is going to become more evident as this unfolds.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would ask the gentleman, everyone has said that the Soviet Union is gone. Is the gentleman aware of how many Typhoon-class nuclear submarines Russia built last year and what they plan on doing with those nuclear tubes? They built five nuclear Typhoon-class submarines last year. Why?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Earlier obviously some people were not here, but there was a discussion about whether or not there was a threat and what the gentleman points out with regard to submarine construction and what was quoted by or what was said by Bill Studeman, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency on January 18, pointed out quite clearly that we have a problem or that we soon will have.

Let me read this quote once again. Bill Studeman said, "The proliferation relates to the nonproprietary nature of technology," meaning that technology is not hardware or software, it is know-how, and he says, "This means that the

proliferation will be new and more diverse forms of lethability, increasing threat reach, that is, longer ranges including ultimately ranges from problem states that can reach the United States toward the end of this decade."

So the gentleman makes a good point with regard to submarines, and your director of your Democrat-controlled administration says clearly on the record there is a problem that we have to face.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further to me, I would also like to point out that Russia today, who is no longer the Soviet Union, just sold to Iran two Kilo-class nuclear submarines. They also sold to Iran and to China rocket-based missiles and long-range missiles.

I am not sure if we need to spend all the money that the gentleman is talking about either, but I am saying that at least I would like to give the President and the Secretary of Defense, whoever he is in 1996, the option to take a look and see if that is an option.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. One further point besides the sale of Russian submarines to Iran, which we now have documented, we also know that the Russians offered to take the SS-25, which is their mainstay nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile, and offer that technology to Brazil to be used for space flight. We know that.

So somehow we are thinking that this technology for nuclear capability is staying within Russia. That is just not borne out by the facts.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to bring out one other point. When we are talking about quality of life, let us take a look at the broad class, when we cut \$177 billion out of the defense budget, that hurts quality of life, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle passed that Clinton tax package that did that.

In that budget was also a COLA for veterans, and you take a look at how many of the billions of dollars it is costing us for Haiti, and then we take a look at quality of life that our soldiers were ripped out, our sailors, after a 6-month cruise, ripped out with a 30-day turnaround and shipped off to Haiti. Then we had two people commit suicide.

So when we talk about quality of life, let us really take a look at quality of life across the board.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I know most of the discussion here tonight has been on the readiness and the defense aspects of this amendment, and that is appropriate. But I do want to point out the foreign policy ramifications of it as well, and just simply to say that the nationwide missile de-

fense system, in my view, does jeopardize American foreign policy interests.

A nationwide defense missile system abrogates the antiballistic missile treaty. That treaty has been the most successful treaty we have ever had in the strategic area, the most successful arms control treaty. It saved a very, very costly missile race for the world.

I think a nationwide missile defense system jeopardizes the implementation of START 1, which is an enormously important foreign policy interest of this Nation right at this moment, and likewise, the ratification of START 2.

I think you are quite right to say that there is a threat to the Nation from long-range missiles, but I also think that threat is secondary to the theater missile threat. Nationwide missile defense, in effect, reverses what our defense priorities, it seems to me, ought to be. The missile threat today is in the short- and medium-range missiles, and that is what our priority ought to be on in the defense program. I think that is what it is on.

We must not be complacent, as others have pointed out, with respect to the possibility of an attack on the continental United States, and we should proceed, in my judgment, with a research and development program for that, but the priority ought to be on the area missile defense.

I think the Edwards amendment has it exactly right. I commend him for it.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Edwards amendment. I am one of the few Members of Congress to serve in the signal intelligence area of our armed services, and I spent time looking at this very matter we are talking about.

If we are seriously concerned about defense of America to all threats, the first thing we need is a military force that is prepared and ready and trained to go to war, and the next thing we need is for them to have the good quality of life every Member of this body has spoken in support of.

Part of the time I worked as a signal intelligence officer. I looked at this very project because it was an assignment I had, and I fully support and will vote continuously for research and development for star wars. But I am absolutely opposed to spending money that we need for the defense of this Nation to look at putting these intercepts in space.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am a freshman, but I am a sad freshman tonight, because I think that the last vote, and if we pass this amendment, has in large part broken the Contract With America, not a Contract With America that was formed just in this last election cycle, but a Contract With America that was formed in the formulation of this Nation.

When we talk about quality of life, there is no quality of life if this country is vulnerable to missile attack, and you and I all know that the entire dynamics of the debate changed in 1984 when SDI became a potential reality.

The quality of life in America was more peaceful, because the Iron Curtain came down.

I have trouble with H.R. 7, but it was President Reagan who said in 1984 that history teaches that wars begin when governments believe the price of aggression is cheap.

□ 2020

Mr. Chairman, upon the formation of this country was John Jay in the Federalist Papers No. 4, who reminds us that—

Wisely, therefore, do they consider union and a good national government as necessary to put and keep them in such a situation as, instead of inviting war, will tend to repress and discourage it. That situation consists in the best possible state of defense, and necessarily depends on the government, the arms, and the resources of the country.

I wish I felt this strongly about a few other parts of the bill, but I must stand firm on my principles. First, I feel that the United States should not become involved in any "peacekeeping" activities of the United Nations. This includes provision of troops, funding, in-kind contributions. Such activities are beyond the scope of the Constitution, and if vital U.S. interests are involved, the Constitution provides the proper avenue for dealing with those interests in a national, rather than international manner. We are walking on a very slippery slope when we involve our troops with U.N. "peacekeeping" activities, and I caution all of the relevant committees to scrutinize any action very carefully before we consider any actions with the United Nations.

Second, there are a number of waivers in this bill that concern me. I point to page 47, line 19. This section gives the Secretary of Defense a waiver to decide that in the case of an emergency the United Nations will not be required to reimburse the United States for in-kind contributions to "peacekeeping" activities. I believe that Congress, not the Secretary of Defense, should decide if the United Nations should foot the bill. This loophole has the ability to be abused.

Lastly, I mention section 512 of the bill, conditions on the Provisions of Intelligence to the United Nations. I realize that this strengthens the conditions of intelligence being provided to the United Nations. However, I object to any U.S. intelligence being provided to the United Nations. In principle, providing classified intelligence information to any international body is undesirable. A government-to-government action has been possible with adequate controls, known to the Congress. However intelligence provided to the United Nations is the same as publishing it in the National Enquirer.

I thank the gentleman for the time to voice these concerns. I hope that the committees with jurisdiction on these issues will take careful consideration of these concerns when these issues arise again. This is a very important issue to the people of Idaho and to the people of America, very sensible people, and they deserve the proper consideration, and they deserve a good strong defense, and they remember what happened in 1994, 1984, when SDI possibly became a reality. Even if this body does not remember, the American people do, and I will cast my vote for this bill and encourage all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment briefly on the threat.

I have heard several comments here tonight like "the threat does not warrant the development of an ABM defense system." I have heard words like "there is no conceivable threat." I have heard the question, the statement, made, that we have no threat because who could put the Soviet Union back together?

Let me remind our colleagues that Zhirinovskiy, possibly the second-most popular, maybe the most popular, politician in Russia, he wants to have a child in every one of the provinces of what used to be the U.S.S.R. and then when he assumes power, the first thing he wants to do is take back Alaska. He will have at his command 25,000 nuclear weapons and the ability to deliver them. If they are targeted somewhere else now, within less than 2 minutes he can target every one of them back here, and we do not have a threat, a potential threat?

Come on now. Let us get real.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], that I listened to his statements about the possible destabilization of our armed situation with the Soviet Union, and let me just remind my colleagues that this amendment eliminates some possibilities of working together with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Yeltsin said in two speeches, January 29 and January 31, 1992, that the strong possibility existed of the Soviet Union teaming up with the United States and using Soviet technology and U.S. SDI technology to develop what Mr. Yeltsin, not President Reagan and not President Bush, but what Mr. Yeltsin described as a global protection system.

Now we are giving up that possibility. We are giving up that opportunity, if we adopt this amendment, that we are not going to hear any evidence

about anything except the system that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] thinks will work. That is a ground-based system. It does not make sense to give up not only the possibilities that our technicians offer us and our scientists say they want to testify about, but also to give up the possibilities that have been offered to us by the Soviet Union.

Since Mr. Yeltsin made that statement, Mr. Chairman, a number of our technical people have been working with Soviet scientists, Soviet diplomats, and talking about the opportunity to have a partnership. I say to my colleagues, "You give that up, you limit yourself, you limit the United States, if you go with this Edwards amendment."

Let me tell my colleagues what else they give up. As my colleagues know, it has been suggested by all of our experts that we might want to have a layered defense. I say to my colleagues, "That means, if you have a ballistic missile coming in, you try to shoot it down first when it launches. That's the best time to get it, before all of the multiple warheads, if it has multiple warheads, break away from the bus, and then you have 10 problems instead of 1 problem. So you try to get it when it boosts up. Second, if it survives, that you might want to get it when it's up high in space. If you can get it then, you don't have to worry about it coming down and having to deal with it with your terminal defense. Last, if everything fails and that missile is coming into San Diego, CA, or New York, or Mr. EDWARDS' district in Texas, then you have one last shot at it, and that's with this ground-based system."

I would suggest it does not make much sense for us as Members of the House to limit our technical experts and say we have adopted the idea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] of the best technology, and he says the only thing that works is the stuff that is launched from the ground. We are not going to try to shoot that missile down when it first boosts up, and we sure do not want to shoot it down in space because that would be a war in the heavens. But we will go with that good old six-gun that the gentleman from Texas says we have got. We can shoot it as it is coming in on our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "So you give up, my colleagues, the chance to have a layered defense, and all we are asking here is not that you choose one. We are asking that you let the committee process take its course, and you listen to our scientists, and experts, and military leaders as they come in and testify as to the cheapest, most cost effective way to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles."

I think that the Edwards amendment, as much as I respect my friend from Texas, is one that limits us in a way that we should not be limited.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is true that the real threat to our security does come from the former Soviet Union, nuclear threat to our security does come from the former Soviet Union, but not in the way that some of our friends and colleagues imagine. It does, in fact, come in a way that was described for us an hour or two ago by the former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California. He talked about the ability to smuggle into the country, in the tons of contraband that cross our borders daily, a nuclear device, or parts of a nuclear device, to be assembled here and then set off possibly by terrorist or terrorist organization. That constitutes the real most immediate threat to our security.

Now coincidentally, just within the last several weeks in Czechoslovakia authorities seized an automobile and the contents of that automobile. In that car were approximately 6 pounds of highly enriched uranium which were smuggled out of the Soviet Union by a Russian, a Ukrainian, and a citizen of Belarus. They were trying to take that 6 pounds of enriched uranium and sell it to terrorists on the open market. Now there are within the former Soviet Union at least 150 sites that contain enriched uranium from which those people, or people like them, can obtain that fissionable material, take it out of the former Soviet Union and put it on the marketplace for terrorist organizations.

□ 2030

We are not paying any attention whatsoever to this most immediate, most serious threat to the security of the United States and in fact our allies, and we fail to recognize this threat at our peril. That is the most serious threat and the most immediate threat, and that is the one we need to pay attention to.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, when this debate began some time ago, some of my Republican colleagues said on this Floor they are not interested in Star Wars. My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], volunteered to donate to charity for every instance when the word "Star Wars" were used. Now, a few minutes later, other Members are arguing for a Star Wars deployment.

Well, this amendment is simple and it is straightforward: If you want to say no to Star Wars, vote yes on this amendment. If you think \$30 billion and 12 years is enough on one program, then simply vote yes on this amendment.

On the other hand, if you believe in Star Wars and you want to spend more money on its deployment and good faith, then simply vote no on this amendment. It is that simple.

But this amendment is not about whether today or some day there might be a threat to the continental United States. Nothing in this amendment stops a ground-based national missile defense system or even continued research for some space-based system. It simply says no to the deployment of Star Wars, a \$30 billion boondoggle, after 12 years, for which there is no evidence that the technology would even work.

Finally, I am not asking that you agree with CHET EDWARDS' opinions, because mine are not important. I am asking that this House agree with the opinions of our top military leaders and past leaders such as Colin Powell and Admiral Crowe, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under President Reagan, to say enough is enough, and tonight it is time to say no to star wars.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman. A ground-based system is treaty compliant. Anything that we do in space would abrogate the antiballistic missile agreement. This would then lead to a reconsideration by the Russians of the START I-START II agreements, which called for a two-thirds reduction in our offensive ballistic missiles on both sides. They are not going to go out and approve START II if we are rushing to deploy a space-based system.

So I think we made a lot of progress with the Spratt amendment, and if we could get this amendment through, I think we would have done a good job for our country. I believe a space-based missile system is extremely expensive, is not treaty-compliant, it violates the ABM agreement on a prime facia basis, and it is not something we should do on this point.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Members to pay strict attention to what they are doing here this evening. You know, you have to be very careful because these guys on this side of the aisle are very cagey. The next thing you know, you have a bill and you have got nothing to it, and it will be like cotton candy. You know what happens when you get cotton candy. They come over here and talk about Star Wars and you have all this debate, and in the meantime your bill is slipping away from you. None of you paid strict attention the last vote you had where you had to strike a clause dealing with congressional funding. Do you know what you just gave away? You gave away a key portion of this bill. Because under this bill, DOD funds under this bill had to be approved by Congress for

peacekeeping. Under Amendment 12 that you just passed, you gave it all away. You gave up a major portion of your bill.

You have got to pay attention to what is going on here on the floor. My dear friends here on the floor and back in your offices, watch these amendments when you are voting on them. You are getting cotton candy, my friends. You are getting a bill that is going to have nothing to it.

For example, when you look at this bill, there is \$1.7 billion by Congress last year for peacekeeping. It did not have to have the approval of Congress. You pass this amendment now, you are not going to have to need the approval of Congress either. And that is the entire point of this bill. That is what the Contract With America is all about. You are putting Congress back in the game. And you just took Congress out and no one even paid any attention.

Look at these amendments. Look at this amendment. They make a lot of noise over here. They wave to you up here and underhandedly take it all away from you. You got to watch these guys or they will hornswoggle you. So I am asking you, watch these amendments or you are going to end up with cotton candy.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing talk about Darth Vader being dead and Star Wars and all of these comical type figures, when we really need to be looking at what we are facing in this world today.

The fact of the matter is, we are not facing Darth Vader, even if you want to call the Soviet Union Darth Vader and say that Darth Vader is dead. If we want to talk about it in those simplistic terms, if we want to talk about something that is this important, national security, in those comical terms, fine, let us talk about it. Darth Vader has had children now and they have spread across the world.

The fact of the matter is, the world is not safer today than it was 5 years ago before the collapse of the Soviet empire. The fact of the matter is we now have, it has been estimated, 20 to 25 countries that are going to have nuclear capability within the next 5 to 10 years, and have that ability to launch nuclear missiles across continents.

We are not talking about Darth Vader; we are not even talking about the former Soviet Union. The nuclear club is going to be expanded beyond the Britains and beyond the Chinas and beyond the Russias and beyond the Americas, and beyond the Indias, and instead the people who are going to be possessing nuclear capability are going to be the Kadafis and the Saddam Husseins and the North Koreas. I keep hearing all this concern about all these wonderful treaties, START I, START II, all these treaties that are going to be thrown out the window.

Well, I am only a freshman and I suppose I did not recall the full debate, but I did not think Saddam Hussein or anybody in North Koera had anything to do with these treaties. They are not signatories to these treaties, they are not concerned about these treaties. And if we sit back and continue to frame this debate in comical terms such as Darth Vaders and Star Wars and all these other things that are not relevant to the debate tonight, that is not relevant to what is going on inside of North Korea, does anybody in this Chamber know what is going on inside of North Korea? Does anybody inside this Chamber? If the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], knows about North Korea's nuclear capability, then I will gladly yield to him and let him talk about the nuclear capability. But the fact of the matter is the gentleman does not know any more than the rest of us know.

And yet we are not talking about North Korea. We are not talking about North Korea tonight. We are not talking about the problems that we may be facing with Kadafi. We are not talking about the unknowns that we are going to be facing with Saddam Hussein. Instead, we are hearing talk about Darth Vader and these other things that demean the process and trivialize in the end what I am the most concerned about, and that is my seven-year-old son and my four-year-old son, my children, my grandchildren. I am concerned about them.

□ 2040

I am concerned about the homeless in the inner cities, and I am concerned about those who are going to bed tonight in south central L.A. afraid they are not going to wake up in the morning because of violence. But their threat not only comes from the inner cities, the threats in South Bronx not only come from the problems in the South Bronx, it comes from threats across the globe. And they are just as dead in the morning, if we do not defend them nationally, as they would be from the spread of violence and poverty.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes an excellent point. Over the past 30 years we have had two wars in America. We had the war on poverty, and we spent \$6 trillion and we lost. And we had a strong buildup with support from Democrats and Republicans, and we spent \$5 trillion during that same period of time. And what happened? The world is a safe and secure place because we won that.

What we are saying is, we want to continue to be strong to deter aggression. We lost the war on poverty where we spent more money, but certainly our investment in defense allows all of us to be here where we are today.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, last March I was in Israel and talked to mothers and fathers who have had to hide their children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] has expired.

On request of Mr. BILBRAY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCARBOROUGH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, last March, when I talked to mothers and fathers who had lived in fear of their home being bombed by ballistic missiles, the comments they made were very strongly saying, we need not only this for Israel, we need this for the entire world so every country has it.

My problem I am having is, I am hearing my colleagues from both sides of the aisle agree that we need to develop the technology. We need to be able to address the point that the facts are that there is more of a threat of a ballistic missile crossing into the United States territory than it is a foreign enemy tank coming in. But we have antitank technology. But we have not developed the technology.

I think the issue comes down to the fact, I keep hearing the dialogue going back and forth of what not to do. I think the people of the United States say, if we are going to develop this technology to protect foreign countries, doggone it, the taxpayers have the right to have their country, America, defended with the same technology.

I think that is all we are saying here. As this technology is developed to protect other countries, let us darn well make sure that we are protecting our children, our neighborhoods and our homes in the same way.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure the gentleman's comments are not misunderstood to misrepresent my amendment. My amendment does not stop research and development of any program. And, furthermore, I hope those same Members that have some concern for ballistic missile attack on the United States understand that those same minds can take a thousand-pound missile, rent a U-haul truck and deliver that missile to any city in the United States.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman to consider that when we secure our borders, I hope that the gentleman understands that same threat when we talk about Border Patrol.

And Border Patrol, because I live one mile from the border, it does not take a long distance missile to hit me. My family is under that threat. So let us remember the national defense.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we are missing here is, we are talking about what our priorities should be. And I think the Spratt amendment makes it very clear. Our priorities should be readiness and theater missile defense.

I was out with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, now ranking minority member, to the Gulf War twice. And it was very apparent to me that when we deploy our kids to the Gulf, maybe someday it will be the gentleman's children, we want to have for them theater missile defense to defend them against incoming SCUD missiles which would carry chemical, biological warfare weapons.

That is a priority. Readiness is a priority. And we would argue that we are spending \$400 million of the taxpayers' money to do research and development about a national ballistic missile defense system. That seems to me to be a rational program. We ought to stay with that program.

The problem is, we have passed a balanced budget amendment. The comptroller of the department of defense tells us that under the most favorable scenario, defense will be cut by \$110 billion over the next 7 years. Under the worse case, if there are no tax increases and if there are very cuts in entitlements, the cuts in defense will be up to \$520 billion over the next 7 years.

So what we are saying is, we have got to take care of business first. The most important thing we have learned over the years is to have our troops ready and prepared so that if they have to go into harm's way, they can do an effective job as they did in the Gulf.

And second, if we are going to send them to the Gulf, then we have to protect them against the threats that they could face. And theater missile defense is crucial to that.

I believe that out of the 400 million and what we are learning about theater missile defense, we someday will have the capability to give the country a treaty-compliant land-based system. The question is, should we rush out and say within 60 days we are going to have demand from the secretary of defense for a plan to deploy some system? And I am told if there were such a system to be deployed, it would have to be something that would not be treaty compliant. I think that is a mistake, because we are at the very point when we are asking the Russians to dismantle two-thirds of their land-based ICBM's. And believe me, that is the biggest threat that is out there.

Let me remind all of my colleagues of something else that we forget, that even though we do not have a national ballistic missile defense system, we still possess tremendous offensive nuclear capabilities against these coun-

tries. So if somebody attacks us, they better think through whether they want to completely destroy their country because it would be my judgment that the President, the commander in chief, would retaliate using nuclear weapons against somebody who used that kind of a weapons system against us.

What I am arguing is that this amendment today is a good one. It puts us in a position where we can go forward, do the development for a land-based missile defensive system. And it is treaty-compliant. It makes sense.

To rush out and try to do some space-based thing today would get us in trouble with Russia, undermine our arms control agreements, cost of a lot more, return us to a cold war fronting with the Russians.

It does not make any sense. I think the Edwards amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I just wanted to make a couple of remarks. I did not intend to speak on this amendment, but I, as I listened to the debate and noted that there was a great deal of concern about whether or not Members who are against this amendment and for developing and deploying, whether or not we care about other things, I think the fact of the matter is that we care a lot.

The fact of the matter is we care a lot about our country. The fact of the matter is we care a lot about our national security, and that is all for the people we represent. If we did not care as a country during the 1950's, we would not have developed the technology and bought the hardware that led us to send in very rapid order, very quickly, 450,000 troops by air to the gulf. That technology today is almost worn out, C-141's and C-5's. But that was developed in the 1950's, and we bought it and put it in place in the 1960's.

If we did not care about this thing, we would not have developed the technology in the 1960's that resulted in the M1A1 tank that was used in the gulf which, believe it or not, Iraqi soldiers let us look through clouds of dust and look through clouds of fog and look through rains, rain storms and allowed us to fire on and hit enemy tanks, when they could not see us.

If we did not care about these subjects, we would not have developed during the 1970's munitions that we saw used in the Gulf war that were so accurate that the old saying today, and today it is an old saying, it is kind of neat, those smart munitions went right down the chimneys of the Iraqi houses. If we did not care, we would not have developed those technologies.

I want to make a point. The point is this, that if we do not get serious about this issue, based on what I know about development of weapons systems and development of technology, we are

going to find ourselves dead behind the eight ball.

□ 2050

I do not want to find ourselves there. Mr. Chairman, again, and I do not want to overuse this statement, but today the Director of the CIA says that this threat is imminent; that by the turn of the century we are going to have to be concerned about this issue from unfriendly countries in far off parts of the world, not the old Soviet Union, but other people.

It was neat when we had the Soviet Union. They were rational folks and we could sit and talk with them. They understood that they had a gun pointed at us and we had a gun pointed at them, and they cared about that issue, so deterrence worked.

I wanted to ask the gentleman, does he think deterrence will work the same way with countries in the Middle East that are trying very desperately to gain this technology? Will it work with the Koreans? I do not want to bet on it, Mr. Chairman. I would rather develop and buy this technology that works, when it works, and that is what our position on this side of the aisle is all about.

Mr. Chairman, finally, one point: Secretary of Defense Perry just last week or the week before came to the Committee on National Security and said, "Please do not micromanage my programs." The amendment just recently passed speaks to a ground-based missile defense system. We have made the judgment that that is the way we want to go.

This amendment goes further and says, "Don't buy space-based." I do not feel like I am in a position to make those decisions, and Secretary Perry just last week said, "Please don't make those decisions for us," so I think this is an ill-advised amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I would add, Mr. Chairman, this is the only case I can think of where we are going to see an amendment offered that eliminates a specific type of technology that may or may not be requested by the Pentagon. We could say, "Why don't we limit the nuclear capability of our aircraft carriers?" or "Why don't we build our nuclear-powered submarine?"

We are talking one technology that may or may not be requested by the Defense Department and saying, "Do not explore this even if it may down the road provide protection for our citizens." I do not understand that mentality. What we are saying is not to force them to deploy a space-based system, we are saying, "Come back and tell us what it is that you think we should do and how quickly can we do it." That is what we are suggesting.

I think it is ill-advised in this case to limit the technology.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago this Congress in its wisdom passed a Balanced Budget Amendment. Two-thirds of the Members in this body said that "We want to balance the budget," and I understand that. I realize the deep concern of the American people about the deficit.

On the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, for years we have been trying to reduce the size of the expenditure because we know that the pressure is on defense versus domestic. We recognize that we have to do it in a way that we do not have the same debacle we had after World War II, after Korea, and after Vietnam. I think we have done a pretty good job. There is no question many of the things that my good friend, the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, has said are true. Many of the things that each of the Members have said today are true. There is a threat from the former Soviet Union.

However, Mr. Chairman, more of a threat to our viability is the readiness of the troops. I think this Congress spoke absolutely correctly when it said "Readiness is first, theater missile is second, and third is a space-based national missile ballistic system." When we go to a base and 60 percent of the kids are on food stamps, when you have a billion dollar backlog in real property maintenance, which is the heart of readiness, when you have a \$2 billion backlog in depot maintenance, when you deploy troops to Iraq or to Korea and cannot sustain that deployment, and I know the chiefs say they can deploy to two different theaters. They cannot deploy to two different theaters and sustain that for any length of time, in my estimation.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not adopt this amendment, the thrust of this amendment, I believe that we will be hurting the very thing that all us are trying to improve and keep.

I have been working 7 years trying to make sure that the medical facilities and the quality of life for the men and women under arms is at a higher level, and it is no easy task, because every time I turn around, the military finds a way to reprogram that money, finds a way to use it for something else.

The Members will be facing the supplemental in a few days. My good friend, the gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG, and I have worked out the best type of supplemental we can possibly work out. I do not think the money should be offset because it is paying for extraordinary operations.

I think it ought to be money that is emergency money, as the President asked for, but because of the pressure of the budget, it is going to be offset. I understand that. I do not agree with it, but I understand that.

There is nobody in this Congress that knows more about the effects of missile attacks than I do. As Members will remember, I am one of the 80 Democrats, and I led the fight for the authorization to go to war in Saudi Arabia. A unit from my home town, one young fellow a block and a half away from me, was killed in a missile attack.

I lost more people in the Saudi Arabia war than any other Member of Congress, so there is nobody that understands the importance of a theater missile system more than I do. There is nobody who understands the importance of protecting this great country against any threat.

However, we do not have the money to protect against any threat in the world. Anybody on our Subcommittee on Defense on the Committee on Appropriations will remember the difficulties we face every year.

Somebody got up a few minutes ago and they said that the Committee on Armed Services put a pay raise in for the Members of the Armed Forces. Half the people I have talked to have been deployed over 50 percent of the time, and the Administration had not asked for a pay raise.

I forced the issue, and the Committee on Armed Services did in fact put the pay raise in. The tally for that pay raise was \$11 billion, one of the most important things we could have done last year, because it had such a beneficial impact on the men and women serving in our Armed Forces.

Certainly, if we ask them to go forth and spend so much time away from home, as many of the Members have done, the least we can do is make sure they have the quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of what we are trying to do today to take a reasonable position, continue the research, but do not make people believe that we can deploy this system prematurely. I would hope the Members would consider very seriously supporting the Edwards amendment and keeping the readiness of this great country at the highest level possible.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and I know from whence he speaks. I know that he, probably more than any Member of this Chamber, knows the price that is paid in our Nation's defense.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded, and I think we all ought to be reminded, by the fact that it is now February of 1995, and 50 years ago we were ending one of the bloodiest conflicts in world history, where we were defeating two totalitarian regimes, one in the Pacific, one in Europe.

One of the key systems that resulted in the defeat and a victory for this country was a little-known system called radar. I do not know very much about radar and I do not know very much about the history of radar, but I

wonder what the debate was in the late twenties or early thirties when people probably just as committed and honorable as those who are in this Chamber were debating the feasibility of whether or not we were going to use a radar system, or even develop it.

Given the fact that in the thirties defense spending was at an all-time low, in fact, I am advised that our current level of funding is the lowest since the thirties, but at that time, how many other competing demands were there?

□ 2100

What other issues relating to quality of life were there? And what system ultimately saved more lives in that conflict than that one system of radar? In fact, I kind of wonder whether or not the perceptions of radar in the 1930's equate with the perceptions that exist today in this body relative to space-based systems.

I would point as evidence of that to the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941. We had an early radar system that was in fact deployed in Hawaii. I do not know what went through the minds of those two technicians who saw those flights of aircraft coming towards that harbor. I do not know whether they thought it was a big joke. I do not know whether they thought it really was a flight of B-12's, B-29's coming from the United States. But whatever it was, they did not take it seriously and the net result was one of the greatest naval defeats in American history.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, because I think we would be ill-advised to preclude a system that potentially could play a role in the defense of this country.

I certainly appreciate and understand and would agree with the comments that have been urged on this Chamber by those who suggest the possibility that we could be facing attacks from barges, or taxis or border crossings or whatever means that someone could use to deliver some means of mass destruction. But the fact remains we must defend against those threats as well as any other, particularly a threat that can be activated on a massive scale by some one individual bent on destruction pushing a button.

When I look, and I heard the comments earlier this evening from the gentleman talking about Russia. And, yes, they are being hammered by a Third World country. But at the same time they are taking their missile technology and selling it to China, they are taking their submarine technology and selling it to Iran and to China, and we are finding that briefcases are being found with plutonium in western Europe, and there are thousands of nuclear warheads and missiles that are not accounted for as we speak on the floor of this Chamber.

All I would suggest is that I think that there are some issues here that go beyond our immediate perceptions of reality. I think that when I look, for instance, at my own district and the

men and women who produce the Aegis destroyers and yes, it is part of our theater missile defense system but very definitely it could be linked into a satellite or a space-based system that potentially could play a valuable role, not only in protecting our men and women in uniform but protecting the shores of this great country.

I urge on this Chamber the defeat of the amendment. I think that, yes, we need to act reasonably and prudently. But I think to preclude one system would be a grave mistake and a grave danger to the future of this country.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I certainly appreciate your comments. The question really should be framed not whether they funded radar in the 1920's and 1930's leading up to World War II but whether they were open-minded enough to be willing to look into funding radar technology. I certainly appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but it seems to me that you can be for readiness, you can understand the troubles, the readiness troubles that we are having, that there are unfortunately men and women in our armed services who are on food stamps, without excluding this, without saying we are just not going to even consider looking into this technology that can save our lives in the future.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes. The gentleman, the previous speaker, raised a question that is entirely relevant to the question at hand today but in the wrong historic context.

The fact of the matter is that radar was developed in England in the 1930's. It was developed as an alternative to a weapons system that had been proposed by a variety of military thinkers in England at that time to create an airborne system of barrage balloons armed with explosives designed to stand in the way and provide a shield against the invading air forces from Germany.

Radar was proposed as an alternative to that in one of the most interesting chapters in public policy thinking that has been talked about in this country in recent years. It was the subject of a series of lectures at Harvard by E.B. White in the early 1960's. I commend it to the gentleman. It is a real illustration in sound scientific military policymaking.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. LONGLEY. This is precisely the point. What if that system of barrage balloons as ill-advised as it might have been had precluded the development of radio electronic detection?

That is what I am saying, is that I think we are ill-advised to preclude one form of technology until we understand where it might lead. That, I think, is precisely the issue.

Mr. SAWYER. I understand the gentleman's point, he has made it several times. I think it is in the wrong historic context. It is the reason I rose to try to correct the point, that the radar was not developed in this country, was not developed in the 1920's, it was done for a vastly different purpose.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I think we have had an honest debate today and it is time to vote. Both sides have been heard on the floor of this House. I simply want to conclude by saying this is not a debate about who cares about protecting the American people. Every Member of this House cares deeply about protecting our national security and every American family.

This debate on this amendment is simply an issue of do you want to deploy Star Wars after we have already spent \$30 billion researching it over 12 years and do not even have the capability of saying the technology will work? Or do you want to save that money, perhaps use it for theater missile defense, use it for a ground-based national missile defense system, use it for pay raises for members of the military, use it for quality of life issues for the military, use it for deficit reduction.

You are either for Star Wars deployment or against. It is that simple. It is not a question of integrity or who cares or who does not. I would urge that the Members of this House vote.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are fixing to take a vote, and the gentleman from Massachusetts on the Democratic side I think framed the entire issue from here, and I think that if you believe him, you should vote for this amendment. If you do not believe him, you should oppose this amendment with every fiber in your body.

Let me repeat what the gentleman from Massachusetts said. He said, "There is no more Darth Vader." He said, "The world is not the dangerous place that it used to be."

If I believed that there were no Darth Vaders in the world today, I would probably vote for this amendment.

But, Mr. Chairman, before we take this vote, every Member of this House needs to remember what the Central Intelligence Agency has advised this Congress. It says there are 25 nations

in this world presently pursuing the technology to build a ballistic missile capable of hitting, not Kuwait, not our carriers, not eastern Europe, capable of hitting the United States.

I recently read that a poll in this country conducted of American citizens said 58 percent of Americans believe that we have the technology to stop such a missile attack. I believe that an equal number in this House apparently are under that misconception.

Ladies and gentlemen, we do not have the technology to stop a long-range ballistic missile attack. That is what this bill is about.

If this amendment passes, then among those 25 nations, we have Iran, we have North Korea, and we have Libya, 3 nations that have said, "We will destroy America if we can." And they are building the technology to do just that.

So we are fixing to vote. You can vote to give the military the technology and the ability to stop such an attack, or, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, you can say there is no Darth Vader.

□ 2110

You can say that Russia is stable and that Russia is our friend, and you can ignore one of the lead stories on NBC News tonight that said Yeltsin is unstable. Or you can vote against this amendment, vote for the safety of the American public that you represent.

If you believe that this world is safe, and that those 25 countries that the CIA says exist, if you do not believe that, then vote for this amendment. But if you want to protect your families, your neighbors, and those people you represent, you will vote against this amendment and you will vote for this bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment and I would like to briefly outline the consequences of proceeding down the path that the bill H.R. 7 suggests.

We find ourselves today again debating the merits of a space-based multi-billion-dollar ballistic missile defense system. For those of us who participated in these same debates a decade ago this has a ring of great familiarity. Yet, the context of this debate today is vastly different than March of 1983 when then President Reagan presented his vision. We are facing deficits of over \$200 billion as a result of the Defense buildup of that era. We no longer live in fear of Russian space and missile technology—in fact we are jointly building a space station using that very technology. Simply said, there is no threat and there is no money. We cannot afford to embark on such an expensive fantasy.

The bill before us reverses the path that we have followed over the past two administrations—that is, to develop a lower cost theater defense system that addresses the very real threat posed by potentially hostile Third World nations. Now we spend roughly \$3 billion per year and will continue to do so for the next 5 years according to the President's budget. This is a rational program which is aimed at the deployment of a theater high altitude area

defense system which will provide a moderately reliable defense against ballistic missiles with ranges up to 3,000 km.

To undertake the national missile defense program required by this bill will require doubling this spending level almost immediately with substantial increases in future years with outyear costs exceeding about \$35 billion by the end of the decade. It is intended to engage a ballistic missile capability which does not now exist.

As my colleagues well know, we have already spent about \$35 billion on star wars over the past dozen years and have precious little to show for it. There is no question that the financial burden of a new program will be placed exclusively on the American taxpayer. Other nations including Israel, South Korea, and Japan have balked at even paying a share of a theater missile defense system. They do not perceive the risks to be sufficient to justify the costs.

There is no question that the development of a substantial long-range missile capability by potentially hostile nations would take at least a decade of highly visible testing. I have no doubt that the most cost effective approach here is simply to intervene through diplomacy, economic pressure, or ultimately through force. Our missile technology control regime has been highly successful over the past decade and it hasn't cost the taxpayer a dime.

The question of achievability of a national missile defense system—and any cost—should be a major consideration for this body. After extensive development and testing of the Patriot missile we have learned that it faced substantial difficulties during Desert Storm. Despite the enormous psychological comfort this system provided, the hard evidence calls into question how many Scud missiles were actually intercepted. Simply said, we have a long way to go in perfecting even this relatively unambitious capability. The challenges posed by a national missile defense system are orders of magnitude beyond a theater missile defense system.

We must face the reality that President Reagan's vision is simply not achievable in the foreseeable future. There is a continuum of ground-based technology development beyond THAAD that could make sense and perhaps should be pursued in favorable economic times. The quantum leap to a space-based long range missile defense system makes no sense now and perhaps never will.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically supported the Spratt amendment—to fund and deploy a theater missile defense system first. I also agree with Mr. Spratt that a ground-based system is the place to start.

And I agree with the author of this amendment, Mr. EDWARDS, that a lot of money has been wasted on space-based systems that were poorly designed and extravagantly funded.

But I am not prepared to support an amendment that prohibits deployment of space-based interceptors which, using new technology, we may need to defend against future threats.

And so, with reluctance, I will cast my vote against the Edwards amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as modified offered by

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 223, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—206

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Owens
Ackerman	Goodling	Pallone
Baesler	Gordon	Parker
Baldacci	Green	Pastor
Barcia	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hinchee	Poshard
Blute	Holden	Rahall
Boehlert	Hoyer	Rangel
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Borski	Jacobs	Reynolds
Boucher	Jefferson	Richardson
Brewster	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Browder	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Rose
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roukema
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Chapman	Kennelly	Sanders
Clay	Kildee	Sawyer
Clayton	Kleczka	Schroeder
Clement	Klink	Schumer
Clyburn	LaFalce	Scott
Coleman	LaTourette	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Laughlin	Shays
Collins (MI)	Leach	Sisisky
Condit	Levin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lincoln	Skelton
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Coyne	Lofgren	Smith (MI)
Cramer	Lowey	Spratt
Danner	Luther	Stark
de la Garza	Maloney	Stenholm
Deal	Manton	Stokes
DeFazio	Markey	Studds
DeLauro	Martinez	Stupak
Dellums	Mascara	Tanner
Deutsch	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy	Tejeda
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson
Dixon	McHale	Thornton
Doggett	McKinney	Thurman
Dooley	Meehan	Torkildsen
Doyle	Meek	Torres
Duncan	Menendez	Torricelli
Durbin	Mfume	Towns
Edwards	Miller (CA)	Traficant
Engel	Mineta	Tucker
Eshoo	Minge	Velazquez
Evans	Mink	Vento
Farr	Moakley	Vislosky
Fattah	Mollohan	Volkmer
Fazio	Montgomery	Ward
Fields (LA)	Moran	Waters
Filner	Morella	Watt (NC)
Flake	Murtha	Waxman
Foglietta	Nadler	Williams
Ford	Neal	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Ney	Wise
Frost	Oberstar	Woolsey
Furse	Obey	Wyden
Gejdenson	Olver	Wynn
Gephardt	Ortiz	Yates
Gibbons	Orton	

NOES—223

Allard	Barrett (NE)	Boehner
Andrews	Bartlett	Bonilla
Archer	Barton	Bono
Armey	Bass	Brownback
Bachus	Bateman	Bryant (TN)
Baker (CA)	Bereuter	Bunn
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Bunning
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Burr
Barr	Bliley	Burton

Buyer	Harman	Paxon
Callahan	Hastert	Petri
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Camp	Hayes	Porter
Canady	Hayworth	Portman
Castle	Hefley	Pryce
Chabot	Heineman	Quillen
Chambliss	Herger	Quinn
Chenoweth	Hilleary	Radanovich
Christensen	Hobson	Ramstad
Chrysler	Hoekstra	Regula
Clinger	Hoke	Riggs
Coble	Horn	Roberts
Coburn	Hostettler	Rogers
Collins (GA)	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Combest	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooley	Hutchinson	Roth
Cox	Hyde	Royce
Crane	Inglis	Salmon
Crapo	Istook	Sanford
Cremeans	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Cunningham	Jones	Schaefer
Davis	Kasich	Schiff
DeLay	Kelly	Seastrand
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Dickey	King	Shadegg
Doolittle	Kingston	Shaw
Dornan	Klug	Shuster
Dreier	Knollenberg	Skeen
Dunn	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Ehrlich	Largent	Smith (WA)
Emerson	Latham	Solomon
English	Lazio	Souder
Ensign	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Ewing	Lightfoot	Stockman
Fawell	Linder	Stump
Fields (TX)	Livingston	Talent
Flanagan	LoBiondo	Tate
Foley	Longley	Tauzin
Forbes	Lucas	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	Manzullo	Thomas
Fox	Martini	Thornberry
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Tiahrt
Franks (NJ)	McDade	Upton
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Vucanovich
Frisa	McInnis	Waldholtz
Funderburk	McIntosh	Walker
Gallely	McKeon	Walsh
Ganske	McNulty	Wamp
Gekas	Metcalf	Watts (OK)
Geren	Meyers	Weldon (FL)
Gilchrest	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Weller
Gilman	Molinar	White
Goodlatte	Moorhead	Whitfield
Goss	Myers	Wicker
Graham	Myrick	Wolf
Greenwood	Nethercutt	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Neumann	Young (FL)
Gutknecht	Norwood	Zeliff
Hall (TX)	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Hancock	Oxley	Zimmer
Hansen	Packard	

NOT VOTING—5

Becerra	Lewis (GA)	Pickett
Lantos	McCollum	

□ 2127

Mr. HOUGHTON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DIXON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: At the end of title II (page 12, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 204. READINESS CERTIFICATION.

Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile defense programs may not exceed the amount made available for national missile programs for fiscal year 1995 until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Congress that the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, and structured and are ready to carry out assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to title 2. This afternoon I had the opportunity to speak on the telephone to a friend of mine from Jefferson City, MO, Bob Hyder, who shared with me that 50 years ago today, as an American frogman, he went to the beaches of Iwo Jima to prepare that island for an attack by the American forces. Bob Hyder, besides being courageous, was fully trained, and ready, and competent at what he did.

This evening I appear here in support of the finest in America, those who wear the uniform of the United States, the men and women who lay their lives on the line, if that be the case.

Members should realize that I speak for a strong national defense. Members should realize, particularly my friends on the other side of the aisle, that I have not made myself overly popular in the White House as a result of a recent budget proposal which exceeds that of the administration by some \$44 billion because in my opinion we need more funds for readiness for those in uniform.

I speak on this amendment which would require that before there is an increase in spending for accelerated development and deployment of a national missile defense, the Secretary of Defense must certify to Congress, to us, that the armed forces are properly sized, equipped, and structured and fully ready; that is the readiness issue; to carry out assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

The national military strategy is set forth in the bottom-up review. It has been our strategy for at least 2 years, and we should understand fully what it is. The national military strategy calls for us having the capability to fight, to win 2 nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts such as a Desert Storm and a defense of South Korea.

That is our national military strategy.

That is why I have said before, and I say again, that we must do a better job in funding the young men and women to carry out this strategy for our country.

What this amendment does limits the amount for the national military defense, as opposed to theater defense, to this same amount that was expended and authorized in 1995. That sum is \$400 million. It keeps it at that level for 1 year. It is a very simple amendment.

I think that we should understand that we need to put our funds into

readiness and into the troops. I visited field commands, I have spoken with military personnel and their families from our country both here in the continental United States and abroad, and let me share with my colleagues that, although our nation possesses the most able military force in the world, our country is at a crossroads in readiness. We should not ignore these signs. We do so at the peril of the young man and young woman wearing the American uniform.

Some units are reporting a C-3 in training. Exercises have been canceled. Quality of life has been degraded. The increased load of peacekeeping, humanitarian relief and forward presence have stretched our military so very thin. As we debate this tonight, young men and young women in uniform are in Guantanamo, Alaska, South Korea, Macedonia, Germany, elsewhere in this globe, standing tall for us. We should not degrade the readiness, the quality of life, the equipment and the modernization for them one iota.

That is why we should keep, that is why we should keep, the figure at \$400 million as a cap for 1 year. We need to do more for the readiness of our troops.

I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will understand this issue and that we will ask that the Secretary of Defense certify to us that this national military strategy can be performed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. SKELTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKELTON. All it says, Mr. Chairman, is that the Secretary of Defense certify to us, to my colleagues and I, that the armed forces are properly sized, equipped and structured to carry out this national military strategy which is a major undertaking. This is not pie-in-the-sky. This is our strategy. It is our design for 2 years. It is being strained at the seams, and that is why we should pass this amendment, because it puts the troops first, it allows national missile defense research, it allows \$400 million a year. Let us not take that money from readiness, from fixing the refrigerators and the roofs for the day care centers, for the equipment, for the backed-up backlogs of materiel for the spare parts shortage. That is why we are today.

□ 2140

Consequently, I urge quite sincerely that we adopt this amendment, because it is reasonable, it is fair, and it stands tall for the troops of the United States of America.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. SPENCE to the Amendment Offered by Mr. SKELTON:

Strike out all after "SEC." in the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment and insert the following:

204. BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE AS A COMPONENT OF MILITARY READINESS.

(a) USE OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 FUNDS.—Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile defense programs may exceed the amount made available for national missile programs for fiscal year 1995.

(b) FINDINGS.—In carrying out program execution of national missile defense programs using funds appropriated for fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Defense shall consider the following findings by Congress:

(1) A critical component of military readiness is whether the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, structured, and ready to carry out assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on February 22, 1994, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that "modernization is the key to future readiness and it is the only way to provide our next generation with an adequate defense".

(3) Given the growing ballistic missile threat, the deployment of affordable, highly effective national and theater missile defense systems is an essential objective of a defense modernization program that adequately supports the requirements of the national military strategy.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings in subsection (b), it is the sense of Congress that an effective national and theater missile defense capability is essential to ensuring that United States Armed Forces are ready to meet current and expected threats to United States national security.

Mr. SPENCE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is not germane to the amendment that is presently pending. This amendment will completely turn around the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri and make it completely inoperative. It will also provide actually that the amendment previously adopted by the House by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] would be obviated, and therefore I feel that it is not in order. It is basically a game that is being played by the majority to try to rid themselves of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would indicate that comments should be confined to the point of order.

Mr. VOLKMER. Fine. Mr. Chairman, this is an obvious attempt to do just the opposite of what the gentleman from Missouri's amendment proposes to do, and also to reinstate the language of the bill basically as it was before the Spratt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] seek to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is incorrect in his point of order, period. It does not. The germaneness question is up to the Chair, but it is germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] limits obligations of funds for fiscal year 1996 for missile defense to the level of such obligations for fiscal year 1995 until such time as the Secretary of Defense renders a specified readiness certification.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] permits obligations of funds for fiscal year 1996 for missile defense to exceed the level of such obligations for fiscal year 1995 on the basis of legislative findings concerning readiness. The amendment and the amendment thereto share a common subject. Each proposition addresses the relationship between 1996 funding levels for missile defense and readiness.

The amendment and the amendment thereto also are alike in both purpose and method. Each proposition seeks to enhance missile defense without impairing readiness. Although the two propositions may reflect differing perspective as to what constitutes readiness, each bears a germane relationship to the other.

The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and the point of order is overruled.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, needless to say, I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. I always have.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and I are friends. We have been for a long time. We have both labored in the same vineyard. I have tremendous respect for the gentleman. We are both dedicated to providing the best kind of defense we can provide for this country. I have tried to accommodate the gentleman and the committee on other occasions in pursuit of the gentleman's views.

But I have to say that no one in this body is more concerned about readiness than I am. I will say that to the gentleman or anybody else. This issue, if

you remember, was raised by this Member the latter part of last year, and indeed some of the things the gentleman quoted in his remarks came from the report that we issued.

I take no back seat to anyone on this Earth to the readiness of our Armed Forces. All I am simply saying in my amendment to the gentleman's amendment is that we also consider missile defense and other modernization things as part of readiness, as they indeed are.

No one can say that modernization is not a part of readiness. All of our leaders tell us, that is readiness. That is a matter of life or death. The readiness will depend on our modernization.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo the comments of our chairman about our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. No one has ever questioned his integrity when it comes to the support of our troops, and his leadership in coming up with the budget that is in fact very thoughtful and looks at increasing defense spending over 5 years by \$44 billion is a tremendous help in this debate to move the problems that we have with our military forces, and we thank the gentleman for that.

We are in agreement that readiness and acquisition and modernization are key issues. The key thing is that we do not think that we have to jeopardize readiness to support missile defense. We would hope that the leadership would come back to us and tell us how we can do it together.

We have made the arguments that in fact there are areas of the defense budget where we have to take money that is being spent on nondefense categories. The gentleman's budget is in fact based on the fact that we would take \$2 billion a year from the almost \$20 billion a year that we are currently spending on nondefense items. We think we can take more. \$13 billion for environmental costs.

□ 2150

Some \$4.7 billion for add-ons that the Pentagon never requested, that are not important to our national security, that were added in; \$3 billions of which could be questioned regarding defense conversion. And then look at the savings from acquisition reform and from the base closing savings that should occur.

We are not necessarily arguing one against the other. We are saying we can do both. We want to work with the

gentleman. We want to work with the administration.

If it means we have to raise the top line for defense, then so be it. But we are not talking about big numbers. We are talking about, first of all, cutting into the 361-percent increase in nondefense spending. While we all agree with cancer research, should the Department of Defense fund the bulk of it? Should the Department of Defense be asked to pay for programs that should be funded through the Committee on Commerce, through Transportation, through Public Works?

What we are saying is, let us spend the defense budget on defense. And if we do that, we will have enough money to up the readiness accounts. We will be able to recapture that \$9 billion in the acquisition accounts that we lost just in 1 year. But we will also be able to work with the administration on the beginnings of their missile defense program.

We think we can have both, and we want to work with the gentleman on the budget that he put together as a first step because it certainly is a move in the right direction.

I support the amendment of our chairman, and I urge our colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend, and I have a lot of affection for our friend from Missouri also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPENCE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we need balance. The key is balance.

In 1987, a number of members of this committee wrote to the Israeli Defense Minister and said, you can defend against air attacks. You can defend against land attacks. But you have no defense against missiles.

Their response has been to build the Arrow missile that will shoot down incoming ballistic missiles coming into Israel. They did not hesitate, because they knew that was an important part of national security.

We have the ability to repel land attacks. We have the ability to repel naval attacks. We have the ability to repel bomber attacks. We have no defense at all against incoming ballistic missiles.

I say to my friend, who is on the Procurement Subcommittee with me, that this subcommittee will pass out a bigger, better, more efficient modernization budget than the President has proposed us. So modernization will not go begging. I know readiness will not go

begging. I know research and development will not go begging.

We need a balanced approach. That is why the chairman's amendment is appropriate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of our Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I regret that I was not here for the earlier debate when this issue arose, but I thoroughly support the gentleman's amendment at this point.

I think it is important that we not tie our hands with the amount of money that we spend on missile defense. There are only a couple of threats that the American people are faced with. We are not going to get an invasion from the sea or from land or even from space. But the fact is that we could get that rogue missile coming in to the United States from Mu'amar Qadhafi or Saddam Hussein or some other character around the world who thinks that he will get to Valhalla a little bit faster when he lobs a big one on New York.

We cannot defend against that. That is insane.

So what is the President of the United States telling us today? In order to defend against that, we are going to cut spending on missile defense. We are going to start going to Geneva and negotiate with the Russians to limit the size, the lethality, the speed of our missile defenses.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the gentleman's amendment and the defeat of the previous one.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY AS A SUBSTITUTE; FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: At the end of title II (Page 12, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 204. READINESS CERTIFICATION.

Of the total amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, the amount obligated for national missile defense programs may not exceed the amount made available for national missile defense programs for fiscal year 1995 until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Congress that the Armed Forces are properly sized, equipped, and structured and are ready to carry out assigned missions as required by the national military strategy.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] for 5 minutes in support of his substitute.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute to the Skelton amendment in order to make a tech-

nical correction of the underlying amendment before us tonight, to limit fiscal 1996 spending on national missile defense to fiscal year 1995 spending levels on our national missile defense effort.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the substitute would make certain that we spend for national missile defense an amount of money that is both sufficient to continue to develop that program and not so much that it threatens our readiness.

I strongly support the efforts of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] to ensure that the readiness of our troops is of paramount importance for our national security.

In order to ensure that they are ready, we must make sure, Mr. Chairman, that they have the right equipment, that they have the proper personnel that are serving in our forces. And this is a difficult job to have readiness.

We have talked about it tonight. We certainly cannot afford to spend less money on these essential elements of our readiness.

Mr. Chairman, my substitute ensures that we are using the proper measure to gauge the appropriate level of funding for national missile defense. And this is the key to it. If we have full funding for our readiness needs, then we can spend more money on missile defense. If we do not have full funding for readiness, then the national missile defense program will have to get by on \$400 million.

In effect, what we are saying is that we have got to do readiness first and then if we have any money left over, then we can increase the \$400 million. That is why it is a substitute to the Skelton amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Montgomery substitute.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS to the amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert "housed," after "equipped,"

□ 2200

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is an ardent proponent of quality of life, and I am sure that in his amendment he inadvertently left out the term "housing." This gentleman's perfecting amendment simply includes the term "housing" so that it

is very clear that he is also talking about the quality of life.

With that brief explanation, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman. I did leave that out about housing. I think this is a good perfecting amendment, and I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this would be a good time to put the question on the Spence amendment. If it fails, another perfecting amendment would be in order.

Is there further debate on the Spence amendment?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELLUMS. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The debate is now occurring on the Spence amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Four amendments are pending. The first one to receive a vote is the Spence amendment to the Skelton amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, and he is my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman, offered an amendment to mine which, as a result of the amendments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the substitute and perfecting amendments, brings us back for all intents and purposes on a vote on my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand there are those that do not wish to vote on my amendment, because it places those at the crossroads of choosing readiness for the troops or for national defense missiles. The choice is clear. We should look out for the troops. We should vote for my amendment or the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the perfecting amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for that is the same as mine.

Mr. Chairman, let us take up for those in uniform tonight as they stand guard for our interests.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is a person of great comity and likes to get along with everybody.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that there are endeavors going on right now by the majority to try to get an amendment in order after the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] in order to change it around.

What concerns me about this whole thing is the gentleman had a very sim-

ple amendment, straightforward. Now we have started on this progress, and Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say it, and I have not taken much time tonight, but we are going to spend a whole bunch of that 10 hours on this little game that is being played. That is what it is, a big game that is being played.

Instead of letting the gentleman from Missouri have his amendment and have it be voted on, straight up-or-down, then we have an amendment to it, and the gentleman from Mississippi offered basically the same thing, to try and get that straight vote.

Now we are going to try and get another amendment, so we never get that vote. I just wanted to let the gentleman from Missouri know what kinds of games they are playing.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I speak strongly in favor of the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. It includes housing. What is more important than taking care of our troops? I think that is very, very important. I thank him for that perfecting amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spence amendment and against the other pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to understand what we are doing here. I agree with the gentleman, if he wants a straight shot on his amendment, because I think his amendment is fatally defective in the same way that the Edwards amendment was fatally defective. It removes balance from our defense structure.

I want to tell the Members what we are doing here. The Bush administration, including Dick Cheney and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, put together before President Bush left office an outline of the defense spending pattern they would have followed, that they thought was prudent.

The Clinton administration has cut 80 percent of the national missile defense money out of the Bush baseline. They have cut it by 80 percent. That is not adequate to continue with decent funding for research and development. It is not adequate to bring the scientists from our National Laboratories and from DOD and ask them what we can do.

If Members vote yes on the Skelton amendment, on basis that Members want to help readiness, they have done exactly what President Clinton wants them to do. He is forcing us to shop off two important aspects of national defense against each other. He has done that by cutting \$127 billion out of the defense budget.

Let me just say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement, I am going to be voting and putting together

a Chairman's mark that is much higher than President Clinton's, so don't worry, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] who I respect greatly, he will have a higher modernization budget.

The gentleman from Virginia I feel surely will present a better readiness budget than what President Clinton has offered us, so do not let them shop off two important aspects of defense against each other. Vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, and vote for the amendment of the chairman, and Members will be offering a balanced defense budget.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to my great friend and general.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, what is wrong with trying to help the troops and improve conditions for them? That is all our amendments do. I am really surprised that the gentleman is opposed to it.

We are saying if the missile systems run over a certain amount in 1995, that they will have to go into readiness. Then if the money is there, the gentleman can move ahead with missile defense.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me offer my general a lieutenant's perspective. It is very important to have the security of your loved ones at home in good shape because you have a national missile defense. That is important to the Israelis, it is important to the British, and it should be important to American soldiers.

There are a lot of aspects of readiness. One aspect of morale is having good protection of your family at home in their community. I think most American service people would feel good about their family in Mississippi or their family in San Diego or Chicago being protected against a rogue missile attack, and I think they would be very upset about the idea that somehow the defense budget had that aspect of defense cut out of it so we could have more money for readiness.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] said tonight, and he understands readiness and understands the troops, when he said American soldiers, some of them are on food stamps, the housing is no good, and I am really kind of surprised that the lieutenant would have any problem with that.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to tell the general that the cavalry has arrived. It is a Republican majority and we are going to increase the defense budget as well as national defense.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman really see anything wrong with all of our troops being ready to fulfill the national military

strategy as set forth in the Bottom-Up Review? That is all in the world I want.

Mr. HUNTER. I will answer my friend in this way. First, we have numerous reports from the field and from some of the leadership itself in the DOD that the Clinton defense budget has slashed readiness, but second, I think that question is akin to saying "Would you as an infantry commander want to certify that you have a perfect defense against machinegun fire before you do anything against mortars?"

We need balance. A national missile defense is an important part of that balance. I think it is foolhardy for us to foreclose missile defense until we get a certification from some other aspect of defense.

Once again, we will increase the Clinton readiness budget, I assure the gentleman, so we are going to do more than the President has offered.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree that we need balance. I am one Member on this side of the aisle who supported the balanced budget amendment, which most of the Members on the gentleman's side did, too. We need to make some tough choices.

We cannot have everything. We cannot fully fund every single line item in the defense budget. My choice is for these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

□ 2210

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], I am not sure what this amendment does, if it really does anything.

You say if it is not certified by the Secretary of Defense that we are ready. And what does he do every time he comes before our committee? He certifies that we are ready.

We know that we are not ready. The gentleman cited the litany of deficits that we have and yet every time the Secretary of Defense comes down there, he says we are ready.

The reason he says that is because the Commander in Chief tells him to say we are ready because the Commander in Chief wants a certain level.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. When Les Aspin was before us, when he was Secretary of Defense and we asked him about the Bottom-Up Review if it came out of the air or if it was a threat assessment, he looked at the ceiling a minute, and he said, "Well, it really came out of the air."

Then when we got the Bottom-Up Review finished, we discovered that it complied with his initial estimates of that. So they are going to certify that we are ready, so I do not know what good this amendment does.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, in closing let me say to my friends, this cuts the President Bush, Powell and Cheney baseline for national missile defense by 80 percent, and this vote, if you vote for Skelton, will lock in that 80 percent cut. Vote no on all of the amendments pending except for the chairman's amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote. Under rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the following recorded votes if there is no intervening debate or business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—221

Allard	Coble	Ganske
Andrews	Coburn	Gekas
Archer	Collins (GA)	Gilchrest
Armey	Combest	Gillmor
Bachus	Cooley	Gilman
Baker (CA)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (LA)	Cramer	Goss
Ballenger	Crane	Graham
Barr	Crapo	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Cremeans	Gunderson
Bartlett	Cubin	Gutknecht
Barton	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Bass	Davis	Hancock
Bateman	DeLay	Hansen
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Bilbray	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bliley	Dornan	Hefley
Blute	Dreier	Heineman
Boehlert	Duncan	Henger
Boehner	Dunn	Hillery
Bonilla	Ehlers	Hobson
Bono	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Brownback	Emerson	Hoke
Bryant (TN)	English	Horn
Bunn	Ensign	Hostettler
Bunning	Everett	Houghton
Burr	Ewing	Hunter
Buyer	Fawell	Hutchinson
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Hyde
Calvert	Flanagan	Inglis
Camp	Foley	Istook
Canady	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Castle	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Fox	Jones
Chambliss	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Chenoweth	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Christensen	Frisa	Kim
Chrysler	Funderburk	King
Clinger	Galgely	Kingston

Knollenberg	Norwood	Smith (NJ)
Kolbe	Nussle	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Largent	Packard	Solomon
Latham	Paxon	Souder
LaTourette	Pombo	Spence
Lazio	Portman	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Pryce	Stockman
Lewis (KY)	Quillen	Stump
Lightfoot	Quinn	Talent
Linder	Radanovich	Tate
Livingston	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
LoBiondo	Regula	Thomas
Longley	Riggs	Thornberry
Lucas	Roberts	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Rogers	Torkildsen
Martini	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Waldholtz
McCrery	Roth	Walker
McDade	Roukema	Walsh
McHugh	Royce	Wamp
McInnis	Salmon	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Metcalfe	Scarborough	Weller
Meyers	Schaefer	White
Mica	Schiff	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Seastrand	Wicker
Molinaro	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Moorhead	Shadeegg	Young (AK)
Myers	Shaw	Young (FL)
Myrick	Shuster	Zeliff
Nethercutt	Skeen	Zimmer
Neumann	Smith (MI)	

NOES—204

Abercrombie	Geren	Moran
Ackerman	Gibbons	Morella
Baesler	Gonzalez	Murtha
Baldacci	Goodling	Nadler
Barcia	Gordon	Neal
Barrett (WI)	Green	Ney
Beilenson	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Bentsen	Hall (OH)	Obey
Berman	Hamilton	Olver
Bevill	Harman	Ortiz
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Orton
Bonior	Hayes	Owens
Borski	Hefner	Pallone
Boucher	Hilliard	Parker
Brewster	Hinchey	Pastor
Browder	Holden	Payne (NJ)
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Peterson (FL)
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Petri
Chapman	Johnson, E. B.	Pickett
Clayton	Johnston	Pomeroy
Clement	Kanjorski	Porter
Clyburn	Kaptur	Poshard
Coleman	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Condit	Kennelly	Reed
Conyers	Kildee	Reynolds
Costello	Kleczka	Richardson
Coyne	Klink	Rivers
Danner	Klug	Roemer
de la Garza	LaFalce	Rose
Deal	Laughlin	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Leach	Rush
DeLauro	Levin	Sabo
Dellums	Lincoln	Sanders
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dicks	Lofgren	Schroeder
Dingell	Lowe	Schumer
Dixon	Luther	Scott
Doggett	Maloney	Serrano
Dooley	Manton	Shays
Doyle	Markey	Sisisky
Durbin	Martinez	Skaggs
Edwards	Mascara	Skelton
Engel	Matsui	Slaughter
Eshoo	McCarthy	Spratt
Evans	McDermott	Stenholm
Farr	McHale	Stokes
Fattah	McKinney	Studds
Fazio	McNulty	Stupak
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Tanner
Filner	Meek	Tauzin
Flake	Menendez	Taylor (MS)
Foglietta	Mfume	Tejeda
Ford	Miller (CA)	Thompson
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Thornton
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Torres
Frost	Mink	Torricelli
Furse	Moakley	Towns
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Trafcant
Gephardt	Montgomery	Tucker

Upton	Ward	Wilson
Velazquez	Waters	Wise
Vento	Watt (NC)	Woolsey
Visclosky	Waxman	Wyden
Volkmer	Williams	Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	Collins (IL)	Stark
Burton	Lantos	Thurman
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Yates

□ 2228

Messrs. BISHOP, NEY, and LAUGHLIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2230

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], as amended.

The perfecting amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, but I think Members on both sides of the aisle, especially the freshmen Members on both sides of the aisle, better realize what they are getting ready to do if they vote against the Montgomery-Dellums substitute.

Now, if this situation comes up, it boils down to this: If you want to protect readiness and you want our troops to have decent living quarters, if you want to have them off of food stamps, then you will vote aye on the Montgomery-Dellums substitute.

If you are determined to increase the spending on missiles and star wars, then you ought to vote no. But I tell you, you are making a mistake if you do not support the Montgomery substitute that looks after the troops of this country, and that is what we are trying to do. We are not going Democrat or Republican. We are trying to look after the human beings that represent this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an aye vote on the Montgomery substitute.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us make this very clear. The Montgomery amendment is the exact opposite of the Spence amendment that we just voted on. It essentially guts the Spence amendment. It cuts national missile defense by 80 percent below the baseline that was set by Secretary Chaney and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Colin Powell. As much as we love our friend from Mississippi, this would absolutely

cut what we have just done. So if you voted "yes" on Spence, vote "no" on this amendment, the Montgomery amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is probably no one who helped me more than three Democrat Members, especially when I was a freshman and sophomore Member of this House, than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the gentleman from Mississippi, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell Members something: This whole debate is about how we are going to cut readiness in the future. That totally detracts from what the readiness is today. It is lousy. I spent the last 4 years of my life fighting on this side of the aisle the liberal leadership that has been gutting defense and cutting readiness levels, time after time after time again. I take a look at the Bottom-Up Review, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] said "Don't you support the Bottom-Up Review?"

Remember history, my friend. The Bottom-Up Review came up after the President cut defense \$177 billion, and was there to justify that \$177 billion cut that gutted defense and gutted readiness.

I look at Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, and Mandela given billions of dollars and Russia billions of dollars that deducted away from defense. I take a look at the A-6's and F-14's. Kara Holtgreen, the first female naval aviator, I pinned on her wings, was killed, and they are looking at it, because of an F-100 engine that stalled in Desert Storm, and we could not replace them because we did not have the money to replace the engines. The first female F-14 pilot. And you are talking about readiness now?

Mr. Chairman, we have air wings that are not flying right now, today. Navy fighter weapons school top gun did not fly against his class because he did not have the fuel to fly against one class. The Navy lost five airplanes in the last 2 weeks, Mr. Chairman. An Air Force general lost his son, who was a good friend of mine. And when I hear that we are fighting to cut readiness, I look at today. I hate it with a passion, the same liberals that culled us in Vietnam. The same type of nonsupport.

All we are asking to do is to have the support of the readiness that we want, and in the past we have not been able to do that. This side of the aisle, time after time and time again has prevented us from doing that. And I take a look at operation Proud Deep, in which we lost a lot of good friends. I still bear the scars from it, because we did not have the support of this body, and I still bear the pain of that.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, Mr. HUNTER, has stated we are going to plus-up readiness with him as the chairman of procurement. We are going to do that. We are going to do what you and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] have not been able to do with the liberal leadership of this party.

□ 2240

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. MFUME, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in the moment that we have remaining, I would suggest that we join together in opposing the Dellums-Montgomery substitute in order to support our colleague on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, surely the distinguished gentleman did not mean to suggest by his comments, which are now public record, that President Nelson Mandela is responsible for readiness or the lack thereof of our armed services.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not. I say it is all part of the problem that we are taking away from the readiness of this country by devoting billions of dollars to foreign countries, and it is causing the lives of our people right now.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I understand the gentleman named countries, but in this particular case, lifted the name of President Mandela as if he were responsible somehow. This gentleman seeks clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has expired.

The question is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 225, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—203

Abercrombie	Hall (OH)	Parker
Ackerman	Hamilton	Pastor
Baesler	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hayes	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Hinchey	Petri
Berman	Holden	Pickett
Bevill	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Porter
Bonior	Jacobs	Poshard
Borski	Jefferson	Rahall
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Brewster	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Richardson
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rivers
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Chapman	Kennelly	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kildee	Rush
Clement	Klecza	Sabo
Clyburn	Klink	Sanders
Coleman	Klug	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Schroeder
Condit	Laughlin	Schumer
Conyers	Leach	Scott
Costello	Levin	Serrano
Coyne	Lincoln	Shays
Danner	Lipinski	Sisisky
de la Garza	Lofgren	Skaggs
Deal	Lowe	Skelton
DeFazio	Luther	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney	Spratt
Dellums	Manton	Stark
Deutsch	Markey	Stenholm
Dicks	Martinez	Stokes
Dingell	Mascara	Studds
Dixon	Matsui	Stupak
Doggett	McCarthy	Tanner
Dooley	McDermott	Tauzin
Doyle	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McKinney	Tejeda
Edwards	McNulty	Thompson
Engel	Meehan	Thornton
Eshoo	Meek	Thurman
Evans	Menendez	Torres
Farr	Mfume	Torricelli
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Towns
Fazio	Mineta	Traficant
Fields (LA)	Minge	Tucker
Filner	Mink	Upton
Flake	Moakley	Velazquez
Foglietta	Mollohan	Vento
Ford	Montgomery	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Moran	Volkmer
Franks (NJ)	Morella	Ward
Frost	Murtha	Waters
Furse	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gejdenson	Neal	Waxman
Gephardt	Oberstar	Williams
Geren	Obey	Wilson
Gibbons	Olver	Wise
Gonzalez	Ortiz	Woolsey
Gordon	Orton	Wyden
Green	Owens	Wynn
Gutierrez	Pallone	

NOES—225

Allard	Bunn	Cubin
Andrews	Bunning	Cunningham
Archer	Burr	Davis
Armey	Burton	DeLay
Bachus	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Baker (CA)	Callahan	Dickey
Baker (LA)	Calvert	Doolittle
Ballenger	Camp	Dornan
Barr	Canady	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Duncan
Bartlett	Chabot	Dunn
Barton	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bass	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Bateman	Christensen	Emerson
Bereuter	Chrysler	English
Bilbray	Clinger	Ensign
Bilirakis	Coble	Everett
Bliley	Coburn	Ewing
Blute	Collins (GA)	Fawell
Boehlert	Combest	Fields (TX)
Boehner	Cooley	Flanagan
Bonilla	Cox	Foley
Bono	Cramer	Forbes
Browder	Crane	Fowler
Brownback	Crapo	Fox
Bryant (TN)	Creameans	Franks (CT)

Frelinghuysen	Latham	Roth
Frisa	LaTourette	Roukema
Funderburk	Lazio	Royce
Galleghy	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Ganske	Lewis (KY)	Sanford
Gekas	Lightfoot	Saxton
Gilchrest	Linder	Scarborough
Gillmor	Livingston	Schaefer
Gilman	LoBiondo	Schiff
Goodlatte	Longley	Seastrand
Goodling	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Goss	Manzullo	Shadegg
Graham	Martini	Shaw
Greenwood	McCollum	Shuster
Gunderson	McCrery	Skeen
Gutknecht	McDade	Smith (MI)
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Hancock	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Hansen	McIntosh	Smith (WA)
Hastert	McKeon	Solomon
Hastings (WA)	Metcaif	Souder
Hayworth	Meyers	Spence
Hefley	Mica	Stearns
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Stockman
Herger	Molinari	Stump
Hilleary	Moorhead	Talent
Hobson	Myers	Tate
Hoekstra	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Hoke	Nethercutt	Thomas
Horn	Neumann	Thornberry
Hostettler	Ney	Tiahrt
Houghton	Norwood	Torkildsen
Hunter	Nussle	Vucanovich
Hutchinson	Oxley	Waldholtz
Hyde	Packard	Walker
Inglis	Paxon	Walsh
Istook	Pombo	Wamp
Johnson (CT)	Portman	Watts (OK)
Johnson, Sam	Pryce	Weldon (FL)
Jones	Quillen	Weldon (PA)
Kasich	Quinn	Weller
Kelly	Radanovich	White
Kim	Ramstad	Whitfield
King	Regula	Wicker
Kingston	Riggs	Wolf
Knollenberg	Roberts	Young (AK)
Kolbe	Rogers	Young (FL)
LaHood	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
Largent	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra	Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Lantos	Yates

□ 2256

Mr. BROWDER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment, as amended, offered as a substitute for the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

□ 2300

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Members please clear the aisles and take their conversations out of the Chamber.

Will Members on this side please clear the aisles and take your conversations out of the Chamber.

For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the committee, seek recognition?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we are waiting to see if we have another amendment right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Will Members please clear the aisles.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Is all this dead time coming out of the 10 hours for which we have to debate this important issue?

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact it is, and that is why the Chair is trying to get order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SEN-SENBRENNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 7 in the Committee of the Whole: subject to the 10-hour overall consideration limit in the rule, the following amendments be considered in the following order, with these amendments and all amendments thereto debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed:

Title III: Hefley No. 5 for 10 minutes; Harman amendment No. 1 or Menendez amendment No. 2 for 20 minutes;

Title IV: Leach amendment No. 32 for 20 minutes;

Title V: amendments No. 13, 21, 24, 30, or 33, or a germane modification of one of those amendments for 45 minutes;

Johnson amendment No. 31 for 5 minutes;

Title VI: Durbin amendment No. 22 or Gilman amendment No. 23 for 10 minutes;

Bateman amendment No. 8 for 5 minutes;

amendment No. 20, 28, or 43 for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that was not mentioned by the gentleman and I want to ensure that my amendment has the right to be offered.