United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1997 No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 23, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 363. An act to amend section 2118 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to extend the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination Program.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] for 5 minutes.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA NOT DESERVED

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the debate about granting most-favored-nation status to China is not just about trade, it is about human rights. We in the United States place great value on our freedoms. The freedom of speech and the freedom to practice religion are ideals on which our country was founded.

The United States is the greatest, freest nation in the world. We enjoy the status, and yet we continue to support the oppressive Chinese Government through trade. This is not right.

The Government of the People's Republic of China is one of the most oppressive governments in the world. We have all seen footage of the terrible massacre in Tiananmen Square. Unfortunately, such massacres are hardly rare occurrences in China.

The Chinese people suffer horrible violations of their basic human rights every day. Citizens have been arrested for crimes such as signing petitions to protect human rights and speaking out peacefully in favor of democracy. Thousands of those arrested for supporting democracy or human rights become political prisoners in Chinese jails where they are beaten and tortured.

To make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, China's human rights violations extend well beyond the political realm. The Chinese people are often arrested as criminals simply for holding religious beliefs. The government continues to increase its persecution of evangelicals, Protestants, Buddhists, and Roman Catholics who choose to worship independently from the government-controlled church, a church that does not recognize the Pope.

Hundreds of Protestants and Roman Catholics were detained last year for practicing their faith. Forty Roman Catholics, for example, were arrested by police officers during Easter celebrations, and many of them were beaten. The police in China have conducted raids on nunneries and monasteries, detaining and torturing many of these people of God.

Furthermore, the Chinese Government maintains a policy of forced abortions and sterilizations. The government is not only killing supporters of freedom and religion, it is killing innocent babies.

As a man of deep religious faith and as a citizen of the United States, I cannot stand for this. By continuing to grant most-favored-nation status to China, the United States is bolstering an oppressive government that is constantly violating the basic human rights of its people.

Most-favored-nation status for China also bolsters a government that works against America's national security interests. Evidence suggests that the Chinese Government is heavily involved in missile and weapons technology transfers to Iran, one of our enemies. This is not a practice that the United States should support in any way.

A recent Louis Harris poll shows that 67 percent of Americans are opposed to renewing China's MFN status. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. A recent Louis Harris poll shows that 67 percent of the American people are opposed to renewing China's MFN status.

As representatives of the people, I believe that Congress should follow the will of the people and revoke this status. It is high time that we follow the will of the people of America and send a real message to the Chinese Government. For the sake of democracy, religious freedom, the lives of the good people of China, and America's national security, I urge my colleagues to vote against renewing most-favored-nation status for the oppressive Chinese Government.

B–2 BOMBER NECESSARY FOR NATION'S DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following contains an executive summary and overall report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TIME LIMIT OF INVOLVEMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA NECESSARY

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

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

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

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

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

Unfortunately, the President failed, before sending our troops there, to outline our goals specifically that our military had to achieve before they could safely leave. We went in there with an ill-defined mission. A well-defined exit strategy based on the achievement of a set of tactical goals has been lacking from the start. Now the President, after breaking his promise to have them out by the end of the year, has extended the deployment at least 18 months from the promised 1-year deadline.

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

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATION PREVENTING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS NECESSARY

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

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

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