

first is freedom of speech and expression, everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want, everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear, anywhere in the world.

My friends and colleagues, we still have a distance to travel on this journey of equality and justice for all.

I heard a young man in church recently say to the congregation in the words of Frederick Douglass who said, When we are noted for enterprise, industry and success, we shall no longer have any hurdles in our quest to achieve civil rights for all.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of this Nation will continue to recognize the works of King, Tubman, Douglass and Lincoln who have done so much to help others. Not it is time that we as a Nation do all we can to ensure that their records are emulated and their contribution will never be forgotten.

□ 2230

THE DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will hopefully not take the entire hour this evening.

My topic this evening is the defense of our country, and as a 9-year member of the National Security Committee, formerly the Armed Services Committee, and current chairman of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, I would like to focus on three specific items relative to our national defense. The first will be our budget and the current conflict in Washington over how much money we should spend on our military over the next 5 years, and especially this next fiscal year. The second will be missile defense, where we are going in terms of protecting this country, and our troops from a missile attack. The third will be a problem I see emerging in terms of arms sales that the Clinton administration has not yet addressed.

Before I get into the budget numbers, in terms of defense spending, Mr. Speaker, I quote an article today that appeared in two newspapers that I have to share with you and all of our colleagues that outraged me when I read it. It was printed; originally the story ran in the Baltimore Sun, and then was reprinted by the Tampa Tribune in an editorial.

It has to do with the abuse of our current social welfare system. The reason I bring it up during this 1-hour special order on defense is that over the past 10 or 15 years we have heard Member after Member talk about, even the President talk about, expensive toilet seats and hammers that were especially designed materials for use by the

military, and much of that criticism, I might add, was warranted, especially where we did not have good control of our procurement process.

And that is why we have worked on acquisition reform in past sessions, and it is again a priority for this session. But we have seemed to never want to talk about the abuse that occurs in the social welfare state and the spending that has occurred totally out of control over the past 30 years. I pointed out during the debate on the National Security Revitalization Act several weeks ago, over the past 30 years, we have had two wars in America. The first war was the war on poverty declared by Lyndon Johnson which we lost. We spent the taxpayers' money to the extent of \$6 trillion over the past 30 years on social welfare programs, yet we have more impoverished people today than at any time in recent history.

During that same time period the cold war ended. We won that war, and we won that war because of our focus on a strong national defense. The purpose of a strong defense is not to fight wars but, rather, to deter aggression.

During this same time period, we were spending \$6 trillion public dollars on social welfare programs, we spent approximately \$5 trillion on national security and national defense, and I think the best evidence of how successful those dollars were in terms of being spent is that we saw communism fall, the Berlin Wall came down, and democracy break out around the world. Even former Soviet leader Gorbachev stated he just could not keep up with America's defense posture which was the reason why they chose to work toward a democratic state and to begin to dismantle the Russian arsenal which is being done. Some would argue to what extent it is being done. At least, it is being done.

I want to highlight this story, because we need to understand, America, what happens with the tax dollars that we spend, and this is probably as good of an example as you could have. It results from an interview that the Baltimore Sun had with an unemployed family in Lake Providence, LA. This family of nine people qualifies and receives \$46,716 a year in tax-free cash from the Federal Government.

Now, I am not an accountant or a CPA, but I know to get \$46,716 of tax-free cash, you would have to make a lot more money if you were paying ordinary tax rates.

I am reluctant to mention the name of this family, but it has been reported in both the Baltimore Sun and the Tampa Tribune, and the lady who was interviewed evidently had no problem with her name being used, as you will see from some of the quotes. The name is Rosie Watson. Rosie Watson gets \$343.50 a month in disability payments because a judge ruled the she is too stressed out to work. Now, that, in fact, may be legitimate. I am not arguing that point. Her common law hus-

band receives \$343.50 a month also from the Federal Government because he is too fat to work. He weights 386 pounds.

Now, in addition, their seven children, ages 13 to 22, all receive Federal support in the amount of \$458 a month because supposedly they have demonstrated age-appropriate inappropriate behavior so they qualify for this special compensation. Multiplying all of those dollars out, you come to the figure of \$46,716 a year from the Federal Government without having to pay any tax.

In addition, they also receive full medical care and benefits through Medicaid which is not included in that sum of money.

When questioned by the Baltimore Sun about this, she said, and I quote, "I got nothing to hide."

In 1978 she told officials that her second child, at age 4, was a threat to other children and, therefore, she should get compensation for that child. She kept reapplying until, in 1984, the officials agreed that he did have a behavior problem, and the award was granted. But a few years later because of that ruling, she was given a \$10,000 lump sum check to make up for back compensation that she had not been provided for that child. In all, the family has received \$37,000 in retroactive payments. That is above and beyond the \$46,716 each year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for all of our senior citizens out there, they have to remember this is coming out of the Social Security system, yes, even the money for the children is coming out of the Social Security system. After 15 years of relentless applications, Rosie Watson has had all of her children put on these disability payments.

Now, here is a rub: You know, you could see that these payments are supposed to do or are designed to help individuals deal with their disabilities and attempt to get back into the mainstream of society. But the Baltimore Sun went on to ask her what she uses the money for, and she explained how she divvies it up each month, and then she said, and I quote, "One need that she has each month is \$120 in allowances for George, who is 14, David 17, Willie, 18, and Denny, 19. 'Being the age they is and being out there with their little girl friends, they need the money,' she says."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing is not only are we paying this family \$47,000 a year of tax-free Federal money, but that four of the children are getting a monthly allotment of \$120, \$30 each, to be used partly to take care of their girl friends.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an example of what the American people feel is wrong with the social welfare state in this country. Now, we can talk about all the hammers and toilet seats we want, and I can tell you that no department of the Federal Government has more oversight than DoD has right now, but this year and this session it is time to focus on reconfiguring the way

we spend money on social welfare programs, and I am glad that is one of our major items under consideration for reform.

Part of the problem in an era where we have declining dollars available for Federal priorities, one of the areas that has got hit the hardest during the past 5 years has been defense spending, and yet, in fact, in this fiscal year no one can tell us what the right amount is to spend on our national security.

We had the President tell us when he was a candidate for office that he would cut \$60 billion off of defense spending over 5 years from what President Bush had projected. Then when he became the President, he said, "No, I was wrong. I am going to increase that cut to \$128 billion," which he is currently in the process of implementing. Many of us on both sides of the aisle last year and 2 years ago told the President that he was making a grave mistake, that cutting defense spending by \$128 billion over 5 years after four successive years of declining defense budgets would just not be able to be lived up to by the military, and that it was imprudent for him to include that kind of cut in his 5-year budget. But he went ahead and did it.

Now, here this year we have the General Accounting Office coming before Congress and testifying that the President's defense needs, as outlined by the bottom-up review, outlined by Les Aspin when he was Secretary of Defense, are in fact \$150 billion short. So the General Accounting Office is saying we are short \$150 billion over 5 years.

Now, the Congressional Budget Office, which reports to the Congress, last year came up with a figure that we are now using this year showing that the budget over 5 years is between \$60 billion and \$100 billion short.

One of the most respected Democrats in terms of defense posture in this Congress, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has come out with his own budget saying in just this fiscal year alone, our defense needs are \$44 billion short, and, therefore, he wants his colleagues, and all of us on both sides of the aisle, to support the restoration of \$44 billion in defense outlays, I should say, over the next 5 years, so we have three different numbers from three different individuals and groups.

What we would like to think is that we base our defense needs on the realities that are out there, and as we see the potential for conflict, the military leadership would come back to us and tell us what it is in the way of manpower and equipment that they need to deal with those potential conflicts. Unfortunately, for the past 2 years, the budget number that we have been given by the administration, as SAM NUNN has said publicly, was simply pulled out of the air. It was not based on real needs and not based on a real net threat assessment.

This year we are trying to deal with it and solve the dilemma of what is the correct amount of funding in terms of our military for this next fiscal year and for the remaining 4 years of the 5-year budget cycle.

Now, President Clinton stood in this very Chamber in January when he gave the State of the Union Message, and he pounded his fist on the podium directly behind me, and he told the American people as well as all of us that he would not accept any more defense cuts, and those were his exact words. Usually the American people want to believe the President, because what he says we would think in fact is what he was going to do. In fact, when he pounded the desk, we figured he really meant this. He also said he was going to add back in \$25 billion over 5 years, in effect, because there was a need for additional funds.

But we need to look at two things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, this year's defense budget is, in fact, lower than last year's, and the President's cuts are still under way, so his notion about not having any further cuts is really not borne out by the budget he submitted to us.

□ 2240

But more importantly, the administration is really playing a charade with the American people. He said at this podium that he was going to add back \$25 billion of new money. What he did not tell the American people was that \$23 of that \$25 billion would not come into play until after the next presidential election. Now that is pretty convenient. In other words, "Trust me. When I run for reelection, and if I am elected, then I will put back the other \$23 billion of the \$25 billion I promised." None of it is going back in this year. It is coming after, in fact, the President has to run for reelection, assuming he would be reelected.

In fact, over the past 5 years the defense spending for this country has gone down by 25 percent. The single largest decrease in any part of the Federal budget has, in fact, been in support of our military, and I am not saying that some of those cuts were not necessary. In fact many of them I supported. But while we have cut defense spending by 25 percent, what outrages me is the fact that during that same 5-year time period we have increased nondefense spending in the defense budget by 361 percent. What that means is that while we have cut defense spending dramatically, Members of Congress have stuck in items in the defense bill that they could not get funded through normal appropriation channels, and that amount has increased 361 percent and includes such items as, in this year's defense bill, \$13 billion for environmental restoration and cleanup, \$3 billion, some of it for questionable dual use conversion projects, \$4.7 billion for add-ons never requested by the military, never gone

through the authorization process, stuck on by Members of Congress.

So what is really concerning to me is that, while we have cut defense spending by 25 percent, Members of Congress keep adding on more and more programs that in some cases have nothing to do with the military.

Now I happen to be a strong supporter of cancer research. I think it is important that we work to find a cure, but I cannot for the life of me understand why all the cancer research is funded out of the defense bill, and many of those same liberals who question the level of defense spending are the ones who put cancer research in the defense bill. Now that does not make sense. Likewise I think a solution for the problem of AIDS is important, but I cannot understand why tens of millions of dollars for AIDS research are in the defense bill. Four point seven billion dollars of this year's defense bill has nothing to do with defense in terms of requirements by the Pentagon, but rather are priorities identified by individual Members and stuck in defense spending provisions.

Mr. Speaker, this has got to stop. If we are going to be fair with our military, then we need to have a clean budget process. What we need for the military should be that. If we think there are other priorities that should be addressed, they should be paid for through other bills that are worked through the appropriation process.

We also need to make sure that, when this President wants to send our troops overseas, as he has done frequently, that he is willing to stand up and ask us to pay for it. Many of us; in fact, most of us in this body; wanted to have a vote on whether or not our troops should be sent into Haiti. In fact many of us signed resolutions. We wanted to have a clear, up-front debate before the President committed our troops because we were debating this issue for months. We knew he was planning on sending our troops into Haiti. The President did not want us to have that opportunity. In fact, as we know, it was a Sunday evening while we were out of session over a recess that he decided he was going to send our planes down to Haiti, and this was only averted, by the actions of SAM NUNN, Colin Powell, and Jimmy Carter. But in fact the troops did go into Haiti, although it was a peaceful process that they went in under, but the point is we have now spent \$1.5 billion of DOD money on the Haitian operation.

So my point is that while we are continuing to use the defense budget for all these other purposes, Mr. Speaker, we are also using defense money to pay for the President's escapades around the world, not just in Haiti, continued presence in Somalia which every day seems like it was more and more of a waste to keep our troops there, and troops in Macedonia, Bosnia, and now the huge operation in Haiti.

What really offended me when we had the hearings on our Haiti presence was to find out that while our troops are being told that we have less money to spend on them, that we are using our DOD tax dollars to pay the full salaries, benefits, housing costs and travel for non-United States troops, troops from Guatemala, Nepal, Bangladesh. Other countries that President Clinton had to entice into Haiti are being paid with United States DOD tax dollars. To me that is an outrage, especially at a time when we are cutting defense dollars in such a draconian way.

Mr. Speaker, all of these budget cuts that we have imposed on the military and imposed on our national security establishment have forced us to push back further and further the whole issue that is my second topic tonight, and that is the issue of missile defense. This is an extremely important issue, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to focus on very aggressively between now and the end of this session because the facts have not been properly brought out to the American people about the real threat that is out there.

We know that there are Saddam Husseins in the world and the other threats that we have seen and had to face down, but it is harder to understand what the threat is in terms of a ballistic missile attack, whether it be deliberate or accidental, or even a Cruise missile attack. We are going to be focusing on this glaring area of our national security where we currently have a vacuum and have no proper defense mechanism in place.

When I asked my constituents back in Pennsylvania if they think that we have a system to protect us against one single missile coming into America fired accidentally or deliberately, they cannot believe it when I say that we have no system in place. They just cannot understand how a country with the assets that we have, spending the money that we spend, does not yet have a ballistic missile defense system to protect mainstream America, as well as our troops in the field. As a matter of fact, many of those who have fought long and hard for the past 20 years against missile defense were the same ones cheering the success of the Patriot system when it was brought into play in Desert Storm. The Patriot system was developed through the dollars that we put forth in the old SDI Program starting under President Reagan. If we had not spent money back then, we would not have had a defensive missile system to take down those missiles coming into Israel fired by Saddam Hussein, as primitive as they were.

Mr. Speaker, despite the money that we have spent and despite what the misconception is of the American people, we still do not have adequate missile defense capability for this country in three different areas, and I want to talk about each of them briefly. First of all, Cruise missiles, the missiles that fly at low altitude, the kind that we

saw Saddam fire at Israel called the Scud missiles. Seventy-seven countries in the world today have Cruise missiles. Seventy-seven countries in the world today, we have verified, have Cruise missiles. Over 20 countries in the world are capable of producing Cruise missiles.

□ 2250

Now, granted, cruise missiles are primarily aimed at sinking ships. But, Mr. Speaker, a cruise missile can be placed on any platform. A cruise missile can be put on a ship at sea. So when our liberal friends say that we do not need missile defense because no missile can hit our mainland, what they forget is that a cruise missile can in fact be mounted on a ship and in fact could be used to deploy against some part of the American mainland.

We are aggressively developing anti-missile defenses for the cruise missile technology, but not as fast as many in the military would like us to proceed, and in fact not as fast as I would like us to proceed, because I think that poses a tremendous threat to our security.

Now, the Russians, on the other hand, have an aggressive program for cruise missile defense. They have the SA-10 and the SA-12. The SA-12 has more capability than our Patriot system, the one we used in Desert Storm. In fact, what are the Russians doing with that system? We have evidence they are selling it all over the world.

So here are the Russians selling a technology even better than the one that we have in terms of our ballistic missile defense. As a matter of fact, our CIA purchased one of these sophisticated systems and delivered it to Huntsville, AL. To the embarrassment of the CIA, the New York Times ran an editorial about how open this whole process was of buying this supposedly sophisticated piece of equipment from the Russians.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if we have the SA-12, countries all over the world have the SA-12, because the Russians have placed it on the open market. So cruise missiles are in fact an area that we have to focus our attention on.

The second area is the adequate protection of our defenses when they are in the theater of operation like we saw over in the Middle East called theater missile defense, where we can protect our troops from the kind of attacks that we saw with Scud missiles. The Clinton administration is in favor of theater missile defense, and, even though they have cut the funding for missile defense significantly, we do have a robust program looking to implement theater ballistic missile defense whenever our troops are deployed. Both the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force are working on aggressive theater missile defense capabilities, and I support those efforts. Hopefully we can wrap up some of the funding for those programs, because who knows where the next threat will come

from, a theater missile being used against our troops or one of our allies' troops.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we are working with the Israelis right now to develop a theater missile system that will be used specifically in Israel called the Arrow system, where 80 percent of the costs of that program are being paid for with United States tax dollars.

So theater missile defense is the second key area of missile defense that we are focusing on, and I support the administration's attempt in that area, as well as leadership of General O'Neill, who heads the office and that operation.

But there is a third area of missile defense we are completely ignoring, and that is the whole area of national missile defense. That was part of our debate that we had on the National Security Revitalization Act 2 weeks ago. There are those of us who feel we owe it to the administration to come back and tell us whether or not we have technologies we can deploy that will give us some capability against a deliberate or accidental launch of one, two, three, or perhaps four or five intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Today we have no such system. Even though the ABM treaty allows each of the two signatories the opportunity to have a ballistic missile defense system, only Russia has one. In fact, Russia has today the only operational ABM system, surrounding Moscow. In fact, if you add in the capability of the large phased array radars around that system, you can in effect say they have a larger system, perhaps even the one that would break them out of the ABM treaty. We have no such system in America.

So if a country, whether it be Russia, or China, or eventually North Korea when they develop the capability, has their own technology or buys the technology to fire one missile at one of our cities, we have absolutely no way today to defend the American people. None. Zilch, zero. Despite all the money that we spend on defense in this country, we have no antiballistic missile system to protect our mainland.

Many say we do not need it because we operate on the theory of mutually assured destruction. We dare the Russians to attack us because of retaliation and vice-versa with them. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the scenario today. In fact, the biggest potential problem we have today comes from instability within the former Soviet Union and the warheads and missiles that are still in place that can in fact be sold to a Third World nation or a rogue nation.

Now, what are the chances of that happening? I have confidence in our intelligence community being able to assess what is the command and control system in Russian today. Let me give you one example. I am going to elaborate on it in a special order in the future.

The mainstay of the Russian ballistic missile system with nuclear warhead capability is the SS-25. Russia has a number of SS-25's positioned throughout their country.

The SS-25 typically operates out of a battery of three missiles, each of which can be programmed to a different city or different target. On each of those missiles in that battery of three is a separate nuclear warhead which means they have three warheads on three different missiles, which can be aimed very quickly at any city in the mainland United States and could hit any one of those cities from any location inside of Russia, or in fact any place that they would choose to take that capability.

That system is the one that worries me the most. Now, why does it worry me? First of all, the SS-25 is mobile launched, which means the mobile launcher for that rocket can be moved very quickly and very easily. What worries me secondarily about the SS-25 is that the Russians have offered that technology to Brazil to be used as a space launch vehicle.

Now, what is so scary about that? What is so scary about that is there is no difference in the configuration of a SS-25 in Russia with a nuclear warhead than it is in Brazil as a space launch vehicle. If the Russians are offering the SS-25 to Brazil, the question we have to ask is where else are they offering the SS-25?

Now, thank goodness, when we found out about the offering of the SS-25 to Brazil, we stepped in and said no, that is a violation of agreements that we have with the Russians, you cannot do that. So they did in fact back off. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is, how much time are we going to have from the moment that a rogue nation gets the capability of a SS-25 and decides they are going to aim that at one of our cities? Can we afford then to wait 6 to 8 years to develop an affective ballistic missile defense system for our country?

I say no. And that is why I think the prudent course for us to take is not to go off spending tens of billions of new dollars in missile defense. We cannot do that in this environment. But we do owe it to our people and to our citizens to look carefully at technologies that we have been working on that are ready to be deployed.

Secretary Perry organized a Tiger Team task force to look at national ballistic missile defense in January of this year. Their preliminary report showed that we could implement a limited thin layer of protection for the entire continental U.S., headquartered in Grand Forks, ND, that would be able to give us a 90 percent effective rate in taking out a battery of three intercontinental ballistic missiles such as the SS-25. That system is doable today. It could be deployed in a matter of 4 years from the date that we give the go-ahead, which could be as early as say July of this year.

The cost of that system over 5 years is not \$25 billion or \$30 billion. The cost of that system is approximately \$5 billion over 5 years. But it would give us for the first time a defensive capability against an accidental or deliberate launch by a rogue nation of a missile like the SS-25.

Mr. Speaker, I think we owe it to our constituents and to our security interests to pursue the development and implementation of that kind of a system. Beyond the system that is outlined in the Tiger Team report is the need to establish a system of sensors in space. Even our colleagues on the Democratic side led by our good friend and expert from South Carolina, JOHN SPRATT, agree that space-based sensors are necessary for us to detect when a missile is being launched any place in the world.

Following that movement toward a limited thin-layer defense system, we also need to develop a space-based sensor system, which allows us to detect when someone would in fact fire a system against us.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I think it is absolutely critical that when we debate missile defense in this year's authorization and appropriation bill, that we do it based on the facts. Because of that, we are going to be implementing an aggressive program to educate Members of Congress and their staffs with real information about situations occurring around the world that could threaten our security, and where missile defense comes in as a critical element, whether it is theater, whether it is cruise missile, or whether it is national missile defense.

We will be announcing within the week a major proactive effort that will be bipartisan that will include briefings for Members, that will include regular handouts for Members, focusing on the ballistic missile capabilities that are out there today, what capabilities our enemies have, and what kinds of technologies are being distributed throughout the world.

It is extremely important that our colleagues, when faced with a vote on missile defense in the future, do so based on fact and not emotion. We are not talking about the term "star wars." As I said during the debate on the National Security Revitalization Act, star wars has no place in the discussion today. Even our colleagues on the other side have acknowledged that.

We are talking about moving very deliberately into technology that we have been working on that we know are deployable within the near term, and doing it in such a way that we can afford it, based upon the budgetary constraints that we have, given our other concerns and priorities.

Mr. Speaker, this debate will occur in the May-June time frame, when we have defense bills on the floor, but I want to make sure as chairman of the Military Research and Development Subcommittee of the Committee on

National Security that Members do so based on factual information.

Mr. Speaker, the final topic I want to hit tonight as relates to defense has to do with technology transfer, and a very scary event that is about to happen or actually has happened and continues to unfold involving the ability of the Chinese enhance their Cruise Missile capability.

Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Times dated February 13 highlighted the sale of Russian rocket motors to China, and the Clinton administration's efforts to try to halt the Russian sale of the rocket motors to China because of our antiproliferation legislation and laws, and because our officials feel the engines will be used in advanced Chinese cruise missiles.

The Clinton administration maintains that the sale of these engines by the Russians violates the missile technology control regime, but the Russian Government recently informed the United States Government and the Clinton administration it would not stop the sale because, and this is what is really outrageous, the White House had approved a similar sale of United States-made gas turbines to the Chinese last year.

We have seen the headlines today, where we have a new agreement with the Chinese on trade relations, but Mr. Speaker, how outrageous is it that we in fact are continuing under the Clinton administration to sell dangerous technology that will allow them to enhance their Cruise Missile capability?

We objected when the Russians wanted to sell their engines to the Chinese, because of what it would do, but we in fact ourselves are committing and have committed that same egregious error.

In fact, this past Monday, February 20, in the Jack Anderson and Michael Binstein column entitled "A Red Flag on Technology Sale to China, the Clinton administration is poised to allow a controversial technology sale that many believe could help the Communist country upgrade its missile program."

We are not just talking now about the sale of the engines. The Clinton administration now is about ready to approve the sale of the technology, so that Chinese can now begin to build the engines that will be used in the cruise missiles that could in fact attack the United States or our allies.

Let me read a quote from one frustrated administration official in the Jack Anderson column: "The Administration knows this in fact would give China this new technology capability, but so far, no one has had the political will to stand up and say no." It further goes on to say "Clearly, the Chinese could use this technology to make engines which are perfectly suited for that requirement," of improving their Cruise Missile engines, "says Kenneth Timmerman, a security specialist and director of the Middle East Data Project."

He goes on to say that there was a confidential memo that Jack Anderson was able to get a copy of that supports Mr. Timmerman's view. I quote from the memo: "Garrett engines," and Garrett is a company that manufactures these engines in the U.S., "Garrett engines and/or production technology would provide an array of high performance capabilities to satisfy China's military requirements well into the 21st Century," one document alleges.

"Another study indicates China could make engines capable of launching a biological warhead about 1,000 miles if it obtained these materials."

Mr. Speaker, what the administration is saying internally, which has not yet come out in public until this article by Jack Anderson was revealed last week, is that internal documents in the administration are cautioning that giving the Chinese this technology will allow them to have cruise missiles that can go up to 1,000 miles with a biological warhead on that cruise missile.

Despite the red flags being raised, the Clinton administration last year lifted the export controls for this particular engine that normally cover the Garrett technology, and they are now about to let the technology itself be transferred to the Chinese.

"Critics of the deal are outraged," as they should be. "This is exactly what we said would happen a year ago," an American official said. "We warned that the Chinese would come after the technology after they got the engines, but the administration decontrolled it anyway. In my mind, it constitutes criminal negligence."

An administration official that opposed the sale of the engines and now the technology itself, saying that they told the administration the Chinese would go to get the technology, which they are doing right now, and that we did it anyway, in his mind, it is criminal negligence.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has to understand that the defense of this country and our people is of the highest priority, and those of us who serve on the Committee on National Security, both Republicans and Democrats, use every minute of the day that we have to focus on how to support that defense.

However, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing occur today with defense spending numbers, with the lack of an effort for adequate missile defense capability, and with uncontrolled arms sales that jeopardize our future security, that is absolutely outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, over the next 4 weeks we will be highlighting each of these components in detail. I ask you and our colleagues to read with great interest what we provide, to challenge it, to ask for backup material and data, so when we have a full debate in May on the authorization bill, that we do it based on the facts and not emotion.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the editorial from the Tampa Tribune of February 13, and that arti-

cles from the Washington Times dated February 13, entitled "Russia Sells Rocket Motors to China" be entered, and that the Monday, February 20 Jack Anderson column entitled "A Red Flag on Technology Sale to China" also be entered in the RECORD.

I thank the Speaker and our hard-working staff for their dedication in allowing me to complete this special order.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune, Feb. 13]

HERE'S A GRAND LITTLE STORY TO STIR YOUR BLOOD ON A MONDAY MORNING

How does an unemployed family in Lake Providence, LA., qualify for \$46,716 a year in tax-free cash from the federal government?

The Baltimore Sun, in a special report, details one woman's crusade to win disability benefits and gives a rare insight into a welfare system infuriatingly out of control.

Rosie Watson, the Sun reports, gets \$343.50 a month in disability payments because a judge found her too stressed-out to work. Her common-law husband, at 386 pounds, was ruled too fat to work, so he gets \$343.50 a month too.

Their seven children, ages 13 to 22, have all failed to demonstrate "age-appropriate behavior," so each of them qualifies for payments of \$458 a month, what the welfare world calls "crazy checks."

The Sun's description of Watson's persistent efforts over many years to convince social workers and judges that various members of her family are incapable of supporting themselves reveals serious flaws in the welfare system, flaws that account for the nation's increasingly hostile opinion of it.

"I GOT NOTHING to hide," the woman told the Sun, and allowed reporters to visit her in her modest home, even opened her Social Security records to them. The inescapable conclusion is that the problems lie with the system, not with people like Watson who, like good attorneys, endeavor to make their best case.

Watson's quest began in 1975 when she tried and failed to convince Social Security officials she couldn't work.

In 1978 she told officials that her second child, at age 4, was a threat to other children and should receive financial aid. They didn't buy it, but she kept up, applying again and again until, in 1984, Social Security officials agreed that he had behavior problems. A few years later she received a \$10,000 check after it was decided he should have been declared disabled four years earlier.

In all, the family has received \$37,000 in retroactive payments, part of \$1.4 billion in retroactive checks mailed after the Supreme Court in 1990 gave children increased rights to disability payments.

After 15 years of relentless applications, Rosie Watson has had all her children put on disability payments. The youngest child, now 13, attends elementary school, where the principal complains that the quest for "crazy checks" is undermining academic standards. The children don't want to fail but perform poorly to please their parents, he says.

Not true, says Watson.

"I ain't never told any of 'em to act crazy and get some money," she said. "Social Security will send you to their own doctor. They're not fooled because those doctors read your mind. They know what you can do and not do."

The Sun discovered that one doctor found a Watson boy had "strong anti-social features in his personality and is volatile and explosive." And, "he said he does not want work."

Apparently, unless government rules are changed, he will never have to get a job.

Here is the Sun's description of what Mother Watson does with the \$3,893 worth of monthly checks:

"As soon as she extracts the nine checks from the [post office] box, she cashes them. She gives the full amount so Sam, 21 and Cary, 22, the father of two children who have moved out of the house since being awarded benefits. The remainder is used for the other children and household expenses.

"Most of the money goes for the children to 'see that they have what's needed,' the woman says. 'With what's left, I pay bills and buy food.'

"One need is \$120 allowances for George, 14 David, 17, Willie, 18, and Danny, 19.

"Being the age they is and being out there with their little girlfriends, they need the money,' she says."

The checks are sent because of a disability, but there is no requirement that the money be spent to try to overcome that disability, the Sun reports. The family's medical needs are taken care of through Medicaid, the value of which the newspaper did not attempt to calculate.

The reporters had a little trouble determining exactly what Rosie Watson's disability is.

In 1974 she said she couldn't work because of high blood pressure, heart trouble and bad nerves, and was rejected. In 1975 she reported it was anemia, dizziness, nerves and bad kidneys, and was rejected. In 1976 she blamed low blood pressure and heart problems, was rejected and gave up for a while.

In 1984 she applied again complaining of stomach problems, epilepsy and sinus trouble. In 1985 the list included "female problems," and an examining doctor concluded: "This is a 34-year-old black female who has seven children under 12 years of age, an alcoholic husband and no money, who complains of insomnia, crying spells, depression."

She appealed that rejection to a judge who determined her unable to cope with the "stresses of any type of competitive employment," and the checks began to flow. Two years later, a judge ruled her husband disabled because he was obese.

The newspaper concludes that the Watson family likely will remain on welfare permanently, with the children moving directly onto the adult rolls.

What did Congress intend when it created such a program that rewards failure more richly than the competitive market can reward hard work?

What it got was places like Lake Providence, where "crazy checks" have become important parts of the town's culture and economy.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 13, 1995]

RUSSIA SELLS ROCKET MOTORS TO CHINA

(By Bill Gertz)

The Clinton administration is trying to halt Russia's sale of rocket motors to China because anti-proliferation officials say the engines will be used in advanced Chinese cruise missiles.

State Department officials notified Moscow last year that the sale of military rocket motors would violate the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), the international accord aimed at blocking the spread of missile technology, according to administration officials.

But the Russian government recently informed the U.S. government it would not stop the sale because the White House had approved a similar sale of U.S.-made gas turbine engines to China last year.

One official said the small rocket motors are taken from Russian cruise missiles and

are suitable for use in Chinese cruise missiles.

The official said the sale would put Moscow in violation of the 1987 MTCR, which bars sales of missiles or components capable of lofting a payload of at least 1,100 pounds of a range of at least 186 miles.

The engine deal is part of broader Russian efforts to supply military hardware and technology to China, regarded as a major proliferator of weapons and technology, officials said.

The U.S.-Russia dispute over the sale comes amid fresh reports that the United States tried unsuccessfully to block an \$800 million contract between Moscow and the Iranian government to build a nuclear power plant.

Russian officials went ahead with the Iranian reactor because of the U.S. agreement with North Korea to provide that rogue nation with nuclear reactor technology, said officials who spoke on condition of anonymity.

U.S. officials believe the Russian support will assist Tehran's drive for nuclear weapons, which many officials say are several years away.

"We have expressed our concerns on that issue and continue to express our concerns," White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta said yesterday. "And, obviously, we think that ultimately there's some hope that this will not take place."

Mr. Panetta said the administration will review "our relationship" with Russia in an effort to force Moscow to "adhere to the policy that we believe in, which is, let us not give aid to terrorists in this world."

Administration officials said U.S. efforts to halt the proposed sale of Russian rocket motors to China were undermined by the sale last year of jet engines made by the Phoenix-based Garrett Co., a subsidiary of AlliedSignal.

The Garrett jet engines were sold to the Nanchang Aircraft Co., which manufactures jet trainers used by the Chinese military.

The engine sale lifted controls on the small engine technology that the CIA believes could be used in long-range Chinese cruise missiles.

China produces six types of surfaced-launched cruise missiles, including the Silkworm, and has exported cruise missiles to Iran, Iraq, North Korea and Pakistan. It also has exported air-launched cruise missiles to Iran.

The officials did not disclose the exact type of cruise missile engine being marketed by the Russians.

The sale of jet engines by the Phoenix-based manufacturer Garrett was bitterly opposed by some CIA and Pentagon officials last year because of just the type of problem raised by efforts to head off the proposed engine sale by the Russians.

"The administration's counter-proliferation program is a total failure," one official said. "There isn't one program that has been able to stop the proliferation of weapons technology."

The Chinese are more interested in acquiring the Garrett engine production technology than the Russian engines, which are inferior to the U.S. engines.

In fact, the Chinese are now seeking to buy the technology needed to produce their own versions to produce their own versions of the Garrett turbine engines, U.S. officials said.

[From the Post, Monday, Feb. 20, 1995]

A RED FLAG ON TECHNOLOGY SALE TO CHINA (By Jack Anderson and Michael Binstein)

The Clinton administration is proving once again that on arms proliferation issues, profit often rules over prudence.

At a time when American officials are threatening the People's Republic of China over its unfair trade practices, human rights abuses and weapons exports, the Clinton administration is poised to allow a controversial technology sale that many believe could help the communist country upgrade its missile program.

"This [sale] would give China the technological know-how to make engines for long-range cruise missiles capable of hitting any city in Japan, Korea—all the way through India," one frustrated American official explained. "The administration knows this, but so far no one has had the political will to stand up and say no."

The proposed deal involves AlliedSignal Inc., the California-based aerospace giant. The company recently informed the government that it intends to sell China the manufacturing technology used to build its Garrett gas turbine engines. This follows on the heels of a controversial decision by the administration last year to allow the Garrett engines to be sold.

AlliedSignal officials told us the technology poses little risk because it is suited only to build aircraft engines. "We are not in a position to judge China's missile engine manufacturing capability," a company spokesman said. "However, the technology involved is specific to civil-certified [Garrett] engines, which are designed for aircraft operations."

Arms proliferation experts believe China wants the Garrett technology to establish a domestic production line for upgraded cruise missile engines. "Clearly, the Chinese could use this to make engines which are perfectly suited for that requirement," says Kenneth Timmerman, a security specialist and director of the Middle East Data Project.

Confidential government studies obtained by our associates Dean Boyd and Dale Van Atta support Timmerman's view. "Garrett engines and/or production technology would provide an array of high * * * performance capabilities to satisfy [China's] military requirements well into the next century," one document alleges. Another study indicates China could make engines capable of launching a biological warhead about 1,000 miles if it obtained these materials.

Despite the red flags, the Clinton administration last year lifted the export controls that normally cover the Garrett technology. This means AlliedSignal is free to sell its manufacturing technology without government approval—unless the administration reverses itself. So far, there's been little indication this will happen.

Iain S. Baird, the Commerce Department's deputy assistant secretary for export administration, maintains there is no legal basis to oppose the sale. He says the Garrett technology is more than 20 years old and "completely impractical" for use in cruise missiles. Baird added that AlliedSignal should be applauded for taking "the unusual step of advising" the government of the sale when it wasn't required to.

In the original engine sale, which came in the wake of the administration's 1994 decision, the engines were to be used in a military jet China was developing with Pakistan.

Many American officials opposed the deal, after intelligence studies found that the Chinese recipient was involved in missile building and that the engines could form the basis for a new Chinese cruise missile.

Nevertheless, the Clinton administration approved the sale, allowing the engines to be exported as civilian goods despite their declared military end-use. Despite specific warnings from Congress, officials at the Pentagon and the Commerce Department also removed export controls from the Garrett manufacturing technology.

Allied Signal says it has sold only 33 Garrett engines to China, and the technology sale hasn't been finalized. A company spokesman added, "At this point, we don't need government approval."

Critics of the deal are outraged. "This is exactly what we said would happen a year ago," an American official said. "We warned that the Chinese would come after the technology after they got the engines, but [the administration] decontrolled it anyway. In my mind, it constitutes criminal negligence."

The anger generated by the proposed sale is not surprising considering a simulated war game played out by the Pentagon last year. In the fictitious battle scenario, which projected what China's military capability and manpower would be in 2010, China routed the U.S. Navy's 7th Fleet, due in part to a line of new precision-guided cruise missiles.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING RE- VISED 302(a)/602(a) ALLOCATION FOR FISCAL YEARS 1995-1999

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 202(c) of House Resolution 6, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revised allocation, based upon the conference report on House Congressional Resolution 218, the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1995, of the appropriate levels of total outlays, new budget authority, and entitlement authority among each committee of the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over legislation providing those amounts.

The revised allocation reflects the changes in committee jurisdiction set forth in clause 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 104th Congress. Pursuant to section 202(c) of House Resolution 6, the revised allocation shall be effective in the House as though made pursuant to sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Section 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 require the submission of an allocation as part of the joint statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution. The allocation provides the basis for congressional enforcement of the resolution through points of order under the Congressional Budget Act.

The allocation is as follows: