

Several weeks ago one of the President's chief economic advisors was asked if she had a family budget that her family lived by, and she responded "no." I think that this is part of the problem.

My family lives by a budget, and we plan for our future. Indeed when I was elected to this office, we had to budget for the cost of maintaining two households and we had to reduce our spending accordingly to compensate for those increased expenses that we were going to encounter.

We need to instill some of those basic fundamental rules that families govern their finances by. We need to instill into this body, the Government of the United States.

I believe this balanced budget amendment will become an issue in the next election of 1996, and I believe that we will see more Members elected both to this body and the one on the other side, more Members elected who will support the balanced budget amendment, and the will of the people of the United States will not be thwarted and that we will have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BASE REALIGNMENT CLOSURE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Secretary of Defense William Perry's recommendation to the Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Commission to close Fort McClellan, AL, is a mistake with significant and dangerous ramifications.

With this recommendation, the Pentagon jeopardizes the American soldier's ability to survive chemical warfare, breaks faith with hundreds of thousands of Alabamians at risk from their neighboring stockpile of aging chemical weapons, and seriously undermines the Chemical Weapons Convention and Bilateral Destruction Agreement.

Let me be specific about what's wrong with the proposed closure of Fort McClellan:

First, it contradicts two earlier directives of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission refusing closure efforts of 1991 and 1993. The BRAC Commission has ruled twice—and the President and Congress concurred—that the chemical defense mission performed at Fort McClellan is vital to our national defense and that the Army's recommendation violates the criteria of military value established by law. The 1993 Commission reprimanded the Pentagon for attempting a second closure—following the unsuccessful initiative of 1991—and warned:

... if the Secretary of Defense wants to move the Chemical Defense School and Chemical Decontamination Training Facil-

ity in the future, the Army should pursue all of the required permits and certification for the new site prior to the 1995 Base Closure process.

The Pentagon has not acquired any of the required permits and certification; its only justification for the proposal is its assumption that the requisite permits can be granted to allow operation of the Chemical Defense Training Facility elsewhere.

Second, it would shut down the only facility in the free world where live agent chemical weapons defense training can be conducted for America and its allies. All United States services, 27 allied foreign nations, and the international CWC Preparatory Commission train at this facility. National and international experts have testified that relocation of the Chemical School and live agent facility would seriously disrupt our chemical defense program for a decade; even more importantly, they maintain, it is highly unlikely that such a move can be accomplished under today's environmental restrictions.

Third, it would destroy a chemical defense capability which is considered vital to the success of the Chemical Weapons Convention, whose article 10 guarantees chemical defense assistance to threatened signatory countries.

Fourth, it would dismantle a working chemical weapons program considered critical to the training of international inspectors for carrying out the requirements of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Fifth, it would abrogate a written commitment of extensive Fort McClellan resources—medical, technical, and security personnel and facilities—to help protect the hundred thousand at-risk civilians in case of a chemical accident/incident during the storage and planned demilitarization of the acrosstown Anniston Army Depot chemical weapons stockpile—as required by the Bilateral Destruction Agreement and Chemical Weapons Convention. This commitment was made in the 1990 demilitarization permit request filed by the U.S. Army with the Alabama Department of Environmental Management [ADEM], which has authority over the demilitarization process. This commitment has been incorporated into numerous emergency response plans and agreements among Fort McClellan, Anniston Army Depot, and the surrounding community. It has been operationalized in chemical stockpile emergency preparedness drills throughout the local area under the direction of the Army and Federal Emergency Management Agency. Finally, it was reconfirmed to me in a meeting with and letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch 6 months ago. ADEM has assured me that the loss of these resources—through closure of Fort McClellan—will virtually prohibit issuance of the permit.

I am shocked and disappointed that the Secretary of Defense who has broad responsibilities for the national and

international security of our country, has yielded to the bean-counters and numbers-crunchers in the bowels of the Pentagon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ADMIT TURKEY TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, prior to being elected to the U.S. Congress, my wife and I visited in the home of Tansu Ciller, now the prime minister of Turkey. Turkey has been a strategic ally of the United States for many years, particularly in our efforts to contain Soviet communism, and of course Turkey was an indispensable ally to the United States during the Persian Gulf war.

Today the country of Turkey is at a crossroads. A Kurdish insurrection is raging in the southeast. An Islamic fundamentalist movement is spreading throughout Istanbul and Ankara.

In the Islamic world there are two models of government; one is the Khomeini model in Iran, and the other is Turkey, the only country among 52 Moslem countries that is secular and democratic.

Turkey's most immediate problem is economic. In 1993, the Turkish lira began to engage in a sharp fall. Since then, investment has slowed down and inflation has reached an annual rate of 150 percent.

To help solve these economic problems, it is essential for Turkey's long-term stability that it be admitted to the European Union. The Clinton administration has acknowledged that they have not paid enough attention to this issue, and they are stepping up their activities.

Today, southern Europe is one of the most volatile areas in the world, and it is time for the U.S. Government to step up diplomatic activities to assure admittance of our longtime ally, Turkey, into the European Union.

If Turkey is not admitted, it will add fuel to the popular conviction that the West is rejecting Turkey out of religious bias.

Turkey and its people should be granted membership in the European