

in Russia, we are no closer to international arms containment and nuclear non-proliferation.

On the contrary, Russia is the biggest supplier of arms and technology to Iran. To date, Russia has sold Iran three Kilo class submarines, of which two have been delivered; MiG-29 and Su-24 deep airstrike aircraft, of which several have been delivered; and several hundred T-72 tanks, of which a few hundred have been delivered.

At the same time, China announced a 21 percent increase in its annual military budget, to approximately \$7.5 billion. This new Russia-China venture could ultimately alter the balance of naval power in Southeast Asia. With the purchase of 22 new submarines, China would be free to pursue its claims in the South China Sea to Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Furthermore, on January 8, 1995, Russia signed an \$800 million contract with Iran to complete two light water nuclear reactors at the unfinished Bushehr nuclear site, as well as attendant training and services. This action by Russia is in direct violation of the international Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (Title XVI of Public Law 102-484). The act imposes sanctions on countries that "contribute knowingly and materially to the efforts by Iran or Iraq, or any agency or instrumentality of either country, to acquire destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons."

Similarly, Russia is in possible violation of many other United States laws which prohibit aid to countries that spread arms and nuclear weapons and related technology. The laws include, but may not be limited to: the Foreign Assistance Act Amendments, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995.

Finally, in the State Department's annual human rights report, Russia was identified as being in violation of international human rights agreements. In the report, Russia was criticized for the horrifying conditions of its jails and the cruel hazing of military recruits. The most serious violations, however, occurred in the Russian military assault on the breakaway republic of Chechnya where massive aerial bombardment of the capital, Grozny, and the dislocation of thousands of refugees "were in conflict with a number of Russia's international obligations." In its most recent action, Russia reportedly has blocked humanitarian assistance to Chechnya by the International Red Cross.

In my judgment, Russia's, \$800 million nuclear reactor contract with Iran is sufficient evidence alone to cut off United States assistance to Russia. With respect to the Russia's human rights violations, let me remind you that China almost lost Most-Favored-Nation [MFN] trade status with the United States, for less.

As a result, I have introduced H.R. 1418, a bill to prohibit all United States foreign aid and military assistance to Russia for fiscal year 1996, unless the President of the United States certifies to Congress that Russia is not exporting any nuclear technology, offensive military weapons, or other military technology. H.R. 1418, however, exempts U.S. aid in the form of humanitarian assistance or assistance

for the purpose of dismantling nuclear and chemical weapons.

If Members support offensive military weapons containment and nuclear non-proliferation, I urge them to cosponsor H.R. 1418.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TAX
RELIEF ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1215) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs:

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, I wish to explain my opposition to the GOP tax proposal.

For me, the most important issue is not tax fairness or the question of good tax cuts versus bad tax cuts. Many other Members have made those arguments with eloquence and insight.

There are plenty of reasons to vote "no" on this bill. But for me, the best reason to vote "no" is the impact this legislation will have on our efforts to reduce the deficit.

The proponents of this package have argued that the tax breaks they want to create are paid for with spending cuts—and they may well be. But that's not the problem.

The problem is that you can't use the same spending cut twice. If you use a spending cut to pay for a tax break, you can't use it to reduce the deficit.

And reducing the deficit must come first.

For years the national debt has paralyzed our Nation. It has prevented us from dealing with critical issues that will impact our competitiveness as a Nation well into the next century. Past efforts to deal with the deficit have largely failed and our debt now stands at \$4.8 trillion.

Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we shouldn't risk losing the opportunity we have today to reduce the deficit now and get on the glide path to a balanced budget. Our economy is strong, productivity is up and there is a growing consensus among the public and Members of Congress favoring deficit reduction. Our country's future is too important to let this opportunity pass.

We should capitalize on the momentum we have today by reducing the deficit and finally putting this paralyzing issue behind us so that we can begin focusing on the many other issues affecting our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this Congress to work with Democrats and Republicans to solve the problems facing this country for the people I represent. I've voted for 10 of the 22 items we've voted on in the Contract With America so far so I'd have no hesitation in supporting this bill if it was a good idea like some of the other ideas in the contract.

But this is not a good idea at this time. There is just too much risk for our country.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TAX
RELIEF ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1215) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs:

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the House voted to pass provisions to lift the Social Security earning penalty on older Americans of retirement age from the current level of \$11,280 to \$30,000 by the year 2000. In part, we have seven very special senior citizens to thank for this action. These people came out to Washington to tell their stories this week because America needs to know how the earnings penalty affects its citizens. Therefore, I would like to share these stories with the Nation.

GLORIA DAVIS, MARINA DEL REY, CA

Gloria has worked since she was 16 years old. Two years ago, when she discovered she owed the Social Security Administration \$4,000 for benefits she received after exceeding the earnings limit, she became active in the effort to change the law. The Social Security Administration gave her 30 days to pay. She has told her story on television and through print media and has heard from seniors across the Nation who wrote her after seeing her on television.

Gloria and her husband owned their own business, but went bankrupt in the 1980's. They lost everything and were saddled with debt. So, Gloria doesn't have a retirement income and must work. Gloria, like many older women, worked at jobs which paid little, and sometimes for employers who did not pay into the Social Security System. Her monthly benefit averages \$467.

Gloria has a background in public relations, sales, advertising, and television production. At one time she was State director of the Miss U.S.A./Universe Pageants, Miss America pageant and several other pageants. She has served as an event planner and trade show organizer for many years. Gloria currently works a full time job at Car Barn Airport Parking.

BETTY BOURGEOU, TAYLOR, MI

Betty entered the workforce at age 50 when her husband left her and her children. She worked two part-time minimum wage jobs at a department store and for a security company. She then became a teacher's aide for a Head Start Program, went back to school and became qualified to be a Head Start lead teacher. However, Betty quit teaching Head Start, the job she loved, when she began taking Social Security. She would lose most of her benefits with both jobs. Her department store job included health care benefits she needed, so she remained employed there.

Betty has received several Employee of the Year awards at the department store over the years, accompanied by pay raises. However, when she takes the raises, she must reduce