

down. People have said, "Do you want to interfere with private property?"

Well, yes; I do want to reduce the incentive people have to buy a going concern that was in no danger, that we know of, of shutting down just so they can shut it down and get richer. We had in this case people ready to step forward. If the owner wanted to sell, a fair price would have been offered. There were people ready to say, "Here's your money and we will take over and we will keep this place running."

We are not talking about confiscating private property. We are not talking about interfering with a legitimate business decision that says, "This is no longer a profitable enterprise. I'm taking my capital elsewhere." We are talking about a set of laws in this country and regulations and accounting practices, and these need to be looked at further, that incentivize someone buying a plant solely for shutting it down. That is something that must be changed.

#### WE TOLD YOU SO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last year, after a long and passionate debate, the United States joined the World Trade Organization. The WTO, as it is known, is an international body based in Geneva with 120 nation members. In simple terms, the WTO is the police force of international commerce and trade, a mechanism for enforcement of the world's trade laws.

Supporters of the WTO promoted entry as a means toward a fair and free trade policy. It was, they argued, a way for the United States to knock down other nation's protectionist trade barriers.

Opponents, who came from all political spectrums, foresaw a different world. Citizen's groups predicted a situation where other countries would pressure the WTO into weakening America's world-leading environmental, health, and safety laws. Economists warned that the WTO would penalize the forward-looking United States to the advantage of the mercantilist nations of East Asia and of the European Union. Nationalists were terrified of an organization that held the United States as equal to the other 120 member nations, for we would have no veto power, despite our obvious stature.

Many of us in Congress worked diligently to defeat the ill-advised entry into this Organization. I believed then, and still maintain, that our sovereignty is endangered by our membership in the WTO. Simply put, we are not equal to other nations. We have the world's most powerful economy, the world's most desirable markets, and the world's most advanced and for-

ward-looking environmental, health, and safety laws. In other words, we have the most to lose. Entry into the WTO made no sense to us; we saw it as a means toward the demise of our sovereignty, the weakening of our standards and laws, and as a means toward the subversion of our already precarious trading position.

Unfortunately for all Americans, we were right.

The WTO handed down its first decision in January, and guess who came out the loser? If you said the United States, you're right. The case, which was brought against the United States by Venezuela and Brazil, challenged a 1993 EPA rule on gasoline standards. Specifically, the rule required America's dirtiest cities to improve their gasoline by 15 percent over 1990 levels. The two plaintiffs argued that this rule put their fuel at unfair disadvantage, that they would be held to higher standards than domestic producers because they didn't have adequate 1990 data. The case was decided by a panel of three trade experts from Finland, Hong Kong, and New Zealand, who unanimously ruled in favor of the plaintiffs.

The WTO ruling granted America three choices as retribution: First, we can change the EPA rule and let in dirtier gasoline; second, we can keep the regulation in place and face \$150 million in annual trade sanctions, such as tariffs on U.S. exports; or third, we can negotiate the terms of the sanctions and perhaps compensate the plaintiffs with lower tariffs on their exports. Regardless of which plan we pick, we lose. U.S. oil refiners, who have invested millions of dollars to come into compliance by producing cleaner fuel and by adequately reporting their data, will be forced to compete with dirtier, cheaper gasoline imports. Of course, the worse part of the ruling is the establishment of the WTO jurisprudence over a wide array of U.S. laws.

The ruling affirmed the fears of everyone who opposed America's entry into the WTO. It deemed our environmental policy too stringent; it provided two weaker nations a means to unfairly enter our market; and worst of all, the ruling undercuts our sovereignty.

Our laws and policies are made through a democratic process. And although we may not always agree with the laws and rules that govern us, we at least have the benefit of representation. Obviously, through this process we hope to balance the concerns of all involved parties. We hope, ultimately, to maintain a modicum of fairness.

The WTO ruling has proven to be the antithesis of the democratic process. We as a nation have been forced to comply with the decisions of a body, whose main interest seems to be the forced opening of our markets. The WTO, in their ruling, subverted our laws and our legitimate trade barriers. They determined that we as a sovereign nation have no right to bar-

entry into our markets, regardless of the merits and regardless of another nation's failure to meet our democratically set standards.

My colleagues, this is dangerous stuff. The WTO's ruling sets a scary precedent. It sends a message to the nations of the world that U.S. policy can be thwarted, that our democratic process means nothing, and that our standards mean even less. Furthermore, the ruling puts our own industries at a disadvantage, for they must continue to play by the rules.

They must continue to obey the standards and rules of production and dissemination.

In the end, America is the only loser. Our involvement in this Organization creates an unfair advantage for our trading partners, who don't have to live up to the same standards as U.S. firms. It forces American businesses, who must comply with stricter standards to compete with companies from countries with weak policies and a strong entry mechanism in the WTO.

As is becoming the standard with our trade policy, the WTO will ultimately force American jobs overseas and force our country to weaken our environmental and health standards. This, of course, undermines the trust of our trade policy, which should serve as a job creation mechanism and as a tool to force other countries to come into compliance with our higher standards. Our involvement in the WTO is, unfortunately, the explication of all that is wrong with our current trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I am afraid that we will continually be forced into inequitable positions by the WTO, that the Organization will serve only as a tool for other nation's to bypass our sovereignty. America is the only loser in this game, and this, my colleagues is game we can't afford to play.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying, this first ruling by the WTO forbodes a dark future for our Nation. I ask that we reconsider our entry into the WTO.

#### SACRED COW DISEASE ALIVE AND WELL IN DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk a bit about what we are getting ready to do today. We are getting ready to go into the Defense Department authorization and I want to know, where are the budget hawks? Where are all these people who have been talking about the deficit? Because when we look at where we are, it is really very, very troubling.

Let me show my colleagues some charts. Everybody has their charts and I did not come unprepared. If we look at this and we look at the United States, which is the blue line, that is where we are spending. If we look at the red line, that is where Russia is spending. As we can see, when the cold war ended, their spending melted down. Not us. We keep right on spending.

Even though we talk about the deficit, we do not do anything when it comes to the defense bill.

Then we look at threat potentials, at the United States and what we are spending on defense, here is what Russia spends, here is what China spends, and here is what a whole range of other countries spend: Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Cuba. Either we are not spending very well or something is really wrong. We are spending an awful lot of money on stuff that there is some question about.

What do I think the real problem is? In Great Britain they are talking about mad cow disease. This Congress has sacred cow disease. They see the Defense Department as the biggest sacred cow around here, and they will not allow anybody to touch their sacred cow. So, everybody, watch. This is our wonderful Republican colleagues pulling the sacred cow back in.

The bill we are taking up today will not allow any cuts at all, even though it is 5 percent above what the administration asked for. Any number of us requested the ability to at least offer cuts to bring it down to what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said was enough, what the Commander in Chief said was enough, but, no, we are not even being allowed to debate that here. We are totally gagged.

Do the Members know what we are going to debate here today? Today this body is going to become the moral police for the military. The people who represent us in the military, we do not want them to have the rights other Americans have, that they defend. Other Americans will get the Constitution defending their rights. People in the military get the Congress. Ask the average American, "Who do you want defending your rights, the Constitution or the Congress?" I think most of them will go with the Constitution. The Constitution looks a whole lot better today.

But that sacred cow, I cannot even touch it today. I had an amendment to try to bring down the numbers. Any number of Members had amendments to bring down the numbers. I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for 24 years, and they are not going to allow us to touch the sacred cow. So sacred cow disease is alive and well.

What are we doing today? We are charging it all to our kids. That is basically what we are doing. Anybody who votes for this bill today and tells us that they are a deficit hawk, that they really want to bring the deficit down, is absolutely wrong. What they are really saying is they will do everything they can to spend money on weapons systems.

I guess that to me is the saddest part of all, because it is even coming out in the military. I just saw their new poster, their new poster that has nothing on it but fancy dandy toys, new toys for the boys from the Congress. These are all cold war weapons. They do not really fit any of the kind of missions

that we are on today. But are we not happy to have them?

I am so old, I remember that when we had Armed Forces Day, we celebrated the men and women who were in the Armed Forces. That is who we celebrated. None of these weapons are worth anything if we are not paying attention to the men and women in the Armed Forces and their families.

So I find this a very sad day as we begin the debate on my last defense bill, because I am leaving. But in fact we have been gagged, we cannot mention one cut. We are going to spend hours here debating whether women should have the same reproductive rights as American women. We are going to have all sorts of stuff about HIV, sexual preference, what kind of magazines they can read, where they can read them, when they can read them, what they can do about them and on and on and on. We are encouraging a culture all driven by the industrial complex. This is sad, and I hope America wakes up.

#### DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL MEETS NATION'S COMMITMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I get a chance to follow my esteemed colleague from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER, because I want to show her some of what she calls wasteful spending on the part of the Republican majority for defense.

I have with me an ammunition pouch. It is an empty ammunition pouch. It was issued by the U.S. Marine Corps and it symbolizes some of the increased defense spending that we are going to be engaged in as we pass this bill through the House. It manifests some of the \$12 billion plus in defense spending which, as the gentlewoman said, is a little less than a 5-percent increase over what the Clinton administration asked for.

This year I had a meeting with the services, and I had the ranking member, the Democrat, my good colleague from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, the ranking member on the procurement subcommittee that I chair, participate in this meeting with me. We asked the services to come in. We asked the Marine Corps and the Army and the Navy and the Air Force to come in.

I had a basic question for them: "Do you have enough ammunition, basic bullets for your troops, to fight the two-war scenario that we request you to fight, that President Clinton has said you must be able to meet?" That means if we should have a problem in the Middle East, like Desert Storm, and at the same time perhaps have a problem in the Korean Peninsula, if the North Koreans should take advantage of our being tied up in the Middle East and start moving down the Korean pe-

ninsula, and we had to move there and fight basically two contingencies at the same time, would we have enough basic ammo to fight that two-war contingency under the Clinton administration's defense budget?

The answer from the Marines—and, incidentally, the Marines are always the most candid, perhaps they are the worst politicians in Washington but they are always the most candid—they said, "Congressman, we don't have enough bullets to fight the two-war contingency that we are charged with."

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield briefly to my colleague, although I did not ask her to yield, but go ahead.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows I was not going to make any amendment that would attack extra ammunition. That is not the point. The point was about some of the weapons that I think even the gentleman might agree we did not need to add.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend but I want to tell her, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, what my jurisdiction includes and what we are adding money for. I want to go through the list, but the most basic one, the one that I charged our staff with first, was to make sure that the troops have enough bullets in their guns to be able to defend the country. That was the first priority that we gave on this \$6 billion add-on.

To get back to my point, I asked the Marines what it would take to fill their ammunition pouches and to add all the mortar rounds, the howitzer rounds and everything else, starting with basic M-16 bullets for infantrymen. What did they need beyond what President Clinton is providing them in his budget? They said, "Congressman, we are about 96 million M-16 bullets short. That means we run out. That means our ammo pouches are empty when we get to that point."

So the first thing we put in this budget was enough money for 96 million M-16 bullets, and we put that in the budget this year. They then gave me a list. I said, "Give me a list of what it is going to take you to be able to handle the two-war scenario." They gave us that list and it came to about \$360 million. That was the first addition that we made.

We then went to the Chiefs of the respective services, because last year when the Republicans added defense money it was charged, "You're adding stuff that the President doesn't want, you're adding stuff that the Pentagon doesn't want, that his Chiefs in the services don't want." So we asked the Chiefs to come before us. We did that because we got a memorandum from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, that said we need to spend for modernization, that is for new equipment for our soldiers, \$60 billion a year.