

So these are the choices that have been before this Congress. This is what we see this administration has done.

You have seen what we proposed. I proposed an organization to have our trade financing, to have our trade assistance, to have our trade negotiation together so we could help our businesses, rather than hurt our businesses and send our opportunities overseas.

Instead of building a bridge for tomorrow, we are building bridges to Mexico and to other countries, with our assistance, so our goods and services cannot be shipped there, but their goods and services can come here. We are shipping those opportunities overseas, because they will not listen. Do Members know why they will not listen? They cannot stand a new idea. It drives them crazy.

If they have done it this way, if it is disorganized this way, you keep it disorganized this way. If you have 33,000 people in the Department of Commerce and 20,000 plus are in Washington, DC, my God, we need every one of them here in Washington, DC.

Madam Speaker, I have had it and I hope the American people have had it, too.

UPCOMING HEARING IN THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I wanted to comment a little bit about the upcoming hearing that will be held tomorrow by the Committee on National Security, myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is here, the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. SPENCE], and our other members.

We will have before us the Secretary of Defense and a number of other military leaders to explain some of the issues that have arisen from the bombing in Saudi Arabia that took place June 25 of this year, the bombing of the Khobar Barracks, in which 19 Americans were killed and several hundred, more than several hundred, were wounded.

Madam Speaker, I think this bombing and the way it took place is symbolic of the way the Clinton administration conducts national defense, at least the American preparation. And the situation we placed ourselves in, that our military leaders placed our uniformed people in, I think is symbolic of the weakness of the Clinton administration on defense, the naivete of the Clinton administration on defense, and the fact that they tend to be, time and again, taken by surprise in this very dangerous world.

Mr. Speaker, first, a number of Americans, since the Middle East is in the headlines again, a number of Americans are asking what we are requesting to do in Iraq. They are worried

about what the administration has in terms of their plan, whether they have a goal, whether they have a military operation that really evaluates all the possible contingencies.

Many people we talked to throughout the country, our constituents, say to us, we think, if we have to, we will go in and do the same thing that George Bush did several years ago in Desert Storm.

I just want to report, Madam Speaker, to the House and to our constituents, that we cannot do today what we did in Desert Storm, because the Clinton administration has dangerously weakened our forces, your forces. They took your United States Army, that numbered 18 divisions, 8 of which we sent to Desert Storm, and they have cut that almost in half, to 10 divisions. So we cannot send eight divisions to Desert Storm if we have to, because that only leaves two left for another contingency that could take place.

They have cut our fighter airwings, our air power, and reduced them from 23 fighter airwings, so we have roughly 50 percent of the United States air power that existed just a few years ago.

They have cut our U.S. Navy from 550 ships to about 350 ships. So Madam Speaker, the Clinton administration has dangerously weakened the United States.

With respect to the attack on the Khobar Barracks on June 25, the analysis that is coming forth from General Downing's report strongly criticizes the way the Department of Defense and the Clinton administration handled the security measures that existed immediately prior to this bombing.

Let me just go through some of the criticisms: They strongly criticized U.S. central command for failing to support the enhancement of force protection measures under an increased threat. Remember, when we say increased threat, that last November, 6 months before the bombing in Saudi Arabia at the Khobar Barracks, we had a bombing with a 250-pound bomb at Riyadh. That was November 13, 1995. We should have learned something from that.

But the Downing report criticizes the U.S. central command for failing to support the enhancement of force protection measures under an increased threat, and they criticize them for creating a confused set of command responsibilities. That means that the so-called czar, this force protection czar that was put in place, that was put in place with such an undermanning of responsibility and had so little authority, that in fact that was nobody in Saudi Arabia who really was in charge of force protection.

They are also criticized for passively accepting Air Force manning and rotation policies. What does that mean? That means that in this fighter airwing the tours are approximately 90 days. That means that the command turns over, 10 percent of the command turns over. Every week, 10 percent of your

command is changed, so there is no continuity of leadership, such that a leader realizes he is going to be there for a while and has a chance to settle down, look at the security problems, and address those problems. So the rotation policy is an extremely bad policy and nobody addressed that.

Let me just say one other thing about the bombing, Madam Speaker, that took place in November, that should have warned us about the Khobar bombing. That was a 250-pound bomb. We should have known that there could be a similar bomb launched on our troops 6 months later at Khobar. That occurred. I hope people will watch the hearing tomorrow and follow this analysis in depth.

TWO MORE RIDICULOUS BIG GOVERNMENT TAXES

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, two more ridiculous big government taxes have been put out by the Clinton administration this week. The first one is under the name of safety in the workplace as respects violence. This is an OSHA proposal, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, megabureaucrats who love to come into small businesses and tell them what they are already doing.

This is what their proposal is. They have, through a study, detected that there is a lot of violence at night at convenience stores, restaurants, and hotels, and places that are open 24 hours a day.

So what do the Washington big government bureaucrats do? Instead of saying, maybe, that we need to address violence in society, maybe more police officers, maybe look into something that we can do, instead of going to businesses and saying, how can we help you with the problems of violence, they go to businesses and say, what are you going to do about it?

So the businesses now, through a new OSHA proposal, will be required, if this passes, to have bulletproof glass; cash registers only at street level, so if people are driving by they can see if they are being held up or not; video cameras, speed bumps, speed bumps in hotels and restaurants because that will cut down on the violence. I can just see some drug dealer saying, come on, do not rob that convenience store, they have speed bumps there; that will keep me from doing it.

There is a requirement also that you have no more than \$25 in your cash register at one time, and have paperwork and training for your employees.

This is what the Clinton administration's view of private businesses are about: We are from the government, we are going to go into the convenience stores, the hotels and the restaurants all up and down the interstates, and anywhere else they might be open 24