

the United States may have to play a more active leadership role than ever now that threats to international security are more ambiguous. As I explained earlier in this speech, the reasons ought to be apparent—only the United States has the ability to project power sufficient to deter threats to the peace in regions like the Persian Gulf or the Taiwan straits; only the promise of continued, active U.S. military engagement in key regions will gain cooperation from major allies and maintain the U.S. position as the ally of choice when conflicts arise; U.S. security interests are directly threatened by challenges even in distant parts of the globe, and only U.S. leadership can build the institutional framework needed to bring stability; and new global challenges across a wide spectrum threaten the United States in ways that require direct involvement.

Let me make one other point to those who are concerned about burdensharing. I agree that we should expect allies to contribute fully and fairly in maintaining international stability. But I also believe that only American leadership can ensure effective allied cooperation. In Bosnia, for example, the allies were willing to commit forces for several years, but without bringing about a peace settlement. Only when the United States became directly involved was a resolution achieved. Moreover, no other nation could design the architecture of a new regional security order as the United States has done in Europe and is working to do in Asia. In a way, there is a paradox to burdensharing—if we want the allies to do more, then we probably have to do more too.

The final failure with which I am concerned is a failure to provide adequate resources. I began this speech by making note of the role the aircraft carrier *Nimitz* has played in deterring conflicts. Today, we are running on the very edge of sufficiency in the number of carriers we keep in the force. We no longer maintain a permanent carrier presence in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean—instead, we swing carriers periodically from one area to the other, and we surge into a region if circumstances require. At best, this is barely adequate. I am concerned that long-term budget pressures will erode the size of the Navy to a level that will not allow even the current amount of coverage. Even if we do not reduce the number of carriers, we are reducing the number of other ships in the Navy—within five years, we will be down to 300 ships, substantially below the level of about 330 that the Clinton Administration said was needed when it first came into office, and the currently planned pace of shipbuilding will support no more than a 200 ship fleet in the long run. Our military presence in Asia—a presence that gave Japan confidence enough to revitalize the alliance—will be in danger.

Moreover, throughout this statement, I have emphasized, time and again, the value of U.S. military engagement all around the world. But one outcome of the Pentagon's recent Quadrennial Defense Review—the "QDR"—was to acknowledge the strain that the current high pace of military operations is placing on our troops, especially on those based abroad in Europe and elsewhere. As one way to reduce the strain, the QDR called for a limit on the number of "engagement" exercises that the regional military commanders had earlier been free to undertake. I am not arguing that this is the wrong thing to do—on the contrary, I

strongly support the Defense Department's efforts to reduce the pressure on military personnel. But the need to limit such exercises points to the simple fact that the size of the force today is, at best, barely adequate to meet peacetime requirements while preparing for major regional conflicts. Defense budget constraints, I fear, will force further cuts in the size of the force in the future, with a devastating effect on our ability to cope with instability around the world.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States has an opportunity to promote a more peaceful, stable world than those of us who lived through the troubling middle years of the 20th Century would ever have thought possible. To do so, however, requires constant vigilance and permanent U.S. engagement abroad. The world will never be entirely at peace. With continued American leadership, however, the threats to peace can be contained, and the realm of peace and prosperity can grow. This requires that the citizens of the United States and the Members of this Congress understand that instability is the enemy and that sufficient resources are needed to combat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### IMPRISONED CHINESE PASTOR XU JONGZE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to call attention to the plight of those persecuted for their religious faith in China, particularly Pastor Xu Yongze. This marks the third occasion on which I have taken to the floor to address Pastor Xu's imprisonment, and I will continue to speak out until Chinese authorities release Pastor Xu.

Tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, I will be eating breakfast in my office by myself. As I announced earlier today, I have reluctantly but resolutely decided that I must boycott the congressional leadership breakfast with Chinese President Jiang Zemin. I fear that the Chinese Government's intransigence leaves me no other choice because for months I have engaged in quiet, respectful diplomatic efforts to secure Pastor Xu's freedom. Many of my colleagues have as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have written to the Chinese leadership. We have discussed our concerns in meetings with Chinese officials and we have sent very clear, consistent signals about the importance of Pastor Xu and religious liberty in China.

We are not alone. Many religious human rights and business leaders have also informed the Chinese Government of their concern for Pastor Xu. Pastor Xu is not the only one to be afflicted. I am told that at least 200 other

Protestant and Catholic leaders are currently imprisoned in China simply for the peaceful practice of their faith.

Thousands, perhaps even millions of other Christians suffer beatings, detentions, and severe fines if they do not submit their religious activities to government control.

Mr. Speaker, I speak out for Pastor Xu because he is perhaps China's most prominent minister and because his plight symbolizes the suffering of so many other precious believers in China. Pastor Xu and the millions of other believers like him have no political agenda. Indeed, they only regard politics as a distraction from their true calling to preach the gospel and worship their lord.

Now, I am baffled, Mr. Speaker, as why the Chinese Government continues to insist on imprisoning and mistreating Pastor Xu and so many other innocent believers like him. China has demonstrated admirable progress in economic reform and security concerns and several other areas, but when it comes to religious liberty, China has tragically regressed.

I truly desire engagement with China and a positive relationship based on mutual respect. But on this matter, China has shown no respect for our concerns. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am left with no other choice. My principles as an American and my conscience as a Christian will not allow me to meet with President Jiang Zemin in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. I do not oppose dialog with China. I welcome such opportunities and I hope that my colleagues who do attend that breakfast find that the discussion is substantive and fruitful. But I also hope that I will have opportunities to engage in further dialogue with China's leadership myself, and I urge those who do meet with President Jiang to raise forcefully the plight of the suffering church.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me humbly but earnestly suggest to my colleagues and to the American people that we remember Pastor Xu and the believers in China in our prayers. And I pray that as Pastor Xu languishes alone in prison he will know that he is not forgotten. I pray that as Jiang Zemin returns to China, he will know that Pastor Xu will not be forgotten.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

SHOWCASING OUR STATE OF  
SOUTH DAKOTA

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, when I came here to Washington, it was for the purpose of trying to bring some common sense to this institution and to this city. I believe that it is infinitely better for my children and for the children of this country and our grandchildren if we can have a Federal Government that is more efficient, that is more responsive, that is smaller, and if we can restore discussion and debate about values to our culture.

Somehow we have gotten to a point in this country where we can accept the fact that if we are willing to write a check to the IRS, it removes us from the responsibility that we have to be good citizens, to work in our communities and our churches, to be good strong family leaders. That is a trend that I believe we need to change and something that we are making progress on. Significant progress.

Progress on issues like welfare reform; the first balanced budget for some 30 years; the first tax cuts in 16 years, since 1981; Medicare reform; important reforms in the area of education that address values that we share, values like parental choice, like trying to give the taxpayers the best value for their dollar and provide the very highest quality education that we can for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity to go back to my home State of South Dakota and to hunt pheasants on a beautiful, crisp, clear day. I should not say it was entirely clear; it was crisp. We were out in the fall of our State and enjoying something that has become a ritual and tradition in South Dakota, and something where government has worked together in a constructive way with landowners, with conservationists, with sportsmen's groups, with our State government, local government, farmers, ranchers to do something that has been very, very important to the economy of our State of South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen growth in that industry that has nearly doubled the revenues that are generated in our State; some \$70 million a year from the process of pheasant hunting in South Dakota. And \$70 million in South Dakota is a lot of money. I think that stands as a model of the way we can work together to address some of these issues on areas where we have common conflicts.

Sometimes we get crosswise between environmental groups and between landowners in certainly our State of South Dakota, but it was a great experience and we had a wonderful time and we had an opportunity to showcase our State.

□ 2145

We have a number of other important challenges ahead of us, if we are going

to complete the task of trying to make government simpler and less complicated for the people of this country.

I had an opportunity to visit with someone in my State who is a small business person whose business was just acquired by another business. I was listening to, as a condition of the sale, I was listening to the discussions that he held that they had to do an environmental analysis. In this environmental analysis they found that the air conditioner that was sitting outside the building was dripping onto the ground and they decided that that was causing distress to vegetation. So what was the solution?

Because it was dripping onto the ground in one spot, they decided to take a 12-inch-by-12-inch concrete slab, 2 inches thick, and to place it on the ground there. And somehow that was the solution that there would be less distressed vegetation with a 12-by-12 concrete slab than there would be with the drip drip that was a pinpoint drip from the air conditioner. I thought to myself, that is a perfect example of a regulation that certainly goes beyond the pail in terms of any rationale or common sense that might be there.

One of the areas that we are going to talk about in the next few weeks and something that I think is long overdue is a discussion of how we can reform the IRS, restructure it and generate a long-term discussion about how we make our Tax Code simpler, less complicated and fairer and hopefully eliminate the enormous amount of time and energy and resources that are spent each year by the people of this country in trying to comply with a Tax Code that clearly has gotten out of control.

Just as an example, we have 480 tax forms in this country. The form EZ, which is the simple form, that has some 31 pages, 7½ million words in our Tax Code. In fact, the estimates have been, the Kemp Commission found that we spent over 5 billion man-hours a year doing nothing but filling out tax returns, some 3 million people in the process of filling out returns which, interestingly enough, is more people than we have in our entire armed services, which means one thing, that is, we spend more time, energy and resources and dollars defending ourselves from our own Tax Code than we do from foreign enemies.

I think that is ironic. I think it speaks volumes for the need for change in this country. I think that one of the reasons we have this complicated Tax Code is that command and control here in Washington, DC; there is so much internal resistance to change in this city.

I was reading recently, as well, that in 1964 there were some 16,000 lobbyists in Washington. Today there are 64,000. The proliferation of lobbyists, in my view, I believe supports the fact that we have a complicated government and a complex Tax Code and most lobbyists spend their time trying to figure out loopholes and exemptions from our current Tax Code.

So it is high time we engage in this debate. It is happening around the country. It is happening in a way which I think hopefully will give us some solutions that come from the ground up, where the people of this country engage in this issue and say, this is what we want to do. I am proud to be a part of that debate. I look forward to having some discussions of that in my home State of South Dakota.

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

[Mr. KUCINICH 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 gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.]

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

[Mr. KINGSTON 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 Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ 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 California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS 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 New York [Mr. McNULTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. McNULTY 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 Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.