in military spending as they embark upon a desperate effort to recapture the glory days of Ronald Reagan's trickles.

Amazingly, they think we have forgotten. They figure that by changing the name to compassionate conservationism they can fool us, but that is just not so. In the FY 2000 budget, the United States will spend more on the interest on Ronald Reagan's debt than on the entire Medicare program. The FY 2000 budget also commits half of all Federal discretionary spending to military programs.

Now, there are some good things in the military budget that I strongly support: Cooperative threat reduction programs, increases in pay for members of our uniformed services, and increased benefits for America's veterans. However, there are processes in the military budget compelled me to oppose it. The current defense strategy calls on the military to be prepared to fight two significant wars at the same time, without any allies, and without a credible military reserve. The bottom line is that we maintain a Cold War era military and its incumbent costs irrespective of any realistic assessment of the threat to our national security. We also maintain at tremendous expense a Cold War nuclear arsenal.

I strongly believe we must leave behind the military structure and devices that we depended upon to win the Cold War and prepare for the real world of today and tomorrow. Instead, we are layering unrealistic demands on top of Cold War needs. As a result, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill became a Christmas tree, laden with gifts of pork for everyone, and the rate of increase in military spending now threatens Social Security, low income housing and nutrition programs. It is clear to me that our national security cannot be measured in bombers alone. I believe our national security depends equally on our domestic programs and on constructive foreign policy initiatives. We can no longer continue to spend nearly half of all of our Federal discretionary dollars on military programs. This misplaced priority compromises our national security by short-changing our investments in programs that make for real security: A healthy, well-educated, properly housed citizenry.

Does the U.S. really need a military that is big enough to simultaneously fight two major regional wars alone? Why does the U.S. need to continue to station 100,000 troops in Europe? Europe cannot defend itself? Why is the United States spending $35 billion per year to maintain over 6,000 nuclear weapons on high alert against an enemy that no longer exists? Why should the U.S. spend another $11 billion on a missile defense system that is technologically infeasible and strategically destabilizing? Why not close the military bases that the Department of Defense no longer needs and support contracting them into profitable commercial and industrial centers? Why should the DOD get more money when it cannot even find over $9 billion worth of inventory and continues to give away millions in over payments to contracting?

More money is not the answer to Pentagon waste. Instead, we should end the obsolete U.S. Cold War military, invest instead in developing multilateral civil institutions such as the organization for cooperation and security in Europe. These steps will reduce the cost of the U.S. Government by more than $40 billion a year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized during the morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, some time back I rose in the well of this House to denounce the burning of Black churches in the south. A few weeks ago, it was my duty and the duty of my like-minded colleagues to denounce the burning of three synagogues in California. Today it is my painful duty to speak out against a new and different incipient hate crime.

I am proud to represent the City of San Francisco in this body. San Francisco is viewed across the globe as one of the most spectacularly beautiful places on Earth, but its real beauty comes not from its location and topography and buildings but from the richness of the cultural variety of its citizens.

In recent days, our Chinese American population has been intimidated, attacked, assaulted, with hate literature of the most pernicious type. I stand here, Madam Speaker, calling on these merchants of hate to stop their nefarious and hideous business.

San Francisco's Chinese American community is one of the most law abiding, industrious, hard working, patriotic segments of our society. They deserve our respect and our recognition; not the oozing of hate literature and the threats of thugs who are in the process of attempting to intimidate a population which for generations has contributed so richly, not only to the cultural variety but also to the economic vibrancy of our city.

This attack on San Francisco's Chinese American community must stop. I call upon the major law enforcement agencies at all levels to be ultra vigilant in seeing to it that these merchants of hate will not go beyond their threats and, in fact, engage in physical actions of intimidation against the Chinese American population.

San Francisco prides itself, and justly so, in providing a secure, safe and civilized haven to all its citizens. The Chinese American population of the City of San Francisco is entitled to nothing less.

I intend to meet with the leadership of that community to reassure them that my colleagues in this body and indeed our Federal Government is fully prepared to protect them in all their rights and privileges as American citizens.