

the time. To facilitate the consideration of the crime bills on the House floor, H.R. 3 was divided into six bills: The Victim Restitution Act, which was passed; the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act, which was passed; the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act, which was passed; the Criminal Alien Deportation Act, which was passed; and the Effective Death Penalty Act.

Now before the Congress is the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grant. Today we continue to solidify the Republican approach to battling crime by considering that H.R. 728 measure, which is designed to place control of Federal anticrime dollars where it belongs, in the hands of the local law enforcement officials who are at the front line in the battle against crime, to decide for themselves where the funds should go for local programs.

H.R. 728 replaces major portions of the President's crime package which passed last year. While the Clinton bill set up categorical grants with no local flexibility, this new legislation solves that problem by establishing block grants to help units of local government improve public safety.

Use of funds under H.R. 728 can include the hiring of police officers, training and equipping law enforcement officers and support personnel. It can also be used to enhance local school security or establish crime prevention programs which directly involve law enforcement personnel such as community policing, town watch, drug courts, special programs to stop crimes against senior citizens, or prevention programs to stop abductions and exploitation of our children. This new bill does not affect in any way the police funding already established in the 1994 crime bill.

The bill authorizes \$10 billion for law enforcement block grants over 5 years with \$2 billion to be distributed each year from 1996 through the year 2000. Most importantly, this bill allows localities greater flexibility responding to their own crime problems. Our own Chief William Kelly of Montgomery County, PA, has had programs instituted with community policing, which are really the outstanding ones of Pennsylvania and the country, I believe. District Attorney Mike Marino's outstanding community program with DUI offenders that pick up the litter all across the county have been the model for Pennsylvania. While crime statistics show that crime has been on the upswing, we know that we can with this bill make a real difference.

The overwhelming incidence of crime occurs within State-level jurisdictions, so these authorities bear the primary responsibility for combating this mounting crisis. However, the Federal Government cannot abrogate its responsibility. Through the Contract With America, Republicans recognize that the best thing we can do is to allow the local authorities, through block grants, the opportunity and flexibility to fight crime in the manner

best for each community by providing them with those block grants.

The Clinton approach to battling crime was very different. After nearly a year of congressional hearings, mark-ups, and floor votes, a delayed recess and weekend votes, the best the previous Congress could do was come up with expensive, Great-Society-type programs. In this new bill before the House it repeals many of the social experiments and replaces them with solid funding which can be used by the local authorities in the manner they think best to fit their needs. This represents a commonsense approach to battling crime on this Nation's streets.

Finally, Congress is listening to the experts in law enforcement and have given them the tools they need to fight crime at home.

Back in my home district of Montgomery County, PA, I have an anticrime advisory board which advises me on the best ways to battle crime locally. They have counseled me on how the Federal Government can assist them in their efforts without bankrupting this country. When they spoke, I listened, because they are the ones who are putting their lives on the line every day. They are the ones that see the damage that crime can cause.

I applaud this new effort on crime as we set forth in our Contract With America. We may face criticism from those who are naysayers, who would rather keep this massive bureaucracy in Washington, which has actually hindered some of our anticrime efforts. But as long as I represent the people of Montgomery County, I will take my directions from them, not from the bureaucrats in Washington.

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

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

#### DEBATE TIME ON NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5-minute special order this evening to partly respond to some of the rhetoric that we heard on the House floor earlier, primarily coming from the minority side, on the allocation of 10 hours of debate on the National Security Revitalization Act which we will have on the House floor Wednesday and Thursday of this week. While I am not going to get into all the details and implications of that piece of legislation, I do want to respond to several of the issues that were raised here tonight by the leadership of the minority side.

□ 2240

Mr. Speaker, we heard it said that when President Bush was in office we had extensive debate before our troops were asked to go into Desert Storm, and that, in fact, is correct, because it was asked for by President Bush and this Congress responded.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side, where was that same debate when all of us jointly asked for a debate on sending our troops into Haiti. We had known we were going to go into Haiti for months at a time. Many of us had asked for a full and open debate of that issue where our troops were being put in harm's way. We were not given 10 minutes of debates on this House floor prior to sending our troops into Haiti.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, where was the debate on this House floor that now sees American tax dollars being used to pay the salaries, the benefits, the housing costs, and the travel for about 2,000 troops from Third World nations that are currently providing protection inside of Haiti? Where was the debate so the American people could vote on that issue before that action took place? Where was the debate on Bosnia, so we could fully debate the President's policy? We never had any debate on Bosnia prior to Presidential action.

Mr. Speaker, I say with a great deal of concern, where was the debate in this House on the President's decision to go in and bail out Mexico? He wanted to do it to the tune of \$40 billion but could get no support. Then unilaterally he sent a \$20 billion loan guaranty. Where was 10 minutes of debate on this House floor before the action?

Mr. Speaker, where was the debate in this House, on this House floor, prior to President Clinton or even after President Clinton changing our policy in terms of national ballistic missile defense? Prior to President Clinton taking office, we had an aggressive program that was also attempting to protect the American people as well as our troops. When the President took office, he unilaterally, without any debate on this House floor, changed that policy.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving ample opportunity for debate. We want bipartisan support. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology of the Committee on National Security, I reached out to my colleagues on the other side. We forged a bipartisan national security bill. This bill, when it was reported out of committee, passed by a vote of 41 to 13. Eleven of our colleagues on the minority side supported that piece of legislation.

In the committee, Mr. Speaker, many of us acknowledged that there were key Democrats who were at the forefront of the defense debate, both in the past, today, and in the future. So that bill, when it came out of committee, had strong bipartisan support, and, in fact, 11 Democrats voted with us.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to get their support, before the markup of the National Security Revitalization Act we reached out and made 32 specific changes in the bill. This was not some piece of legislation jammed down the throats of committee members. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we reached out, and over the weekend before the markup, made changes that Democrats offered to us to enhance the bill and to get their support for that particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in total, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman, allowed 32 separate changes to be made in the chairman's mark. Mr. Speaker, this was in fact a bipartisan bill, a bill that reflects our concern with the direction this administration has been going in terms of national security. We are going to have our debate on the floor, but to somehow attempt to mislead the American people, and there were so many distortions and half-truths that were spoken by our colleagues on the House floor, is a gross injustice, both to this institution and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance to get all those issues out on the table on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. I look forward to that debate, and I hope that the American people will also be watching the debate and the final vote on restoring our national security interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to speak to the issue of what the minority talked about as far as the majority not supporting national defense. I can remember being on this floor, Mr. Speaker, when the majority, or the now-minority, turned their backs on our men and women in Desert Storm, would not support them, and yet we had debate on that issue.

I can remember the first event that they brought up was homosexuals in the military, when the majority of military folks do not want homosexuals in the military.

I remember that most of that same leadership, all of the leadership, voting for Clinton's tax bill, which cut defense \$177 billion, and then also put the highest tax that they had ever had on the American people. They had increased the marginal tax rate of the middle-income taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I can look, and when Colin Powell and Dick Cheney and then-candidate Clinton said that anything below \$50 billion would put us into a hollow force, but yet these same Members that are now saying that they are hawks cut defense \$177 billion. Not a single Democrat at the Democratic White House fundraiser put a foot down when military men and women in uniform were serving as waiters. It would have happened at our fundraiser, I guarantee you.

I can remember at the extension of Somalia, we then in the minority voted against it, saying it would cost billions of dollars. Then I also look at how the policy was changed toward General Aided. General Aided is still there, by the way. Then we weakened our strength. Then they denied armor, and then we lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded. Why? Because the Democratic leadership would not support our troops.

Now they say that we are weakening national security. Twenty-two killed and seventy-seven wounded, with the father of one of those killed that received the Medal of Honor chastising the President.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], who is one of our experts on missile defense.

The gentleman is talking about H.R. 7, the Defense Revitalization Act, part of the Contract with America that is coming up in a day or 2 on the House floor. He is one of the few Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who has had the experience of being shot down by an enemy missile in his illustrious career in serving in Hanoi.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I don't know if it is illustrious, being shot down.

Mr. HUNTER. But he managed to get five MiG's before they got him.

I guess I would ask my friend, he has seen the language that places us square in the middle of the missile age. That is, it mandates that we develop theater defense against missiles, and we develop a national defense against missiles.

I would asked the gentleman, what is your feeling with respect to our timing? Do you think we are coming too early, too late? What is your opinion with respect to missile defense?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California, my first concern is yes, I believe looking at Desert Storm and the other, that we need to support missile defense. However, I want to tell the gentleman from California, which may not be the position that he wants, I look at the Air Force. They want the C-17, they want the B-12, they want the F-22, and they want F-15's, and the Navy wants to upgrade F-14's and the Air Force F-115's.

We need to take a balanced look and see how much money is available without taking from the other services. I support missile defense, but I think we have to be real careful with the funds available, and we are cutting down everything.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

With respect to national missile defense, what is the gentleman's feeling with respect to what the former Soviet States are doing, and with respect to what China and North Korea are doing?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the liberal side of the Democratic leadership would tell us that there is no threat from Russia, but yet the Soviet dropped five nuclear-class *Typhoon* submarines last year, that is five nuclear submarines, when we gave them \$1 billion to dismantle nuclear weapons.

They built a MiG 35, which is superior to the SU-27, which is superior to our F-14's and F-15's. They have an AA-10 missile which is superior to our Amram missile, so they are investing in those kinds of weapon systems, while ours are going down.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at what they are doing in pushing out the joint airplane, they are pushing out beyond the year 2010, when we have no chance of building up even to a Bottom-Up Review level.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### AMERICAN MISSILE DEFENSE

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and then to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], to ask first the gentleman from Pennsylvania about his feeling with respect to H.R. 7, the Contract With America, regarding missile defense of the Nation and missile defense of our theater forces.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, in response to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] the Russians also, as we know, have been selling their submarines. They recently sold at least two submarines to Iran.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Two *Kilo* class. Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And Iran has been doing very well in the training of those submarines, which presents a whole new threat for us, with Iranians having capability in the seas.

The question of our colleague and friend on missile defense is an important one. This President changed our policy from the Reagan and Bush era with absolutely no warning to this Congress, to say that we no longer need to have a defensive system to protect