Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak today on the topic "National Security Under a Republican Congress." Among the powers granted to Congress, those given us under Article I, Section 8 — to raise and support our Armed Forces — have provided much debate and discussion in this body.

I believe the differences between Republicans and Democrats can best be described in two simple phrases. The first, used often by President Reagan, is "peace through strength." The second, which we will use often in the upcoming budget debates, is "defense spending is not the enemy."

Under a Republican Congress, while we would recognize the momentous changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, we would not call for massive reductions in our military capabilities as many of our Democrat colleagues suggest. Yes, the world has changed; however there are still many unanswered questions concerning the new Commonwealth of Independent States. There are still, according to some estimates, nearly 27,000 nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union. Recently, there were protests in Moscow for a return to communism and the trial of President Yeltsin and Mr. Gorbachev. There is still unrest in Soviet Georgia and a settlement has yet to be reached in Yugoslavia.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is the growing problem of missile proliferation among Third World countries. (see Chart A) Already, 14 Third World countries have ballistic missiles. Many believe that in the next decade this number could reach 25 or more countries possessing this technology. Most alarming, by the year 2000, six or more nations will have ballistic missiles with ranges reaching over 3,000 miles. A new twist to this problem was recently cited by Central Intelligence Director Robert Gates, when he testified before the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. Mr. Gates expressed his concern that as the situation in the former Soviet Union deteriorates, Soviet scientists may begin to emigrate to Third World countries and enable these countries to greatly improve their military capabilities. Yes, Mr. Speaker, a more peaceful world today, but what about tomorrow? A Republican Congress would look into the future and maintain peace through strength.

The Gulf War was a strong warning that our military must always be prepared to respond to a crisis anywhere in the world. Because of the sound build-up of our military during the Reagan years, we had a military that was able to move 541,000 personnel, tanks, planes, and supplies halfway around the world and sustain combat operations. Because of Reagan's belief in
"peace through strength", we had a military that was well-trained and well-equipped.

The Gulf War was also a clear example of the differences between our parties. The majority of our Democratic colleagues voted not to give the President the authority to use force against Iraq and instead voted for a continuation of sanctions. Had this been the policy that prevailed, we could still have half a million of our soldiers in the sand. Today, our troops are home and Iraq is out of Kuwait. Do we really want to draw down our forces to a level that we are unable to respond to another "Persian Gulf" crisis?

Our former colleague and now Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, has clearly sounded the warning to move slowly to maintain "peace through strength." Speaking before the Defense Orientation Conference last October, Cheney emphasized:

The good news of course is that because of the changes in the world we can safely reduce defense spending. We can safely restructure our armed forces.

The bad news is that we have never, ever before, when we've gone through one of these periods, gotten it right.

We've always blown it. Every time previously in this century when we've significantly downsized the force, when we've gone from major war time forces in World War I or World War II, we've ended up in such a hurry to demobilize that we've forgotten the fact that nearly always, sooner or later, we once again find ourselves in the position where we have to once again go to war.

Do we really want to ignore the fact that there are still many questions surrounding the dissolution of the Soviet empire? Do we really want to ignore the growing problems of missile proliferation? Do we really want to ignore the lessons of the Gulf War? A Republican Congress would heed Secretary Cheney's words to "get it right" and not slash the capability of our armed forces. A Republican Congress would say "Yes, it's a more peaceful world today, but let's maintain this peace with American strength and not return to the 'hollow forces' of the 70's."

Recently, the airwaves have been replete with calls to cut defense spending and fund the answers to all our economic problems. Budget Committee Chairman Leon Panetta, has already formulated a 10-year plan that would make significant reductions in our defense spending while creating new domestic programs. Senator Sasser, the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, has a plan that would cut between $120 billion and $150
billion over five years. This plan pales in comparison to Senator Kennedy's proposal to cut $210 billion over seven years.

These proposals miss the point -- "defense spending is not the enemy." We have already achieved savings from the defense budget, and if Democrats insist on taking more out of defense they will seriously threaten the quality of our Armed Forces.

The Department of Defense submitted a 6-year defense plan last January. If this plan is followed, defense spending will be 3.6 percent of GNP by the middle of the decade. (Chart B) Before the Budget Committee, Secretary Cheney stressed, "prudence requires that we as a nation not make defense reductions more rapidly or more deeply than planned through FY 1996. It will be a tremendous challenge to carry out planned reductions without undermining the future quality of our armed forces." A Republican Congress would heed this warning.

Democrats have argued that the Pentagon has failed to react to world changes; however, the Pentagon's 6-year plan is based on a reduced Soviet threat and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact. The centerpiece of this plan is called the Base Force -- the minimum force structure required to protect U.S. national interests. (Chart C) Secretary Cheney has moved the Department of Defense from the mentality of the Cold War to focusing on the new threats our nation faces. A Republican Congress would support this base force concept and not seek to undermine the quality of our forces by seeking unrealistic defense spending cuts.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the fate of one program typifies how a Republican Congress would differ from a Democratic Congress. That program is "The Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). In 1983 President Reagan had a vision -- to protect American citizens from the horrors of a nuclear missile attack. Each request for robust funding of research and development was met with opposition from the Democratic Congress. Each request for robust funding was significantly cut by a Democratic Congress. A Republican Congress would have fully funded this Reagan vision and today we would have SDI.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of our national defense is important to all members; however, as I've pointed out, there are clear differences between our parties. A Republican Congress would move more slowly in the face of an uncertain world situation. A Republican Congress would oppose deep cuts in defense spending. Mr. Speaker a Republican Congress would maintain the peace by ensuring a strong national defense.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1990</th>
<th>FY 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army Divisions</td>
<td>28 (18 active)</td>
<td>18 (12 active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Carriers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier Air Wings</td>
<td>15 (13 active)</td>
<td>13 (11 active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Force Ships</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Fighter Wings</td>
<td>36 (24 active)</td>
<td>26 (15 active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Bombers</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>