

third-plus-one. You believe that one-third-plus-one, a minority, ought to be able to control whether or not an item is preserved or not. I think that if I can come to the floor and convince the majority of Members, the simple majority, that it is in the country's interest and it is a valid item, that it should be preserved.

Some may say, "BOB, you may be concerned about an item in West Virginia that would be line-itemed out." Certainly. But I think that if I can come to the floor and convince the majority of Members, the simple majority, that it is in the country's interest and it is a valid item, that it should be preserved.

Today it may be my problem. Tomorrow it may be somebody else's problem. Those of you from defense industry States, for instance, may feel some concern about what happens to military installations and defense projects that are so important, knowing that one-third-plus-one and an unsympathetic President, whoever, whenever that could be, could completely play havoc with your particular concerns.

This is a majority-rule country, 50 percent, and so I would simply ask Members to look closely at the Spratt-Stenholm-Wise substitute that will be offered, and I might add as well, that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] will be offering an additional amendment should our substitute fail. We will be offering an additional amendment that would simply add the provisions of this legislation to the existing Republican version in case the provisions of the Republican version are struck down as unconstitutional or should the President choose to follow the process that we have outlined versus the one that the Republican version outlines.

Let me also, as I finish up, reassure everyone in both cases you are guaranteed a vote in this Congress. You do not get away from that, and no Member gets away from having to go on the record, and in our case, it is usually 10 days from the time that the President submits that rescission to Congress.

I urge Members to take a close look and to vote for majority rule in this process.

EXPRESSING CONCERN FOR OUR MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to be part of this historic 104th Congress and to actively participate in one of our most sacred and basic responsibilities, insuring that the military forces of our country are prepared to fulfill any task, defeat any threat, and perform any mission their civilian leadership calls upon them to execute.

While this responsibility falls to every Member of Congress, I am espe-

cially pleased to have the additional honor of serving on the National Security Committee, formerly the Armed Services Committee. This committee assignment gives me the unique opportunity to examine our military and its overall capabilities to fulfill its missions in detail.

This will be a challenging assignment, but we have the wisdom and the very capable leadership of two veterans of this committee to guide us, first, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of my subcommittee, the Procurement Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned today for the ability of our military to perform the many tasks we require of them, given the drawdown of our forces and the precipitous decline in funding over recent years. Any inability to perform missions is, I must stress, not for the lack of dedicated, professional, capable American men and women in uniform.

I am concerned that we, as a Nation, and specifically as a Congress, have not given our military the tools, the training, the equipment, and the support they need in recent years commensurate with the missions we have given them.

That is why I am looking forward to the committee hearing process this year. It will give me and my colleagues the opportunity to judge exactly the state of readiness that currently exists in our forces and that we need to do to restore the level of efficiency and readiness we think is desirable.

In examining the state of readiness of our forces, I think certain basic elements are guideposts. First, the quality of life for our service men and women and their families must be high, especially since we ask them to perform long hours often away from home for months at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve as a member of our armed services, particularly amongst the first marines and rangers assigned to northern Iraq during Operation Provide Comfort in the days in the aftermath of Desert Storm, but I am also proud to have served with soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines over a period of time both on active duty and as a reserve officer, and I can personally vouch for the high quality and standards under which they serve.

Our forces, No. 2, must have adequate, realistic, comprehensive training to professionally meet the many challenges they face in this still very dangerous world.

□ 2120

No. 3, they must have adequate spare parts and equipment both to train realistically and to engage in potentially hostile missions.

No. 4, we need modern equipment. It is essential, as we cannot afford to stop the replacement of equipment to meet

the ever sophisticated battlefields and threats around the world. We need our equipment ahead of time, not in the middle or after the fact because at that point it is too late.

No. 5, we need a sound ability to deploy our troops to crises around the world and especially as our force structure declines. It is key that we maintain an ability to influence world events through the rapid deployment of men, women, material and equipment in situations that affect our national interests.

Our military forces have taken the brunt of budget cutting for too long. It is clear that statistics are now indicating that our level of defense spending has now reached amongst the lowest level since prior to Pearl Harbor. For a Nation of our size and economic significance it is time that we question whether in fact we are devoting the resources that we need to the crises that we may be asked to confront.

I think this is not a blank check. I think defense is on the table as we look at the budget, along with everything else other than Social Security. But I think we have to examine carefully our needs and be prepared, if necessary, to devote the budgetary resources necessary to insure military success in any contingency.

Toward that end I look forward to our committee work this year and will be working hard especially with my chairman, both the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] to do what is necessary.

I think it is also important that we establish the fact that in this new Congress defense is going to be receiving the same level of scrutiny as any other program in the budget. It is interesting that in the last 3 weeks, since this Congress first began to consider legislation, that our first major piece was the Congressional Budget Accountability Act, which held the Congress to the same standards that we hold the rest of the Government and the rest of the private sector.

Our next major piece of legislation was the balanced budget amendment. Just several days ago we passed unfunded mandates legislation. Again, in the course of looking at both the balanced budget amendment as well as the unfunded mandates legislation we were confronted with numerous requests. In fact, in the case of unfunded mandates nearly 160 different amendments that sought to carve out special exceptions from the unfunded mandate provisions of our legislation, the same type of opposition and exception was brought to the balanced budget amendment debate.

I mention that because this afternoon this House defeated an attempt to apply special provisions for the Defense Department under the line-item veto. That provision was defeated.

As a Congress we intend to stand behind principle, we intend to be consistent and we intend to confront the issues that we must confront in every area of the budget. It is on that basis that I feel very strongly that if we work and look realistically and honestly at the issues that confront us and the crises that we may be asked to confront, the needs of our defense will be self-evident and evaluated on the same basis as every other national priority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I and a lot of other members of the Committee or Armed Services have been looking forward to listening to the gentleman from Maine talk about national defense because he has a special background of expertise, having been a Marine, having worked in Iraq during the post-Desert Storm period. He understands operational requirements and problems, he understands systems and he understands people, especially the people of the U.S. military. I look forward to listening to him tonight.

I might just say with respect to the dollars that are spent on national security, I saw an interesting fact when looking over the defense budgets that this House and the other body and the President have passed over the last 10 years or so. If you take President Clinton's defense plan and look at the 1998 projection and you compare that to the 1988 defense budget, the annual budget, and you compare them in real dollars; that is, in 1987 hard dollars, so you discount inflation, the national defense budget of this country, the annual budget in 1998 will be \$100 billion less than the budget was in 1988.

So it is clear that this President has taken most of the budget cuts from national security.

I know the gentleman is a historian of sorts, that he has looked at military history and understands that after every conflict in recent times, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and finally the closure of the Cold War, we have cut deeper and in worse ways than we should have. We have cut the wrong systems in many cases, and we have cut too deep and too soon.

I am reminded of General Marshall's words after World War II when he was asked how the demobilization was going. He said this is not a demobilization, this is a rout.

A few years later in Korea we were unable to stop a third rate military from marching right down the peninsula.

So I look forward to the gentleman's words. I think they come at a very important time in our history.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

I think the gentleman has made some very important points. I am advised now that this fiscal 1995 budget is the tenth consecutive year of real cuts in

defense spending and that we are approximately 35, as much as 40 percent below the level of spending in real dollars than we were in the 1986 budgets in the last several years of President Reagan's term in office.

What is very interesting is I am advised under the Bush administration that cuts proposed resulted in cuts of personnel of approximately 600,000, meaning not only cuts in the military but lost jobs in the defense sector, about 600,000, and that when we consider the current cuts proposed in the current administration's budget that could be 1.2 million jobs in this country.

You know, jobs are important, not only because of the fact that they give productive employment to our citizens, but they also represent some of the highest paying jobs in this country. But even going beyond that, this is about much more than jobs; it is about making sure that we have a strong national defense and that we are applying the resources that we need to meet the crises that we may be asked to confront.

Again, I am appreciative of the administration's effort to reinvent government. But it might interest our listeners to know that although the Department of Defense only comprises 40 percent of the civilian work force in this government, as much as 75 percent of the cuts in full time equivalent positions are occurring in the Defense Department in the area of defense.

I do not think that it is fair that the Defense Department is unjustifiably singled out, particularly given the level of commitments that we currently maintain.

There is also a more important point that needs to be made. Our defense budget, our resources must be in line with our commitments. There is a need for a balance. Our commitments cannot exceed our resources and our resources must be adequate to our commitments. But they have to be in balance, neither one can be out of line with the other because if we do not have the resources we need to cut back on the commitments, and by the same token if we make the commitments we have to make sure we have committed adequate resources to be able to fund our objectives.

I am advised that based on the administration's own bottom-up review two separate analyses of the bottom-up review indicate that the strategy that the administration is pursuing, including as it relates to the funding, is that there are discrepancies of everywhere. In the case of the General Accounting Office, there was an estimate that the defense was being underfunded to the tune of \$150 billion. By the same token, the Congressional Budget Office made a similar estimate of between \$65 billion and \$110 billion underfunding. That means that based on the structural needs identified in the bottom-up review, based on our national defense strategy and the defense strategy and

the threats that we could potentially face throughout the world, including the need to face two regional crises simultaneously, that we are not committing the resources that we need to meet the threats. In fact, there is some question not only whether or not we can confront two regional crises, but whether in fact we would be able to sustain a single major crisis.

□ 2130

Obviously we have got a level of commitment and dedication in our armed forces. I have every confidence that they are highly motivated and that they are doing the best to maintain their training and readiness, and I know that they are dedicated enough and will meet any mission that we might assign to them.

But again the underfunding, based on the commitments, the level of commitments that we seem to be seeing throughout the world, indicate to me that it is time for very serious reexamination, and I might mention, as I mentioned earlier, we passed the Congressional Accountability Act which is applying to the Congress the same standards that we apply to the private sector. We passed the balanced budget amendment in this House and sent it off to the Senate. Again we passed a clean amendment. We have protected no area of the Government from scrutiny that the balanced budget amendment will force. At the same time we have got unfunded mandates legislation that, in fact, we have specifically prevented the opportunity for anyone to carve out specific areas where the Congress could fail to have to take responsibility for spending or mandates that might be forced on our local and State government, and again, as I mentioned this afternoon under the line item veto, we are treating defense on the same basis as every other aspect of the Government.

I might mention that 2 days ago the House Committee on National Security, formerly the Committee on Armed Services, as I mentioned, worked up and marked up for forwarding to the House floor H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, and again it is important to know that we are following consistency and principle in the way we address these issues. H.R. 7 is an important first step toward restoring United States national security to the levels expected by the American people. It establishes a policy framework on national security issues, a policy framework that is designed to establish the threats that we face and provide a framework by which the party, the new Republican majority, and the Democrats in the Congress through the normal budget authorization appropriation process, can ensure that we are dealing adequately with needs of our defense and the resources that it might compel. But what is very significant is that this bill passed on a bipartisan vote of 41 to 13, again a very

strong commitment from Members of both political parties behind a National Security Revitalization Act.

Several provisions that are also very important, some that may even be controversial or that will compel further public discussion, but we supported a requirement to deploy, to develop and deploy, theater and national missile defenses, a critical capability long neglected, and one of the issues that came up in committee and, I am sure, is going to come up on the floor of this House is that we are saying that it is time to eliminate much of the distinction, frankly the artificial distinction, that has been made between theater antimissile defense and national or ballistic missile defense. In fact the technology has advanced and accelerated to the point where the technology that we saw demonstrated so vividly during Desert Storm in fact can potentially be extended to prevent us against threats from intercontinental ballistic missiles. I recognize this is going to cause changes in national policy, but again it has become evident that the technology exists for missiles to be directed at this country, but simultaneously the technology also exists for us to find methods by which we can counter that threat to the innocent men, women and children of this country, and I think it is important to understand that.

I was also somewhat surprised to learn in the course of my studies on defense issues in the last several weeks the important role that the Aegis destroyer program plays and might potentially play in the antimissile defense systems in terms of the role of not only the theater antimissile defense systems, but what this technology may represent in the future, and again these are issues that I am sure my own constituents may not even be aware of, but this type of technology needs to move forward, and I think that we are going to see that start to happen once the National Security Revitalization Act is moved forward and passed, hopefully, in this House.

We have also established provisions designed to limit the placement of the United States troops under United Nations command. We have asked, and this legislation will require, congressional prior authorization before military forces can be deployed for certain U.N. peacekeeping operations.

And finally, based on the threats that exist to us throughout the world, we have established a bipartisan commission that would consist of equal Members of both parties, appointed by the Speaker, appointed by the leadership in the Senate and by the President, that would be instructed to revisit the defense policy blueprint, the bottom-up review, to ensure that we adequately identify these threats that we face, the strategies that we need to confront those threats, the force structure that will be needed to implement the strategy and the resources that we will need to make sure that our force

structure, equipment and readiness are to the standard that the American people expect.

I might mention and it might be appropriate to cover briefly many of the different commitments that we have, many of them that are recent in nature, and frankly I think that the expectation at the end of the cold war was—our experiences proved contrary to what we have actually seen in fact.

As my colleagues know, as I speak on the floor of this House we have forces in Cuba handling significant numbers of refugees. We have the same commitments in Panama. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that between the two different locations we have as many as 20 or 30,000 refugees being cared for by thousands of American men and women in uniform. We have nearly 7 to 10,000 forces in Haiti, and again those forces may be withdrawing shortly, but presently they are engaged in a very important mission. Some of us may have disagreed as to whether or not it was appropriate to commit those forces, but now that they are there we are a hundred percent committed to seeing that they have what they need to fulfill the mission they have been assigned.

Furthermore, we have commitments in Bosnia. In addition we have commitments in Kuwait in the Persian Gulf, and again the subtleties of defense policy are sometimes difficult to articulate, difficult to understand, but personally I am of the opinion that one of the reasons we were forced to commit forces to Kuwait in the Persian Gulf in the latter part of last year was based on the fact that we had undertaken commitments in Haiti and the interrelationship, if you will, between our military action in one part of the world and what it potentially signals to potential adversaries in other parts of the world in terms of their estimate of our ability to respond. And again this underlies the fact that it is imperative that our national defense be second to none and that there be no question in anyone's mind of our commitment and our willingness to do what we need to do to defend this great country and its interests overseas.

We are all familiar with what has been happening in North Korea. We have commitments in Rwanda in Africa. We still have commitments in northern Iraq, a part of the world that I was privileged to serve in. We have upcoming commitments in Somalia. I have not even discussed what is happening in Russia and the Soviet Union, the threat that potentially is represented in the Middle East arising out of the Chechnya rebellion, as well as the instability in the Middle East and Israel, the real concerns that many people have as to the peace process and again our need to project the level of strength in the Middle East and around the world that will make it absolutely clear that we will not be challenged by any adversary, again a number of serious issues, very expensive in nature, and part of the reason that I am very

concerned that our forces are not only being committed extensively but whether we have got and in fact have devoted the resources that are going to be necessary to make sure that we maintain the level of defense posture around the world that, again, leaves no question in any adversary's mind of our ability to defend our vital interests.

I would like to end and spend the next several minutes not talking about abstract issues of defense strategy, or weapons systems, or funding, but I would like to talk a little bit about the people, and I have been privileged to meet many of our men and women in uniform, particularly as a new Member of Congress.

□ 2340

Most recently, a week or two ago, I had an opportunity to visit at the Brunswick Naval Air Station, located at Brunswick, ME, in my district. I wanted to visit that installation to learn about the important role of the P-3 maritime patrol aircraft, the missions they are assuming. I was very surprised to learn in my own district in Maine that men and women had been committed overseas, not only in Bosnia. In fact, during the day of my visit, one of the squadrons was returning from duty in the Adriatic area, again serving our national interests and serving the interests as they have been articulated and committed to by our Commander in Chief. Not only were they serving in the Bosnia region, but in fact they had actually seen service in the Somalia area, in the Gulf, in the Middle East and the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. That was a surprise to me, even as someone who is a veteran of military service, to learn that an installation in my own district was playing such a critical role overseas, again helping project the American military presence in areas of the world where it was necessary.

I was privileged to spend some time with Capt. John Rodgers, the commanding officer of patrol wing 5, based in Brunswick. In addition, with Dave Nelson, the commanding officer of the air station. Both gentlemen were extremely helpful to me in helping to understand not only the important role of the facility and its strategic location along the North Atlantic and access to the North Atlantic sea lanes, but also the important missions served by the men and women of the P-3 squadrons in Brunswick and the P-3 squadrons in the U.S. Navy around the world, and again how important they are to the Navy's mission and to the mission of the American military.

Again, I had a great opportunity to meet not only some of the men and women returning from Bosnia, but particularly Comdr. Frank Munoz, the executive officer of patrol squadron 10. I was very surprised to learn not only had he just finished a 6-month deployment, he was greeted by his wife and children who obviously missed their

husband and father, but it was actually his second deployment in the course of 12 months. Again, a perfect example of the level of commitment that our men and women in the armed services have to their jobs and to their missions.

Recently also I had an opportunity to visit the headquarters of the commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, particularly to spend some time with Rear Adm. Vernon Clark, the deputy commander in chief of Atlantic Naval Forces, who was kind enough to provide a small congressional delegation with a briefing on our threat and forces posture in his areas of responsibility.

Then a surprise, and a pleasant surprise at that, I had an opportunity to visit with Vice Adm. George Emery. Much to my surprise I learned that the commander of Submarine Forces Atlantic is a native of Springvale, ME, again in effect a constituent, certainly a native of the great State of Maine. But again, both individuals highly committed to their work and very serious in their concern and willingness to perform their duty in the interests of this country.

I also had a chance to spend some time with Comdr. Jack Loye, the commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Toledo*, a new Los Angeles attack submarine which will be commissioned shortly. I had an opportunity to visit his boat, his submarine, as well as talk with members of his crew and to see firsthand the level of pride, dedication, and commitment that each of these individuals had to fulfilling their mission in the course of serving in the Navy and aboard the U.S.S. *Toledo*.

Again, knowing and seeing firsthand, learning how difficult it is to perform in our military today, particularly in the case of a submarine where you could literally spend months at sea with little or no contact with your family.

I had an opportunity also to visit the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt*. Again it was a bad weather day, but we flew out to the flight deck, landed on the flight deck. The *Roosevelt* was approximately 200 miles out at sea, and despite the bad weather, it was performing its training mission prior to upcoming deployments.

I had an opportunity to spend some time with Rear Adm. Steve Abbott, the commander of carrier group 8, a committed admiral and playing a very important role with this carrier task force. I also met the commanding officer of the ship, Capt. Ron Christiansen, and Comdr. Tank Rutherford, the executive officer of the *Roosevelt*.

Again there was a special significance for me to visit the *Roosevelt* because during my time in northern Iraq with the marines of the 24 Marine Expeditionary Unit and in serving with the rangers and the sailors and the airmen assigned to that part of the world, the *Theodore Roosevelt* was one of the naval vessels that was providing support for our mission.

I cannot begin to describe the feeling that one has on the ground in a hostile

area, knowing that the men and women of the Navy and the Air Force were in the skies above the area to protect us if necessary on a moment's notice.

But most important, a number of constituents, residents of the State of Maine. Capt. Nils Sjostrom, whose parents live in West Southport; Lt. Stacy Murch, a young naval aviator and a recent graduate of the University of Maine at Orono, again at sea, flying the training missions required of his duty. His mother lives in Harrison. Also Cory LaPlante of Norridgewock, Stephen Willard of East Baldwin, Edward Hood of Caribou, Benjamin Crehore of Westport Island, and Michael Nantkes of Lincoln. Again, young men from the State of Maine, some of them from my district, doing their duty, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day on a vessel of our Navy. Again, this is the type of commitment that we are seeing with our young men and women in uniform.

I might mention not only the young men and women in uniform, but the kind of infectious example that they set and the impact that their service and their values have on others. I was pleased to have with me on the day I was in Brunswick my chief of staff, Floyd Rutherford, and he brought his two boys with him, Chip Rutherford and Chris Rutherford. And again, those young children, those young men, young boys, were very touched by the standards and the professionalism that they saw exhibited to the point that they might at some time want to consider service in the Navy or in the armed services. And again, that is the kind of positive impact that the training and discipline of military service has on our men and women, particularly on those civilians and those who come in contact with them.

But I want to end on a final note, and this is something that underscores for me what this is really all about, the level of commitment of our men and women in uniform. There was a resident of our great State, M. Sgt. Gary Gordon, who gave his life in Somalia. And I thought that I might end this presentation this evening by reading from the citation which by direction of the President under a joint resolution of Congress he was awarded the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty. And I don't need to mention that the award was made posthumously. But I would like to read the type of situation that he confronted, so that people listening tonight can understand again how deeply committed the men and women of the armed services are.

M. Sgt. Gordon was serving in October 1993 in Mogadishu as a sniper team leader. His team was providing precision fire from a lead helicopter during an assault. I am going to read from the Medal of Honor citation exactly the way the official record reflects his duty.

They were providing covering fire at two helicopter crash sites, and while

subjected to intense automatic weapon and rocket-propelled grenade fire, M. Sgt. Gordon, when he learned that ground forces were not immediately available to secure the second crash site, he and another sniper unhesitatingly volunteered to be inserted to protect the four critically wounded personnel of the two downed helicopters, despite being well aware of the growing number of enemy personnel closing in on the site.

□ 2150

I might mention that this young man did not volunteer once, did not volunteer twice, he volunteered three times to be inserted to go to the aid of those wounded personnel. And as the citation states, "after his third request to be inserted, permission was finally granted. He was inserted 100 meters south of the crash site, equipped with only a sniper rifle and a pistol," and I do not need to mention that those were weapons that were not necessarily adequate to the situation he was confronting.

Through pure courage, MSgt. Gordon and his fellow sniper proceeded under intense small arms fire and fought their way to reach the critically injured crew members. MSgt. Gordon immediately pulled the pilot and other crewmembers from the disabled aircraft and established a perimeter which placed him and his fellow sniper in the most vulnerable position. They were there to protect the wounded.

Despite the fact that Gordon was critically low on ammunition, he provided some of it to the dazed pilot and radioed for help. He then continued to travel the perimeter, protecting the downed crew. After his team member was fatally wounded, and Gordon's own rifle ammunition was exhausted, MSgt. Gordon returned to the wreckage, recovering a rifle with the last five rounds of ammunition and gave it to the pilot with the words, "good luck." Then armed only with his pistol, MSgt. Gordon continued to fight until he was fatally wounded. His actions saved the pilot's life.

Where, Mr. Speaker, where do we find men of this caliber? This is what it is all about. And the irony of this situation, a terrible irony, a tragic irony, is that when we do not have the equipment, the resources that we need to fulfill the mission, we still have the commitment of the American men and women who man our armed services, who are willing to give their lives in such situations. And that is what this is all about.

If we are going to commit our forces, we need to do whatever we need to do to make sure that they have the equipment, the training, the resources, that go along with the commitment. And if there is a final irony in the tragic situation that occurred on that October 3, 1993 in Mogadishu, is that after this event, the forces there finally received the M-60 tanks that they needed, the armored personnel carriers and other equipment that if that equipment had been available on that day may have

saved MSgt. Gordon's life, as well as the lives of the other 17 men that were killed in that action. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, when we commit our forces, we do not have the time, it is past the time where we can make the funding decisions, where we can develop the resources, the equipment, where we can provide the training they need. When we commit our forces they are on a moment's notice. They have got to be ready at that time. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. And coming from his background and as a marine officer, I think that his description of the importance of our national security posture and especially his description of the people who gave their lives for us in Somalia in Mogadishu is especially fitting.

I thank the gentleman for his expertise, and I look forward to working with him this year, because he is on the Committee on Armed Services. And we are all going to listen to him, junior member and senior members will listen to the gentleman from Maine.

Let me just add that we passed, in the Committee on Armed Services, a few days ago H.R. 7, that is the bill to revitalize the National Security Act of the United States. And that was referred by some people as a campaign promise that Republicans made and a lot of words but lacking in substance and somehow something that did not justify a serious debate and serious action.

Let me just say that in going over all of the findings and recommendations and provisions of H.R. 7, I feel that the Republican leadership and now a bipartisan majority of the House Committee on Armed Services, which endorsed this bill, has taken a step in the right direction.

For those people that said that this was not a factual set of findings, that somehow we were overblown with respect to the crash in national security, let me just go through a few of the statistics.

We said that there have been, between 1993 and 1999, budget plans for American defense that has cut defense spending by \$156 billion. That is absolutely accurate. President Bush cut defense spending by in excess of \$50 billion, conferring then Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, and others.

President Clinton came along and cut national security \$127 billion below the level that President Bush cut.

So the facts that are laid out in H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, are absolutely accurate on that point.

It also states that during the fiscal year 1995, we are reducing DOD by about 182,000 people. That is a rate of over 15,000 per month or over 500 people per day. That is absolutely accurate.

And further the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that 1.2 million defense-related private sector jobs will be lost by 1997. That is accurate.

The bill goes on to state and define that in missions involving U.S. peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts involved in the fiscal year of 1994, over 70,000 U.S. personnel—I think it was mentioned by one of our experts that the Bosnian airlift has gone on for longer than the Berlin airlift—United Nations' assessments to the United States for peacekeeping missions totaled \$1.5 billion. We pay 31.7 percent of all the peacekeeping costs that the United Nations incurs.

At the same time the United States of America undertakes unilaterally its own military missions like airlift missions in Africa, in Bosnia, and other places. And we pay for that ourselves. The French do not help us. The British do not help us. We know the Japanese do not help us. They are tight with their dollars. So we pay for our unilateral efforts and then we also pay the lion's share of the contribution to the United Nations operations.

Let me tell you what happens. The gentleman well knows that when we are involved in these peacekeeping efforts, we do what people in the military call "taking expenses out of hide."

Taking expenses out of hide means that because we are paying for these peacekeeping operations in Rwanda, Haiti, Bosnia, and other places, troops are going untrained. That means, as the gentleman from San Diego, my seat mate, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], says, top gun does not get to go through its exercises. As he says, pilots fight like they train. The way you keep your pilots alive in combat is to train them well. But they do not get that training because we are taking those readiness dollars, those dollars that maintain their combat readiness, and we are spending those on peacekeeping operations.

I would challenge any Member of the House who wants to utter derogatory words with respect to the facts that are in H.R. 7, I would challenge any of them, as I challenged the Secretary of Defense to find any factual mistakes in the findings that we made in this bill.

Further, the bill goes on to say that a return to the hollow forces of the 1970's has already begun. The Secretary of Defense took issue with that. He said, that is not true. We are by far the most ready and the best military in the world.

Well, that is true. We are, as of right now, the most ready military in the world.

But we say that a return to the hollow forces has begun. And let me tell you some of the symptoms.

In 1994, one third of the units in the Army contingency force and all of the forward-deployed and follow-on Army divisions were reporting a reduced state of military readiness. During fis-

cal year 1994, training readiness declined for the Navy's Atlantic and Pacific Fleets. Funding shortfalls for that fiscal year resulted in grounding of Navy and Marine Corps aircraft squadrons and cancellation and curtailment of Army training exercises.

Those are symptoms of a return to a hollow military.

As of January 1, 1995, military pay is approximately 12.8 percent below comparable civilian levels. As a result, it is estimated that close to 17,000 junior enlisted personnel are having to take food stamps.

□ 2200

The Secretary of Defense may not like that fact, but that is the fact. They came out of his Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, farther, and one factor that really influenced at least the Republican leadership's decision to sponsor H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act, we looked at what President Clinton wanted in terms of force structure. He decided he wanted to take our Army divisions from 18 to 10. He decided he wanted to take our air wings from 24 to 14. He decided on our reductions in Navy ships that were fairly massive. He decided on making a number of cancellations of weapon systems.

But even to support that constrained, reduced force structure, the General Accounting Office found that the President's budget, the amount of money that he made available to us to support the forces of Army and Navy and Marines that we wanted, was \$150 billion short. He did not give us enough money to do what he told us to do.

That is according to the General Accounting Office. The Congressional Budget Office came up with a figure that was less than \$150 billion, but nonetheless a very substantial figure, many tens of billions of dollars.

So we were faced with a situation in which the President apparently, according to our analysts, is not giving enough money so that the people that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] spoke about so poignantly, our fighting soldiers, will have the right equipment, the best equipment to carry out very dangerous missions.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just propose a question. I would be very interested in any thoughts the gentleman has on this.

Could the gentleman address the issue of what the underfunding does to the leadership in terms of the types of decisions that they need to make, the day-to-day decisions based on the financial necessities of maintaining the forces, particularly the high levels of operation and high levels of deployment, and how that has an insidious effect on our military structure?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to tell the gentleman that when you are forced to use your money for the peacekeeping operations, if that is what the gentleman is talking about, these new missions the President gives

you—for example, when our marines came back from Bosnia, my understanding is they were given 12 days with their families after being away for many months, and sent immediately into the Haiti theater.

When that happens, and when the military has to use its money for operations, that means that they have to stop training exercises in many cases. That is why three Army divisions, three of our top Army divisions, were given C ratings that were less than combat ready. That means that they do not have enough money for training. That means that they do not have ammunition for training, perhaps. That means that their equipment is not kept up to speed.

Last year we did about 64 percent of what we required in terms of depot-level maintenance. That means our big equipment that we needed to take into the shop and get fixed so we could take it out on the next operation, we only did about 64 percent of what we had to do. That means that some equipment was 64 percent ready, and that means, in shorthand, if you had 100 tanks, you fixed 64 of them, not 100 of them.

What it does is make our military less ready to be able to respond to a national emergency. That is bad.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. LONGLEY. It does, Mr. Speaker.

Could the gentleman address the issues relating to the base closing process? Are we really reconsolidating and realigning our facilities?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the base closing process, to answer the gentleman, was supposed to be a process in which we cut military infrastructure. By cutting down the overhead in the rear, just like a business, if you have a lot of people out there making products and you have a lot of people in the back offices who are executives, if you close down some of your overhead, that is all the white collar workers, then you become more efficient and you are able to make more products for the amount of money invested.

The idea with our base closure was, in pulling down this massive force structure that won the cold war for us and won Desert Storm for us, by reducing divisions from 18 to 10, by reducing our fighter air wings from 24 to 14, and on down the line, that what we needed to do at the same time was reduce a lot of these bases in the United States because we did not need all that overhead, just like a company does not need a lot of overhead if it reduces its operations.

That is true in many cases. We had bases in this country that were designed to hold off attacks from the Apache Indians. Those bases just managed to stay around because, even after peace was entered into between native Americans and our Federal Government, there was a good old Congressman there who wanted to keep that bastion of Federal soldiers with that

payroll in his district, so we did have bases that did not perform a strong military mission. We did need to close those.

However, what we have done now is we have gone beyond closing those bases that are truly useless. We have started closing bases which have a real military requirement, but beyond that, we are not closing the bases effectively.

What has happened is that in closing bases, we have bought ourselves massive environmental problems and massive environmental costs, and we now see that it is costing us a ton of money to close the bases, much more than we ever anticipated.

What that means is like an uncle who has a string of condominiums. He just wants to give them away to his nephews, but his nephews tell him, "Uncle, before you give those condominiums to us, free of charge," like we want to give a lot of our bases away to States and counties and cities, "we want to charge you \$1 million apiece to clean them up."

So we are spending a lot of our military money paying lawyers who are involved in lawsuits and administration of environmental laws with respect to our bases. We are not moving a lot of dirt, we are not really doing a lot of real substantial cleanup work. We are basically paying now a massive bureaucracy which shoves paper back and forth to its various members and gets paid for it, and at the same time keeps the bases from totally closing, and all that money comes out of the military budget.

I would say to the gentleman now that instead of spending as much money as we should on fuel, on flying time, on steaming time, on ammunition, we are now spending an extraordinary amount of money with lawyers and environmental regulators in the base closure business, so we have become ensnarled in a massive bureaucracy. We are going to have to cut off some of those environmental costs. I think we are going to have to defer them to a later time and simply, in some cases, put a padlock on those bases that we have closed, but stop spending our readiness money that keeps our troops ready to fight.

Does that answer the gentleman's questions?

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

Mr. HUNTER. Would the gentleman continue to yield, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. LONGLEY. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention one other thing that the Republican leadership placed in this National Security Revitalization Act, H.R. 7, that is related to the safety of the American people. We stated in this act that we shall deploy national ballistic missile defense systems and theater missile defense systems.

We live in an age of missiles. Dozens of countries now are developing bal-

listic missiles. We cannot avoid that, we cannot deny it. We cannot say, "That is war in the heavens, and we are not going to participate," because those missiles go up into the sky but they come down and they land in cities, they land on military bases, they land in the theaters where our young people in uniform serve.

We live in an age of missiles. We have to realize that, just like our forebears learned at the start of the century that we had entered the age of machineguns and we had entered the age of tanks and armor, and we had to adapt to that.

We still had a few old generals who wanted to keep the cavalry because they loved the cavalry. We had cavalry training operations up into the 1930's. Some of them said, "Boys, we just want to get faster horses, that is the answer." But that was not the answer.

The Democrat leadership has been reluctant to acknowledge that we live in an age of missiles. I will never forget watching Walter Mondale standing at the Democrat Presidential nomination convention in San Francisco and saying of the Republican idea of defending ourselves against incoming nuclear missiles, "That is war in the heavens, and I will never participate in that."

I cannot help but think, because Mr. Mondale is a fine gentleman, that if he was watching CNN and watched American Patriot missiles shooting down incoming Scud ballistic missiles—that is a slow ballistic missile, but a ballistic missile nonetheless, made by the Soviet Union—I am sure that when Mr. Mondale saw that incoming Scud coming into an American troop concentration, young men and women from the United States stationed in Saudi Arabia, and he saw a Patriot missile shoot up just like a bullet hitting a bullet and destroying that Scud, I am sure Walter Mondale, who said "I will never participate in war in the heavens," probably said "Thank heavens."

On that line, we now have to come together, Democrat and Republican, and concede that we live in an age of missiles and we have to do two things. We are going to have to have a capability of shooting down Scud missiles, the new missiles that North Korea is building and proliferating in the Middle East, Soviet missiles that are being sold by out-of-work generals in the former Soviet Union to Middle Eastern clients, to terrorist nations, and we have to have the ability to shoot those missiles down when they come into our troop concentrations in the Middle East or elsewhere.

Those are called theater ballistic missiles. They are kind of like the Models T's of missiles. They crank along a little bit slower than ICBM's.

□ 2210

Second, we have to be able to shoot down ICBM's, because other nations than the former Soviet Union are making ICBM's. Red China is making ICBM's. Those are missiles that can

travel from China to the United States of America. North Korea is making ICBM's. They are trying to develop ICBM's that will be able to reach initially at least Alaska and later on other parts of the United States.

So we have to have a system that can deter, can beat, just like that Patriot missile going up and shooting down that Model T ballistic missile, the Scud, we have to have a system that can go up and shoot down one of those Cadillac ICBM's made by the former Soviet Union, made by red China, made by North Korea. And as our intelligence leaders have told you, the people we pay in our intelligence agencies, all of these nations, some of them led by very unstable leaders who want to get a piece of the action, who want to be superpowers, who want to have leverage in world affairs, are using as their weapon of choice, they envision their weapon of choice to be the intercontinental ballistic missile.

So we have to embark on a program to develop a national missile defense and a theater missile defense and this H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act that was passed by the House Committee on Armed Services, and I probably say, passed by about 40 some votes to 18, I think, Democrats and Republicans passed this act.

This act says it shall be the policy of the United States to develop and deploy a national missile defense and a theater missile defense. That is the first time a body in either House has made such a strong commitment.

I am proud of my colleagues who joined with us, myself, the gentleman from Maine; our great chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, FLOYD SPENCE, who led that bill through the markup process. I am glad so many Members of the other side of the aisle joined with us to see to it that American is well-defended. You cannot defend America if you do not defend against missiles.

Mr. LONGLEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the strong note that is important that the public understands and the Members of this House understand is the very strong bipartisan commitment, not only in the other pieces of legislation that have been proceeding through this House in the last 3 weeks, but we have had strong cores in each party who have been aggressively working together to try to address issues of concern to the national interest.

As we move through the next several weeks, particularly as we hear more about the National Security Revitalization Act, I think that the public is going to recognize the strong bipartisan, nonpartisan commitment to defending this great country against the threats that she faces as we move into the future.

I welcome the opportunity to work with the chairman of the subcommittee and with the members of the committee as we address these very important issues.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and tomorrow on account of attending a funeral.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 5:30 p.m. and tomorrow, February 3, on account of attending Grandparents Day at granddaughter's school in Detroit.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. THURMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, on February 3.

Mr. BARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. THURMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mrs. LINCOLN.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. COSTELLO in two instances.

Mr. GEJDESON.

Mr. RUSH.

Ms. ESHOO in two instances.

Mr. CLAY.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. KIM.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. HOSTETTLER.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 3, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

269. A letter from the Chairman, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the Commission's report, including unaudited financial statements, covering the operations of the Panama Canal during fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3722; to the Committee on National Security.

270. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's annual report "Energy Outlook, 1995," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(1); to the Committee on Commerce.

271. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on various issues of the Safety Research Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2039; to the Committee on Commerce.

272. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 10-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

273. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the fiscal year 1994 report on implementation of the Support for East European Democracy Act [SEED] Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5474; to the Committee on International Relations.

274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the administration's annual report on United States assistance and related programs for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5814; to the Committee on International Relations.

275. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report on procedures established for effective coordination of research and development on arms control, nonproliferation and disarmament, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 711; to the Committee on International Relations.

276. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB