

she intends to stand firm and not pay any ransom for this most recent rash of kidnappings in her country.

The United States and the Philippines have a very long and proud history of friendship and cooperation, although not always in agreement on each and every issue, thus punctuating the need to continue to work closely with the Philippines in helping them resolve this internal crisis.

I understand that the new administration's, President Bush's administration, strategy review is expected to cast the Asian Pacific region as perhaps the single most important region for military planners. I cannot agree with this renewed focus more. Of course it will bring more attention, not only to my home island of Guam, but to our relationship with the Philippines.

While in Manila, I met with President Arroyo, participated in a series of discussions with Vice President Guingona, who is also concurrently the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, about the implementation of the visiting forces agreement between the U.S. and the Philippines which was formulated in 1999.

□ 1415

This positive step forward hopefully will revive and reinvigorate the security relationship between our two countries, which has declined following the U.S. withdrawal from the military bases there in 1992.

I also drew attention to some of the cleanup issues that are remaining from Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Station, formerly U.S. sites, which I also visited. I think it is important that we have a clear understanding of the problems that continue to exist. Last month, the House passed my amendment to the foreign relations authorization bill, which encourages a nongovernmental study to examine environmental contamination and any health effects emanating from these former U.S. facilities. I want to make clear that the United States is not legally required to provide cleanup, but we continue to have a moral obligation to at least investigate and do what we can.

A new study on May 14 by the RAND organization entitled "U.S. and Asia—Toward a New U.S. Strategy and Force Posture" reinforces the current administration's thinking by outlining the importance of an engaged United States in the Asia-Pacific theater. This study argues that the U.S. engage in new relationships with the Philippines and with Guam. Specifically, the study reports that the U.S. should expand cooperation with the Philippines and that the Philippines may present an interesting opportunity to enhance Air Force access in the western Pacific. I could not agree any more with that study.

The Philippines is an important country to the United States, not only because of our long historical relation-

ship but because of our new strategic posture and challenges that we face in this century. I urge all House Members to consider this information and to consider this important piece of our puzzle, our strategy puzzle, in the Asia-Pacific region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE 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 Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROEMER 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 Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESIDENT PROPOSES TO CEASE LIVE COMBINED ARMS TRAINING ON VIEQUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to come to the well today to learn that President Bush is proposing to cease live combined arms training on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques by 2003. In short, the President and his administration are ignoring the issue of military readiness and national security.

In opinion editorials, congressional testimony and official DOD press releases, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General James Jones, and the former Chief of Naval Operation, Jay Johnson, repeatedly stressed to the Clinton administration the importance of combined arms training at Vieques. Their simple and continued message has been very clear: "Without Vieques, the Second Fleet cannot train, evaluate, or certify Battle Group/Amphibious Ready Group teams for combat operations."

In fact, Admiral Johnson testified in a hearing in 1999 that "Vieques is not only the sole training facility on the East Coast that offers crucial combined

live arms training, the range also serves as a model for the world because it offers the ability to conduct actual time synchronization of air, ground, surface, and subsurface components with live ordnance."

Even former President Clinton's special panel on military operations on Vieques concluded that "the separation of certain aspects of current training into their component parts cannot replicate the ideal solution that has been available by the integration of all operational activities at Vieques."

Meanwhile, it appears that this decision will and could perhaps put American men and women at risk in the future. Why? Because it denies them the necessary combined arms training needed to succeed in combat operations. From World War II through our most recent crisis in Kosovo, our Nation's military has been able to meet our Nation's call to arms because of the preparation we afford them at training ranges all over the world but in particular here at Vieques. History has taught us the success or failure of our Nation's military and the risk of loss of life is a direct function of the preparation we afford them prior to combat. Closing the Vieques training range will result in a significant loss of critical combat training, which is essential to our Navy and Marine forces.

Whether it was the Gulf War, that I participated in, or other military operations, we are beginning to dull our own Nation, as if we can place our men and women at risk and somehow, if we are able to conduct these operations with standoff weapons, that there will be no risk of life. We should fall upon our knees and thank the military leaders, those tough NCOs that are out there, those master sergeants, those lieutenants and company commanders who are doing the tough training, because that is what saves lives on the battlefield. And when they train on the ground, it has to be coordinated not only from the sea but also from the air for a combined operation.

I was on the island of Vieques. They need to be able to land the Marines, and the Marines landing need to be able to call in; whether it is naval gunfire, whether it is artillery, or whether calling in from the ship to air, the air to land, but all coordinated on one point. Why? To increase the lethality. Now that sounds brutal, but what is fighting our Nation's wars about? It is bringing lethality to a particular point in time so we can win on the battlefield.

So I am very disappointed that someone down at the White House or others have made judgments without being very good listeners to our military planners, and I appeal, I appeal to the administration to rethink what they have done here. There is absolutely no substitute for training with live ammunition. Do not succumb to the temptation that live fire combined with arms training on Vieques can be duplicated elsewhere or overemphasize simulation

technology. While simulation is valuable training, our servicemen and women will ultimately be playing Nintendo and think that that is war.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the President of the United States, this Congress, and the American people about the essence of combat operations. In short, combat is to close with and destroy the enemy by firepower and maneuver and/or close combat. This applies to all aspects of military operations, whether it is air, whether it is on land, or whether it is sea. It is dirty, it is ugly business, and war fighting requires the confidence and ability to handle live fire.

FATHERHOOD RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to promote responsible fatherhood for Father's Day.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in addition to supporting the great efforts of the gentlewoman from Indiana, I would like to be able to acknowledge that we are filing today H. Res. 166 that will commemorate and thank all of the valiant heroes and volunteers in the city of Houston and surrounding areas through Tropical Storm Allison.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that these volunteers deserve this recognition. They are still out on the battlefield fighting, and there are those who are still suffering as well as those who have lost their lives. We will honor these volunteers with H. Res. 166, signed by a large number of the members of the Texas delegation, and thank them for the valiant effort they performed during Tropical Storm Allison.

And I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to let the gentlewoman from Texas know that my heart goes out to her and all the people who were affected by that devastating flood situation in her district.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution to promote responsible fatherhood on behalf of Father's Day. Twenty-nine members of the Congressional Black Caucus, including the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution.

In introducing the resolution, Mr. Speaker, we aim to raise the awareness of the importance of fathers being involved in the lives of their children. I understand that all men are not dead-beat dads, some men are simply dead broke. I am probably one of the very few Members of Congress who knows personally what it is like to grow up in

a home without a father. My experience growing up fatherless is what has stirred my passion to become a leader in this movement.

Fatherlessness affects our children in more ways than we can count, preventing our children from fully reaching the potential we know they have within. While there are millions of fathers who actively support their children, there are many others who do not due to financial or social circumstances. Many absent fathers are part of the working poor and may wish to aid their children but simply cannot financially.

The goal of the fatherhood resolution is to promote responsible fatherhood, the emotional and financial support of one's children. In wishing all of God's children, all of our Father's children, a happy Father's Day, which is coming up on Sunday, I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to the promotion of this effort, of the bill that we have in, H.R. 1300, which would authorize block grants to fund programs at the local and State level, nonprofit organizations, et cetera.

The Responsible Fatherhood Act of 2001 has already garnered broad bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate, and I would encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this bill to provide men with the tools and the resources necessary to become responsible fathers.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my Happy Father's Day to you too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 thought I would take the well and talk a little bit about the hearing that we held today in the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the House Committee on Armed Services concerning the issue of missile defense.

What we did today, Democrats and Republicans, is talk to General Kadish, who heads the missile defense program for this administration, for this Nation; and we talked specifically about tests: where are we, what have we done, what works, what does not work, and where do we need to go.

One thing that General Kadish led with, which I thought was very important for Americans to understand, is that we have made progress and that we have accomplished some very important things for America. The first one goes back to the killing of 28 Americans in the Desert Storm oper-

ation when Iraqi scud missiles, which are ballistic missiles, they go about 50 percent faster than a 30.06 bullet, came in and hit a concentration of American troops, resulting in 28 deaths. We fired back as much as we could with the then Patriot missile system. At the end of that conflict, we had MIT come in and analyze whether or not we had gotten any of those missiles. One of the experts from MIT said he did not think we got any. The Army said they thought we got about 80 percent, they were not sure, but that we did have some problems.

Well, since that time, since the early 1990s, during Desert Storm, we have developed a missile defense system, now called PAC-3, the Patriot 3 missile defense system, which can shoot down on a regular basis, on a consistent basis, on a reliable basis, those incoming scud ballistic missiles. We have now had eight tests, and every one of those eight tests has intercepted.

I hear a lot of folks talking about whether or not we can hit a bullet with a bullet, because it sounds so impossible. Well, a bullet from one of our Capitol Hill policemen, a 38 bullet, for example, goes about 1,200, 1,400 feet per second. A scud missile goes maybe 7,000 feet per second. That is a scud ballistic missile. So it goes as much as four to five times as fast as some bullets. And even if we take a very high velocity bullet, a big-game rifle or a rifle that one would use on the battlefield, like a 30.06 that goes about 3,000 feet per second, a scud missile even goes about twice as fast as that bullet.

□ 1430

And the Patriot missile system that we fire at that thing, goes in excess of 4,000 feet per second. So both the target missile, that is the ballistic missile, and the missile that we shoot up to knock it down, go faster than a bullet. And eight times in our tests, we have successfully hit a bullet with a bullet.

What does that mean. Well, it means to Americans who are thinking, as they sit around the breakfast table with their family and child who may join the armed services and be stationed in the Middle East or on the Korean peninsula, it means that this country, in response to the missile threat, working as hard as it can in developing technology as quickly as possible, has developed a defense, at least against these scud missiles that are being proliferated around the world, which we are apt to see in a conflict in the near future.

It means when you have a base camp with a Marine expeditionary unit filled with 19- and 20-year-old kids from all of the farms and cities of this country or a part of the 101st Air Mobile Brigade out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky or an Air Force unit stationed somewhere enforcing the no-fly zone, it means if our adversaries launch a ballistic missile, that is a pretty slow ballistic missile as they go, but still as fast as a bullet, if they launch a scud missile attack at that contingent, our PAC-3,