

refueled at sea, and those sailors would be alive today. We are at one-half force strength. At the same time, we have more than tripled our number of deployments around the world. I might add, these are places where I contend we don't have national security strategic interests at stake.

In November of 1995, in this Chamber, we were debating whether or not to go into Bosnia. We said on this floor, it is easy to go in; it is hard to get out. We had a resolution of disapproval. It wasn't until President Clinton said: I guarantee if you vote down that resolution of disapproval, we will send the troops over there and they will all be home for Christmas, 1996. Guess what. They are still there.

It will be very difficult to get them out if the same thing happened in Kosovo. Regarding the threat in the Persian Gulf, just to handle the logistics of a war if it should break out in the Persian Gulf, we would have to be 100-percent dependent upon our Guard and Reserve to take care of the defense of this Nation. This is very difficult because the Guard and Reserve components also are down in numbers because of the retention problems we have.

That is serious. When you take that and the number of deployments, along with one-half force strength, the third component is we don't have a national missile defense system. Sometimes, I say it is handy not to be an attorney in this body because when I read the ABM Treaty that was passed, introduced by the Republicans, back in 1972, between two great superpowers, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, I contend that doesn't exist anymore. Yet that is the very thing that has been used for the last 8 years by our previous President to keep us from deploying a national missile defense system.

In 1983, we made the decision we were going to put one into effect. We were online to do that until this last administration came in.

Next, I think it is important to realize this euphoric assumption that many have—and the press does not discourage this notion; it might be our force strength is down, our deployments are up—we don't have a national missile defense system, but there is no threat out there in terms of a national missile defense. Virtually every country out there has weapons of mass destruction. Many countries have missiles that will reach the United States of America.

Take China, for example. If they fired a missile, it would take 35 minutes to get here. We have nothing in our arsenal to stop that missile from hitting an American city. Compare my State of Oklahoma and the terrible disaster, the tragedy that took place. The smallest nuclear warhead known to man is 1,000 times greater in explosive power. Think about that. China has missiles that can reach here. Do other countries besides Russia, North Korea, and China have the missile? We don't know for

sure. They are trading technology and trading systems with countries such as Iran and Iraq, Serbia, Libya, Pakistan, and others. The one thing they have in common is they don't like us. We have a serious problem.

We don't have the modernization people think. I heard people say: At least we have the finest equipment in the world.

I was proud of Gen. John Jumper not too many months ago when he came out and said: Right now we don't have anything in our arsenal as powerful in terms of air-to-air combat as the SU-27 and the SU-37. It is my understanding, if we go on with the SU-22, it is not as good as the SU-37 they are building today.

Look at our training and retention. We see our pilots leaving. We see our midlevel NCOs leaving. I talked to pilots at Corpus Navy. Forty pilots said: It is not the competition outside; it is not the money. This country has lost its sense of mission. We are not getting the training we need.

Our Air Force pilots cannot go into the desert and have red flag exercises because we don't have the money to do it. The Senator from Arizona talked about not having bullets, ammunition. We don't have bullets and ammunition. RPM accounts, the maintenance accounts, are supposed to be done immediately.

I was at Fort Bragg the other day in a rainstorm. Our troops were covering up equipment with their bodies because we don't have the money to put a roof on the barracks down there. Our equipment is old. We found some M915 trucks had a million miles on the chassis. They were in bad repair.

We see the cannibalization rate at Travis—C-5s sitting in the field with rotting parts. It is very labor intensive to get the parts back on and to uncrate new parts and replace them. In many areas, our mechanics are actually working 14 to 16 hours a day. Our retention is down.

I can think of nothing more significant at this time than to start doing exactly what our new President said he would do when he was on the campaign trail; that is, assess the problems we have now and how can we put ourselves back into position, where, No. 1, we can adequately protect America from an incoming missile.

As the Senator from Arizona said, we might have tried the same thing with the sea-based AEGIS system. We have \$50 billion invested in 22 AEGIS ships, but they cannot reach the upper tier. It costs little to get them up to knocking down incoming missiles and they can protect the troops in North Korea and both coasts in America. The opportunity is there.

I wish we had proceeded with this 10 years ago. I believe we are on the right step. The single most significant thing we can do as a Senate and Congress and the President of the United States is to rebuild our defense system, to satisfy the minimum expectations of the

American people; that is, to defend America on two regional fronts.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 310 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 311 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### THE RETIRED PAY RESTORATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, each day in America 1,000 World War II veterans die. Seven days a week, every day of every month, thousands of World War II veterans die. It is with this background that today I am going to be talking about legislation which I introduced a short time ago.

On January 24th I sponsored S. 170, the Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001. This bill addresses a 110-year-old injustice against over 450,000 of our nation's veterans. Congress has repeatedly forced the bravest men and women in our nation—retired, career veterans—to essentially forgo receipt of a portion of their retirement pay if they happen to also receive disability pay for an injury that occurred in the line of duty.

We have, in America, a law that says if you are a career military person and you also have a disability you receive while in the military, when you retire you cannot draw both pensions. If you, however, retire from the Department of Energy, or you retire from Sears & Roebuck, you can draw both pensions, but not our dedicated service men and women. They cannot draw both pensions. That is wrong. That is what this legislation is trying to correct.

The reason I did it on the background of a thousand men dying every day is because we have to do something before it is too late for those people. We have many World War II veterans who

spent a career in the military. They were in the military and received a disability. In all of these years, they have only been able to, in effect, draw one pension. That is wrong.

S. 170 permits retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service connected disability to receive military retirement pay while also receiving veterans' disability compensation.

Last year, I along with Senator INOUYE, introduced S. 2357, the Armed Forces Concurrent Retirement and Disability Payment Act of 2000. I was extremely disappointed that we did not take the opportunity to correct this long-standing inequity in the 106th Congress.

Out of 100 percent of what we should have done last year, we did 1 percent. We did very little.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Memorial Day is just over one hundred days away. There is no better honor this body could bestow upon our nations veterans who have sacrificed so much, than to pass this legislation before Memorial Day.

We are currently losing over one thousand WWII veterans each day. Every day we delay acting on this legislation means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands of men and women. They will never have the ability to enjoy their two well-deserved entitlements.

Given the tax and budget debate we are now in, I am gravely concerned that we will not have the resources that will be needed to properly fund this legislation and honor those who served our nation—our veterans.

President Bush rightfully this week is focusing attention on the U.S. military. It is very important that he do that. I think the way he is approaching things appears to me to be very reasoned. He is saying we are going to keep Clinton's budget in effect this year until we have a chance to really understand what is happening. But he ordered Secretary Rumsfeld to take a close look at it.

One of the things I want him to take a close look at is not only the readiness of the military and what happens to those people who have already served in the military, but I also say that it is very important that everyone recognize we do need and deserve and will have some kind of a tax cut. But we have to be aware of the fact we are basing these proposed tax cuts on uncertain forecasts. We are forecasting 10 years in the future.

A few days ago here in Washington they forecast morning temperatures in the midforties. Most mornings I get up and take a little run. So I was kind of happy that we were going to have a break in the weather. The forecast was it would be kind of warm. I got up, put on shorts and a T-shirt. Out I went. It was 33 degrees. There is a lot of difference between 40 and 33. I was real cold. I say that because people can't forecast very well the weather 1 day ahead. I think we who are depending on

the economists to forecast 10 years ahead must approach this with caution. I know we will do that.

We also have to be sure this tax cut is proper in size. We have to make sure we do not take away from debt reduction and that we take care of Social Security and Medicare.

Also, in addition to these projections, and the size that we are talking about with this tax cut, we want to look at fairness. Are we approaching this in the right way? Is it really appropriate?

This is in the form of a question and not a statement. Is it really appropriate that the top 1 percent and the wealthiest 1 percent get 43 percent of the tax cut? They pay a lot of the taxes—about 20 percent of the taxes. I think there has to be a debate, once we determine the projections, about the size of this tax cut—what we are going to do and how we are going to distribute that?

I was home this past weekend. Most Americans—in fact 80 percent of Americans—pay more in withholding taxes than they do in income taxes.

I also say this: The business community is concerned the tax cuts are not directed toward them but, rather, individuals. We have to make sure the tax cut we come up with is fair. As I said, this Senator supports tax cuts for all Americans. I think we have to make sure these tax cuts protect Social Security and Medicare and that we have some money left over to invest in health, education, and things such as my taking care of veterans.

Of course, for me, the biggest tax cut the American people can get is to recognize if we pay down that debt, everybody gets a tax cut. The magnitude of the tax cut that President Bush is pushing we hope will not eliminate any ability of increased funding for veterans. This is going to cost money, but it is going to cost money that is one of the fairest ways we could spend some of the surplus.

I say to President Bush: We should not leave our veterans behind. I say to Members of this Congress: We should not leave our veterans behind. Our veterans have earned this and now is our chance to honor their service to our Nation in a different way. I will work very hard to ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the dividend of our current surplus. Specifically, we have to have a fiscally responsible tax cut that allows us to protect Social Security, provide a prescription drug benefit, fund education, ensure a strong and stable military, and continue to pay down the debt.

Today, over a million and a half Americans dedicate every minute of their lives to the defense of this Nation. The U.S. military force is unmatched in the history of the world in terms of power, training, and ability, and this Nation is recognized as the world's only superpower, a status which is largely due to the sacrifices our veterans made during this last century. So rather than honoring their

commitment and bravery by fulfilling our obligations, the Federal Government has chosen instead to perpetuate a 110-year-old injustice. Quite simply, this is wrong. It borders on being disgraceful.

I hope everyone within the sound of my voice will join in honoring these veterans who deserve what they have earned. They are not asking for a handout. They are asking for what they deserve. They have disabilities. They have fulfilled their commitment in the military and are subject to that retirement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Kansas, how long does he wish to speak?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Five minutes or less because I preside at that point in time.

Mr. REID. Senator BOXER has made a request through me and I ask this of the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to speak at 4:20 p.m. for 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to Senator BOXER speaking for 25 minutes?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 315 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### SUPPORT FOR THE DEFENDERS OF OUR NATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, on July 27, 1920, in a speech before the Republican national convention in Chicago accepting his party's nomination for Vice President, Massachusetts Governor Calvin Coolidge exclaimed, "The nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten." With these striking words, Coolidge chastened the convention delegates to never take lightly the sacrifice of American soldiers, who during World War I, left freedom's shores to defend democracy abroad. Back then, Coolidge recognized that a great country must honor its guardians, lest it be forgotten.

This week, President George W. Bush has come forward under the same banner as Coolidge did in 1920, to declare that America must not forget its defenders. In a speech before the brave men and women of the United States Army's 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart Georgia, President Bush proposed \$5.7 billion in new spending for the soldiers, sailors and airmen of the Armed Forces. Specifically, the President has proposed dedicating \$400 million for across-the-board pay raises, \$1