

## NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this morning as I read the Wall Street Journal, I came across Mark Helprin's article called "The Fire Next Time." The thesis of Mr. Helprin is this:

The consensus that doing much to protect America is preferable to doing too little has been destroyed. If the President does not rebuild it, we will suffer the consequences.

I commend this article to the Senate. I do not think it is totally the President's responsibility. It certainly falls on many of us to help the President and the Secretary of Defense and those in the National Security Agency and the Vice President, all of them working on what should be our defense policy, to find ways to rehabilitate our national defense. Very clearly, we do not have the defense we need for the future.

At one point in this article, Mr. Helprin says this:

God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap. For what they perceive as an extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters altogether or shortens with quick victories.

I do hope all of us will think about how we can restore our national prestige in terms of being the superpower of the world and having the power to defend that position.

I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 2001]

## THE FIRE NEXT TIME

(By Mark Helprin)

From Alexandria in July of 1941, Randolph Churchill reported to his father as the British waited for Rommel to attack upon Egypt. In the midst of a peril that famously concentrated mind and spirit, he wrote, "You can see generals wandering around GHQ looking for bits of string."

Apparently these generals were not, like their prime minister, devoted to Napoleon's maxim, "Frappez la masse, et le reste vient par surcroit," which, vis-a-vis strategic or other problems, bids one to concentrate upon the essence, with assurance that all else will follow in train, even bits of string.

## CONSENSUS DESTROYED

Those with more than a superficial view of American national security, who would defend and preserve it from the fire next time, have by necessity divided their forces in advocacy of its various elements, but they have neglected its essence. For the cardinal issue of national security is not China, is not Russia, is not weapons of mass destruction, or missile defense, the revolution in military affairs, terrorism, training, or readiness. It is, rather, that the general consensus in regard to defense since Pearl Harbor—that doing too much is more prudent than doing too little—has been destroyed. The last time we devoted a lesser proportion of our resources to defense, we were well protected by the oceans, in the midst of a depression, and without major international responsibilities, and even then it was a dereliction of duty.

The destruction is so influential that traditional supporters of high defense spending, bent to the will of their detractors, shrink

from argument, choosing rather to negotiate among themselves so as to prepare painstakingly crafted instruments of surrender.

A leader of defense reform, whose life mission is to defend the United States, writes to me: "Please do not quote me under any circumstances by name. . . . Bush has no chance of winning the argument that more money must be spent on defense. Very few Americans feel that more money needs to be spent on defense and they are right. The amount of money being spent is already more than sufficient."

More than sufficient to fight China? It is hard to think of anything less appealing than war with China, but if we don't want that we must be able to deter China, and to deter China we must have the ability to fight China. More than sufficient to deal with simultaneous invasions of Kuwait, South Korea, and Taiwan? More than sufficient to stop even one incoming ballistic missile? Not yet, not now, and, until we spend the money, not ever.

For someone of the all-too-common opinion that a strong defense is the cause of war, a favorite trick is to advance a wholesale revision of strategy, so that he may accomplish his depredations while looking like a reformer. This pattern is followed instinctively by the French when they are in alliance and by the left when it is trapped within the democratic order. But to do so one need be neither French nor on the left.

Neville Chamberlain, who was neither, starved the army and navy on the theory that the revolution in military affairs of his time made the only defense feasible that of a "Fortress Britain" protected by the Royal Air Force—and then failed in building up the air force. Bill Clinton, who is not French, and who came into office calling for the discontinuance of heavy echelons in favor of power projection, simultaneously pressed for a severe reduction in aircraft carriers, the sine qua non of power projection. Later, he and his strategical toadies embraced the revolution in military affairs not for its virtues but because even the Clinton-ravished military "may be unaffordable," and "advanced technology offers much greater military efficiency."

This potential efficiency is largely unfamiliar to the general public. For example, current miniaturized weapons may seem elephantine after advances in extreme ultraviolet lithography equip guidance and control systems with circuitry not .25 microns but .007 microns wide, a 35-fold reduction that will make possible the robotization of arms, from terminally guided and target-identifying bullets to autonomous tank killers that fly hundreds of miles, burrow into the ground, and sleep like locusts until they are awoken by the seismic signature of enemy armor.

Lead-magnesium-niobate transducers in broadband sonars are likely to make the seas perfectly transparent, eliminating for the first time the presumed invulnerability of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, the anchor of strategic nuclear stability.

The steady perfection of missile guidance has long made nearly everything the left says about nuclear disarmament disingenuous or uninformed, and the advent of metastable explosives creates the prospect of a single B-1 bomber carrying the non-nuclear weapons load of 450 B-17s, the equivalent of 26,800 100-pound bombs. Someday, we will have these things, or, if we abstain, our potential enemies will have them and we will not.

To field them will be more expensive than fielding less miraculous weapons, which cannot simply be abandoned lest an enemy exploit the transition, and which will remain as indispensable as the rifleman holding his

ground, because the nature of war is counter-miraculous. And yet, when the revolution in military affairs is still mainly academic, we have cut recklessly into the staple forces.

God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap. For what they perceive as extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters altogether or shortens with quick victories. In the name of their misplaced frugality we have transformed our richly competitive process of acquiring weapons into the single-supplier model of the command economies that we defeated in the Cold War, largely with the superior weapons that the idea of free and competitive markets allowed us to produce.

Though initially more expensive, producing half a dozen different combat aircraft and seeing which are best is better than decreeing that one will do the job and praying that it may. Among other things, strike aircraft have many different roles, and relying upon just one would be the same sort of economy as having Clark Gable play both Rhett Butler and Scarlett O'Hara.

Having relinquished or abandoned many foreign bases, the United States requires its warships to go quickly from place to place so as to compensate for their inadequate number, and has built them light using a lot of aluminum, which, because it can burn in air at 3,000 degrees Celsius, is used in incendiary bombs and blast furnaces. (Join the navy and see the world. You won't need to bring a toaster.)

And aluminum or not, there are too few ships. During the EP-3 incident various pinheads furthered the impression of an American naval cordon off the Chinese coast. Though in 1944 the navy kept 17 major carriers in the central Pacific alone, not long ago its assets were so attenuated by the destruction of a few Yugos disguised as tanks that for three months there was not in the vast western Pacific even a single American aircraft carrier.

What remains of the order of battle is crippled by a lack of the unglamorous, costly supports that are the first to go when there isn't enough money. Consider the floating dry dock. By putting ships back into action with minimal transit time, floating dry docks are force preservers and multipliers. In 1972, the United States had 94. Now it has 14. Though history is bitter and clear, this kind of mistake persists.

Had the allies of World War II been prepared with a sufficient number of so pedestrian a thing as landing craft, the war might have been cheated of a year and a half and many millions of lives. In 1940, the French army disposed of 530 artillery pieces, 830 antitank guns, and 235 (almost half) of its best tanks, because in 1940 the French did not think much of the Wehrmacht—until May.

How shall the United States avoid similar misjudgments? Who shall stand against the common wisdom when it is wrong about deterrence, wrong about the causes of war, wrong about the state of the world, wrong about the ambitions of ascendant nations, wrong about history, and wrong about human nature?

## THE PRUDENT COURSE

In the defense of the United States, doing too much is more prudent than doing too little. Though many in Congress argue this and argue it well, Congress will not follow one of its own. Though the president's appointees also argue it well, the public will wait only upon the president himself. Only he can sway a timid Congress, clear the way for his appointees, and move the country toward the restoration of its military power.

The president himself must make the argument, or all else is in vain. If he is unwilling to risk his political capital and his presidency to undo the damage of the past eight years, then in the fire next time his name will be linked with that of his predecessor, and there it will stay forever.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask consent I be given 10 minutes to address the Senate.

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

#### OFF-SHORE DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong opposition to oil and gas exploration off the coast of Florida. Specifically, the issue at hand is the sale of Lease Sale 181. I am certainly not alone. There are 16 million Floridians who join in this opposition. Senator BOB GRAHAM as well, Florida State elected officials, certainly the legislature of Florida and most of the Florida congressional delegation opposes any drilling in Lease Sale 181.

Lease Sale 181 may not be included in the current moratorium on lease sales off the coast of Florida, but in the hearts of all Floridians it is part of the moratorium. Moreover, there has never been a production drilling rig actually producing off the coast of Florida because Floridians unequivocally oppose offshore drilling because of the threat it presents to the State's greatest natural and economic resource: our coastal environment.

Florida's coastal waters provide an irreplaceable link in the life cycle of many species, both marine and terrestrial. Florida's beaches, fisheries, and wildlife draw millions of tourists each year from around the globe, supporting our State's largest industry, tourism. Florida's commercial fishing industry relies on these estuaries as nurseries for the most commercially harvested fish. Nearly 90 percent of the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico are caught on the West Florida Shelf and contribute directly to Florida's economy.

Oil spills would be devastating to Florida's beaches, coastal waters, reefs, and fisheries. The chronic pollution and discharges from drilling would detrimentally effect the shallow, clean water marine communities found on the Florida outer continental shelf. For these reasons, I cannot sit back and watch as my State, one of our nation's environmental jewels, is degraded.

I know some may have differing views because other issues or concerns consume their constituents; and I respect those views. However, in Florida the environment and tourism are of paramount importance. The beaches, the abundant fisheries, and the pristine waters make Florida what it is today; and the people of Florida want it to stay that way. Just as drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would not solve the administration's claimed energy crisis, drilling in Lease Sale 181 will not either. Increased conservation and increased fuel efficiency in our cars would do more to meet our country's energy needs than drilling in Lease Sale 181. For these reasons, I must adamantly object to and vigorously oppose the sale of Lease Sale 181; and I hope the rest of this body listens to the pleas of Floridians.

All of the oil and gas that would come out of this proposed lease sale would only give about 2 months worth of energy for the country. That is simply not a viable tradeoff for the damage it would do to our economy and our environment. We are not willing to make that tradeoff in Florida. As a matter of fact, as you talk about drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, isn't it interesting. If you put it into the context of all the barrels of oil that are projected to be pumped from that wildlife refuge, that energy consumption could be replaced if we but increased all new vehicles in their energy efficiency by 3 miles per gallon. That puts the crisis in context.

Conservation is considerably important. The use of research and development to produce more energy-efficient appliances, more energy-efficient automobiles—there is no reason why this country that has the technological prowess cannot produce a car that is economical and that will get 80 miles per gallon. We have that within our grasp. Think what that would do to our energy consumption.

As a matter of fact, when you look at the uses of energy by this Nation, the transportation sector is the sector that consumes most of that energy. Just think what future energy-efficient automobiles could do for us.

But that is a subject of larger proportions. Today, I rise on behalf of a State that has ecologically pristine beaches and the need to be kept just that way. This proposed lease sale for oil and gas drilling clearly jeopardizes the future economy and ecology of Florida.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor. 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. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, just prior to the Easter recess, the Senate completed action on the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution. I voted in favor of final passage of the budget resolution, recognizing that it does not reflect everything that I wanted. However, I am thankful the Senate-passed resolution does contain a fair amount of what President Bush had originally proposed in his budget plan.

Nevertheless, it is my hope that when the Senate does go to conference with the House—which has passed a more stringent budget resolution—the end result will yield a budget resolution more in-tune with the President's more responsible package.

As it was originally put forward, I felt the Bush budget plan provided much of the fiscal responsibility I have long sought from Washington prior to, and since, becoming a Member of the Senate. Specifically, it restrains the growth of spending, reduces the debt as fast as is prudent, and allows for meaningful tax cuts. This is what I like to refer to as a "three-legged stool" approach. For this package to work, however, we have to insist on a balanced approach, because fiscal responsibility, like a three-legged stool, cannot stand if one leg is significantly longer or shorter than the others.

Unfortunately, if we characterized the Senate budget resolution as a three-legged stool, it would be rather wobbly right now since under the Senate budget resolution, discretionary spending increases at 8 percent, and that is double the amount the President suggested.

People often forget the President's proposal increased spending by a modest 4 percent at a time when inflation is approximately 2.8 percent, meaning it contains a real increase of 1.2 percent. In contrast, the Senate budget resolution, in real terms, results in a spending increase of 5.2 percent. That is a 333-percent higher rate of growth than what the President proposes.

These increases may sound like small numbers in the grand scheme of things, or in the Senate, but do not be fooled. It adds up to tens and hundreds of billions of dollars in more spending over time.

If we continue to spend money at this rate, we will have less resources to address important national needs, such as reforming Social Security, reforming Medicare, or providing a prescription drug benefit.

Indeed, according to calculations by the Concord Coalition, the Senate budget resolution includes new and expanded entitlement spending that is going to cost \$600 billion over 10 years, and discretionary spending that may total \$240 billion over 10 years.

Coupled with the resulting increased interest cost of \$550 billion, this package of amendments to the budget resolution could reduce the on-budget surplus by \$1.4 trillion over 10 years.

I say to my colleagues, enough is enough. We have to stop this rampant