

allows companies to save on taxes on their United States profits as well.

By reducing their tax bills, companies can increase their profits and better compete against rivals both in the United States and abroad. Many American companies assert that some profits are taxed twice, at home and abroad, putting them at an unfair disadvantage against rivals in countries abroad with lower or no taxes.

But the corporate flight from taxes has raised concerns among some members of both parties in Congress. Bipartisan legislation to block such moves has been proposed, but House Republican leaders have refused to allow it to reach a vote.

Congress permits companies to move their headquarters outside the United States, but it requires shareholders to pay taxes on capital gains earned until that time. These taxes can be paid by the company or by the shareholders. The Stanley board decided that shareholders should foot the bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, over the next few days, I will be taking time to comment on legislation recently approved by the House of Representatives, H.R. 4546, the fiscal year 2003 National Defense Authorization Act.

I voted against this legislation because it perpetuates the misguided spending priorities and lack of accountability that is ingrained at the Pentagon.

In my upcoming series of floor statements, I will be outlining some of the reasons I opposed this bill. I will also be describing several common sense amendments I drafted to H.R. 4546 that were blocked from consideration on the floor by the House Rules Committee.

Before I get into some of specific reasons why I opposed this bill, I wanted to mention a few of the provisions I felt are worthwhile.

I am pleased H.R. 4546 continues the effort begun a few years ago to improve the pay and benefits for our men and women in uniform. This legislation includes a 4.1 percent pay raise, with other targeted raises of 6.5 percent for mid-grade and senior noncommissioned officers and mid-grade officers.

The bill also reduces out-of-pocket housing costs for military personnel by increasing housing allowances to cover 92.5 percent of all housing costs. The ultimate goal is to eliminate out-of-pocket expenses by 2005.

The bill extends the practice of authorizing special pay and bonus incentives for key personnel. These incentives will also be extended to National Guard and Reserve members.

H.R. 4546 also includes long overdue provisions to assist military retirees. For example, for individuals with a disability rating of at least 60 percent, the bill would eliminate the requirement that retirement pay be reduced by an amount equal to any disability compensation received through the Department of Veterans Affairs. Congress should now work toward repealing the disability compensation offset for all veterans.

Important enhancements to TRICARE were also included in the bill.

I was pleased these quality-of-life improvements for active duty and retired personnel

were proposed. I have consistently worked throughout my congressional career to ensure our military men and women are not forgotten in military budget debates. After all, having adequately compensated, fed, and trained troops is arguably more important to our national security than gold-plated weapons systems.

Unfortunately, these worthy provisions were heavily outweighed by the many problems in the rest of the bill.

The problems with the bill include the gag rule under which it was brought to the floor.

There were more than 80 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for the defense authorization bill. Only 25 were allowed on the House floor. Of those 25, around half were noncontroversial amendments that were eventually rolled into a manager's amendment.

What would be the harm in providing 10 minutes of debate on all of the amendments submitted to the Rules Committee? That would allow approximately six amendments to be debated per hour, which would mean it would take 2–3 days to finish the bill, assuming we actually would work a full day. Is that really too much to ask—that we should have 2–3 days to debate Pentagon spending which, after all, accounts for \$1 of every \$2 available to Congress for discretionary spending?

This House used to debate the defense authorization bill for a week or more at a time. Apparently, the Rules Committee believes that Congress doesn't have the right to debate Pentagon priorities during a time of war. Stifling debate does a disservice to the American people and does not constitute national security readiness for our country.

Under the gag rule on H.R. 4546, Congress was authorizing \$833 million in spending for the Pentagon for every minute of debate. It was an expensive debate, but not an extensive debate.

So what type of issues did the Rules Committee and the House Republican leadership believe the American people did not deserve to have a debate about?

I offered five amendments questioning the merits of weapons systems like the Crusader artillery system, the Comanche helicopter, and the F–22 fighter jet. I also offered an important amendment with Representative RON PAUL to reinforce Congress' constitutional prerogatives relating to war.

The Rules Committee blocked all of these amendments from even being debated on the House floor.

Since the Rules Committee wouldn't allow a debate during floor consideration of the bill, over the next several days, I will take time on the House floor to explain my amendments and why the House should have adopted them.

Two of my amendments were offered on behalf of Secretary Rumsfeld to help him carry out his stated intention of terminating the unjustifiable \$11 billion Crusader artillery system.

Even President Bush has lambasted the program. During the campaign, when asked for an example of a wasteful Pentagon program that would be sacrificed in the name of military transformation, he said, "I'll give you an example—the Crusader Howitzer program. It looks like it's too heavy, it's not lethal enough."

Even soldiers on the front line know the Crusader is a turkey. I recently met the father of an Army artillery soldier. I asked him what

his son thought of the Crusader. He said his son considered it "a joke."

Despite universal support among independent military analysts as varied as the CATO Institute, the Center for Defense Information, and the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments for terminating the Crusader, some powerful Members of Congress have decided that they know best and included nearly half a billion dollars for the Crusader in H.R. 4546 as well as report language prohibiting the cancellation of this ridiculous program.

My amendments sought to overturn this misguided effort to keep the Crusader program.

One of my amendments would have cut the \$475.2 million from the Army's research, development, test and evaluation account that was provided by the House Armed Services Committee for the Crusader.

My other Crusader-related amendment would have prohibited the funds in H.R. 4546 from being spent on the Crusader program until the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to Congress certifying his continued support for the program as well as an analysis of a number of problematic aspects of the Crusader program.

Proponents of the Crusader claim it is faster and can fire farther than the system it's replacing, the Paladin. The Army even faxed talking points to some select members of the House Armed Services Committee with the disingenuous, outrageous claim that U.S. soldiers would be killed if the Crusader program was cancelled.

The Crusader is essentially a computer simulation. I think there have been a few laboratory tests. But, make no mistake, the Crusader essentially doesn't exist. It's still on the drawing board. It's not scheduled for deployment until 2008. For the Army to make the claim that terminating the continued development of a computer simulated artillery system threatens the lives of U.S. soldiers is pathetic and misleading, to say the least.

So, what's wrong with the Crusader? In short, everything.

Let's start with the mission. Planning for the Crusader began after the Gulf War when the Army discovered the Paladin system had trouble keeping up with our tanks and fighting vehicles. But, the Crusader's mission—blowing holes in massive lines of approaching soldiers—is irrelevant to the real world threats we face. The Soviet Union doesn't exist. There are not going to be lines of communist troops marching across the plains of Europe.

Further, in Kosovo and Afghanistan, the two largest post-Gulf War military engagements, it became clear that aircraft with smart bombs and, in Afghanistan, on-the-ground human spotters, can effectively take out enemy positions just as effectively as any artillery system. In fact, probably more effectively since the Crusader would likely have trouble negotiating tough terrain like that found in Afghanistan.

Besides, the Army is already developing the Future Combat Systems (FCS), a portion of which has the same artillery mission and deployment date—2008—as the Crusader. So, as the Crusader is being deployed, it is immediately made obsolete by its more high-tech successor, the FCS.

The Crusader also has a number of technical problems.

A June 1997 GAO report found the cannon cannot fire if the automated loading system fails. There is no manual backup system.

The automation of the Crusader has been one of its key selling points because it would allow troops to remain under the protection of armor. But, as GAO has noted, if the automated system fails, the crew will be forced to resupply the vehicle by a "time consuming hand process, making them more vulnerable to counterfire."

Another key selling feature—the Crusader's theoretical rapid rate of fire—would drop dramatically if the cooling system fails.

A lot has also been written about the weight of the Crusader. While the weight has been reduced from 60 tons to about 40 tons, as GAO reported in February 2002, "the deployability advantage gained does not appear significant." GAO also warns that development is not done and the weight could again increase.

Not exactly the faster, more mobile force the Pentagon says it wants.

At its current weight and size, the only possible way to load two Crusaders onto a single C-17 is back to back. But, that only leaves mere inches of room, not enough space to properly restrain them with heavy chains.

There is also some concern on how the Army has reduced the weight. The Army reduced the size and payload of the system. The Army also plans to remove the heavy armor and road wheel protection and turn them into kits that can be applied when needed in combat situations. Weight reduction by removing armor is probably not much comfort to the soldiers.

There have also been development problems.

For example, the cost of the Crusader program has increased by \$1.5 billion.

Testing to date has been restricted to modeling and simulation, hardly sufficient to determine if the Crusader can operate in real-world operational environments.

As GAO noted in its February, 2002 report, many critical Crusader technologies are not sufficiently mature to start product develop-

ment. GAO wrote, "If, after starting product development, the Crusader technologies do not mature on schedule and instead cause delays, the Army may spend more and take longer to develop, produce and field the Crusader system. Crusader performance goals may be at risk."

GAO also wrote, "Confining delays in maturing technology to a time prior to the start of product development . . . is critical to saving time and money . . . a delay during product development costs several times more than a similar delay that occurs before product development."

Despite all of these problems, and Secretary Rumsfeld's stated intention to kill the program, Congress fully funded the Crusader program in H.R. 4546.

The conference committee that will be created to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the DOD authorization bill should kill the Crusader program. If they don't, and if money is included in the upcoming DOD appropriations bill for the Crusader, I will do my best to eliminate its funding.

The Crusader is not necessary for our national security. Rather, it is a corporate welfare boondoggle for a well-connected defense firm.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEEKLY READER

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Weekly Reader, the nation's oldest and most widely-circulated periodical for school children.

The Weekly Reader dates to 1902, when Charles Palmer Davis visited his daughter's one-room schoolhouse and found only two students who knew William McKinley was the

President of the United States. After this experience, Charles Davis decided to create a children's newspaper.

Beginning with the first publication of Current Events on May 20, 1902, Weekly Reader has brought world and national news into classrooms in ways young people can understand. It has helped children learn to read and understand how events affect their lives and define their role in society.

I have a particular affection for Weekly Reader because my third grade teacher, Mrs. Kapella, encouraged me to become a member of the Weekly Reader Book Club. Over the course of the school year, I became the proud owner of seven books of my very own. This set me on a wonderful course of loving to read and sparked a lifelong interest in American history, how we became a nation, how we settled the West and how we became a world power.

The Weekly Reader's accessible style has helped students appreciate many of the important events that have shaped our world during the past century, including World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the Civil Rights Movement, the first Moon landing, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the tragic events of September 11, 2001.

Present in 90 percent of school districts in the United States, Weekly Reader is read by nearly 11 million students each week. Weekly Reader does more than report the news; it teaches tolerance and encourages children to speak their minds about important topics.

I applaud Weekly Reader for connecting our children to the world, encouraging them to become critical and imaginative thinkers and helping them grow into the leaders of tomorrow.

The longevity and popularity of Weekly Reader speaks volumes about its importance as a learning tool, and I join with others who cherish the publication in congratulating them on their centennial anniversary.