

so that we may continue to enjoy not only the results of the research, but also the economic benefits that will arise from the fruits of that research. I90[H13SE9-402]{H8139}F

CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this evening to take this opportunity to address a very important subject. Tomorrow this House will once again consider legislation that would improve our campaign finance laws.

I know that my colleagues will say well, we have been here before. In fact, we have been here before many, many times, because this Congress and previous Congresses have considered year after year various forms of campaign finance legislation and none of those have ever passed both Houses, signed by the President and actually become law. So there is a growing frustration and cynicism among the American public.

I believe that this is a cause still worth fighting for, that there is a consensus still yet to be maintained and to be gained and I hope that we can do that this Congress; whether it is this vote tomorrow or whether it is later on.

The bill that I am proposing is the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999, which we have worked hard to draft in a fair and bipartisan manner and will address the greatest abuses in our campaign system. I am delighted to have two of my colleagues joining me in this discussion tonight, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). I want to hear what their views are on this and why this is important for us to address this subject of campaign finance reform, and particularly this bill that we have all cosponsored, the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999.

So I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who has done such a tremendous job in showing leadership on an issue that I think is vital to our political process. I know he has been active as a State party chairman in Montana. He understands the political process. He understands the role of parties and candidates, and I am very grateful for his support, and I want to yield to him so he can talk about why this is needed.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas

(Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, and let me compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his untiring effort at trying to help reform the campaign finance laws of this country.

We started this process as freshmen in the last Congress, holding hearings, drafting legislation, bringing together Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan bill, and it was his leadership that helped us accomplish that.

It seems to me that we need to accomplish three things when we are going to reform the campaign finance laws. At least from my judgment, there are some things that are broken in the current system and we need to accomplish some changes.

One of those is that we need to have more competitive campaigns. Over 90 percent of the Members of this House who stand for reelection are reelected election after election after election. Even in the great revolutionary election of the 104th Congress in 1994, nearly 90 percent of the Members who stood for reelection were reelected.

One of the reasons for that is that it is difficult for challengers to raise the resources necessary to have a viable election. In fact, I find it kind of interesting that there are some who helped sponsor legislation similar to this in the last Congress, when they came as freshmen Members who this was their first time in Congress and they had maybe run a challenger's race who are now incumbents, some might say are entrenched incumbents, who do not support campaign finance reform that would allow us to have competitive elections, but I appreciate the gentleman's untiring effort.

The other thing we need to do is deal with the issue of soft money. As the gentleman knows, soft money are large corporate contributions, labor union contributions. It has been the tradition of this country for almost all of this century that large organizations, corporations and labor unions, should not be able to contribute unlimited sums of money to the political process because the view is that they would overwhelm the process. This bill that we are advocating would put restrictions on soft money to the political parties.

The other thing that we need to accomplish when we reform finance laws is to maintain our commitment to the First Amendment. Some people would advocate changes in the campaign finance laws that would have the effect of stifling the competitive thought that is out there; the outside groups and others who want to express themselves about what we do here. So there are some who in closing the soft money loophole want to close the loophole of the First Amendment, the right for people to express their views, and we cannot allow that to happen, too.

So what this bill does is it says to the political parties, the political parties

cannot accept soft money but allows independent groups to be able to continue to express their views about what we do and how we go about doing it and in the process not chilling free speech.

So those three things, this bill does. It protects our First Amendment freedoms, reinforces them. It eliminates the potential problems that soft money and the corrupting influence that that might have on our political parties but it also endeavors to make campaigns competitive again, which is so important to this country.

So I just want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his hard work. This is a good bill. Our colleagues are going to have an opportunity to vote on this this week. I think this is the right alternative to reform our system, and I know that the gentleman has been a strong advocate for that, and I thank him for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Well, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He is exactly on point, that we do not want to harm the First Amendment and the freedoms we all enjoy in the political process in order to just do something and make a change in the law.

So I believe that we can have a balance, that we can actually stop the flow of soft money into our national political parties; we can stop the greatest abuse; we can still have a significant and critical role that the parties play but still not infringe upon those groups that are out there expressing themselves in election.

Imagine how counterproductive it would be if we burdened these outside groups and said, you cannot participate in the political or we are going to put so many regulations on you that your participation will be really rendered meaningless.

So I do not think that is the direction we want to go. This bill is very balanced. It addresses the abuse in our system, but like the gentleman said, it makes sure that we protect our First Amendment freedoms.

So I am delighted also to have my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), here, who has been so outspoken in favor of reform and particularly supportive of the Campaign Integrity Act. So I would just like to yield to him for his comments on this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, but also for his leadership on this issue.

As freshmen together 2 years ago, the gentleman played the leadership role in working together, Republicans and Democrats, over a very thoughtful 5-month period, meeting with experts on constitutional law, citizens who felt

the way we finance campaigns ought to be changed, people who thought the status quo was fine, listening to all opinions and approaches before, I think, developing a very reasonable, balanced, thoughtful approach that is real reform. It is not, as some of these measures are, hidden as a campaign advantage bill, which gives an edge to one party or the other.

This bill is designed to create more of a citizen Congress, to push us back toward a Congress as a representative of the people that we have the privilege of representing, and that is why I am so glad to be a part of this effort.

I think we are drifting away from a citizen Congress here in this Nation.

□ 1945

The average cost of a congressional campaign, a competitive, open seat is just a little under \$1 million, and it is doubling about every 4 years.

Now, there are a lot of good people in my communities who would do a great job in the U.S. House of Representatives or in the U.S. Senate, but they do not have \$1 million and they do not know where they would get a hold of it; and as a result, they are not going to raise their hand to run for Congress. My concern is not that the very wealthy cannot make the decisions, many of them can. But for a country founded on a representative democracy where people from all walks of life, and whether they have a big wad or they have made some choices in life that they have pursued other goals, and so that they do not have that, but they would be great here in Congress are not going to be able to run.

So what this bill does is really start to push us back toward a citizen Congress, start to close that national loophole on soft money, preserves free speech for individuals, groups, even for States to remembering soft money the way they have very responsibly. It increases and indexes, which is long overdue, the individual contributions which again, to move people into Washington and back home where we want that support to come, and increases disclosure so that people who are watching our campaigns, who are trying to decide which person to vote for can quickly and electronically determine who our backers are and that that represents part of their decision-making in this process.

And, as importantly, which the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) have stressed, we encourage people to get involved in the process, groups who want to do score cards, individuals who feel so strongly about an issue they want to take out ads to get involved, and we preserve and encourage that free speech, but we start that very important first step back toward a citizen Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us believe that the first step in any campaign fi-

nance reform is first to enforce the laws that we have already on the books, because it does not make such sense to add new ones if we are not going to enforce them either. Secondly, we have to preserve free speech. But after that, the real choice tomorrow when Congress meets on campaign finance reform is this: do we go with the Shays-Meehan bill which has gotten a lot of attention, and those two sponsors have worked very hard on behalf of that bill. I take nothing at all away from them. But my concern is that Shays-Meehan will pass the House again, not much of a margin, but it will pass again and it will die exactly where it died last year, in the Senate. They have debated it fully, they have had a great discussion on it; it is not going to pass the Senate. Even if it were, it could never pass constitutional muster. It would be struck down and never be the law of the land. I guess my concern is that each year we raise campaign finance reform and each year it fails.

I think we turn off another group of voters who are hoping for more of a citizen Congress, who want these changes. People say today, well, campaign finance reform does not rate very high in all of these polls they take by the day and the hour anymore around here. My thought is that I think people still want campaign finance reform. They want to change the way we do business in Washington. But I think they have given up hope that we will do it. I think they have given up belief that we will do something that makes life a little tougher on us, and it will; that gives more of a fair chance to challenges, and it will; that forces us out of Washington and back in our districts; more of a citizen Congress, and it will.

None of those are easy tasks, but it is the right thing to do, and rather than pass a bill forward that I sincerely know will die, and it will die again next year and it will die again the year after, I think the HUTCHINSON bill is a substantial, significant reform measure that can pass the Senate, that we know, we know can pass constitutional muster and can become the will of the land to start to restore that faith in what Washington is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good measure, and I would say to the gentleman that I am here tonight mainly to tell him that with his integrity that was shown throughout the impeachment proceedings, the integrity shown throughout his service here in Congress and before in Arkansas, the gentleman has shown he is not afraid to take on the tough issues. I know that this is a balanced bill, it does not give an edge to our party, and I love being a Republican, but I am glad this does not give us an edge necessarily.

I do not think we ought to take one for the Democrats either. It ought to be balanced. The gentleman has

worked hard to do that. I think this is a great, solid, significant step for people who still have hope that Washington will change, bring a little more moderation and balance into how we finance our campaigns. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his leadership on this important issue. In addition to my friend from Montana and my friend from Texas, we have had the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) who has been extraordinarily instrumental this year in moving this legislation forward, as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) who is former president of the class, who has really pushed this legislation and has been a real leader on this effort.

The gentleman mentioned how we got here and where we started with this as a freshman class, when I think back about the process and the history as to how we got here. When we look back, whenever we first came here as freshmen, we were still warm from the campaign trail; we understood that there needed to be some changes, we understood what people were telling us to get up here and make a difference and work with our colleagues from the other side of the aisle. So I will never forget our first term whenever we had six Democrats from the freshman class and six Republicans from the freshman class that were assigned together to work out and hammer out together in a bipartisan fashion this legislation. So we met together. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) led the Democrat side, and I chaired the Republican side; and we met over a period of five months.

This is not something that happened quickly. As the gentleman mentioned, we heard from constitutional experts; we heard from the political party leaders, we heard from the ACLU and the National Right to Life. We heard from candidates. And through that process, we reached some conclusions as to what we needed to do to get this passed.

First of all, we said, if we are going to pass legislation, we have to avoid the extremes. That is what has killed reform in the past, is that everybody moved to their perfect bill, to their perfect idea which was usually sort of an extreme position over here and said, this is what is going to work, and we find out there was not anyone else who supported that position, or there was not a majority that did. So if we are going to pass something, we have to avoid the extremes in legislation. That is what we propose to do.

The second thing we have to do is we said we have to be realistic. We have to figure out what can pass this body, what can pass the Senate, and what can be signed into law. And as my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

BRADY) said, we have to follow the Constitution. We cannot just fight against the Supreme Court; we cannot just move in that direction and say we are going to ignore the First Amendment, we are going to hope that they change their position. We have to follow the Constitution, and that was the guideline that we had.

Finally, we said we have to seek common ground. If we are going to work, Democrats and Republicans together, we seek the common ground, and those are the principles that we followed. The result was that we gave up some things that we wanted, but we came up with a bill that we genuinely believed in our hearts could pass this body, could pass the Supreme Court, could be signed into law and really change our society in terms of our campaigns.

So we did that, and we introduced the bill the last Congress, and we fought an enormous battle against our leadership many times. Our leadership was not excited about this. We said this is important for the people and so we have to stay engaged in this.

Finally, we moved this forward with other reformers and we had a huge debate on the floor of this House. We advocated for our bill, the freshman bill of the last Congress. There were our good friends, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), who said well, ours is a better bill, and they worked very hard on their bill. It was what we considered not seeking the common ground, but going for that ideal, some of the extreme positions, and they said, give us a shot at this comprehensive reform. It will pass the Senate. We said, there is not the votes over in the Senate. They said give us a shot, give us a shot. So we sent that bill over to the Senate, and as was predicted, it could not break filibuster; it could not get the votes necessary and it died.

Once again, that increases the cynicism of the American people. It says, Congress cannot deal with this issue. So it tears our hearts out. We come back to this Congress, and I do not know about my friends, but I really see a change in America. I see that they are more interested in reform now than ever before. I would just like to yield to my colleagues to comment about what they are hearing in their town meetings, what the American people are telling them. That is the sense I get, is that they are more excited, but there is a real malaise in this Congress about it.

Could my friend from Montana comment?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the things that I believe is that oftentimes people do not say that they want campaign finance reform as high on their list of reforms more because I think they believe that Con-

gress is incapable of reforming campaigns as opposed to what they really want. There is no doubt in the minds of the people that when I talk to that, they believe that there is something pretty wrong with the system the way it is now.

The gentleman was commenting earlier, the gentleman from Texas's comments that we have to follow the Constitution. I do not feel following the Constitution is an obligation; I think it is a privilege to follow the Constitution. There are some who have the arrogance to say that the Constitution gets in the way of how we would reform campaign finance laws. Some of my colleagues have proposed an amendment that would allow us to put restrictions on people's freedom of speech in order to change how we finance political campaigns.

The fact of the matter is, the tradition, the history of this country is that individuals and individual groups have a right to speak out about the political leadership in this country before we ever had the Constitution. The fact is that that is not only part of the Constitution, but a part of the tradition.

I just want to comment on one thing. Because what people are saying to me as much as anything, they are concerned about the abuse of soft money because they read about it in the paper; but they also know that today, elections are not competitive. They know that incumbents get reelected and the power of incumbency and the ability of the resources to gain reelection has created a tremendous advantage for incumbents. Many of the other reform measures, particularly the Shays-Meehan measure, my greatest objection to that bill is the fact that it does not do anything to help with competitive elections.

In fact, I met last week with one of the public interest groups that have been strong advocates for campaign finance reform, and I raised this objection to them. I said, but the problem with Shays-Meehan is that it does not do anything to get us back to competitive elections, and their comment to me was, so what? That is the way the system is now.

Well, if we are going to reform this system, one of the things that we should try to accomplish is to restore the idea that people can compete for elections. Now, there are two thoughts about that. One is public financing of elections. I do not happen to support that. The other is to allow people to get the resources from the party that they are affiliated with. That is what this bill does. This bill says there is no limit to how much your party can support you to help you get the resources to your campaign, but it has to be hard money; it has to be appropriate money.

Now, what the Shays-Meehan bill does and what the greatest flaw in it is it creates an environment where the

parties are going to be competing with candidates for money. So what we are going to have is, parties will raise money and incumbents will raise money, but challengers are not going to be able to raise money. We know that is how the system will work.

Our bill fixes that by saying there will be a separate limit. Parties can raise a limit that they can use to support candidates, and candidates have a separate limit; and there is no money going back and forth between those. So it eliminates that competition. And by lifting the limits of support that parties can give to challenger races, it means we can have a competitive race in every district in America. That is what the goal of our bill ought to be.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the point the gentleman is making, if you have an incumbent, a United States Congressman who has \$1 million in his war chest, and he is very, very difficult to compete with financially and you have a challenger, he can raise money individually, but that the party can put more money into his campaign to make that race more competitive. Is that what you see in this bill?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right. As the gentleman knows, the Shays-Meehan bill perpetuates a situation where the parties cannot do that. So what happens around here, and you know that, is incumbents build these huge war chests and that discourages a challenger from ever entering the race because they know that they could never compete. One of the interesting things, if we study campaigns, is that challengers actually win with less money than incumbents do, but there is a certain minimum threshold that they have to get across. What most incumbents do is they try to keep their challenger from crossing that threshold.

Under this bill, under the bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, every, every challenger out there would be assured of the opportunity to cross that threshold because their party could help them get over that threshold and we could have competitive elections again.

□ 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just go through the basic revisions of the bill and then yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for some additional comments.

But so that my colleagues will understand, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act does the most important thing, it addresses the enormous abuse in our system, which is to ban soft money to our national parties. This is where our Federal candidates, our Federal officers are going out and raising enormous sums of money usually in the chunks of \$100,000, \$200,000, sometimes \$500,000 for the parties, and then it flows into the different campaigns through ads.

This has been the abuse in the 1996 election. It continues to be an enormous problem for our political system. So we ban that soft money to the national parties.

Then these people raise the objection that, well, how about if the State parties raise the soft money? We do not prohibit that. Well, the State parties try to do get out the vote efforts, some basic things that build the party structure, that help our candidates locally, but it has not been a problem.

But to make sure that it does not become a problem, we say that there cannot be any transfer of soft money from the State party that is using it for a get out the vote effort might have some excess cash and will transfer it from the national party. Well, they cannot do that. The national party cannot take any soft money from the State parties or from anyone. It is prohibited. So we address that.

The second thing that we do is that we assist the parties. If we take this soft money away, we have to help the parties. So we help them to raise the hard money, we call it the honest money, the regulated money. So it increases the individual contributor limits to all candidates, PACs going to the parties from \$25,000 per election to \$25,000 per year. The contribution limits to the parties is raised.

As the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) said, we remove the party candidate coordination limit. So we strengthen the parties, but it is all hard dollars. It is all the honest money.

Then we help the candidates out there. They have to raise the money. We finally help the individual by indexing the contribution limits for individuals to inflation. So as inflation goes up, it will not just erode that contribution limit, but we strengthen the role of individual by indexing it to inflation.

Then we increase disclosure. We are simply trying to provide the American public more information as to what the candidates are spending so that they are required to report more regularly, monthly, and more timely, and more information.

Then to the third party or the issue advocacy groups, they are required to disclose information as to who they are and how much money they are spending.

So we are providing information to individual voters out there to strengthen them in that way. We are reducing the influence of special interests by banning soft money to the national parties. Then we are strengthening the parties by allowing them to be able to raise the hard money, the honest dollars, according to the law much easier.

So I think that this is a good bill, is balanced, and this is the main provisions that we try to address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for pointing out the key parts of this bill, because it is very reasonable. As he says, it puts a premium on hard money, which sounds like a hard phrase, but the principal of hard money is so sound for America.

What it says is that we think a contribution ought to come from a person, from their pocketbook, from what they have earned, what their family has decided to contribute to another person, to a party, to a cause that they believe strongly in. I want everything to be hard money. I want it to come from a person directly to a party, principle, a cause that they believe in.

I watch our Republican women's clubs in parties. Each year, they will host a fundraising, barbecue, or catfish fry, or silent auction that one will go to. They will work for 2, 3 months ahead of time. They will get a local business person to donate the food. They decorate the tables. There are silent auction items, quilts that they have made, local restaurants donate a dinner. They have got American prints. Flags have been flown over the Capitols, just good solid American products.

People are out there, and they get their neighbors to come to bid on these. Together, they might, they might net maybe \$2,000, maybe \$800 that they will net, they will make off one of these events after 2 or 3 months of hard work to give to their local candidates in their State and the people that they support.

To me, I put so much more value on that \$800 or that \$2,000 that has come in hard money from real people than a check written that same day for \$200,000 from some company, some industry, some group that goes in soft money to one of the parties or some other direction. Because I really think for the future of democracy, for the citizen Congress, that hard money is so valuable long-term, getting people involved, keeping us close to the people that we represent.

Let me destroy two myths for my colleagues if people out there have bought into this at all that we hear quite a bit. One is that the Republicans and Congress do not support campaign finance reform. Everyone knows historically that the party that is in majority up here has tended to resist some of the reform because, frankly, they used the current system, they fought hard, played by the rules to get to that majority. So human nature says they are a bit resistant.

Since we had campaign finance reform under Richard Nixon, the Democrats held the House for more than two decades and resisted campaign finance reform for all that period, or most that period themselves. So, historically, whoever is in the majority tends to resist a bit, and those that are in the mi-

nority use it as campaign tools. So that is what has happened again. Do not believe this. We have found so many good solid Republicans who want to change the way business is done.

It is really to Speaker HASTERT's credit that he has scheduled a very reasonable timetable this year. Rather than rush into it, rather than just let one bill be anointed, Speaker HASTERT set a September timetable which was very fair. He said first things first, let us tackle our budget. Let us be the first Congress since 1974 to get our budget done in time. Let us focus on rebuilding our defense, on quality education, on local control, on tax relief. Let us make first things go first and schedule a good time for campaign finance reform.

Let us go through the committee process so that all the good ideas, and there are a lot of them, on campaign finance reform can be heard, which was done. Then the four major bills are set for debate tomorrow. I think that is a very fair timetable. We are already in the election process. If we made a change today in haste, we would only be giving the advantage to one person or another in these campaigns.

Rather than to rush through this, let us do it right. It is so important that we do it right, that we have a full and open debate. We are getting that. That is to Speaker HASTERT's credit. I am very proud that he has given us this opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I will make a few closing remarks here to my colleagues. Tomorrow's debate I believe is critically important for the Nation. I would like to think as a result of this debate we are going to pass out of this House a legislative proposal that will go to the Senate, that will garner the support necessary there, and be passed by the Senate, get over the filibuster, and be sent to the President.

But I am a realist here in this Congress, and I understand the battle we are up against. I know the temptation is, well, we passed Shays-Meehan out of the last Congress. Let us come back in and just cast the same vote. We had about 150 votes for our bill here, but the Shays-Meehan got the majority, and it went to the Senate, and it failed over there.

I would just make a comment here that I think is instructive that we can learn from it. I actually used this quote in the last debate in the last Congress. This was from Roll Call, a publication here on Capitol Hill. It is dated August 6, 1998, a year ago, when we were engaged in this debate. It says, "One leadership source said that the Republican leaders favored the Shays-Meehan bill going to the Senate because the Senate already voted on it, and it has no chance of passing. While the freshman bill would pose a slightly greater threat in the Senate because,

when you offer something new, and streamline, it becomes a new fight.”

I just yearn for a new fight. I think that we ought to learn from our past mistakes. We gave the best shot for Shays-Meehan. It has been voted on in the Senate once. It has been voted twice. It has never broken the magic number in order to get it passed. So we do not know what would happen over there. But we do know what would happen if we repeat the same actions of the last Congress.

So I would just urge my colleagues to support reasonable, realistic, common-sense reform that addresses the greatest abuse in our campaign system. I believe the Campaign Integrity Act, the old freshman bill, is much wiser now since we are upper classmen. We have been here, but we are not frustrated. We are not cynical. We believe that we can do this for the American people.

If, perhaps, that we send this over to the Senate, we repeat the same action of the last Congress, we send Shays-Meehan over there once again, and they do not break filibuster, then that is three times. Perhaps then we can take the ideas of this bill, we can work together in a common way, Democrats and Republicans, and we can move forward a bill and actually get it passed this Congress. It is still my goal. It is still my desire. It is my yearning, and I believe it is the yearning of the American public.

THE INFLUENCE OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH ON MILITARY VICTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, early this year the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the NATO alliance achieved a military victory in Yugoslavia. The military objective of the 3-month long campaign in the Yugoslav province of Kosovo was to drive the Serbian armed forces out of Kosovo.

This objective was achieved largely through the use of air power applied in a sophisticated and comprehensive manner. The bulk of the sorties flown were executed by fighter-bomber aircraft based in Italy between 200 and 300 miles away from their objectives in Yugoslavia.

These sorties were accomplished largely by F-15E, AF-8B, and F-16 aircraft operated by the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other European countries, and Tornado attack aircraft operated by Great Britain and Germany and also French attack aircraft used by the Air Force of France.

In addition, heavy, long-range bombers, B-52s and B-1Bs based in England

and B-52s based in Missouri delivered a substantial fraction of the weapons on the targets.

Finally, unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft were used extensively for the first time in this conflict.

Although air power has been a significant component of all warfare since 1939, it can be argued that this was the first campaign where air power was absolutely the dominant factor.

Given what has happened in Kosovo, it is a legitimate question to ask how the air power that achieved that victory was created. The record shows that it did not happen overnight. In 1944, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Army Air Forces, General Henry H. (Hap) Arnold said, “the first essential of air power is preeminence in research.” The key word in this statement is research. It is important to understand how this research was performed, who paid for it, and how the results were used.

In 1917, a provision was put in the Naval appropriations bill to create a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics called NACA because the inferiority of American aircraft during World War I was patently obvious, not a single airplane of American design or manufacture was used in combat during World War I.

The decision to create NACA changed that circumstance for all time. A research laboratory in Hampton, Virginia, the Samuel Pierpont Langley Aeronautical Laboratory was established a year later, and from then on, the United States of America has been preeminent in military aviation.

For a short period, the Germans and the Japanese built more airplanes than the United States during World War II. However, after less than 2 years, American air power emerged in vastly superior numbers with aircraft that were decisively superior in quality. The reason why the United States could accomplish this end was due in large measure to the research done in the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics between the First and Second World Wars.

All-metal airplanes, efficient radial engines, accurate flight control systems that made dive-bombing possible were all developed during those years in the NACA laboratories with the assistance of the military.

A strong and independent civilian research agency had been created to advance knowledge in aeronautics. The chairman of the committee was always a civilian, but both the Commanding General of the Army Air Corps and the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics were statutory members of the committee. Thus, a close connection to the military was assured.

Things have changed since the end of the Second World War, but the aeronautical strength of the United States still depends on the successor institu-

tion to the NACA that was established after the end of the Second World War.

□ 2015

In 1958, the launch of the Sputnik by the Soviet Union as the first man-made object to orbit the Earth stimulated the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA. This organization consisted of all of the facilities of the old NACA plus some military facilities that were added to enhance the space mission of the new agency.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 made the new agency responsible for continuing the support of military aviation. This most important mission has been successfully accomplished for the past 40 years and the results were evident in the Kosovo campaign.

The most successful fighter-bomber of the 20th century is undoubtedly the F-16. The facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were used extensively during the decade of the 1970s to develop the flying qualities of this aircraft. Many thousands of hours of wind tunnel and flight simulator time were devoted to the creation of the F-16.

The former commander of the Israeli Air Force and the current president of the state of Israel, Ezer Weitzmann, has called the F-16 the “Spitfire” of the 1980s after flying the F-16 himself. Weitzmann became famous in 1948 when he flew a black painted “Spitfire” in the Israeli war of independence. Thousands of pilots across the world have agreed with his assessment.

The F-15 aircraft was also a product of NASA technology through the employment of NASA's extensive facilities. The conically cambered wing on the F-15 was a product of NASA research and the attack version of this airplane, the F-15 “Strike Eagle,” is one of the most potent attack aircraft in the world.

Finally, the concept of vertical take-off in land combat aircraft originated in the United States and was picked up by British aerospace concerns. The first version of the aircraft that eventually became the “Harrier,” the “Kestrel,” was extensively tested in NASA facilities in the 1960s. The “Harrier” eventually evolved into the AV-8B, which was also tested extensively in NASA flight simulators and wind tunnels. The former was particularly important in developing the complex flight control system for this aircraft.

As previously mentioned, a remarkable feature of the Kosovo air campaign was that a significant fraction of the damage done on the ground was due to aircraft that were based more than a thousand miles from the combat zone. B-52 and B-1B bombers based in England delivered thousands of tons of bombs and other guided weapons on targets in Kosovo and Yugoslavia.