

colleagues know where the money is? Take a look at Arastide's bank account. But yet we have not done a thing in Haiti. But, yes, we lost some people there. We got kicked out of there.

In Somalia, the same thing. We cannot fight a Kosovo and fly 86 percent of all the missions just because the U.N. and NATO do not have the aircraft and the technology. Either they need to upgrade their aircraft and technology for standoff weapons or they need to pay the United States those billions of dollars that it costs us: \$16 billion for Bosnia, the four times going into Iraq, bombing an aspirin factory. At the same time, General Ryan told me we put a year's life on every one of our aircraft, a year's life, and which we have parts.

What is happening today? We are only keeping in 22 percent of our enlisted into the military. I talked to the SEAL team commander yesterday. He has right the opposite. Those kids are motivated. They have increased their recruiting and retention; but yet they have problems in research and development and procurement. But when we only keep 22 percent of our enlisted, think about our experience level in maintenance.

The average fighter in the Air Force is 18 years. Our bombers are 39 years average age. I have got Marines carrying World War II radios. Yet, Mr. LIEBERMAN says that our military is the best in the world.

If we tell these kids to go somewhere, they are going to do it; and they are going to try and achieve. But that is not the point. A, they need the training.

Do my colleagues know that, in Kosovo, the two helicopters that crashed, and one helicopter crew was killed, all of them, that those helicopter crews had never had a flight in a combat-loaded helicopter because they did not have the money to train with a combat loaded? They had never trained with night goggles because they could not get the goggles into the squadron. Both those helicopters crashed.

Do my colleagues know Captain O'Grady that was shot down was not air combat qualified when he was shot down over Bosnia because they did not have the money for the training?

Do my colleagues know that in the Navy and the Air Force we have no more adversary aircraft? The reason that I am alive today is because, when I fought against the MiGs in Vietnam, I had better training and better equipment. But the training today is substandard. We do not have those adversary aircraft.

I just spoke to the COs in the fighter weapons schools in both services. The FMC rate, the full mission capable rate of our aircraft and our equipment has gone down. If we had to meet the mini-

mums of a quadrennial review or bot-toms-up review, we could not do it today. I think that is wrong.

I think for the Clinton-Gore White House to drag our military through 149 deployments, depreciate our men and our women and our equipment, cut their military and then the veterans' COLAs I think is wrong.

I stand before my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, tonight. Are we perfect on the Republican side? Absolutely not. We have got a long way to go, I think, with our own budgets and everything else.

But I do think the principles of Ronald Reagan of less taxes and smaller government, of making sure that government that is wasteful is eliminated, those principles are sound and go forward a long way.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks as he has discussed the defense needs of this country and the needs that we need to follow through. I certainly want to join with him.

But by the same token, I think it is important, and I say this now, anytime one starts pointing fingers, I was reminded that anytime one points one's finger, there are always three pointing back at one.

The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has been doing a lot of finger pointing at this side of the aisle, talking about liberal leadership.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in talking about the liberal leadership, many of my colleagues support some of the same things we want to do, including defense. But the leadership along with Clinton-Gore has fought welfare reform, they fought a balanced budget, they fought a lot of the initiatives we think are responsible for the economy.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, Presidents do not spend money. Congress appropriates.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. True.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the shortages that we allowed to happen in the defense needs of this country have originated in this House of Representatives, not the President. We both agree to that.

Therefore, my concern about the current budget implications today is that, when my colleagues base their entire budget on a tax cut, and the newest one now that they have proposed, the gentleman's leadership has proposed, not the gentleman, there is no money left. If we take 90 percent of the total unified budget and apply it to the debt, there is no money left this year to increase defense spending in those areas where the gentleman from California and I would agree. That is my problem. If my colleagues take it out 10 years, there is no money.

Let me go back. The gentleman from California mentioned the Reagan years. I happen to be a Member that served here during that period of time. I happen to be a Democrat on this side of the aisle that helped pass much of the Reagan revolution.

But I think it is important that we set in proper perspective, when we start comparing total outlays in spending as a percent of gross domestic product during the Reagan years was 21½ percent. It increased to 22 percent in the Bush years. It has dropped to 20 percent in the Clinton years, which the gentleman's side of the aisle had deserved some credit for bringing down the spending.

But when one counts administrations, it is not correct to say that government has grown in the last 8 years. It has not. Federal employment has dropped from 2.1 million Federal employees during the Reagan years, went up to 2.2 million in the Bush years, and dropped to 1.8 million in the Clinton years.

I do not say that in defense, because I am much more interested in the future than I am in the past. I rejoice in the fact that we now have a surplus, that we are, in fact, discussing how we shall spend the surplus. During my hour, we are going to talk about this surplus is fictional. We cannot spend it like it is real money. It is projected.

But discretionary spending, defense, defense spending, let me make this point to bear out what the gentleman has been saying as regards to defense. The Johnson years, oh, how we have heard about those. Discretionary spending as a percent of gross domestic product was 12 percent. The Reagan years, it dropped to 9.5. The Bush years, it dropped to 8.5. The Clinton years, 6.8. Nondefense, though, 3.7. Johnson. Reagan, 3.5.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5 minutes that was yielded to me earlier in the evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCARBOROUGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not if the gentlewoman from Ohio will agree with this. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has just spoken. I would like to make maybe a 1- or 2-minute comment. I have to run to a dinner.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I can yield from my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that.