

Chambliss	Hulshof	Radanovich	Lantos	Murtha	Sherman
Chenoweth-Hage	Hunter	Regula	Larson	Nadler	Shows
Coble	Hutchinson	Reynolds	Leach	Napolitano	Sisisky
Coburn	Hyde	Riley	Lee	Neal	Skelton
Collins	Isakson	Rogan	Levin	Oberstar	Slaughter
Combest	Istook	Rogers	Lewis (GA)	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Jenkins	Rohrabacher	Lipinski	Oliver	Smith (WA)
Cooksey	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen	LoBiondo	Ortiz	Snyder
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Royce	Lofgren	Owens	Spratt
Crane	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Lowey	Pallone	Stabenow
Cubin	Kasich	Ryun (KS)	Lucas (KY)	Pascrell	Stark
Cunningham	Kelly	Sanford	Luther	Pastor	Stenholm
Davis (VA)	King (NY)	Saxton	Maloney (CT)	Payne	Strickland
Deal	Kingston	Scarborough	Maloney (NY)	Pelosi	Stupak
DeLay	Knollenberg	Schaffer	Mascara	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
DeMint	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner	Matsui	Phelps	Tauscher
Diaz-Balart	Kuykendall	Sessions	McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	LaHood	Shadegg	McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Doolittle	Largent	Shaw	McDermott	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Dreier	Latham	Shays	McGovern	Rahall	Thurman
Duncan	LaTourette	Sherwood	McIntyre	Ramstad	Tierney
Dunn	Lazio	Shimkus	McKinney	Rangel	Towns
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Shuster	McNulty	Reyes	Turner
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Simpson	Meehan	Rivers	Udall (CO)
Everett	Linder	Skeen	Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
Ewing	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Velázquez
Fletcher	Manzullo	Souder	Menendez	Rothman	Visclosky
Foley	Martinez	Spence	Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Fossella	McCollum	Stearns	McDonald	Rush	Watt (NC)
Fowler	McCrery	Stump	Miller, George	Sabo	Waxman
Galleghy	McHugh	Sununu	Minge	Sanchez	Weiner
Ganske	McInnis	Talent	Mink	Sanders	Wexler
Gekas	McIntosh	Tancredo	Moakley	Sandin	Weygand
Gibbons	McKeon	Tauzin	Mollohan	Sawyer	Wise
Gilchrest	Metcalf	Taylor (NC)	Moore	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Gillmor	Mica	Terry	Moran (VA)	Scott	Wu
Gilman	Miller (FL)	Thomas	Morella	Serrano	Wynn
Goode	Miller, Gary	Thornberry			
Goodlatte	Moran (KS)	Thune			
Goodling	Myrick	Tiahrt	English	Markey	Smith (MI)
Goss	Ney	Toomey	Franks (NJ)	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Graham	Northup	Trafficant	Greenwood	Roukema	Vento
Granger	Norwood	Upton	Houghton	Salmon	
Green (WI)	Nussle	Vitter			
Gutknecht	Ose	Walden			
Hansen	Oxley	Walsh			
Hastert	Packard	Wamp			
Hastings (WA)	Paul	Watkins			
Hayes	Pease	Watts (OK)			
Hayworth	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)			
Hefley	Petri	Weldon (PA)			
Herger	Pickering	Weller			
Hill (MT)	Pickett	Whitfield			
Hilleary	Pitts	Wicker			
Hobson	Pombo	Wilson			
Hoekstra	Portman	Wolf			
Horn	Pryce (OH)	Young (AK)			
Hostettler	Quinn	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—11

English	Markey	Smith (MI)
Franks (NJ)	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Greenwood	Roukema	Vento
Houghton	Salmon	

□ 1431

Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, LUCAS of Kentucky and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. THOMAS, RADANOVICH, and GILMAN and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3605) to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 514 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 514

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pur-

suant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 4576, the fiscal year 2001 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NOES—214

Abercrombie	Costello	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Coyne	Gordon
Allen	Cramer	Green (TX)
Andrews	Crowley	Gutierrez
Baca	Cummings	Hall (OH)
Baird	Danner	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hill (IN)
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Hilliard
Becerra	DeGette	Hinchev
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Berkley	DeLauro	Hoefel
Berman	Deutsch	Holden
Berry	Dicks	Holt
Bishop	Dingell	Hooley
Blagojevich	Dixon	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Doggett	Inslee
Bonior	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Borski	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	Edwards	(TX)
Boucher	Ehlers	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	Engel	John
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Campbell	Evans	Kanjorski
Capps	Farr	Kaptur
Capuano	Fattah	Kennedy
Cardin	Filner	Kildee
Carson	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Clay	Ford	Kind (WI)
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Klecicka
Clement	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Clyburn	Frost	Kucinich
Condit	Gejdenson	LaFalce
Conyers	Gephardt	Lampson

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 514 is an open rule for a strong bipartisan bill. In fact, the Committee on Appropriations approved this bill 2 weeks ago by voice vote and without an amendment.

I have always admired the patriotism and dedication of our military personnel, especially given the poor quality of military life for our enlisted men and women; but today we are doing something to improve military pay, housing, and benefits.

We are helping to take some of our enlisted men off of food stamps by giving them a 3.7 percent pay raise, and we are offering \$163 million in enlistment and reenlistment bonuses. They are called bonuses, but they earn them.

To follow through on our health care promises to our service men and women, we are providing a 1-year 9 percent increase in health care resources. A good portion of these funds will go to improve care for our military retirees who have never been given the treatment that they deserve.

At the same time, we are boosting the basic allowance for housing so that our military families do not have to pay as much out of their own pockets.

Along with personnel, we have to take care of our military readiness. We live in a dangerous world, and Congress is working to protect our friends and families back home from our enemies abroad. We are providing for a national missile defense system so that we can stop a warhead from places like China or North Korea or Iraq if that day ever comes.

We are boosting the military's budget for weapons and ammunition. We are providing \$40 billion for research and development so our forces will have top-of-the-line equipment for their job.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying bill, because now more than ever we must improve our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in strong support of the Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 2001. This bill provides \$288.5 billion in budget authority for the programs of the Department of Defense, the very programs that ensure the security of this Nation and which, in large part, enable our country to keep the peace and remain the leader of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects the understanding of both Democrats and Re-

publicans for the need to ensure that our national defense is second to none.

□ 1445

This bill also reflects the understanding that in order for our military to maintain its global superiority, it is necessary to make substantial financial commitments in order to restructure our Cold War forces to meet the challenges of the 21st century. This bill addresses serious readiness deficiencies and equipment modernization shortfalls that have seriously strained the ability of our military forces to meet the demands of the many missions they undertake.

I am pleased to support this revitalization of our armed forces. Among the important provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a 3.7 percent military pay raise and \$12.1 billion for the Defense Health Program, which provides monies not only for active duty personnel and their families, but also to an unfortunately limited extent military retirees and their dependents. This bill does make positive strides in expanding prescription drug coverage for Medicare eligible military retirees but falls short in providing for a permanent health care system for military retirees.

While I appreciate the fact that the bill contains a provision requiring the submission of a plan to Congress by an independent oversight panel no later than December 31, 2002, I would encourage the subcommittee to at least consider including the language of the Taylor amendment in a conference agreement since this amendment was agreed to by an overwhelming vote of 406 to 10 during the DOD authorization debate. We have made a promise to our military retirees, and it is time for us to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also continues the commitment to a wide range of weapons programs that will ensure our continued military superiority in the skies, on land, as well as at sea. I am particularly pleased this bill includes \$2.15 billion for the procurement of 10 F-22 Raptors, the next generation Air Force fighter that will assure our continued dominance in any air campaign against any foe in the future with air-to-air and air-to-ground capabilities. The bill also provides \$396 million in advance procurement and sets aside an additional \$1.411 billion for research, development, test and evaluation of the F-22.

The bill also includes \$1.1 billion for the procurement of 16 V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft for the Marine Corps, \$336 million for 4 Air Force V-22s, and an additional \$148 million for research and development on this important addition to our military arsenal. In addition, the bill provides \$249 million for various F-16 modifications.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess in April, I had the opportunity to trav-

el to Bosnia and Kosovo to see firsthand the dedication of the men and women of our military who are serving there. I had the privilege of visiting some of the National Guardsmen from the State of Texas who are serving in Bosnia to see how they are faring under very difficult circumstances. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that these troops are doing a remarkable job and are fully aware of the importance and necessity of their mission.

However, as I mentioned in the Committee on Rules yesterday, this bill does nothing to fund the missions that we have undertaken in Bosnia and Kosovo. Mr. Speaker, it is vital that funds to reimburse the Department of Defense for expenditures already made to meet our obligations in that region be included. It is simply not responsible to delay this funding, forcing the Defense Department to face shortfalls in critical operations and maintenance accounts during the last quarter of fiscal year 2000.

I was certainly gratified when the chairman and ranking member of the committee assured me yesterday during the hearing before the Committee on Rules that this funding would most likely be included in the conference agreement on the military construction appropriations measure no later than August 1, and I know of their commitment to making the Department whole. However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we all understand that American men and women are serving an important mission in Bosnia and Kosovo and this Congress has the responsibility to provide the money to make this mission a success without shortchanging other programs within DOD.

I spoke with a representative of the Army this morning who told me that the Army faces a very bleak picture in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year if this money is not provided forthwith. It is unfortunate that this legislation is on the floor without addressing the money for Kosovo and Bosnia. Because if this money is not provided as an add-on to the military construction appropriation later this summer, the Defense Department and the Army, specifically, will be forced to curtail, drastically curtail, training and other activities that are critical to the success of their mission.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill; and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would share with my colleagues that I believe we have a very fair rule and also a very strong bipartisan bill that is coming to the House floor that will serve the national security needs of those men and women who serve in our armed forces.

I want to compliment the Committee on Appropriations. I think the chairman and the ranking member did a very good job in working with the authorizing committee. I have not seen this type of cooperation in the 8 years I have served here in Congress. Sometimes we get conflict between the authorizing and the appropriating committees, but in this case I extend great compliments on their work.

Let me first speak about the quality of life. Despite 5 years of sustained efforts to improve the quality of living for U.S. military personnel and their families, service members continue to voice their displeasure with the military life by leaving the force, which is very bothersome to many of us. As a result, each of the services has experienced significant recruiting and retention problems, threatening the strength and readiness of the all-volunteer force.

The authorizing and the appropriation committees recognize the great personal sacrifices made by U.S. service members and have focused quality-of-life improvements in two areas: one, reforming the Defense Health Program and, number two, sustaining the viability of the all-volunteer force.

While efforts in these areas in recent years have been substantial, there are no silver bullets to end the quality-of-life challenges facing the U.S. military. It will require a commitment to a long-term battle against these challenges if America is to sustain the world's foremost military force. It is with this commitment that the committees recommended a quality-of-life package that will improve the military health care system, provide for fair compensation, support the morale, welfare and recreational programs, and improve the facilities for which the military personnel live and work. We also are working on sustaining the proper weapon systems that they need.

Let me speak for a moment about the military health delivery system. Again, I extend compliments to the appropriators, because what we are trying to do here is put our arms around all of these different programs that are out there, and specifically with regard to the military retiree. Now, all of us here in this body have heard from our constituents about the TRICARE System. As we seek to implement TRICARE, we have had hiccups and little burps here and there with that system, and it has been difficult. We have sought to make improvements. And I appreciate the support of the appropriators. We are going to work to create savings in the claims processing area, which will save \$500 million and then will be poured back into the system.

Now, what about the military retiree? The military retiree is disgruntled, and rightfully so. The question is whether or not we as the Federal Government are fulfilling our obligation to

the military retiree, given the sacrifices that they have given on behalf of the Nation. With the expectation that they would receive health care benefits for life, have we been fulfilling that requirement? The answer is no.

When the military retiree retired and lived next to that military base during the 1970s, 1980s and into the early 1990s, there was a comfort zone. Even though they were turning 65, they gained access to the medical treatment facilities despite in law that they would be triggered into the Medicare program. When we went through the base closure process, they were triggered directly into Medicare, and they did not gain access to the medical treatment facilities. So they came to Congress.

Congress is fishing for the right answer. We create different types of pilot programs, and we struggle with them and try to figure out what is the best way to provide relief in the system. I believe we have come close to finding the right answer, and that is we have put our arms around these pilot programs and we extend them to 2003. We sunset the programs. We have created the commission to examine it; and in the meantime, what we can deliver is the pharmacy benefit. I appreciate the appropriators for funding the pharmacy benefit to the military retiree. It is a generous benefit.

What was bothersome to the military retiree was that they felt that because of their sacrifice and the protections of the freedoms and liberties that we enjoy in our Nation, that perhaps they should be treated a little differently. So it bothered them that they were then taken and thrown right into the Medicare system back in 1965, which many of them did not even realize until the early 1990s. So now, as Congress is presently about to deliver a pharmacy benefit that is different from the Medicare population, it is a richer benefit, the last thing we should do is now say, oh, every grandma and grandpa who never served in the military should now be treated just as if they had served in the military.

What a curious thing. I think some people in this body look out the window and think, well, everybody should drive the same kind of car and should be treated the same way. False. I just wanted to bring this up because it was not long ago, about 10 days ago, that the President endorsed that. Well, of course he endorses it, because he thinks everybody should be treated alike in this country. That is false. There are different people who have done different things.

So I want to compliment the appropriators who have said, yes, we are going to follow the lead from the authorizing committee; and we are going to fund the pharmacy benefit for the military retirees, which they rightfully deserve.

I also want to share that we are providing a 3.7 percent military pay raise

that has been funded; also \$163 million for the reenlistment bonuses. Those are extremely important. We provide \$64 million for the basic housing allowance. I think many of us wish that the numbers could be higher in that regard, but the more monies we can move directly into the pockets of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines is extremely important. The more money we get in the pocket, and especially tax free, the more we can actually help them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first, let me plead guilty to one of the accusations that was leveled by the previous speaker. I do believe that older people who are sick should have their prescription drugs covered. The fact that there are 70- and 80-year-old women who did not serve in the armed forces and who cannot afford their prescription medicine does not seem to me a good reason to deny them a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. So I will plead guilty to that accusation.

Indeed, that is one of the reasons why I am opposed to this bill. Much of what it does is very important, the pay increase and the improvement in the living conditions for the people; but it maintains an effort to fund inadequately an extremely flawed strategy. Obviously, we should provide the funds necessary to carry out what we say we are going to do militarily. The problem is we say we are going to do too much. We continue to err by keeping large numbers of troops in Western Europe when our Western European allies are well enough financed to be able to do this on their own. We continue to hold to an obsolete two-war theory. We continue to fund weapons whose idea began in the Cold War.

□ 1500

So, yes, I want an adequately funded military. I want one with a margin of safety. I want the United States to be as it has been and will continue to be by far the strongest Nation in the world. But we make a mistake when we overreach and then use the overreach as an excuse to overspend. And there we have also, of course, the tendency of people, particularly in the Senate, to add weapons whose primary justification is not the enemy they will confront but the constituents they will comfort.

We have nuclear attack submarines that we are going to fund, and I have not yet been able to have anyone explain to me who the enemy is. They are wonderful weapons. But the fact that they are so technologically skilled is not enough of a justification to have them. It is unlikely that they are going to encounter Iranian, Libyan, or North Korean submarines that they have to encounter.

This bill will spend more than half of the money available to the Federal Government in discretionary accounts. And prescription drugs are relevant. Because the people who support this bill are telling us, on the other hand, some of them, that we cannot afford prescription drugs, that we cannot afford to send money to build schools, that we cannot afford more police on the streets, that we cannot afford more effective cleanup.

This bill overspends to defend the people of Western Europe against non-existent threats when they can afford to do it themselves. It overspends on weapons whose political justification far exceeds their military justification. It overspends to fund outdated theories that date from the Cold War. And, consequently, it requires us to underspend on important domestic priorities.

The bill ought to be defeated and sent back to the committee. It increases by tens of billions of dollars over last year, and that comes directly out of every other appropriation bill.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would advise everyone that it is no secret that the Republicans are putting together the plan to derive a pharmacy benefit for the over-65 individuals of whom are most needy; and we are not ashamed of that at all.

I will also say that what a curious thing it is that we will always have a critic that will always question a weapons system that will say, well, what is the purpose of that? It has never shot a nuclear missile?

My colleagues, we had a B-2 bomber, this is called the Spirit of Indiana, and I dedicated that B-2 bomber in Indiana; and when I dedicated it, I prayed that it would never drop a bomb.

Now, why would we ever build a billion-dollar weapon system and pray that it would never drop a bomb? Because it is a deterrent.

A police officer, when he carries a weapon, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), he says a prayer that he never has to use his weapon. When he pulls that weapon, he does not say, I want to brandish it, I want to threaten, actually, I want to pull the trigger and shoot and kill someone because it is going to make me feel good. No. It is used as a deterrent. We have different weapon systems out there that are used as a deterrent, and they are extremely important.

For the gentleman to question to say, why are we building nuclear weapons, in fact, that we are never going to use them, and then to say that we have other domestic priorities is ridiculous and rather silly.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I did not question nuclear weapons. I questioned nuclear submarines, attack submarines.

Obviously, we should have nuclear weapons. I want us to keep most of them. My point was nuclear attack submarines had a Cold War justification; and given the state of the enemy that we are likely to confront today, the smaller, poorly armed, evil-minded states, nuclear attack submarines are a waste of money and do take away from other things.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Russian Bear has been replaced by a thousand Vipers; and we have to be leaning forward and be very prepared and be very ready because we do not know who is going to be the next threat.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that I think this is a very fine rule that allows the House to work its will on this very important legislation. I think this is an exceptionally good bill.

First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), our chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), our ranking Democrat, for their excellent leadership on this particular bill.

One of the things that I think stands out in my mind about this bill is the fact that we are moving forward the Army's program to transform Army brigades to a new medium configuration that can be deployed within 96 hours anywhere in the world on a C-130 or, better, on a C-17. I am very pleased that the Army has selected Ft. Lewis, Washington, as the place to do this transformation of two of these brigades.

I think the Army is correct to try to have a more deployable force. We saw the problems in Kosovo with the Apaches, first of all the inability to deploy them for some period of time, and then the fact that they were not prepared when they got there to be utilized. I think that is a serious problem for the Army that we must confront.

I would only say to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), that attack submarines, by the way, were just given a scrub by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They think the fact that we only have 50 is a serious mistake. They think we should have about 68. We will be very fortunate if we can keep 57 attack submarines.

Now, I would point out to the gentleman that there is an ASW role for attack submarines. There is a special forces role for attack submarines. There is a very important intelligence role. And they are very crucial in any kind of a war-fighting scenario against

any country. Anytime somebody has a ship at sea, an attack submarine is the last thing they want to confront. So I think they still have a very important utilization.

One of the things that I worked on, and I see my good friend from Texas and my good friend from California here on the floor, has been the effort to modernize our bomber force. In this whole defense debate, I do believe the one serious mistake we are making is not adequately funding our bomber force.

I was particularly proud of the fact that the B-2 bomber was utilized, along with the B-1s and the B-52s, in the war in Kosovo and Yugoslavia. Many of us read the report in Newsweek that talked about the difficulty against relocatable targets. Well, I will tell my colleagues this, that the B-2 with the 2,000-pound JDAMs was used against fixed targets and it was extremely accurate and extremely effective.

In fact, we are now going to, with the money that is in this bill, put a new bomb rack on the B-2s and we are going to be able to put 80 500-pound JDAMs on each of these planes. And they will all be independently targetable. We will be able to take out 80 separate targets in one sortie. I mean, this is revolutionary.

We are also adding capability with Link 16 to give the B-2 not only the ability to go deep underground but also to go against relocatable targets and, with the use of submunitions, to go against advancing armor. This will turn out to be the most impressive, the most important conventional weapon ever developed by the United States or by any military force in the history of mankind. I am proud that the Congress, this House, four times voted with the gentleman from Washington on this particular issue.

I think we have been vindicated by those who said it could not fly in the rain. By the way, in Yugoslavia, it was the only plane that did fly in the rain that could drop bombs because we were using the GPS system, which does not rely on laser guidance. So I am very proud of the fact that we continue the modernization of the B-2 with some adds in this particular bill to give it even greater capability. Its mission planning has been improved. We were giving it a multitude of bombs that it can handle. It will be a conventional weapon that I think allows us to make some reductions under START I, under START II, and eventually under a START III agreement in the number of nuclear weapons that we need for deterrent purposes.

I think it is much more important to have conventional weapons that we can utilize. It is true that deterrence is based on weapons like the Trident submarine, which I have been a major supporter of. But we are not going to use those weapons. In fact, I hope that we

can take the four Tridents that we are downsizing and use them for conventional purposes, to add a conventional capability with Tomahawk to those four Tridents and maybe using two of them for special forces operations.

So I think there are many good things.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and H.R. 4576.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first year that the President has brought us a reasonable defense budget for consideration. Over the last 7 years, the President's budget has failed the military service chiefs and our fighting men and women in uniform. While the President's budget was reasonable this year, it still failed our arms services to the tune of \$16 billion, according to what the service chiefs have told us.

However, under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), the House has once again added funding to support our defense requirements. While still living within a balanced budget, we have added \$4 billion to the President's defense request. This was used to fund much-needed programs.

For instance, the B-2 bomber that my friend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) just spoke about was the central part of the success story from the air war in Kosovo. The B-2's success in this conflict underscored our need for an adequate and modern bomber fleet.

We also learned some very important lessons about the effectiveness of our smart bombs during the war and we learned we had some shortcomings. We found that there are changes that could be made that would make our bomber fleet more effective. One of those was to add 500-pound bomb capabilities instead of just the 2,000-pound bombs. We used to talk about how many planes it would take to take out a target. Now we are talking about how many targets one plane can take out.

Unfortunately, the President failed to fund the research and development of the 500-pound JDAM and the 500-pound JDAM bomb rack even though the service chiefs had told us that that was a high requirement.

It was under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) that funding was added for these upgrades and advancements. In total, the committee added funding of \$96 million for upgrades on the B-2. These include the Link 16 upgrades that will modernize the cockpit and allow for in-flight replanning, research, and development of the 500-pound JDAM and the integration on the B-2.

The flights that we had over Kosovo were actually 30-hour flights that went

from the State of Missouri. And when we are on long missions like that, sometimes changes are made in the planning. These Link 16 upgrades will allow for that. With the success of the B-2, these upgrades will allow our military to exert further strength and keep freedom and peace abroad, thus making B-2 truly the Spirit of America.

This is just one program of many that the committee has seen fit to fund at the level it needs. Faced with a very difficult task, the committee found a way to ensure that our forces are taken care of and our national security remains strong. I congratulate them for this bill, and urge a yes vote on this rule and on the legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we in Congress get our priorities straight. Today, despite the so-called economic boom, tens of millions of Americans are working longer hours for lower wages than was the case 25 years ago. They are working two jobs or they are working three jobs and they are desperately trying to keep their heads above water.

In the United States today, 44 million Americans have no health insurance, and millions more are underinsured. The United States has the greatest gap in the industrialized world between the rich and the poor, and 20 percent of our children live in poverty, the highest child poverty rate of any major country.

Millions of senior citizens in this country and middle-income families cannot afford the prescription drugs they need, and the U.S. Congress has made the health care crisis even worse by cutting in 1997 several hundred billion dollars from Medicare. Throughout this country, veterans who put their lives on the line defending this Nation are unable to get the quality health care they need and deserve.

In the United States today, we are experiencing an affordable housing crisis, with millions of hard-working families paying more than 50 percent of their limited incomes just to pay the rent; and some of the more unfortunate low-income workers are people sleeping out on the streets or in their automobiles.

In this country we talk a whole lot about education, but millions of American middle-class families cannot afford to send their kids to college and many of our kids who graduate find themselves deeply in debt.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the middle class of this country, the working families, our senior citizens, our veterans, our young people, low-income people, have some very serious problems.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, when these constituents cry out to Congress and ask for help, they are told over and over again that there is just no money available to help them, that we just do not have the resources. But when it comes to military spending, it appears that the defense contractors who want to design the most exotic and expensive weapons systems in the history of the world are able to obtain all of the funding they want. When it comes to defense spending, we apparently have billions to spend on the construction of a national missile defense system that many scientists believe will not work and is not needed; billions to spend on aircraft carriers and fighter planes that just coincidentally are built in the States and districts of powerful Members of Congress; billions to spend on military projects that coincidentally are built by contractors who contribute huge sums of money to both political parties. When it comes to military spending, we apparently have the resources to increase the defense budget by 7 percent, a \$22 billion increase from last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the U.S. needs a strong and superior military system. We must be prepared for the new threats and challenges that lie ahead. We must provide decent pay, good housing, good quality health care and child care and other vital services to our men and women in uniform.

We must do a much better job than at present in understanding the cause of Gulf War illness which is why I am offering an amendment later on in this bill so that we can better understand the cause of that illness which is affecting 100,000 Americans.

But the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is enough is enough. Today when we look at our military budget, it is not just that we spend more than 18 times as much as the military spending of all of our potential adversaries combined; but when we combine our spending with NATO, who will be our allies in any major international conflict, the numbers are absolutely incredible. The bottom line is that we as a Nation have got to get our priorities right. There is a limited sum of money out there, and we must make sure that we spend it appropriately. We cannot turn our backs on our seniors, on working people, on the children and simply look toward the military budget.

I would ask that this bill be defeated, sent back to the committee and brought forth again for a more appropriate response.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN).

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take with my short time maybe a little bit different

tack here. I want to speak on the rule for just a minute or two. I think this is a good rule. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) earlier from the other side who took some time to talk to the rule and to the bill. I think that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) have taken great effort to fashion a bill that warrants debate. The rule this afternoon allows for that kind of debate to take place here in the House and offers everybody an opportunity should they wish to be heard on that. I suggest to Members that they approve the rule.

On the bill, itself, Mr. Speaker, we find increasingly here in the House that nothing is easy when we are talking about appropriations bills. We are asked increasingly to do more with less, whether we are talking about this bill or any of the others that will come these next few weeks and months. I happen to believe that our priorities in this case are appropriate. I think as I said on the rule issue a few moments ago that some time and energy has taken place here to make sure that we do have a bipartisan bill for us to look at.

We have a bipartisan opportunity for us to talk about what should be done and what should not be done, but when we are talking about money and when we are talking about taxpayers' money and priorities, I believe that this time around we are going to offer the House an opportunity to vote affirmatively on a bill that has those priorities in place. Whether we are talking about those of us who want to geographically cast ourselves from the Northeast and the Midwest and the West and the South, I think that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) have taken that time, have listened to their members, they have listened not only to the members on the subcommittee and the full committee, but they have listened to Members at large who had things to say before the committee during some of those hearings.

I would say to our colleagues who are out in their offices and will be back here later this afternoon and this evening to vote on this bill that they take a good look at it. I think that we have begun this early in our system of rules and bills because it is a bipartisan effort. I suggest approval later this evening.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider the defense appropriations bill. Buried in this bill is a seemingly innocuous provision that would have a profound effect. The provision would require the Defense Department to obtain prior approval from

both defense authorizing and appropriating committees before transferring funds to the Justice Department for litigation.

The motivation for this provision may be to allow the Congress to keep track of funds appropriated to the Defense Department, but the provision has a major unintended and adverse effect. It would effectively block the Defense Department's contribution to the Justice Department's suit against the tobacco industry. This suit is currently under active consideration in the courts. Cutting off funds would seriously cripple DOJ's efforts to hold the tobacco industry accountable and to recover the billions of dollars spent by the Government on smoking-related health care.

The tobacco lawsuit is strongly supported by the Department of Defense. Smoking-related illnesses cost the Department nearly a billion dollars each year. If the Justice Department case is successful, it could result in a substantial financial benefit to DOD health care programs which stand to share in the recovery.

I had considered offering a simple amendment. It would ensure that the restrictions on transfers would not apply to currently pending litigation. It would thus ensure that there is no unintended impact on the tobacco case. However, I do not intend to offer my amendment at this time. I understand that the underlying provision is part of the bill's report language, not its statutory language; and I believe that the provision can and, I am hopeful, will be fixed in conference so that it no longer has any impact on the tobacco litigation.

However, other appropriations bills moving through the House, such as VA-HUD and Commerce-State-Justice contain statutory language that is explicitly designed to stop the tobacco lawsuit. This is simply wrong. Rather than supporting the administration's effort to protect the Federal taxpayers and public health, these bills are trying to defund the litigation. This is nothing less than a secret gift to the tobacco industry. As the other appropriations bills move through the process, I urge my colleagues to strip out special protections for big tobacco; but if these provisions remain, I intend to shine the spotlight on them and fight to eliminate them.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and to express my full support for H.R. 4576, the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001. This important legislation honors the men and women serving in our Nation's armed services. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for their leadership and com-

mitment in addressing the needs of our service men and women and their families.

This bill enhances recruiting, retention and quality-of-life programs. It also includes a 3.7 percent pay raise and an additional \$64 million for basic housing allowances. It also addresses procurement shortfalls that our military has suffered since the Kosovo campaign.

In particular, I am thankful for the gentleman from California's support for metrology and calibration accounts and the C-17 Globemaster funding levels. I look forward to working with the gentleman to explore the active associate wing concept for any additional C-17s procured.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is good for the U.S. service men and women, good for the national security needs of our country, and a sound investment for the people of the United States. Once again I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the staff of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations for their long hours and dedication. I know my district and the Nation's service men and women are better off because of their commitment. I support the rule and the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today would in 1 year raise funding for the Pentagon by \$24 billion. Given some of the stories I have heard from the troops in the field, some of that money might be well spent. Unfortunately, I do not believe it is in this bill, and I do not believe it is getting to the folks that need it. I met the dad of a Marine who had a fancy new digital radio, that is true, they had acquired that for him; but the Pentagon told him they could not afford a waterproof cover for the nonwaterproof digital radio, and his dad was in GI Joe's in Oregon buying the kid a waterproof cover for his radio. There is something wrong with a Pentagon that can provide the fancy equipment, but it cannot provide the basics. We still have families in the military on food stamps. This bill does not take care of that problem. We have recruitment and retention problems. We have problems for hard duty, sea duty. There were requests by the Pentagon to fund those programs. They are not funded in this budget.

This budget does not take care of the young men and women serving us in the military, but it does take care of the defense contractors. Huge new weapons programs will be rushed forward with this bill. More billions for Star Wars that is yet to have one successful test. We are going to rush production of the F-22 aircraft. Yet this is

an aircraft that is 2 years behind on its flight tests and has yet to complete even basic flight testing.

But we are going to move ahead to procurement of a weapon that may not be needed that at this point does not work at a cost of \$300 million per fighter plane. It is supposed to be stealthy. The only thing stealthy about it is if we spend all our money on F-22s, they will be stealthy, we will hardly see an American fighter plane in the next war because we will not have hardly any and the ones we have might not be able to fly. Let us slow that down.

Contractors return voluntarily nearly \$1 billion of overpayments sent to them by a Pentagon that cannot keep track of its funds, and the GAO says there were another \$5 billion of overpayments at least that were rendered. They cannot even do bookkeeping. The answer is to give them another \$24 billion; \$24 billion that does not go to the troops, \$24 billion that does not go to basic readiness, \$24 billion that does not go to recruitment and retention problems, \$24 billion that flows to weapons systems that we do not need, that do not work, that are costing outrageous amounts of money.

It is time to inject a little common sense into this debate. I am going to offer an amendment on the F-22 to slow that program down and save \$1 billion. I am also going to offer another simple common sense amendment, perhaps too common sense for us inside the Beltway here, not for me but maybe for other Members, that would say that any contractor who three times is convicted of procurement fraud against the taxpayers of the United States would not be eligible to further contract with the Department of Defense. I will not even go back in time. If we did it retroactively, it would disqualify all our defense contractors. But let us go from this date forward and say from this date forward defense contractors are not going to commit fraud against the taxpayers of the United States; and if they do, they will lose their contracts.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States when it speaks of we the people of the United States, it goes on to speak of forming a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, securing the blessings for ourselves and our posterity.

Providing for the common defense is something that we as Members of Congress need to do. But we also have to ask when \$24 billion extra is put into a defense budget, when the defense budget today is in excess of \$300 billion, we have to ask whether or not some of the other promises to the people of this

country are being ignored. Because certainly the national defense should include the ability to provide for decent health care for all, for a decent education for all, for decent jobs for all. That too should be part of our national security. If that is not, then we should in the alternative make sure that in this huge Federal budget that we meet the economic and social needs of the people.

□ 1530

Now, this bill, Mr. Speaker, includes a provision for \$1.8 billion for a boondoggle called the National Missile Defense System. This system is a fraud on the taxpayer, and it is a danger to arms reduction. First, the technology is not feasible. It is not testable, and, therefore, not reliable. It does not protect against real threats, but it does richly line the pockets of military contractors.

It will destabilize our relations with our allies worldwide and will spark a new and expanded nuclear arms race. It violates years of work towards disarmament and nonproliferation. This national missile defense, so-called defense, is a technological failure. A recent New York Times article gives Congress an inkling to the truth about this missile defense.

This Times analysis, which was based on a report from an MIT scientist, goes on to state that, well, the national missile defense system depends on the system's ability to discriminate between the target warhead of an incoming missile and decoys, something has gone wrong with this system.

According to the New York Times, the system has failed those tests, that it cannot discriminate between the target warhead of an incoming missile and decoys. This is a quote from the newspaper, "The Pentagon hailed the first intercept try as a success, but later conceded that the interceptor initially drifted off course and picked out the decoy balloon rather than the warhead," end of quote, that is because, according to the Times, the system cannot tell the difference between warheads and decoys. Experiments with the National Missile Defense System have revealed that the system is, quote, "inherently unable to make the distinction," and that is between the target warhead, and decoys. The New York Times characterized the MIT scientist as saying the signals, quote, "from the mock warhead and decoys fluctuated in a varied and totally unpredictable way," that is inner quotes, revealing no feature, inner quotes, "that can be used to distinguish one object from another," end quote.

Indeed, the Times reported the test showed that warheads and decoys are so similar that sensors might never be able to tell them apart. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the national missile defense which we are about to appro-

priate close to \$2 billion for does not work and cannot work because it is inherently unable to tell the difference between warheads and decoys, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpaying America.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. After this report appeared in the New York Times, Defense saw to it that this letter that was sent was classified. Now, it was classified before we had a chance to have a debate over this on this floor; that classification tactic was simply, I believe, to chill the debate.

I am going to be called on the appropriate legal enforcement agencies to investigate this whole effort to cover up a system that does not work, to trick up test results, because there is fraud and deceit here. The taxpayers are being cheated. I am going to offer an amendment that seeks to, as other Members will, deal with this subject, because the national missile defense does not address the real threats that exist, and the system will simply line the pockets of major defense contractors.

It is wrong to cheat the taxpayers of the United States. And that is what this so-called phony missile defense program does. We have already spent \$60 billion in the last 15 years on anti-missile defense research, and it has not produced a weapons defense system that can work. It is wholly ineffective. It is a lie, and it needs to be exposed and it will be.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 6, 2000]

MISSILE DEFENSE IS POLITICAL FICTION
(By Frances FitzGerald)

The debate over national missile defenses has been nothing short of surreal.

On the one hand, President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore have been promoting a limited defense system to protect the nation against attacks by rogue states, though the system has not been proven and may never work reliably. They have also been asking Russia to agree to amend the anti-ballistic missile treaty to permit such a system, though the Russians have always adamantly opposed such an amendment and continued to do so at the summit meeting last weekend in Moscow.

On the other hand, Gov. George W. Bush has promised a much more robust national missile defense, though based on technologies he has not yet named.

In addition, he has promised deep reductions in the American and Russian strategic arsenals. The Russians, however, have already told us that they see a larger defense effort as a threat to their nuclear deterrent. The idea that they would make deep reductions in the face of such an effort defies logic.

Everyone in Washington knows all of this, so what is going on?

The answer, of course, is politics. But it is a politics that cannot be understood apart from the history of the debate, a debate that has never been about reality.

On March 23, 1983, President Ronald Reagan, whose hard-line anti-Soviet policies had by then given rise to the largest anti-nuclear movement in Cold War history, personally—and almost in secret—wrote an insert

to a routine defense speech, calling on the scientific community to turn its great talents to the cause of world peace and to give us a means of rendering nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete."

In background briefings after the speech, there was talk of such Buck Rogers weaponry as space-based lasers that could destroy the entire Soviet missile arsenal.

Reagan's own officials, among them Secretary of State George Shultz, were appalled, and some speculated that the president had gotten the idea from a science-fiction film. It took them almost a year to discover what a stroke of political genius the speech insert was.

Since 1946, opinion polls had shown that the vast majority of Americans believed that scientists could develop a defense against nuclear missiles if they put their minds to it. Indeed, except when the issue of vulnerability was front and center in the news, most Americans expressed confidence that the United States had a defense against nuclear weapons already.

Just two weeks after Reagan's speech, a White House poll asked respondents whether they believed scientists could come up with "a really effective way to destroy Soviet nuclear missiles from space." The answer was, as always, a resounding yes.

Reagan certainly expected this answer. In addition, he and his close aides recognized that, because of its inherent ambiguity, a defense initiative would appeal to conservatives as a way to develop a weapons system even while it appealed to the public at large as a means to eliminating the nuclear threat.

By the time of Reagan's re-election in November 1984, all of his top officials had lined up behind the Star Wars concept. A number of existing research programs were cobbled together, and the Strategic Defense Initiative was launched with great fanfare and much rhetoric about the potential of lasers and other exotic technologies.

Shultz, Robert McFarlane and other moderates in the administration wanted to use SDI as a bargaining chip for Soviet strategic weapons.

"It would be like giving them the sleeves off our vest," Shultz told the president.

However, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, his aide Richard Perle and their fellow hard-liners had other ideas. They saw SDI as a way to block offensive-arms reductions, to tear up the 1972 ABM treaty and to begin an arms race in defensive as well as offensive weapons.

The two sides brawled for the rest of the Reagan administration, and neither succeeded in gaining its ends.

In the meantime, however, SDI became extremely popular in the polls. While the hard-liners pleaded knowledgeable conservatives by blocking strategic talks, Reagan pleased the public by offering to share SDI technology with the Soviets and promising the elimination of nuclear weapons. The anti-nuclear movement, its rhetoric stolen, gradually faded away.

In the past 15 years, the United States has spent \$60 billion on anti-missile-defense research and has yet to produce a workable weapons system. An effective defense of the country remains wholly elusive.

Yet Republican conservatives have continued to speak as if exotic technologies were ready to jump off the assembly lines, and have continued to press for a deployment of something—anything—that would irrevocably commit this country to an open-ended process of developing national missile defenses.

Congressional Democrats tried to resist the pressure, but their ability to do so waxed and waned with their own political fortunes and those of the Republican right. In early 1998, or around the time the Republicans took their impeachment case against President Clinton to the Senate, the Democrats gave way.

The previous fall a commission headed by Donald Rumsfeld, a former defense secretary, had concluded that "rogue states" could acquire ballistic-missile technologies, and North Korea had test-fired a long-range missile out over the Pacific.

In January the Clinton administration pledged financing for the deployment of a national missile-defense system to cope with this threat. In March the Senate, with administration support, overwhelmingly approved a resolution calling for a deployment.

At the time, White House officials commented that the administration's support for the bill would help to defuse a potent political issue for the Republicans in the campaign of 2000.

Last fall Clinton announced that he would make a final deployment decision this summer, in the very midst of the presidential campaign.

This determination clearly had little to do with technology, for the schedule did not permit time for adequate testing—and since then one of the two tests has failed. Rather, it had to do with the fear that the Republicans would call Democrats weak on defense.

In their unsuccessful attempt to persuade the Russians to agree to the deployment, administration officials assured them that they could defeat the system if they kept 1,000 or more strategic nuclear weapons on full alert. This was hardly a bargain for either country, given the decay of the Russian early-warning system and the increasingly real threat of an accidental launch.

In the midst of these technological and diplomatic embarrassments for the administration, Bush revived the political issue by calling for the entire Reagan program: Star Wars, radical nuclear-arms reductions, the de-alerting of nuclear forces and the sharing of anti-missile technology with our allies and possibly the Russians as well.

The proposal is, of course, self-contradictory. It is also wildly implausible, in that the Pentagon is no more likely to agree to give away advanced American technology than it ever was, and no country except the United States can afford an open-ended missile-defense program.

But then, the majority of Americans did not notice any of these problems when Reagan made the proposal 15 years ago.

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 2000]

A STRATEGY OF SILENCE ON MISSILE DEFENSE (By Greg Schneider)

If President Clinton wants to show Russian President Vladimir Putin the potent mix of interests making ballistic-missile defense a priority in this country, he could invite Putin to continue their summit at the Wyndham Franklin Plaza Hotel in Philadelphia.

There they would find an archetypal blend of politics, military and industry in the form of a week-long conference hosted by Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) and co-chaired by the Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and Lockheed Martin Corp.

Inside those closed-door sessions are the stakeholders in a campaign to create a land-based anti-missile system designed to shoot down warheads launched at the United

States by terrorists or "rogue" states. The National Missile Defense program is to receive \$12 billion over the next six years and could grow much larger.

While President Clinton weighs a decision on whether to order construction of the system, and while Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush calls for an expanded defense shield, the nation's defense contractors are uncharacteristically silent about this potential windfall of them and their shareholders.

The Philadelphia conference is closed to the public and press, though representatives of several foreign militaries will take part. The companies in attendance and others in the defense sector do virtually no marketing of missile defense in the media. They don't even do much direct lobbying on Capital Hill, according to executives, lobbyists, staffers and experts.

The technology is too risky, sources said, and the issue has too many international complications. But mostly there is little need to lobby, because Congress is already dead set on finding a way to stop hostile foreigners from hitting American troops or cities with long-range missiles.

"It's religion on Capital Hill," said an industry executive who asked not to be named.

"I think [the companies] sense there's an irresistible drive that something is going to be fielded, and perhaps in this instance they can sit out the overt plug for the system itself and let the events just carry the current like a wave ahead of them," said retired Army Col. Daniel Smith, chief of research at the nonpartisan Center for Defense Information. "That way they can be good guys in a sense and still get the contracts and save their powder for the real battles."

Critics charges that the companies take a subterranean approach to the issue, funneling money to think tanks that use speeches studies and seminars to spread the gospel of missile defense. "It's been a very sophisticated disciplined lobbying effort," said William D. Hartung of the World Policy Institute in New York.

The stakes are high and growing. The national has spent more than \$60 billion on missile-defense research since Ronald Reagan announced his plan for a space shield against Russian warheads in the early 1980s. It could spend anywhere from \$30 billion to \$50 billion more on the National Missile Defense program by 2015, depending on how extensive a system is built, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Thousands of companies across the country benefit from ballistic-missile defense programs, though nearly half of the spending goes to four major players: Lockheed Martin, Boeing Co., Raytheon Co. and TRW Inc.

Although much of the work is done in Alabama and California, a breakdown of \$2.55 billion in current contracts shows 46 Northern Virginia-based companies receiving a total of \$166 million, according to Eagle Eye Publishers, Inc. in Fairfax. Seventeen contractors in Maryland and the District divided another \$28 million.

Others would like to get into the field. Northrop Grumman Corp., for example, has spent years prepping for a chance to build radar for an expanded version of the National Missile Defense program.

But John Johnson, director of advanced technology businesses at Northrop Grumman's electronics sector near Baltimore, said he recently learned that National Missile Defense prime contractor Boeing is planning to stick with the radar it currently buys from Raytheon.

"It's difficult to understand why in the world they would not want to have competition," Johnson said. "Especially when you consider the fact that whoever does this is going to have a monopoly for the next 20 to 30 years in that particular line of business. We're talking a tremendous amount of money, billions of dollars, for tens of years."

Such scale is especially irresistible to the big companies that hunger for huge, long-term contracts after a decade of industry consolidation and several years of rejection by Wall Street. The primary question is how far Congress will ultimately be willing to go.

Reagan's original vision of a vast space shield, dubbed "star wars," evaporated in the hot glare of physics and negative publicity. But the Persian Gulf War rekindled the issue as Saddam Hussein menaced Israel and attacked U.S. troops with crude Scud missiles. The military had no reliable answers to that threat so Congress ordered it to come up with something.

Since then, North Korea and other potential enemies have worked to develop rocket technology that could let them deliver warheads of every description to faraway places—theoretically including the United States.

So the Pentagon is stoking antiballistic missile technology on two fronts: The National Missile Defense program would establish a limited network to protect the nation from the odd missile or two launched by terrorists. And several "theater missile defense" programs are aimed at protecting troops or ships in battle from Scud-like threats.

Boeing is the lead company on National Missile Defense, having won a three-year, \$1.6 billion contract in 1998 to assemble a basic system.

Lockheed Martin lost out on that contract but is the major player in theater missile defense, with its upgraded version of the Patriot missile and the Army's \$14 billion Theater High-Altitude Area Defense, or Thaad, system. The company could gain an important role in national missile defense as well, if the program is expanded to include Navy ships using Lockheed Martin's Aegis combat system.

Raytheon and TRW are present as subcontractors on virtually every type of missile-defense program. Raytheon makes the crucial X-band radar for both National Missile Defense and for Thaad, as well as the "kill vehicle" on the tip of the NMD missile. TRW is creating the battle management, command and control system for NMD; is working with Boeing and Lockheed Martin on the Air Force's Airborne Laser program; and is competing to build a low-orbiting network of early-warning satellites.

The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, which coordinates most of the systems, also has a small-business innovation program that has awarded about \$450 million in research contracts to thousands of companies in all but about three states since 1985. The agency sends out a monthly newsletter highlighting technology contracts in particular states, which experts say is BMDO's most overt effort to emphasize the far-flung political constituencies of its programs.

National Missile Defense is by far the most politically sensitive project. It is a topic not only at this weekend's summit in Russia but also in this year's presidential campaign. The central issue is when to begin deploying a land-based missile-defense system, and how big to make it. Many defense officials expect President Clinton to postpone the deployment decision until the next administration.

One executive in the defense industry said that while contractors believe George W. Bush would act faster and on a bigger scale, they also have faith that pressure from Congress would make Democrat Al Gore follow suit eventually.

Either way, the executive said, the research dollars will keep flowing.

Such research could lead to valuable spin-off technology in other business areas such as communications, remote sensing and optical technologies, said Malcolm O'Neill, who heads Lockheed's air and missile defense efforts. O'Neill, a retired Army general who was the first commander of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, continues to serve on a BMDO advisory panel.

The industry's expectation that research dollars will flow regardless of when the system is deployed is one reason, insiders say, that defense lobbyists are not trying to push missile defense.

A bigger factor is that the topic "is so political that the defense contractors really don't want to be prominently involved in something that is that visceral in terms of opposition or support," said Richard Cook, a veteran lobbyist and former head of government operations for Lockheed.

Cook recalled catching a company official briefing a group of senators on the promise of missile defense in the early 1980s. "I chewed [him] out," Cook said. "I said, 'Hey, what are you doing talking about missile defense? You have no idea what it's going to cost, and the politics are such that you're going to have little or no influence and in fact you'll probably end up embarrassing Lockheed.'"

At that time, too, he said, the company's own scientists were divided over whether the technology would even work.

Critics argue today that the whole effort—but especially National Missile Defense—is technologically impossible. "This isn't going to defend anyone except defending the interests of some defense contractors and lining their pockets," Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich (D-Ohio) said last week at a rally against missile defense.

He pointed out that the four biggest contractors are heavy campaign donors. The defense industry as a whole supplied more than \$2.3 billion in soft money to the major parties last year, according to Common Cause.

Hartung, the arms-control expert at the World Policy Institute, charges that defense companies have shaped the debate over missile defense by working indirectly through think tanks and study groups that influence key participants.

"These companies are desperate for cash, and they view this system as their meal ticket—not for this year but for the next generation," Hartung said.

He emphasized links between defense contractors and the Center for Security Policy, an arms advocacy group run by former Reagan defense official Frank J. Gaffney Jr. The center has written speeches for politicians who support missile defense, hosted conferences and honored public figures for championing the cause.

Gaffney said in an interview that he hopes his group has helped accelerate interest in missile defense, but he rejected the suggestion that his effort is tainted because the center's board of advisers includes executives from Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman and other companies.

"I think people who don't like our message would find any pretext to dismiss the message," he said. The center reported that corporations contributed 17 percent of its \$1.2

million in revenue for 1998, the most recent year available.

Gaffney also is intimately involved with a new group called the Coalition to Protect Americans Now, which has funded a pair of television ads warning that "America is unprotected against missile attacks and calling on the president to deploy "a strong missile defense—now."

The ads, which were being run on CNN this weekend so that the president could see them in Europe, are being funded by Colorado heiress Helen Kriebel, Gaffney said.

He expressed frustration that the companies involved in ballistic-missile defense have not so far chosen to participate. That was a sentiment shared by Curt Weldon, the Pennsylvania congressman who persuaded the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization to hold the conference in Philadelphia tomorrow through Thursday.

"I think they've not done enough", and they've benefited from these programs," Weldon said of the companies. "They have a responsibility I think, to use their resources to at least make the case why it's important business-wise. We're not doing this because it means jobs, but the fact that it does means jobs make it somewhat critical for them to tell that story."

Five or 10 years ago, Weldon said, the companies were reluctant to take a high profile because the programs were so controversial. "But we've changed that. We've changed the whole debate in this country," he said. "Now I think it's appropriate for them to weight in . . . and I will continue to press them until that happens."

SCIENTIFIC PANEL SAYS NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE WON'T WORK

The Union of Concerned Scientists and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Security Studies Program today released the first major study presenting technical evidence that the planned US National Missile Defense (NMD) system would be defeated by simple responses from new missile states.

The report, by a panel of eleven independent senior physicists and engineers, also finds that the current NMP testing program is not capable of assessing the system's effectiveness against a realistic attack.

"This so-called national missile defense system won't do the job," said report chair Dr. Andrew Sessler, former director of the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and past president of the American Physical Society. "The United States should shelve its NMD plans and rethink its options for countering missile threats."

The NMD system is intended to defend US territory from attacks by tens of intercontinental-range ballistic missiles armed with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. President Clinton is scheduled to decide on deployment this fall, after a third intercept test in June and a Pentagon recommendation in July. The first intercept test in October scored an ambiguous hit; the second test in January was a miss.

The report was researched by top scientists from Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, MIT, Cornell University, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Maryland, and the University of Pennsylvania. Study members include senior defense consultants to the US government and nuclear weapons laboratories, and former members of the Defense Science Board, the Rumsfeld Commission, and the Lockheed Corporation. The scientists used physics and engineering calculations to analyze both the planned NMD system and the simple steps—

known as "countermeasures"—that nations developing long-range missiles could take to foil the defense.

For biological or chemical weapons, the missile warhead can be divided into many small bomblets that would be released from the missile early in flight and overwhelm the defense with too many targets. The analysis in the report shows that the technology for bomblets would be readily available to an emerging missile state.

"Any long-range missile attack with biological weapons would surely be delivered by bomblets," said Dr. Kurt Gottfried, a physicist at Cornell University and chair of the Union of Concerned Scientists. "The planned NMD system could not defend against such an attack."

The report also finds that attackers using nuclear weapons could defeat the system by deploying their warheads inside mylar balloons and releasing many empty balloons along with them, presenting the defense with an unwinnable shell-game. Or a nuclear warhead could be covered by a shroud cooled to very low temperatures, preventing the heat-seeking interceptor from detecting and homing on the target.

The US intelligence community, in a September 1999 report, also found that developing nations could deploy countermeasures with their long-range missiles and would be motivated to do so by US NMD deployment.

"Any country that can deploy a long-range missile with a nuclear or biological weapon can deploy these countermeasures," said Dr. Lisbeth Gronlund, a physicist at UCS and MIT. "Pentagon claims that the system can deal with countermeasures simply do not stand up to technical scrutiny."

The study shows that the NMD testing program will not be able to determine if the system would be effective against these countermeasures. Tests against realistic targets will not be conducted before the first phase of deployment in 2005, if at all.

"Since we find that even the full NMD system would be defeated by realistic countermeasures, it makes no sense to begin deployment," said Dr. Sessler. "A defense that doesn't work is no defense at all."

As a companion to the new report, USC produced an animation that shows how straightforward devices like balloons and bomblets would confuse the NMD system. The animation and report can be viewed on the UCS website at www.ucsusa.org/arms/.

MISSILE SHIELD ANALYSIS WARNS OF ARMS BUILDUP

(By Bob Drogin and Tyler Marshall)

WASHINGTON—The U.S. intelligence community is writing a secret report warning the Clinton administration that construction of a national missile defense could trigger a wave of destabilizing events around the world and possibly endanger relations with European allies, a U.S. intelligence official said Thursday.

The new National Intelligence Estimate will sketch an unsettling series of political and military ripple effects from the proposed U.S. deployment that would include a sharp buildup of strategic and medium-range nuclear missiles by China, India and Pakistan and the further spread of missile technology in the Middle East.

A supplement to the highly classified report will also note that the threat of attack from North Korea has eased since last fall, when Pyongyang effectively froze its ballistic-missile testing program in response to U.S. overtures.

Outside critics have long argued that the proposed national missile defense could

backfire and actually diminish national security and global stability. But the CIA-led analysis and updated threat assessment are the first official evaluation of how the system could generate new threats.

The administration has pledged to decide this fall whether to proceed with an initial base of 100 "interceptor" missiles in Alaska, backed by ground-based phased radar stations and satellite-based infrared sensors, in a system designed to shield the continental United States from a limited missile attack.

Proponents of the system argue that North Korea, Iran or Iraq may threaten U.S. territory with intercontinental ballistic missiles someday. Critics argue that the threat is exaggerated, that the antimissile technology is unproved and that deployment would undermine crucial arms control and nonproliferation regimes.

CIA analysts believe that Russia would accept U.S. arguments that no system could protect against the number of missiles Moscow could launch and that its deterrent thus would be preserved. But China has only 20 CSS-4 intercontinental ballistic missiles in vulnerable silos, and the analysts say that, after a U.S. deployment, Beijing would conclude that it had lost its deterrent force—and act accordingly.

"We can tell the Russians that [the missile defense] won't affect the viability of their deterrent force," the intelligence official said. "I don't know how we can say that to the Chinese with a straight face."

If the U.S. system is built, the CIA believes, China would install multiple independent nuclear warheads on its missiles for the first time in an effort to overwhelm any missile shield. Beijing has possessed the technology for more than a decade but has not used it so far.

In addition, Beijing is deemed likely to build several dozen mobile truck-based DF-31 missiles, which it first tested last year, to create a more survivable force. It also is likely to add such countermeasures as booster fragmentation, low-power jammers, chaff and simple decoys to confuse or evade U.S. interceptors.

The intelligence official said that Russia and China both would increase proliferation, including "selling countermeasures for sure" to such nations as North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Syria.

Moreover, the official said, India is deemed likely to increase its nuclear missile force if it detects a sharp buildup by China, its neighbor and longtime rival. That, in turn, likely would spur Pakistan, India's arch-enemy, to increase its own nuclear strike force, the official said.

Former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft called such a scenario "plausible" and expressed concern about its possible implications.

"We ought to think whether we want the Chinese to change their very minimalist strategy," he said in a telephone interview. "I'm not sure what the answer is, but this is certainly one of the possible consequences that, in a sense, is more serious than the Russian reaction might be."

THE LIKELIHOOD OF A DOMINO EFFECT

Other specialists said that, while it is likely China would move to increase its intercontinental ballistic missile arsenal—now thought to be about 20 strong—it is questionable whether India and Pakistan would follow suit.

"China has had a strategic capability for a long time relative to India, and India has hardly gone on a missile arms race to counter it," noted John E. Peters, an arms

control specialist at Rand Corp., a Santa Monica-based think tank.

Michael O'Hanlin, who tracks the missile defense issue at the Brookings Institution, a nonpartisan think tank in Washington, argued that, however dramatic it may sound, a domino-style nuclear arms buildup would be a lesser threat to the United States than China's potential willingness to develop and sell missile defense countermeasures to countries like North Korea. Arms control specialists have expressed strong concern that the missile defense system as designed would be incapable of overcoming relatively cheap and easy-to-deploy countermeasures, such as clusters of decoys.

"If they do that, it could defeat the entire purpose of the national missile defense," O'Hanlin said, "That is the scenario that's very important."

Further afield, the intelligence official who outlined the report said, America's allies in Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization could be angered if the United States is seen to be walling itself off from its allies with an antimissile shield.

N. KOREA'S TEST PROGRAM FROZEN

The updated threat assessment notes that North Korea has frozen its program to test an intercontinental ballistic missile—the Taepo-Dong 2—since the administration proposed relaxing economic and diplomatic sanctions last year.

The missile still could be tested on short notice, the official said, and related tests of the system's electronics, pumps, tanks and other equipment are still going on.

CIA analysts, who warned last year that Iran may try to test an intercontinental ballistic missile by 2010, have detected little progress in Tehran's program. "We're not seeing some of the things we expected," the official said. "We're not seeing the threat advance."

The White House requested the intelligence estimate as part of its decision-making review.

The analysis, to be delivered next month, presents two different scenarios of how other nations are likely to react to a U.S. deployment.

The first is based on the premise that Russia agrees to U.S. demands to amend the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty of 1972 to allow a missile shield. The second assesses the effect if Russia refuses and Washington simply abandons the arms control process, as many Republicans have demanded.

At the moment, Russia and China are the only potential adversaries capable of hitting the United States with nuclear missiles. Russia has about 1,000 strategic missiles and 4,500 warheads.

The report pointedly declines to describe North Korea and other hostile states as "rogue" nations, since the argot suggests that their leaders are irrational.

"The term rogue state almost predisposes you in favor of" the missile defense system, the intelligence official said.

Moreover, the report warns that the missile defense shield would not protect Americans against what the official called "more accurate, more reliable and much cheaper" ways of delivering chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. These include ship-launched missiles, suitcase bombs and other covert means.

"The joke here is, if you want to bring a nuclear weapon into the United States, just hide it in some drugs," the official said.

BIPARTISAN THINKERS LOOK PAST
TRADITIONAL ARMS CONTROL

(By Carla Anne Robbins)

WASHINGTON—When President Clinton goes to Moscow next month, he will try to sell Russian President Vladimir Putin a new arms-control “grand bargain.”

For years, the prospect of any agreement would have been greeted with cheers and sighs of relief. This deal, in which Washington trades somewhat deeper cuts in both sides’ arsenals for Moscow’s grudging acquiescence to a limited U.S. missile-defense program, is supposed to break a seven-year stalemate in nuclear-arms reductions.

But a decade after the Cold War’s end, a group of American thinkers from both parties is raising a more radical idea: Traditional arms control simply might not work anymore.

With the world vastly changed, they are calling for the old rulebook to be jettisoned. In this bold new order, there would be deep, even unilateral cuts in U.S. nuclear forces. Russia, and perhaps China, would join the U.S. and Europe in building missile-defense systems. Finally, there would be a global campaign, championed by Washington and its allies, along with Moscow and Beijing, to control the spread of terror weapons.

Stephen Hadley, a top aide in the Bush Pentagon, says he can imagine a day when the U.S. and Russia simply “advise” each other of their nuclear plans. “It’s a perverse outcome of Cold War arms control [that] both sides have kept an inventory of strategic weapons far above what they need or want,” he says. Jan M. Lodal, a former top official in the Clinton Pentagon, warns that the U.S. is “making a huge diplomatic effort to preserve treaties that don’t have any effect on the real problems” of fighting proliferation.

It is hard to overstate what a sweeping change this would mean. For 30 years, mankind’s survival was thought to rest on the successful negotiation and implementation of arms-control treaties. Only arms control could walk the world back from the nuclear brink.

So why would anyone dare to try a different way?

Consider some current problems:

The U.S. and Russia agreed in 1993 to slash their arsenals to 3,000 to 3,500 long-range weapons, but domestic and international wrangling has blocked the cuts. Even if Mr. Clinton and Mr. Putin make a deal, the GOP-led Senate is threatening to reject it, while the Pentagon is already planning a larger antimissile program. The next president will have to start renegotiating the grand bargain a few months after taking office.

The nuclear-driven India-Pakistan conflict is today’s most dangerous clash. But since neither country is recognized as a “nuclear state” under the nonproliferation treaty, the U.S. can’t give them technology or know-how to help prevent accidental launches or wars of miscues.

Chemical weapons have been outlawed by an international treaty championed by the U.S. But the organization negotiated to monitor the ban has been hobbled by its members’ states’ lowest-common-denominator restrictions. The country setting the lowest denominator? The U.S.

With such a grim record, there may be little choice but to start over. Nobody can be sure how well a new arms-control order would work. But here’s how it might look:

Step one: The U.S. must begin, the new thinkers say, by shrinking its own arsenal to reflect a world where nuclear war with Rus-

sia is far less of a risk than the risk of Russia losing or selling off its weapons to rogue states or terrorists.

Moscow—which spent only about \$5 billion on all its defenses last year, or less than 2% of the Pentagon’s budget—already is calling for both sides to go down to 1,500 long-range weapons. U.S. military planners are insisting on keeping 2,000 to 2,500 weapons.

Mr. Lodal says the U.S. can cut back to 1,000 “survivable” weapons, mainly on hard-to-find submarines, and still deter all potential enemies. For the sake of speed, he says the U.S. should make those cuts unilaterally and expect the Russians to follow suit. Future agreements with Russia would focus on “transparency” to calm suspicions of a secret buildup by either side.

There is a precedent of this “arms control by example.” In 1991, President Bush broke all of the rules, unilaterally taking all U.S. strategic bombers off alert and pulling all American short-range nuclear weapons out of Europe and Asia. A week later, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev pulled all of his short-range nuclear weapons back to Russia and pledged to slash another 1,000 long-range weapons from the Soviet arsenal. The shocking moves and countermoves had analysts heralding a new “arms race in reverse.”

Step two: The U.S. has to figure out how to build missile defenses without creating a permanent international crisis.

There are serious doubts about whether the technology is ready or the rogue-state threat imminent. Nevertheless, national missile defense may be a political inevitability.

The prohibition against building defenses, enshrined in the 1972 ABM treaty, is the most passionately held arms-control taboo. During the Cold War, stability was supposed to be based on mutual vulnerability to devastating nuclear retaliation.

That high-risk equation may no longer be necessary, says Barry Blechman, a longtime critic of President Reagan’s Star Wars concept who now embraces the need for limited defenses. The threat today, he argues, comes from a few rogue states or terrorists, making defenses an easier technological problem to solve. But the challenge is still so daunting that it will be years before the U.S. can build anything that can defeat Russia’s force.

“I’ve always been of the mind that deterrence is what you do if you can’t defend.” Mr. Blechman, chairman of the Stimson Center, a Washington international security think tank.

The biggest challenge may be to calm Russia’s fears of a multibillion-dollar missile-defense race. Russia is unlikely to launch a major nuclear buildup. But a spurned Moscow could still make real trouble: slowing arms reductions, cutting off cooperative nuclear-security programs or even selling technology to foil missile defenses to North Korea or Iraq. By pulling out of the ABM, and provoking a crisis with Russia, the U.S. would also seriously damage its already strained credibility as a crusader against global proliferation.

Mr. Hadley, who now advises the presidential campaign of Texas Gov. George W. Bush, but says his ideas are his alone, believes the best hope is to revive a Bush administration proposal to bring the Russians and perhaps the Chinese into a “Global Protection System.”

The U.S., he says, could start by sharing early-warning data with Moscow. Russian and U.S. defense companies could collaborate on building and selling smaller theater missile-defense systems to countries that

otherwise might be tempted to acquire their own missiles. Most ambitiously, the U.S., Russia and Europe could work together to develop a national missile-defense system that all could deploy.

The West would likely have to foot a good part of Russia’s cost, while Moscow would have to implement far tougher technology-transfer controls. If China also wanted in, it “would have to show a real commitment to the effort against proliferation that so far it hasn’t shown,” says Mr. Hadley. Even then, China, which has about 20 long-range missiles capable of hitting the U.S., is almost certain to increase its nuclear forces to be sure of being able to overwhelm the U.S. system.

Some of the fiercest opponents to Mr. Hadley’s plan could be members of his own party, who increasingly argue that the U.S. can ignore a weakened Russia’s objections. And while Mr. Gorbachev once expressed interest, it isn’t certain whether Russia’s new leaders would want to join.

Step three: Really fight weapons proliferation.

Nuclear tests by India and Pakistan showed how few tools there are to punish countries determined to flout international treaties. The U.S. is still hoping to dissuade the two rivals from mating nuclear warheads to missiles. If that fails, it may have little choice but to rewrite or defy the nonproliferation treaty, providing both countries with the technology and know-how to prevent accidental wars.

“Arms-control treaties are only good when they reflect the underlying realities,” Mr. Blechman says.

Ferretting out secret cheaters is even harder. Politics is part of the problem. To win Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Clinton administration reserved the right to block challenge inspections on national security grounds and barred monitors from taking chemical samples abroad for analysis. Now “other countries will have the ability to block the inspectors the same way,” warns Amy Smithson of the Stimson Center. The Indian parliament is considering the Technology may be a bigger obstacle, especially when chemical and biological weapons can be cooked up in a garage or a bathroom.

So what to do? The new thinkers suggest the U.S. will have to move beyond treaties. It will need to enlist Russia and China, the biggest potential sources of illicit weapons, as well as its European allies, in a global antiproliferation campaign: Sharing intelligence, policing their defense industries and scientists, and joining in diplomatic initiatives to isolate offenders.

Sen. Richard Lugar, a longtime arms-control proponent, says that even with their weaknesses, these multilateral treaties can still provide useful “norms” for rallying international pressure or justifying unilateral punishments, as in the U.S. bombing of Iraq. “It may be the only real sanction in the world is the U.S. armed forces,” the Indiana Republican says.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) if he has any more speakers.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I respond that I reserve the final 2 minutes to close. There are no other speakers on the floor.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may assume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some of the comments from the critics of the bill and from those of whom consistently vote against the defense bills that are brought to this House floor in a bipartisan basis. It always is difficult for me to try to understand the dimension of others of whom perhaps do not share my opinions, because I, for one, believe that part of the purpose of forming a government is to make sure that we protect the Nation's borders; that we protect our interests; that we protect those of whom sleep in peace and tranquility and domestically within the borders of our own country, so we take great pride in our police force, our firefighters, those who serve in the military, those of whom who put on the uniform and say they give an oath to lay down their life.

It was a Vietnam veteran that turned to me when I was a young cadet and said I want you to memorize this statement: those who serve their country on a distant battlefield see life in a dimension for which the protected may never know.

Those of whom may be the protected yet have never seen the horrors of a battlefield are very quick to become the critics of the defense industry, become critics of those of whom serve in the military, those of whom question a system of honor and of integrity, of character, of the essence of the nobility of life.

They say, well, we will be there when you need it; that is false. It takes the commitment of a Nation, weapons systems that we will use in the next war are not crafted and built based on the successes of the last. If we do that, it is a prescription for failure.

You design your weapons systems thinking far ahead; it is why when you go into battle that we want to place our men and women who serve in harm's way with the ability to overmatch, so we do not see the coffins coming back to Dover, Delaware.

That is why I enjoy it when the defense bill comes to the House floor, because it is one of the few bills that this body comes together as Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana. Since I am a little hard on you, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not take from anything that the gentleman said that the gentleman would endorse fraud.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I will reclaim my time, that is a silly statement. No one in this body endorses fraud, for crying out loud. I do not even know where that came from. What bothers me is it is easy to say, oh, well, the Pentagon, they spend this much on

a weapons system, they spend that much on a part, these weapons systems are highly sophisticated and it takes awhile. They only make one or two parts. It is not making 10,000 parts.

Let me go back to my compliment, though, to the body. My compliment to the body is that we have many Members in here that have put on the uniform, and no one ever asked when we took that oath whether we were Republican or Democrat. So those of us who served in the authorizing committee and the appropriating committees who have the interest on national security keep that dimension.

Now, there will always be a critic of a bill for one particular reason or another. We have those of whom who are passivists. They should take pride in themselves, if they are a passivist, say they are a passivist. Do not just pick apart the bill for one reason or another. Expose your character. If they do not, I will be more than happy to.

Let me tell you something else that has bothered me when we take an individual who may be a critic of the defense industry or, in particular, of our defense. They are the same individuals of whom are seeking to socialize our military. So when they stand up here on the House floor and they talk about, well, we are having recruiting and retention problems in the military, and they give this long laundry list of what is wrong with the military, see they are the same ones who endorsed socialization policies of our military.

Socialization policies that, in fact, then begin to hurt the military. A sergeant at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, came up to me and says, Congressman, if the Army gets any more sensitive, it is going to cry. We have to stop and think what are we doing to the military.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled around; and I have conducted a lot of hearings, being chairman of personnel. Well, many are quick to blame recruiting and retention problems on a good economy, easy access to other sources of college funding, reduced propensity to enlist, a shortage of quality recruits. My findings point to other issues that stress the military force. It is called lack of spare parts, lack of adequate training time, aging equipment and high depreciation rates on our equipment, socialization policies, longer working hours and prolonged family separation due to an increased operational tempo.

We also have a mismatch in the Clinton/Gore national security strategy between a foreign policy of engagement and enlargement at our national military strategy. When we take 265,000-plus troops and put them in 135 nations all around the world and then we begin to have them serve as quasidiplomats, we then have a workforce out there that begins to then have questioned the mission; it is called mission credi-

bility. They say I do not mind being separated from my family, but to do this? And they say then, wait a second, what happened to the warrior. The warriors now have become the humanitarian.

They are outstretched all over the world as quasidiplomats on all of these humanitarian missions. Now, are some of them noble? Are some of them worthy? Yes. But we always have to be very careful about what happens when you take a warrior and we then turn him into a humanitarian. You dull the war-fighting skill. When you do that to a division, it takes us a year to retrain the division back to the war-fighting skill.

So as I listened to some of the comments of some of the Members, it is easy to pick apart the bill. I believe that this bill is going to receive a large bipartisan support.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I understand his criticisms and critique. We could give a critique on both sides of the aisle, but what the gentleman just said, I think, is the most important thing, and that is, we need to continue to maintain a bipartisan consensus in the House for national defense, for our troops, for taking care of the spare parts problems. I think it is good if we can try to work and build consensus behind national defense.

I hear some of the criticism on my side of the aisle, because they are worried about wastefulness. They are worried are we doing enough in terms of testing, national missile defense, have we done enough testing on the F-22. Frankly, as a member of the committee I am concerned about those issues myself.

I think we need to be careful as stewards of national security not to always believe everything we are told, I know the gentleman does not fall under this category, by the Pentagon is necessarily totally accurate. I mean, we have to go in and do a good job of oversight and looking at what has actually happened. And that is why I was impressed when the gentleman said he was going out and taking a look to see about spare parts.

By the way, our committee has added hundreds of millions of dollars over a sustained period of years on these issues during the Reagan buildup, during this buildup; but I hope we can try to have the rhetoric in a constructive tone, rather than in a tone that kind of gets us into a fight over this issue.

There still is a huge consensus in this Congress, at least 325 Members, who are strongly committed and it is very bipartisan. So I just wanted to make those points.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time. My compliments to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

He has have devoted a great deal of his time in Congress to the issues of national security. The issues on spare parts, I think American people would be shocked to go out on the flight line and see that we are swapping out engines to put F-14s in the air.

If we told our parents that, you know, I am going to be a little bit late for Christmas dinner because I have to pull the Chevy engine out of the car and put it in any other car, they say what are you doing; that sounds ridiculous. With the spare part problem out there that we are actually swapping out engines to put planes in the air is a little stunning.

I want to compliment the gentleman, because he has worked very hard on our spare part problem and concern.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this is a good bill. I see the gentleman from California here. I want to say to the gentleman, too, our subcommittee, it is a great subcommittee to be a Member of, there is never any partisan rhetoric to speak of; and we try to focus in on trying to do the best possible job with the resources we have to do the best for defense.

I think this year, for example, taking the money and accelerating the two brigades that will be part of the Army's effort to lighten up and be more mobile. That is a great decision on the part of the committee. I hope the Congress will endorse that, and I hope we can get the Senate to go along with it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think we are going to see the real compliment of the work product that came, not only out of the authorizing committee, but also the gentleman's work, this bill is going to pass in a huge bipartisan bill. I compliment the gentleman.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It will pass with a very significant bipartisan vote of both Democrats and Republicans.

□ 1545

I would only like to underscore one point that I made earlier in the debate, and I would hope that the leadership on the other side of the aisle in this body will impress upon the leadership on their side of the aisle in the other body how important it is to move the defense supplemental for Kosovo and Bosnia right now. Because while there is significant money in this bill for 2001, our troops face a crisis in the fourth quarter for fiscal year 2000, beginning in about a month, because of the inability of this Congress to fund what has already happened in Bosnia and Kosovo, and because of the fact that this requires our military to take

money away from training and to take money away from the vital things that need to be done right now in the remainder of this fiscal year.

So while it is laudable that we are going to pass by a significant bipartisan vote a good piece of legislation for the fiscal year that starts October 1, we need to move the money in the supplemental for the remainder of this fiscal year, or we are going to face a real crisis situation starting about August 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) to close.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) spoke about and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). The supplemental is important. We have over 21 ships that are tied up to the pier that cannot go anywhere, and we are going below that 300-ship Navy. Yet, there are some people on that side of the aisle that would even cut defense in an emergency situation like this. I think that is wrong.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. When I served on the authorizing body, it was the absolute best committee to serve on. There are no Republicans and no Democrats on that committee; they are all looking forward to helping the men and women in the services. Unfortunately, when we get to this floor, there are critics of those policies that want to cut for social spending. That is wrong. We put at risk our men and women in the services.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the authorizers. This is a good rule. I thank especially the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who has been tied up in another committee today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule and a good bill. I thank my colleagues for supporting it. We need to get the other body in line with the supplemental.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4576, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 514 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4576.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1550

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I are pleased to bring before the Membership today the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill for the Department of Defense. This bill, which received strong bipartisan support in our subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations, passing through the committee with no amendments, continues the efforts of the Congress to ensure that our Nation's military is ready for the challenge of the 21st century. Those challenges are daunting as any we have faced during the Cold War, and I am gratified that my colleagues understand that our security and the defense of freedom must remain above partisanship.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the beginning of this that the foundation laid by our subcommittee is designed to make certain that America remains as the single superpower well into the