

will be in the forefront of the fight to make certain that the efficiencies that we have long sought will finally come to bear.

The military has often told me that they are having a difficult time in recruiting people to serve in the armed services of our country.

□ 1115

It may be that the veterans who have served before are telling them that it is not all what it is cracked up to be. I think if we decide to emphasize the need to provide these expedited claims processes, we would find more veterans thrilled with the idea that their government is standing by them, as they stood by us. Maybe you would find young recruits thinking about engaging in military service, when they asked a veteran, that they would get that gold-plated assurance that, yes, the government did stand by me after I had served and made my life better.

So I thank the gentlemen and gentlewomen who have participated in increasing the supplemental by this \$19 million. I urge us to do more. I urge us to do a lot more, because, again, if we are to be the kind of Nation that leads others to prosperity and peace abroad, if we are to be the Nation that holds the ideals of that flag behind the Speaker's rostrum to the high standards we would expect, if we are that Congress that believes that that flag deserves protection from desecration, that we ought to make certain that this Congress is the one that expedites the appeals process and the claims process for those valiant men and women who have risked their lives to make America strong and secure. We should do nothing less, and we must do much more.

MILITARY NEEDS MORE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor a number of times over the last 8 years during the Clinton administration strongly criticizing the Clinton administration for what I consider to be a weakening of our national security. We had budgets that annually were short in terms of equipment being replaced, low pay for our military personnel, substandard housing for our military families, a lack of readiness, spare parts and training for our forces that might have to move around the world on a moment's notice, and overall shortchanging of national security by substantial amounts each year in the budget.

I want to go through the facts that I have laid out over the last several years with respect to what was then the Clinton administration's defense

budget. First I pointed out that we have cut our military forces since 1991–1992, the days of Desert Storm, by about 50 percent, and I pointed out that we had gone from 18 Army divisions to 10, we had gone from 24 fighter air wings to only 13 active air wings, we had gone from 546 Navy ships to 316, now down to less than that and going toward a 300 ship Navy.

I pointed out that we had declining mission-capable rates for our frontline aircraft. A mission-capable rate is if I called up a neighbor who has two cars and I ask him what his mission-capable rate was, and he said wait a minute, DUNCAN, and he went out to try to start them and only one started, he would say 50 percent; one out of two.

The mission-capable rate is the ability of an airplane, whether it is a fighter plane from a Navy carrier deck or an Air Force aircraft from an air base, to be able to fly out, take off, go do its mission, whether it is reconnaissance or escort or fighter duties, and return back to that base and land. Can it do its job? That is a mission-capable rate.

The mission-capable rates of all of our front-line fighters have been dropping dramatically during the last 8 years of the Clinton administration. I pointed out that they have gone down, and this chart represents that fall in mission-capable rates. They have gone down from an average of about 83 percent to 88 percent back in the early nineties to only about 73 percent today. So that means that this small Air Force that we now have, these 13 air wings, actually are less than that, because each of those air wings has fewer aircraft that are ready to go than the air wings of the force of 1992.

I pointed out during the last 8 years of the Clinton administration that our shipbuilding rate was falling; that instead of building the 9 to 10 to 11 ships that we needed each year to maintain at least a 300-ship Navy, we were consistently building only four or five or six or seven ships, building toward a 200-ship Navy. That is compared to Ronald Reagan's 600-ship Navy of the 1980s. I criticized that strongly.

I criticized the fact that the Army, by their own admission, by their own statement from the Chief of Staff of the Army, was \$3 billion short of basic ammunition. One thing you do not want to run out of in a war is ammunition; yet we were \$3 billion short. I criticized the fact that the Marine Corps was \$200 million short of basic ammunition.

At the same time, we criticized the fact that the U.S. Air Force was at one point 700 pilots short. That got up in the Clinton administration to as high as 1,200 pilots short. The last time I talked to Secretary Peters, then-Air Force Secretary under the Clinton administration, right at the end of the administration, at that point it had gone from 700 pilots short to 1,300 pi-

lots short. It had gone back a little bit. We were still 1,200 pilots short in the U.S. Air force.

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly criticized the Clinton administration as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement of the Committee on Armed Services for what I consider to be an inadequate budget that did a disservice to our men and women in uniform, and, more importantly, did a disservice to national security.

Well, today we have a new administration. It is the Bush administration, and it is headed by George W. Bush, a President whom I admire, a President of great personality, great vision, good common sense, and a President whom I think most Members of this House, whether they are Republican or Democrat, have a deep respect for.

But, Mr. Speaker, facts are stubborn things, and if we are going to maintain intellectual honesty in this body, and I think all of us try to do that as much as we possibly can, we have to be consistent. I have looked at this budget that this President has sent over to Congress, and this budget, which is seeking right now to plus-up defense, to add to defense \$18 billion, which would take it up to a level \$18 billion ahead of the last Clinton budget that was submitted and voted on and increased by this Congress, I find that that budget is still totally inadequate.

Facts are facts. We still have only 10 Army divisions, down from 18. We still have only 13 Air Force divisions, Air Force air wings, down from 24. This year, under this administration's budget, we are only going to build five ships, which is building at a rate that would lower the U.S. Navy to less than 200 ships.

We still have the \$3 billion ammo shortage in the U.S. Army. We still have the \$200 million ammo shortage in the U.S. Marine Corps. We still have a major gap in pay between our military personnel and the civilian sector.

I checked the other day, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Air Force, where is the pilot shortage now? Are we down from the 1,200 in the Clinton administration? The answer was no, we are still at 1,200, and we might even be shorter over the next several months.

Spare parts, have we got the spare parts that we need? The answer is no. We started something in the Clinton administration, Mr. Speaker, that I thought was an important tool of accountability, and that is that our great chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), always asked the military to give their honest answer after we had the Clinton budget. He would say, what do you really need? What is your unfunded requirement? What is that you need in terms of ammo, spare parts, pay, training, that your budget did not give you? They would send over a list.

Well, this year we have continued that practice with my President in the White House, George Bush; and the answer this year is close to \$30 billion short from the military.

We had GAO do a report for us, and we asked them if you take all of our ships and tanks and trucks and planes and you figure out about how old they are and how old they will be when they have to retire, figure out how many we have to replace each year so we have a fairly modern force. Could you do that for us?

That is like telling a guy that owns 100 taxicabs, figure out how many taxicabs you have to buy each year. If each of your taxicabs has a 10-year life, how many taxicabs do you have to buy each year so your taxicabs average about 5 years old, so they are not too old, so you do not end up with a bunch of '56 Chevys. The answer is you have to buy about 10 each year to keep that taxicab force fairly modern.

So we asked the GAO, do the same things for our tanks, trucks, ships and planes; and they came back with an answer, and their answer to us was the United States of America needs to spend an additional \$30 billion a year to have modern equipment for the people that wear the uniform of the United States to operate in training and in war.

We also asked them to tell us how much more money they thought we needed to spend on training if we wanted our pilots to have enough flying time and our people that operate our ground equipment to get enough training time. They came back with an answer of about \$5 billion more a year we have to spend.

We said what is it going to take if we full up our personnel and give them pay that is commensurate with the civilian sector? The answer was it is going to average about \$10 billion a year.

We said how much more do we need for missile defense if we really want to have a robust missile defense? We asked a lot of experts that. We figured out we need to have between \$2 and \$5 billion a year more.

We asked how much for ammunition, because we are about 50 percent short. Along with the Army \$3 billion shortage and the Marine Corps \$200 million shortage, all the services are short in what we call precision munitions.

That is what Americans watched in the Desert Storm war against Saddam Hussein when they watched the guy that the news stations called the world's luckiest taxicab driver, the car going across a strategic bridge, and we were coming with an aircraft to knock that bridge out, and we launched not a lot of bombs like we had to in the old days, the carpet bombs, and hoped to knock the bridge out; we launched one bomb at one of the struts under that bridge, and we could see on a camera

that bomb going in, a laser-guided bomb, hit precisely at that strut just as the taxicab driver got to the end of the bridge, and it blew up that bridge.

That is called a precision munition. It is very important in warfighting. We used it in the Kosovo campaign. So instead of having to carpet bomb with a lot of dumb bombs, you send one in that hits precisely the right point, and you get the same capability.

Well, we are about 50 percent short in those precision munitions across the board. So if you add money for the ammunition account and the munitions account, that is about another \$5 billion a year we have to spend.

Mr. Speaker, that adds up to over \$50 billion for equipment, for people, for training, for spare parts, for ammunition. I wanted to be able to stand here today and say my President, George Bush, provided that, just like my President Ronald Reagan came in in 1980 and rebuilt national defense and brought down the Russian empire under a motto, under a program that was called Peace Through Strength.

If you are strong, you can help the weaker nations in the world. If you are strong, you can help people to become free. If you are strong, you can protect your own people. If you are strong, you may be able to convince your adversary, which was then the Soviet Union, that the right way in this world is to go to the bargaining table with the United States and make a peace agreement. That happened under Ronald Reagan.

This budget this year submitted by this administration is more than \$100 billion less than Ronald Reagan's budget in real dollars in 1985, \$100 billion less. Now, it is true we do not need as much money as we needed in 1985, when the Soviets were ringing our allies in Europe with SS-20 missiles, when they were developing high combat-efficient capability in the air and on the land, and when they had a massive ICBM force threatening the United States.

□ 1130

We needed to spend more, but we have cut too much. We cut too much in the Clinton administration, and I am sad to say that this defense budget does not do much above the Clinton administration's level. It does a little, but it does not do much.

That takes me, Mr. Speaker, to my next subject, which is China. I spoke yesterday during the vote to give China Most Favored Nation trading status. That means we are going to give them the same privileges in trade with the United States that we give our best friends around the world.

I argued that, in 1941, we were sending American steel to Japan to build the Japanese fleet, we were sending petroleum to Japan to fuel that fleet, and we had one Congressman, Carl Anderson, who said 6 months before Pearl

Harbor: If we have to fight the Japanese fleet, we are going to fight a fleet that is built with American steel and powered with American petroleum. Six months later, we had thousands of Americans dead, lots of planes shot down, lots of ships destroyed by a Japanese fleet fueled with American petroleum and built with American steel.

I analogize that to China. We are sending \$80 billion a year more in China than they are sending to us, so they end up with \$80 billion more American dollars than we end up with dollars from them. They are taking those dollars, Mr. Speaker, and they are buying and building a war machine that one day may kill Americans on the battlefield. They bought the Sovremenny class missile destroyers from Russia. Those were designed with Sunburn missiles for one purpose: to kill American aircraft carriers. And they bought those after they had been embarrassed over the Taiwan issue by the United States, and they vowed never to be embarrassed again.

So they bought the Sovremenny class missile destroyers. They are buying air-to-air refueling capability from the Russians. They are buying high-performance SU-27 fighter aircraft from the Russians; and, yesterday, as we walked out of the vote giving China Most Favored Nation trading status and guaranteeing this flow of American dollars to China, we walked out to look at a headline in the Washington Post and the newspapers around the country saying China completes \$2 billion deal with Russia to now buy 38 SU-30 aircraft. Those are attack aircraft, from Russia. And we also noted that they are now Russia's biggest customer for Russia's war machine.

So we spent trillions of dollars offsetting Russia's war machine during the Cold War, and now we are rebuilding that war machine with American trade dollars in China.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close on a good note. Hopefully, there is a good note here. One hope, and I think this is the hope of all Members who understand the plight of America's military today, Democrat and Republican, I think certainly all members of the Committee on Armed Services, we need that \$18 billion. We are told we might not even get the \$18 billion above the Clinton budget that we thought we were going to get and which we made a place for in the budget a few months ago.

If we do not get that \$18 billion, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see more planes that cannot get off the ground; we are going to see more empty ammo pouches with the Army and Marine Corps personnel who have to defend this country; we are going to see more spare parts shortages throughout the services; we are going to see more substandard housing for military families; and we are going to see a continued decline of America's military strength.

Now, we did do something very phenomenal last week; and we recognized this in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker. That was that we did shoot down a bullet with a bullet in a national missile defense test.

Now, I have put up here, Mr. Speaker, the results of the last eight Patriot 3 tests. That is our smaller defensive system that handles Scud-type missiles, and I put it up here to show that, in fact, we are now hitting a bullet with a bullet with missile defense. We can shoot a Scud missile that goes faster than a .30-06 bullet, that is a high-powered rifle bullet with a Patriot 3 missile that also goes faster than a .30-06 bullet. We have had now eight out of nine successful intercepts.

Mr. Speaker, at about 11:09 on Saturday night last Saturday, 148 miles above the earth in the mid-Pacific, we hit a Minuteman missile launched out of Vandenberg, California, going some 11,000 feet per second. That is about four times the speed of a .30-06 bullet. We hit it with an Interceptor from Kwajalein Island, 4,800 miles from the west. We launched that Interceptor, and it also had a speed about four times faster than a .30-06 bullet, and they collided 148 miles above the earth.

That utilized radar capability, the Beal Air Force station in California, also our ex-band radar on Kwajalein, also radar at Hawaii with hundreds and hundreds of Navy and Air Force assets monitoring that test. And with some 35,000 Americans, whether they were members of the Army that helped develop the radar or the Air Force team that launched the missile from Vandenberg Air Base or the Navy and Coast Guard that provided security, some 35,000 plus Americans, engineers, scientists, technicians, blue collar workers, participated in making that test a success.

It was a great day for the United States, but it was a chart along a very difficult road of trying to achieve missile defense.

The Bush administration has the right idea about missile defense. They know it is necessary because we live in an age of missiles. We found that out when we had a number of our personnel killed in Desert Storm by a ballistic missile launched by Saddam Hussein at an American force concentration. We can defend today, even though we have a weakened defense, we still have defenses against ships, tanks, aircraft. We have no defense against an incoming ICBM coming into this country.

So that is why the administration is working with the Russians to try to develop a cooperation that will allow us to deploy defenses, and it is why also the Bush administration has the right idea, that if we cannot make an agreement with the Russian, it is in our national interests to build a missile defense system, because it is the United States Government that has a con-

stitutional responsibility to its people to provide for national security. National security must now and forever on include defense against incoming ballistic missiles.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the administration would work overtime to try to increase this defense budget. Let us not look back on this era of relative prosperity when the American people are doing well as an era that was similar to the era immediately preceding Korea, when we decided that there would not be any more wars and that we did not need to have a military that was ready to go. Then, on June 6 of 1950, we found ourselves pushed down the Korean peninsula by a third-rate military; and when the dust had cleared, over 30,000 Americans lay dead because we had underestimated the danger of the world; and we had also underestimated the drawdown of the American military that took place after World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep a strong military. That is the underpinnings of our foreign policy, which is ultimately the underpinnings of our economic policy. So let us try to get that \$18 billion, Mr. Speaker. It is crucial to everybody that wears a uniform in the United States, and it is crucial to every American.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. GRAVES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the Vice President.

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the Vice President.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KERNs, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 180. An act to facilitate famine relief efforts and a comprehensive solution to the war in Sudan; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2001, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2976. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 2000, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2977. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report, pursuant to P.L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2978. A letter from the Legal Technician, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Occupant Protection Incentive Grants [Docket No. NHTSA-01-10154] (RIN: 2127-AH40) received July 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2979. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Kern County Air Pollution Control District, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution District, Modoc County Air Pollution Control District [CA032-0241a; FRL-7001-2] received July 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2980. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District [CA241-0239a; FRL-7005-1] received July 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2981. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01-19), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2982. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting