

Following this vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill under the direction of Senators LEVIN and WARNER.

Rollcall votes are expected on the amendments to the DOD bill all afternoon Monday.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment following the statement during morning business by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

#### DEFENSE BUDGETS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we have for the most part today been dealing with the Defense authorization bill. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, it is something we wrestled with for some time. We realize how tight our budget is, and I thought it would be important for those Americans who care about those things, that remnant out there, that we give them some perspective as to where we are, what this authorization bill would mean, and how it would affect our Armed Forces.

In the early 1990s, our defense budget was as high as \$326 billion, as I recall, well over \$300 billion. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, President Bush commenced a decline in that budget. He had projected it out over a certain number of years and then it began to flatten out at a fairly substantial rate over \$300 billion.

What happened was, in our glee over the collapse of the Soviet Union, we allowed that budget to continue downward. We reached as low as \$286 billion, I believe, in the mid-1990s, \$20 billion more or less than former President Bush had proposed, and as a result we reduced our personnel very rapidly.

We had problems in a number of areas funding our budget, and as a result, the military began to suffer. In

particular, what suffered was our plans to recapitalize defense in America. I am talking about ships and planes and equipment that is pretty expensive. We paid the electric bills. We trained our men and women in uniform. We paid their salaries. We did the things we needed to do, but as one naval officer said, we created a bow wave out in front of the ship of increased capitalization needs. So we have been doing that for some years.

Gradually, we made a few increases since I have been in the Senate in the last 3 years, an increase in our defense budget, but it has not been much.

President Bush ran on the promise that he would do more for defense. He said, "Help is on the way." We remember that phrase.

We do indeed, this year, have a Defense appropriations bill that shows the largest increase in probably well over a decade. I know the President pro tempore is so familiar with these numbers, there is no need for me to recall them for him. We made some progress, and as I read this budget, this authorization bill, we will take defense spending from \$296 billion last year to \$328. If you count the supplemental of \$6 billion, we have a \$35 billion increase in defense, which amounts to a little over around 10 percent of the budget.

I thought we would have more impact, but I have not seen it. It strikes me that presumably the money has gone to do the things we need to do. We promised and committed to higher pay and better medical care, as we promised our men and women in uniform. They received that, and they are pleased with it. Retention and recruitment and morale is up, for which we can certainly celebrate, but it has left us not nearly as much as we had hoped we would have to begin to do better about capitalization.

For example, it was not too many years ago we were looking for a 600-ship Navy. We are now down to around 315 ships. We have ships going out of service every year because of age and lack of serviceability, and the number of ships coming on are less. So at the present rate, we can expect our fleet to fall well below 300. Maybe that is wise. I doubt it. I think we are getting a bit thin. I say that simply to say the money is not there in this budget to build ships at the rate it needs to.

I served as the ranking member on the Sea Power Subcommittee and dealt with those numbers, along with Senator KENNEDY, and we did the best we could with the moneys we had to allocate, but we are not where we need to be in shipbuilding.

So now we find ourselves in a war against terrorism. I think it is causing us to reevaluate what we have done with defense. As a percentage of our total gross domestic product, our spending on defense is at a low level, certainly since the midpart of the last

century. We are at a low level in spending as a percentage of the gross domestic product.

I think we can do better. Right now, in short order, we will receive the QDR, the Quadrennial Defense Review, report. That should help us plan for the future. I hope it will be a bold and aggressive call for reform and change and innovation. I think it will have some of that in it, but I am not sure it will go as far as we would like it to go. We will be looking at that.

Then the Secretary of Defense is also completing his review, and he will analyze the situation and will make a recommendation to us for a reformation of our military, a transformation of our military, so it is more capable of dealing with conflicts of the kind we are discussing this very night, the television commentators are discussing: Are we ready to fight that kind of war?

I believe we need to be sure we are. I do not think it will cost us an amount of money that we cannot afford. I am not sure we are where we need to be with regard to transformation to go from a military that was capable and required to defend on the plains of Europe against massive attacks by tanks and infantry and troops from the Soviet Union to a world that is much more complex, much more diverse, requiring more speed, more maneuver, more mobility to transport troops around the country.

I salute Senator LEVIN and Senator JOHN WARNER, the ranking Republican on the committee, for working together to reach an accord at this critical time in our country that I can support at this time, and that was not easy. We had some differences of opinion, and when the bill came out of committee on a partisan vote, 13-12, we were distressed about that. In the days that have gone by since and after this terrorist attack, I think we all realized it was necessary we should reach an agreement on how to proceed.

I believe that was done. I can support this bill as I understand it today, and we will probably vote next Tuesday. We will have made a step in the right direction. Our challenge, of course, with \$20 billion more in defense, is to confront terrorism around the world.

Our distinguished President pro tempore is a student of Roman history, the best in this Senate, probably one of the best in the United States. I thought I would share tonight a little bit of Roman history, Appian's Roman history; as someone referred to me, what the Romans did about terrorists.

This is the situation they faced: Pirates were developing throughout the Mediterranean. It became unsafe for Roman ships to sail. According to Appian, in a very short time these pirates increased in number to tens of thousands. They dominated now not only the eastern waters but the whole Mediterranean to the Pillars of Hercules.