

acknowledged, not only by Members of the Congress, but also, for the first time in four years, by the President himself.

Now that the President has admitted that there is a shortfall in funding for national security, the services themselves are coming forward and testifying, as they did today, and telling us what the problem is. They now feel that they are not circumventing their commander-in-chief if they lay their cards on the table before Congress. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I was pretty shocked by the numbers and the situations that were described today by the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Air Force, and I want to share those numbers and those shortfalls with you.

First I want to point your attention to what is known as mission capable rates. Mission capable rates mean when we have an aircraft carrier off the shores of the Middle East and we have planes on that carrier. We make an analysis as to whether or not its planes can fly out, hit their targets and return safely to the carrier. That is a pretty important part of our power projection with the U.S. Navy.

Our mission capable rate, that means the ability of the airplane to fly off the carrier, wheels up, move that two or three or four hundred miles to its target, drop its ordnance and come back, that rate has gone down from 69 percent in 1993 to 61 percent today.

With the Air Force, the mission capable rate of their aircraft has gone down from 83.4 percent in 1991 to 74 percent today. That means 25 percent of their aircraft are not mission capable. They cannot do their job.

With the Marines, we have gone down from 77 percent in 1995 to only 61 percent mission capable rate today.

Mr. Speaker, the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Army also talked about other aspects of their equipment that are now in shortfall. You know we had a 600 ship Navy a few years ago under president Ronald Reagan. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, we decided we could bring that Navy down some. But this president, President Clinton, is building ships at such a slow rate that we are building to a 200 ship Navy. We are going from a 600 ship Navy to a 200 ship Navy, and we cannot accomplish our responsibilities around the world with a fleet that small.

With respect to ammunition, the service chiefs told us that our ammunition shortfall now is 1.7 billion for the Army and 193 million for the United States Marine Corps. Ammunition is pretty basic, and we do not have what we need.

With respect to equipment, this CH-46 helicopter is right now the mainstay for the United States Marine Corps until they get the V-22. That aircraft, which has had a number of crashes in the last several years, is over 40 years old. Their attack vehicle, their amphibious vehicle that they ride out of the ships on and go right up on the

beaches when they have to make a front-on assault, that vehicle is an average of 26 years old.

With respect to personnel, the United States Air Force is going to be 700 pilots short this year and the United States Navy is going to be 18,000 sailors short this year. The U.S. Marine Corps aviators are having a separation rate, that means the rate where they come in and tell their unit I am leaving; I could reenlist, but I am leaving; I am going to go into private enterprise. I may be a pilot for an airline, I am leaving. Only 42 percent of them separated in 1995. Most of them stayed on with the Marine Corps. Today, 92 percent of our pilots are leaving. They are getting out of Dodge. They are going into the private sector. That leaves us short.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will continue over the next several weeks to talk a little bit more about the shortages we have in defense, and lastly I will talk a little bit about what we are going to have to do in terms of putting resources into defense to rebuild our military.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SECURING SOCIAL SECURITY BEFORE CUTTING TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we did several things today, and I do want to comment on one of the earlier speaker's assessment of the pending tax bill, for, as I was saying earlier in debate, we all understand the value of giving relief to working men and women.

Interestingly enough, the substitute tax relief bill that the Democrats are proposing does that very thing. But it has one singular common sense provision: It recognizes that Social Security is a Contract with America. It is a trust. It is a fund that we are committed to securing. You cannot secure a trust fund if you raid it.

So the one difference I have with my colleagues is I am prepared to vote for tax relief, after we have secured Social Security, after we have been told by the Social Security trustees, "You have fixed Social Security for those who are receiving it now, for those who receive it 10 years from now, and those who may receive it way into the next century."

So I hope my colleagues will consider the reasonableness of legislation that does not spend dollars we do not have, and waits in fact a year from now when we can truly confirm that we have fixed Social Security.

Today we did something else, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to just comment briefly on the fast-track legislation, because most of us agree that trade, which creates jobs, has to be a bipartisan approach or has to have a bipartisan approach.

The one thing that is attractive to Americans when you speak of trade is jobs. It is opportunities for small businesses. It is the ability to sell one's wares and ideas internationally and be assured to get a good dollar and fair compensation for that.

I have been on record supporting the African Growth and Opportunity Act which passed the House this past summer, giving opportunity to small businesses, providing dollars for infrastructure support, opening up Africa to the many opportunities or many business opportunities for both Americans and Africans to work together.

I have supported the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which works with our Caribbean friends, again establishing opportunities for our business opportunity, to work free of barriers.

At the same time, this legislation was brought to the floor of the House in a bad manner and at a bad time. For example, we are facing financial crises around the world, but the Republicans have not seen fit to fund the International Monetary Fund. Why? Because that is not popular.

□ 2015

That sounds off negative connotations. I would simply argue that seeing governments collapse or financial systems collapse, when we have the opportunity to work with the IMF, is irresponsible.

Yet, we bring a trade bill that is not collaborative, does not work with Members on both sides of the aisle, does not work with business and working Americans to discuss issues dealing with the environment and dealing with the question of working conditions.

Last year when we were talking about this issue, I offered an amendment to work on the question of difficulties in Texas along the border. Let me read it, Mr. Speaker, my amendment, called "Review of conditions along United States-Mexican border".

The President shall establish a task force to review conditions along the United States-Mexican border relating to housing, labor, the environment, and other relevant issues, as they relate to United States companies that are located along the border.

The task force should determine the ways in which partnerships made up of public and private entities can improve conditions along the border. The President shall report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act on the results of the review under subsection A.

My understanding is, without a call to my office, this was put into the present bill. The tragedy is that the bill failed because we did not have collaboration. We had politics. In fact, Members of the other party were quoted as saying, "We want to see who will get on the line and vote for fast

track, Democrats, so we can go in their districts, if they do not vote for it, and threaten their elections."

This is not the spirit in which we should work. We should be working in a bipartisan manner to tell Americans that, yes, trade is good. Trade brings about jobs.

At the same time, we will not abdicate our responsibilities for ensuring that trade does not negatively impact on our environment; that safety rules are not eliminated or violated, as we travel from one country to the next, moving from surrounding countries and bringing large trucks into our boundaries; that we require safety standards; and yes, that we ensure that jobs are not lost, and that there are good and positive working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, we can work on trade issues. We can create jobs. We can help business. We can help small businesses. But this House must do it together.

We must ensure that Americans realize that trade is about jobs and the environment and working together.

COMMENDING THE HOUSE FOR OUTSTANDING WORK ON SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY AND IMPROVING THE LIVES AND HEALTH OF SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House this evening to commend the House for its outstanding work. I appreciate the time to address the House, because I think it is very important. With the passage today of the Save Social Security Act, it is one more way to make sure that our senior citizens are protected. This new legislation will make sure that with any budget surplus, and with the \$1.4 trillion, the first money from that surplus will go to the social security trust fund for our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, with senior citizens living longer we want to make sure they live better. We wanted to make sure we strengthen the social security system. We also at the same time want to look to improving health care for our seniors and others. That is why the House is to be congratulated for leading the way here in Congress and in Washington on FDA reform, to make sure we speed up the approval of lifesaving drugs and medical devices.

That legislation, while we are waiting for a cure or vaccine for many illnesses, will help us be able to make sure that we are helping with clinical trials and with third-party review, and be able to make sure that we help our citizens live longer and better.

I am interested in also pointing out that here in Congress and the House we have worked to double the NIH funding, the National Institutes of Health. That is very important when it comes

to increasing the research monies that are allocated for breast cancer research, uterine cancer, ovarian cancer, prostate cancer. It is coming at a very important time.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we are having the first ever march of its kind, a march to fight against cancer, to find a cure in our lifetime for all the cancers. This is an important march where very important health care providers, health care practitioners, researchers, and entertainers will be here on the Washington Mall, together with elected officials, to make sure we stand arm in arm to make sure the kind of dollars, resources, and emphasis is placed on cures for cancer.

That dovetails with legislation that I have introduced, Mr. Speaker, to protect our senior citizens, the Senior Citizen Bill of Rights. In that legislation we are going to roll back the 1993 tax on Social Security. We are going to keep social security off-budget, so it is not used for other purposes, but used for seniors and their security.

It will also address the notch baby problem, those babies born between 1917 and 1926 who are in their golden years and should be able to have the full benefits that other Social Security recipients have. Our notch baby provision will be addressed in that legislation.

We also, in the Senior Citizen Bill of Rights, increase the penalties for those who would commit fraud against senior citizens, such as telemarketing fraud and others who would prey upon our senior citizens and take away their life savings.

Also our legislation calls for elimination of the inheritance taxes. Many people have a family business, a family farm, and they take the money and have to give it to Uncle Sam, instead of making sure the next generation of the family can enjoy the fruits of labor that many of our families and friends have built up over a lifetime.

Finally, we have patient protection. We have legislation this House has adopted to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that doctors have the final say in making sure our patients get the medical advice they need, get the referrals to specialists they need, get the admissions to hospitals that they need, and as well, have the right to appeal a wrongful denial of health care on behalf of their patients and our constituents.

I think we have done a great deal to move forward in health care as far as senior citizens, on their rights, on their security, and making sure, above all, that Social Security and Medicare are protected and saved and strengthened.

The final item which I think we will embark on is the fact that we make sure with Medicare we have those new prevention programs on an annual basis, the mammograms that are annual, we have the pap smears, we also have the colorectal cancer screening, the diabetes screening, and osteoporosis.

Those kinds of prevention programs we fought for are making a difference, and the fact that those who would now defraud Medicare are eligible for jail terms and loss of rights to be a provider are strengthening Medicare the way citizens want.

We need to move forward, together with much other legislation, but we certainly have to take this time to look at what we have done for our seniors, and to make sure we redouble our efforts to do even more.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4060

Mr. MCDADE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4060) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-749)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4060) "making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, \$161,747,000, to remain available until expended, of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey, \$419,000;

Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida, \$200,000;

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$322,000;

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, \$113,000;

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsend's Inlet, New Jersey, \$200,000;

Lower Cape May Meadows—Cape May Point, New Jersey, \$100,000;

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, \$300,000;

Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, \$750,000; and