they defined as ''insignificant progress'' was the ability to walk by age 5. It was not doctors who were making that decision. It was accountants in an HMO who were saying, ''Being able to walk by age 5 is insignificant.'' So there was a matter of dollars and cents versus a young boy's health.

That is the point the Senator from Massachusetts makes about the urgency of having an agenda on the floor of the Senate that deals with real issues that affect real people. We have a ''legislative landfill'' here. You know landfills. Almost all landfills are out of sight, over the hill, down the valley. You go through a big gate and don't even see it. You drive your merchandise down there that you want to dispose of, then you dump it and they cover it up.

We have a legislative landfill here in the 105th Congress. There was tobacco legislation. It was sent out to the landfill, and covered up. Campaign finance reform also went into the legislative landfill, and was covered up. Add the Patients' Bill of Rights as another bill sent into the legislative landfill they have created, and covered it up.

FARM CRISIS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we talk about the farm crisis and whether Congress will address a farm crisis that is urgent. I just want to make this point. I watched this week, as did all Americans, this hurricane that came roaring out of the Caribbean and threatened a fair part of the southern part of this country. My heart goes out to those people, worrying about their State, their lives, their property, and everything that they have saved and built. Then a wind comes along at 100, 125, and 150 miles an hour, and wipes it away.

There is an emergency declaration, as we always do. Whether it is floods, fires, or earthquakes, or hurricanes, Congress responds with an emergency declaration. We say: You are a victim and the rest of the country wants to help.

A week ago, the President sent down an emergency request to this Congress dealing with the farm crisis. It wasn't a wind, it wasn't a fire, it wasn't a flood, it wasn't a hurricane or an earthquake. Family farmers in this country have been literally devastated by the abject collapse of farm prices. Grain prices have just collapsed. In my State, in 1 year net farm income collapsed 98 percent.

Ask yourself: Could anybody on your home street or block or in your county or your city survive if their net income dropped 98 percent? The remaining income is 2 percent. These are people who milk the cows, plow and put seed into the ground, and harvest in the fall. These are people in this country who raise America's food. They take enormous risks. They turn their yard light on and with their family have hopes and dreams to make a living.

There has been a 98 percent collapse of the net farm income in North Dakota for family farmers. Prices have collapsed. We have the worst crop disease in this century. This President is right when he says we have an urgent farm crisis and he sends down an emergency proposal to deal with this.

Two nights ago, I drove home after a conference committee on the Appropriations Committee. In that conference meeting, on a party-line vote, the President was told: We don't care about your emergency request. We don't think it is quite that important. We are going to offer up a 4-foot rope to somebody drowning in 10 feet of water, and we will suggest somehow that we have helped.

I was sorely disappointed. More than that I was angry when I drove home that night. We meed to understand that these folks who farm America's land out there, the family farmers, don't ask for very much. All they ask is for an opportunity to make a living. When farm prices collapse and when they are hit with crop disease, it is as much a crisis for them as wind, flood, fire, or tornado. This Congress has a responsibility to help.

There is a week and a half left in this Congress. If this Congress doesn't help, thousands and thousands and thousands of farmers and their families living on the land will lose their livelihood.

I know the Senator from Nebraska has some information about exactly what the President has proposed and what the stakes are here, State by State, and what we are trying to do. I yield for a moment to the Senator from Nebraska for a question and some comments.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, one of the things we had hoped to do with this legislation is to get consideration similar to the disaster request which we all know will occur as a result of this hurricane.

We have experienced this before. The Nation comes together as a country; suddenly we are Americans. A U.S. Senator asked to help the people in Mississippi, the distinguished majority leader's State. In Alabama, probably Florida as well, and Louisiana, clearly there are damages. Here comes a natural disaster. Here comes Hurricane Georges. Nobody could have prepared for that hurricane. It has destroyed people's lives, cost them hope. What will happen is, a disaster declaration will be made, a request will come to the Congress to put the law of the country on their side, to give them opportunity and hope again. That is what the law can do at its best; it can give people hope.

I know this very well, I say to my friend from North Dakota. About a year and a half in a business, in 1975, a tornado hit Omaha, NE, and I thought we were pretty much out of business as a result of the tornado having blown us away. However, I come to find out, 2 days later, that Mayor Zorinsky, the mayor of Omaha at the time and the man who preceded me in the U.S. Senate, requested from the President of the United States, Republican President Gerald Ford, a disaster declaration, and the law was put on our side. It gave us a chance to build our business back, gave us a chance to pursue our dream. That is what the law tends to do. That is what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was talking about earlier. I get hundreds of calls a year, and, more than any other issue, people say, ''Senator, I don't have any power when I am dealing with an HMO; can you change the law and give me some power? Can you help me in dealing with this entity?'' We are trying to change the law not to create a bureaucracy but to give people some hope.

My expectation will be, when the disaster declaration occurs for these southern States, it won't be a partisan issue, it won't be Republicans and Democrats, it will be U.S. Senators and U.S. Members of the House of Representatives rallying to try to make certain that people in the southern part of the country that have been damaged by this disaster are given some hope or given some opportunity.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, I was surprised, as you were, late Monday night when the House conference on appropriations for agriculture rejected the President's request for disaster assistance for the Middle West that has been destroyed and damaged by a natural disaster, a decline in demand that has produced losses across the board in agriculture. Still the most important part of our economy, creating more jobs than any other sector of our economy, and farmers throughout the bread belt of the United States, the bread basket of the United States, have lost hope. I was very surprised that it would occur on a straight party line vote that Members—who will likely say yes if the President puts down a disaster declaration request for the hurricane—voted no.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, they say, ''We are reopening Freedom to Farm; that is the reason I'm to vote no.''

I ask my friend from North Dakota if he is aware of the kind of income contribution that this disaster declaration will make to our States. There are many times when I come down here and deal with a piece of legislation and I ask myself, Will this have an impact on Nebraska? Will they feel it?—especially when I am talking to Nebraskan farmers out harvesting right now and who might not have seen what happened Monday night. Are you sure this will help? In Nebraska, the difference between what the President asked for and what the House conference, on a straight party line vote, voted for is $257 million.

Rest assured, if this was a transportation grant, our entire delegation would be united. There is no Republican or Democrat differential when we

are trying to get a $250 million grant for Nebraska. Yet there is a decision here as a consequence of this Freedom to Farm argument—$257 million worth of income to Nebraska.

I have written the Midwestern Governors' Association and the Governors in those associations urging them to call their delegation as a consequence of not just what their State will lose but what their farmers are going to lose. Two hundred and fifty-seven million dollars' worth of income on Main Street America, in Main Street Nebraska, will make a lot of difference not just to farmers but to whether or not the businesses on Main Street will survive.

In Iowa, the amount of money is $365 million. I have written Governor Branstad and urged in an immediate letter: ''Governor, weigh in on this, because you are about to lose $365 million''; to the Governor of Illinois: ''You are about to lose $341 million''; in Indiana, $182 million; in Kansas, $195 million; in Minnesota, $256 million; in North Dakota, $115 million; in Ohio, $133 million; in South Dakota, $149 million; in Wisconsin, $80 million.

There are Senators from these Midwestern States who voted no for ideological reasons, because they don't want to reopen the Freedom to Farm. I don't understand that. This would make a tremendous difference in our being able to get through this recession.

The President asked for a disaster declaration. As I said, I have written all of the Governors in these States putting out an appeal. It will occur when each one of these Governors are going to come to us and ask for considerably less, and the beauty of this is that it doesn't go to the Government, it goes to individual family farmers; it increases their income and makes it likely to get their operating loans extended for another year.

I ask my friend if he is aware of the tremendous change in income pictures that will occur as a consequence of what the President has asked for and what the conferees turned down. Again, I ask a second question of my friend from North Dakota. He has had plenty of town hall meetings, just as I have. I am asked, ''How do we persuade those easterners to go along with us?'' The problem doesn't appear to be easterners, or people on the west coast either. Both Senators from California, both Senators from Connecticut, both Senators from Maryland, both Senators from Massachusetts, both Senators from Nevada, both Senators from New Jersey—even though they are not going to benefit—did precisely what the Senator from North Dakota said earlier. It is not just important for us to come here and defend our region, our Nation is in trouble. Our Nation is suffering as a consequence of the crisis and the disaster occurring in the Midwest right now.

We are going to respond. We are going to vote aye because we know that we need to pull together as a country. I am sure that it is likely to be 100–0 when it comes time to decide whether or not we are going to respond to a disaster in the southern States that has occurred as a consequence of this hurricane. I come to the floor, Mr. President, to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he is aware of the tremendous amount of assistance that each one of these States is going to get, and if he, as well, hears from his farmers when he goes home, ''How do we persuade the folks on the east and west coasts that we have a problem out there that needs to be addressed?''

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska asks an important question. I want to emphasize again that the President has sent down an emergency request. He sent down an emergency request and said what is needed in order to address the farm crisis is $7.9 billion. Now, I will say to my friend, as I indicated when I started this, when the emergency request comes—and it will—to deal with this hurricane that just hit, I am going to vote for it. Perhaps other hurricanes will hit during this season. I have voted for aid for earthquakes, floods, fires, and hurricanes; and I always will because this country has a responsibility to do that. I won't think twice about it. We don't have hurricanes in North Dakota, but when a hurricane hits in this country, count me as someone voting for the emergency request.

FEMA and others will evaluate what is necessary, and the President will send us a supplemental emergency request. I have always voted for them and I will again. It wasn't, as I said, a fire, flood, earthquake, tornado, or hurricane that caused the crisis that required the President to send up this emergency request. It was the collapsed prices and crop disease. It was the worst crop disease of a century combined with a total collapse of prices.

Now, why do we have some people who ought to be voting in support of this emergency request reluctant to do so? As the Senator said, it is ideology. This Congress, a couple years ago, passed something called the Freedom to Farm bill. I didn't vote for it. I didn't think it was appropriate. I don't think you will have family farmers in this country when prices drop off the cliff and you don't have an adequate safety net for them. If you don't have a price support for them to get across the price valley, farmers can't make it. The big corporate farms will get across the valley because they have the financial strength to do it.

Some may decide that they don't care about family farmers or whether they exist. They may worship at the altar of a ''free market'' that doesn't exist in agriculture. They decided that we were going to cut farmers loose. Even if prices collapse after we pass this Freedom to Farm bill, they are going to refuse to budge because they have so much pride in the work they did a couple years ago that they don't want to admit it was wrong. I am not asking anybody to admit that.

I am just saying that farm prices have collapsed. Wheat prices have dropped 57 percent since passage of the farm law. North Dakota farmers lost 98 percent of their net income in one year. The same is true through much of the Midwest in the farm belt. At this point, shouldn't Congress stop, look, and listen and say this is a crisis? Does this country want family farmers with yard lights that light up the hopes and dreams on the family farm out there in the country? Do they want family farmers in the future? They should for a lot of social and economic reasons. Then Congress has to come forward now and address this issue that the President has recommended with an emergency request.

The Senator from Nebraska has gone through and talked about what it means to these States. I want to describe it in slightly different terms. There is not a Republican or a Democratic way to go broke. Family farmers don't care about party labels, tickets, or politics. They care about whether they are going to be able to make it through the winter?

I talked about a young man named Wyatt the other day. He is a sophomore in school right now in Stanley, ND. He wrote a letter to me that brought tears to my eyes. He said, ''My dad is a family farmer.'' After he described what the family was going through, he said, ''My dad can feed 180 people and he can't feed his own family.'' That describes better than almost any description we can offer how productive our family farmers are. Yet, they are being wrung dry by prices that have collapsed, and they are told that even though they are all-star producers, somehow they don't matter.

It seems to me that we must, as a Congress, address this issue, and the point is this: There are those who say let's address this issue by doing what is called increasing the AMTA payment by some 19 cents a bushel for a bushel of wheat. That is like walking up to somebody bleeding to death and holding out a Band-Aid and saying, ''Aren't I wonderful? Here is a Band-Aid.''

The people proposing it know better. They have told me in private that it will not address this problem. It won't get those farm families into the field next spring. Tens of thousands of them will be broke and forced out of business before they can get into the field next spring because this is a half-baked solution. It is, as I said, like offering a 4-foot rope to somebody drowning in 10 feet of water. Let's not have half-baked solutions. Let's not pole-vault to get over the election.

Let's pass the emergency request of the President to solve this problem. We need to help these farmers have the hope that they can get in the field next year, plant a crop, harvest it in the fall, and have some hope that perhaps prices will rebound and they will be

able to continue farming in this country in the future. Either we are going to decide to solve this problem or we are not. That is what this is about.

First of all, I respect the fact that I come from a political party that lost. I understand that. I understand winning and losing. I belong to a political party that doesn't control this Chamber. I understand that. I am perfectly willing to lose from time to time. We do. In fact, it is getting habit-forming. But I am not willing to lose quietly on this issue.

Up until the last 2 minutes of this legislative session, I intend to be on the floor demanding that this country respond to the urgency of this matter, just as we would if it were a natural disaster. I will be demanding that we respond to the hopes and dreams of family farmers that are going to lose their family farms if we don't act. They will lose it in the next week, the next month, or the next 4 months, and they will lose it as sure as I stand here, if we come up with half-baked solutions.

I know the Senator from Nebraska wants to add to that. Let me just say again, it is the old silk-purse-out-of-a-sow's-ear thing. We have people here resistant to doing what they know in their heart is the right thing to do because they are worried because it would look like a 180-degree turn on Freedom to Farm. Don't worry about that. Let's figure out what we can do together, all of us together. Let us do what we know in our hearts will help the farmers get into the fields next spring and have some hope that maybe they can make a decent living. If we do that, we will have done something to strengthen this country and invest in this country's future.

Then we can then go home with pride and say to those that Thomas Jefferson described as the ''best Americans,'' those producing our foodstuffs on the family farms, that we have done something to assure their future and give them an opportunity.

Our economy is doing better. Inflation is down, unemployment is down, and the deficit is almost gone. All of those numbers are good and the country feels better about the economy. We should be able to say to family farmers that we will not, in these good times, turn a blind eye to their economic plight. They matter to this country.

I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska once again.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, just briefly, I appreciate very much the answer the Senator from North Dakota has provided. I want to make it clear again that I put out an SOS to the Governors of the Midwestern region, pointing out to them what they are about to lose.

To the Governor of Illinois, $341 million of additional income to the State of Illinois. Is that going to make every farmer in Illinois prosperous? No. For all of the free market, plenty of people are still going to go broke in Illinois even at that. But $341 million, I say to the Governor. It is the same way in Indiana—$182 million; Iowa, $365 million; Kansas, $195 million; Michigan, $60 million; Minnesota, $250 million; Missouri, $120 million; Nebraska, $250 million; North Dakota, $115 million; Ohio, $133 million; South Dakota, $150 million; Wisconsin, $80 million.

I have been a part of the Midwestern Governors Association. During the agriculture crisis, there was the appeal that we made to Congress. Our income is declining; our tax revenues are going down; we are not able to support our schools—many of the things that happen as a consequence of things beyond our control. We found a positive response in the Republican Congress in the 1980s. We came and made the appeal. The Congress responded with the new farm bill which helped us enormously.

Mr. President, I hope this little presentation or request of the Governors, as well as our correspondence to the Governors, will produce a response. I hope and I pray that sometime in the next 10 days we can, as we most assuredly will—when the majority leader comes to the floor on behalf of Mississippians, and many other people in the South who have been damaged by Hurricane Georges, we are not going to walk down here with a partisan hat and say, ''That is the majority leader, he is a Republican, and for ideological reasons I am going to say no.'' We will say yes.

I hope in the next 10 days that we can find a way on this Agriculture appropriations bill to send this bill back to conference and instruct the conferees to do the right thing, which is to grant the President's request for the disaster assistance, which will brighten the days of not just American farmers but also Americans who understand that our livelihood depends upon their success and their prosperity. I hope we are able to take our partisan hats off and deal with this thing as U.S. Senators and not as Republicans or Democrat Senators.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me finish with just 1 minute. I know our colleagues are on the floor. They look like they want to do some serious business.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might just say, the business we are doing is very serious. While I will not take a position one way or another on the issue, I would be remiss, and all others would be remiss, if we did not recollect last year how Senator DORGAN stood the floor on behalf of his constituents and others with regard to the devastating floods, and when he spoke just now about his support about other areas of the country, and I think in the depths of his heart about those harrowing experiences in which he so ably represented the citizens of his State.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WARNER. Let me just continue for 1 additional minute, and then turn the floor over to the Senator.

I don't like having to come here and ratchet away on this issue day after day. I know some get tired of that, but this literally is about whether people will survive out on the family farm. I have used some letters to try to describe their plight. I used a letter the other day of a woman who described the two jobs she has, the two jobs her husband has, in addition to raising kids and running the farm, and all the part-time jobs her kids have. She wrote how they are just flat broke, out of money and with no capability of making it. The price of hogs is down. The price of cattle is down. The price of grain has collapsed. She said to her daughter, ''Let us try to buy you one pair of new jeans for school.'' And her daughter said, ''No. Mom, I understand we can't afford that.'' They are just out of money and about to give up hope.

This Congress needs to intervene to do something. We need to say to our farmers, ''You matter to this country.'' I am not saying we should prop up some artificial economy for farms. I am saying that these farmers face monopolies in every direction they turn. They face monopolies with the grain trade. They face monopolies with the way they do business with the railroad. They face them with the cattle slaughter. They face them with the hog and sheep slaughter, and they face them with the flour millers.

I had charts. I will not put them up again. In every area, the top three or four companies control 60, 70, and in some cases 80 percent of all of the activity. And these farmers are told, ''You compete in the free market.'' Then they have to compete with other countries that deeply subsidize their products. It is not a free market. It has never been free. We are the only ones who will come up with these goofy stories and tell the farmers to go to the grain markets which are stacked against them. Then when prices collapse, we tell our farmers we are not going to be there to help. This is the only country that does that.

This country ought to decide now that it made a mistake putting the future of family farmers on a free market that doesn't exist, and we ought to correct it. This President says that we have an emergency need, and he asked for a supplemental appropriations to meet that emergency need totaling about $8 billion.

I drove home the other night after the conference committee between the House and the Senate. That conference, on a party-line vote, said no; we are not willing to do that. I hope we are going to change that result in the next week and a half, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have a question for the Senator.

One is, there has been a great deal said by the Senator from North Dakota about changing the farm bill and reopening the farm bill relative to taking the caps off the marketing loan rates. It is my understanding that the existing farm bill has marketing loan provisions in it; that the real discussion and

the recommendation from the President has simply been that we raise the caps of an existing program within the existing farm bill; that, in fact, the initiative would not involve any significant change in the farm bill, certainly no more so than accelerating or increasing half the payments. Will the Senator share a view on that?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct. The farm bill that Congress passed said we would provide a support price equal to 85 percent of the five-year Olympic average of the average price of this grain. Then they put an artificial budget restraint on it even though they promised that formula. Once again, the big print giveth and the little print taketh away. Despite the promise, they put an artificial cap on it. That means our support prices don't work. The promise doesn't offer real help and it doesn't offer protection.

What we have proposed—and the President and others have proposed—is to get rid of the artificial cap and to give them what the big print said they would give them and stop this taking away with the little print. That is all this proposal is about.

Mr. JOHNSON. If I may follow up on that, the Senator from North Dakota has been one of this body's leaders relative to budget responsibility, fiscal responsibility, and the overall effort that we have gone about in bringing the annual Federal budget deficit from $292 billion only 6 years ago to at least a unified budget surplus this year. I think the Senator from North Dakota was deeply involved in the crafting of the legislation that set up the framework that allowed us to bring this country to the current point of much greater fiscal responsibility.

But it is my understanding, in the context of that debate and setting up the pay-as-you-go budget mechanisms that were established in the early 1990s, which have been so successful, that one of the underlying premises and understanding of that legislation was that there would be from time to time emergency needs that would be met with the request from the President with the concurrence of the Congress, and that it is not inconsistent with the underlying legislation and the progress that we have made towards reducing the deficit. So long as we use care to denominate emergencies as only things which are truly emergencies and are reasonably not foreseeable by either the White House or by the Congress, the funding of these emergency needs is not inconsistent with the effort we have made to reduce the deficit and to maintain the discipline of the 1990 and 1993 budget agreements.

Is that the Senator's recollection relative to the context of this emergency budget request?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes. The Senator from South Dakota is, of course, correct. Emergency needs have always been anticipated and expected in the budget process. When emergency needs are requested, I am someone who will always vote to fund those emergency needs. It is not outside of the scope of what we decided to do when we decided to try to get this country's fiscal house in order. The Senator is correct about that.

I don't understand why some continue to insist that the funding doesn't exist for this emergency need. Of course, it does. Of course, it is a need.

Let me say to the Senator from Virginia, when I said he is here for serious business, that the implication was not that this isn't. This is the most serious business for me in this Congress. I know the Senator from Virginia is involved in defense and a range of other issues that are also very serious for this country. I very much appreciate his service and the service of the Senator from Arizona.

The Senator from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON, of course, is from a farm State, just like mine, that is suffering the same kinds of problems. It is devastating. This crisis is really devastating to not just the economy of the State but to the families who tonight will go to bed not knowing whether they are going to be able to hang on to their family farm. That is the dilemma here, and it is something we have to face.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the RECORD will reflect that when the Senator made his comment, this Senator said no, I respect him, it is serious business, and then reflected on how ably the Senator has represented his constituents during this crisis.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

1999 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we had a very significant meeting yesterday of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which was a culmination of months and months of work on behalf of many of us trying to explain to the American people the very threatened situation that our country is in, and I am very proud that we had a meeting that I will describe to you in the next few minutes which, I think, is going to actually change America's approach to our defense system. I think it is very appropriate to talk about this now because I also would be speaking in favor of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1999.

I think it is important for us to understand the deplorable condition of our defense system. We have for 14 consecutive years, counting this year, actually had a decline in defense spending. It has dropped and it has dropped and it has dropped. I have to hasten to say this also transcends politics. It has been in Republican administrations and Democrat administrations. Of course, during the administration of President Clinton it has been worse than it has been before. We are now at the lowest level in procurement since 1960. This was attested to yesterday by General Reimer, Dennis Reimer, the commander of the Army.

Our military now is smaller than it was in the 1930s and is on more missions than we went on during the Vietnam war. Our Army deployments have tripled, the Air Force deployments have quintupled, if there is such a word, and the Navy ships in the Persian Gulf have reached one of the lowest states of readiness in 5 years. We have Navy aircraft crashes. They are called class A mishaps. They have doubled this year, the highest in 5 years, and CNO Adm. Jay Johnson has attributed this to a lack of spare parts.

As I go around to the various military installations, I see that we don't have spare parts, that we are cannibalizing perfectly good aircraft to get spare parts to keep other ones running.

The Navy was 7,000 short in their recruits this year—7,000. That means we don't have enough sailors to go out and man the ships necessary to meet the minimum expectations of the American people. The pilots are leaving the Air Force in droves. Right now, our pilot retention has dropped below 20 percent. Madam President, it costs $6 million to put a pilot in the seat of an F–16, and yet we are down now to a 20-percent retention.

What does this mean? It means that it costs almost 100 times as much to go out and retrain someone as to retain someone who is already there. What is the reason for this?

I spent most of the August recess, Madam President, going around to the various military installations in my plane. In fact, I was taking journalists with me so they would start writing about this deplorable situation that we find our military in right now. I know one of the individuals who went with me in my plane is Roland Evans, of Evans and Novak, and we made a lot of visits to various installations on very, very short notice. In one of the installations, we had over 20 pilots in one room. I said, ''Why is it you are down to 20 percent? How many of you in here, after this tour of duty, are going to come back in and continue your careers flying for the Air Force or the Navy?'' About 20 percent are going to do it. It is actually a little below that now in the Navy.

I said, ''What's the reason for it?'' They started out with the fact that we have starved the budgets for the military to the extent that they don't have