

a threat out there and that we could cut down the size of our military; and, as the Senator from Arizona said, we did cut it down from some 3 million troops to 1.4 million. I am certain a mistake was made.

Now we look at the problems we have in our military and they go all the way across the board. No. 1, we have inadequate troop strength. We know that. That is a fact. We can't do what has to be done in Iraq and other places and have enough reserve for a contingency that might happen in North Korea, Syria, or any other place. This is something that has concerned us.

No. 2, force strength deficiency is resulting in a crisis in our reserve component. Our Guard and Reserves are all overworked. They are unable to carry on the responsibilities they have. We can't expect the employers to continue with all these deployments and pay these people, hold these jobs, particularly in an economy that is not robust. This problem is serious.

A third problem that took place over the last administration was a slowing down of our modernization program. I have said in the Senate that we are sending our troops out to fight on the ground with artillery that is World War II technology. The best thing we have in artillery right now operating is called Paladin. Paladin technology came about in the 1950s. When you tell people you have to get out and swab the breach after every shot, they don't believe you until they see that is the case. There are four countries, including South Africa, making artillery pieces better than that which we have.

Then with all of these problems out there, we find out that the threats are greater today than they were during the cold war. People don't like to hear that, but back in the cold war, we had one great threat. That was the Soviet Union. We were the two superpowers. They were predictable. We knew what each other had. We developed a program under a Republican administration that I did not agree with. That was a program of mutual assured destruction. That is, I will make you a deal: You don't defend yourself against us and an incoming missile; We will not defend ourselves. So if you fire on us, we will fire on you. Everybody dies and everybody is happy.

That seemed fairly reasonable at that time. Now we have a little sense of the changing threat out there and recognize it is not coming from one place. We have some 20 countries that have weapons of mass destruction or that are developing them. It is not something we can quantify now as to what kind of force structure we need.

That brings me to my second point one more time. While we don't know how much savings will be effected, we do know it is going to cost millions and millions of dollars for every installation that is closed. We cannot afford it now. We cannot afford to leave our force structure where it is, our modernization program where it is. We can-

not allow the Russians, who are selling on the open market their S.U. series that are better than our F-15s and F-16s—we want to give our troops, the most capable troops in the world, the resources and modern resources to make sure they have something that is better than the enemy has.

The third reason it is very significant is, we are going to rebuild. We have been asking the administration to give us as much detail as to what our future force structure should look like. I am not criticizing them for not being able to come back with it because this is a moving target. We have threats that are out there we didn't have before. We have to learn how to accommodate these threats and how to combat them. Until such time as we know what the force structure is going to look like, I don't believe we should be closing any infrastructure. If we have an inadequate force structure right now that is down to here and we have perhaps more infrastructure, it does not make sense to bring the infrastructure down to an inadequate force structure and then build that up and wonder, wait a minute, why do we have something that can't be used.

So for that reason, until we find out what our force structure is going to look like, we don't know what remaining installations will be needed. Let's stop and remember, we had 97 major installations that have been closed. That is behind us. We supported that. Those were the four BRAC rounds. We are now to a point where we do not know what the threat is going to be. We don't know how we will have to rebuild our force structure and our system. So we don't know what kind of infrastructure it is going to take to accommodate that.

These three reasons were not present in 1989. They were not present in 1991, 1993, and 1995. But they are present today. So we have to face this crisis, which we will, and rebuild our military. And when we get to the point where we know what it is going to look like and how to adequately defend against this new threat, we had no idea it would be out there as recently as 3 or 4 years ago, then it is time to maybe look and reevaluate where we might be. It would be premature to do it at this time.

I support the amendment. These are three very good reasons that were not present in the future rounds.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a

period of morning business until 2:50 today with time equally divided.

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1174

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1174 is at the desk and is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1174) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the measure and I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that time consumed during the quorum call be equally divided.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

OUR OCEANS AT RISK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am a Midwesterner by birth. I come from the flatlands of Illinois, cornfields and prairies. Frankly, it has meant I see things differently than others. I can still recall as a young boy the first time I saw an ocean. I was off to my brother's wedding in California, all of about 9 or 10 years old, and I got to see the Pacific Ocean. It was an amazing spectacle to me. I had never seen anything like it. The closest I had come to that was the Mississippi River. I developed a special attachment and passion of taking my family, as they grew up, to oceans on a regular basis, to beaches, and the great time you have together.

I never reflected on the fact that the great, vast, mighty body of water, that ocean, might some day be vulnerable; it seemed so impenetrable, so vast, so diverse, so huge.

This week in Washington, the Pew Oceans Commission will release its report. The chairman of that commission is an old friend of mine, a great public servant, Leon Panetta of California. I commend this report to everyone in the country, whether you live near an ocean, as most Americans do, or you are from the Midwest and a flatlander, as I am. It talks about a great resource of America and a great resource of the