

are the kinds of things at which I believe we have to continue to look.

As we have grown, I wanted to bring a little exhibit. I asked the general services office to make for me a list of all the programs that are federally funded. This is the book of federally funded programs. I am not saying they are not all excellent, but I am saying this thing continues to get bigger, continues to get larger, continues to have more and more programs and not much of an effort to go back and evaluate them to see if they are still appropriate, to see if they need to be changed, to see, indeed, if they need to be there. We don't really evaluate as closely as we might the new programs that are thrown out there, whatever they may be, to see, is this an appropriate thing for us to do at the Federal level or, indeed, should it be done somewhere else.

So I have been feeling fairly strongly about this point. I am not sure we all recognize the size of the things that we do have. For example, how many employees do you suppose there are in the Federal Government? Quite a few? Yes, about 1.9 million. It has gone up the first part of this administration, and now it went down by about 29,000. Now it is 1.861 million employees. And they are good employees, I understand that. I am not critical of the employees. But I am saying this is the size of the Government. We try to do some things to hold down the size, to hold down the spending. Maybe even more importantly is to keep Government as close as can be to the governed. I think we see this regionally quite a bit.

I happen to be from a State in the West, a small population State. The kinds of programs, the kinds of administration, the kinds of governmental activities you need in our State are quite different from what they are in New York City or in Philadelphia. So having it closer to the people allows for the kinds of changes that need to be there. We are concerned about spending. Indeed, we should be. We spent, last year, about \$826 billion on discretionary programs, not defense and those others. As a matter of fact, non-military spending last year was up 8.7 percent over the last 2 years. So that is an awful lot of dough.

At any rate, I just couldn't resist the idea of saying, let's take a little look at each of these programs, and let's see if they are still current, if they are still doing the job they were designed to do, if they are appropriate to be done on the Federal level as opposed to some other level of government, and what can we do to make them even more efficient.

I was very impressed over the weekend with all of our recognition of President Reagan, his efforts to sort of do some of these things, keep them as small as possible, keep them as appropriate as possible. I think it is a job that we have as well, and one that I hope we will take up with more vigor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Arizona.

#### ENDING THE COLD WAR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I, too, would like to comment on one of the legacies of our late President Ronald Reagan, the legacy of ensuring that the free world would prevail over the Soviet Union in the cold war.

I thought it was interesting that in one of the comments about Reagan very recently made on National Public Radio, June 8 of this year, Mr. Gennady Gerasimov, spokesman for Mikhail Gorbachev, said this:

I see President Reagan as a grave digger of the Soviet Union and the spade that he used to prepare this grave was SDI, a Strategic Defense Initiative, so-called "Star Wars." The trick was that the Soviet leadership believed that this SDI defense is possible and then—because it's possible, we must catch up with the Americans. And this was an invitation to the arms race, and the Soviet economy could not really afford it and this way Reagan really contributed to the demise of the Soviet Union.

Who better to know that than the spokesmen for Mikhail Gorbachev who have said similar things? Twenty-one years ago, President Reagan posed a very important question to the American people. He asked us to consider whether the free people of the world should continue to have to rely upon the threat of a massive retaliation of nuclear weapons to prevent an attack by the opposition. He asked: What would it take to free the world from this threat? He answered as follows:

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. . . . But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

We began making that investment. It was one of the reasons we had a deficit during the Reagan years. It was part of the so-called defense buildup, to invest billions of dollars in the research—yes, there were failures, but there were many successes—to develop a Strategic Defense Initiative, an ability to defend ourselves against a ballistic missile attack from an enemy. A lot of Americans probably think we developed that strategic defense, that we have that capability today. They might remember that during the first Persian Gulf war Patriot missiles shot down some of the Scuds that were fired by Saddam Hussein.

But the grim reality is strategic defense is still not a reality. We still don't have the ability to defend against a missile attack. What happened during the Persian Gulf war? We used an air defense system to shoot down airplanes, and in the field, literally, as we shipped it from the United States to Israel and to Saudi Arabia and to Ku-

wait, made modifications in it so that we hoped it might work to shoot down some of the missiles that Saddam Hussein shot toward Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In fact, some of those missiles—roughly a third of them—were intercepted by the Patriot. It was a crude weapon that was modified in the field. It had never been tested against other missiles. Yet we used what we had at the time because of the threat that existed.

Throughout the Clinton years and the first Bush administration, research continued. Every time we got close to, as they say, bending metal, actually building a missile, somebody would object and say we are not quite there yet. We haven't proven it can work. It is going to cost a lot of money, or the Russians—then the Soviets—might be unhappy with it.

After the demise of the Soviet Union, we agreed to scrap the ABM Treaty, and both President Putin and President Bush agreed that there was no need for a treaty that would define how many missiles each country could have and how many nuclear warheads because, frankly, we didn't have the need for them anymore and they were costly to maintain. We would destroy as many of ours as we wanted to destroy, and they could destroy all of theirs that they wanted to destroy. It was too expensive to keep around. There are still some. There are still some in Russia, I might add, where some believe it still might be worth trying to develop this offensive capability because the U.S. has never deployed a ballistic missile defense. There are those in China who believe the same thing, and also in North Korea, who I suspect believe we are bluffing.

Let me quote something from a high-ranking official in Iran, from Iran's clerical hierarchy, delivered at Tehran's Al-Hussein University very recently, and reported in the May 28 edition of a newspaper in London:

We have a strategy drawn up for the destruction of Anglo-Saxon civilization and for the uprooting of the Americans and the English. The global infidel front is a front against Allah and the Muslims, and we must make use of everything we have at hand to strike at this front, by means of our suicide operations or by means of our missiles. There are 29 sensitive sites in the U.S. and in the West. We have already spied on these sites and we know how we are going to attack them.

There is more that we could bring to the information from the intelligence community, that is open material that we are all aware involve plans by leaders in North Korea, Iran, and other places to try to develop missile technology and nuclear technology to attack places such as the United States. The North Koreans already have the capacity to attack Hawaii and Alaska, and we don't yet have a missile defense system in place to stop it.

Thanks to President Bush and the efforts of the Congress and the missile act that we passed, we have put into place a program to actually develop and deploy a missile defense system. It

is not the be-all and end-all. It would not destroy everything the Soviet Union used to be able to use against us, but it would stop the kinds of missiles that North Korea, Iran, and perhaps others might want to send our way.

Yet today we are at a crossroads. We begin debating today the Defense Authorization Act and expect amendments to be offered once again to cut the heart out of the missile defense program, prevent it from being deployed to actually be able to shoot down the missiles of an attacking country. It is interesting what is at work here. I say cut the heart out. They want to cut out over half a billion dollars—\$515.5 million—from the missile defense program. Why? They claim it hasn't yet been operationally tested. What does operational testing mean? It means you take it out of the laboratory kind of testing and put it into the ground; put the missile into the silo, and you run against it a real test with an offensive missile like the one you want to be able to defend against and see if you can knock it down. That is real operational testing, battlefield conditions.

Sometimes you cannot afford to do that kind of testing, and you have to go with what you have just as we did in the first Persian Gulf war. There are other examples. The JSTAR is a program that had never been operationally tested, but we found that we needed it and, as a result—it is the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System, which is an aircraft that played an important role in the 1991 Persian Gulf war by providing warning to forces on the ground when the Iraqi military was on the move. This had never been tested. JSTAR was in preproduction; it was a preproduction aircraft. They literally had to outfit it on the way to the theater. We used it and it worked.

The Predator is another example, and the Global Hawk. Unmanned aerial vehicles have been valuable assets on the war on terrorism. They were not operationally tested. They were hardly ready for use, but we needed something that could do what they did. That is the way it is with missile defense today. We need to have the ability to shoot down a missile aimed at us by, for example, Iran or North Korea or some other enemy that might think we are bluffing.

What about this claim that it hasn't been operationally tested? Mr. President, this is how we operationally test it. We put it into the silo, erect the radars, send a target missile against it, and see if it will work. We have had many tests—something like 18 tests, and all of the most recent tests have been successful. We are quite confident it will work. It needs to be tested in battlefield conditions, and this is the way to get it done. But the cuts that are being proposed would prevent us from buying the number of missiles we need in order to conduct this testing and still have enough left in the ground

to prevent an attack should there be one launched against us.

There is a basic catch-22 being imposed against us. That catch-22 is that you cannot deploy it until you can operationally test it, and you cannot test it until you deploy it.

It would be folly for us to support an amendment that would prevent us from fielding these missiles. Eventually, we are only talking about 20 interceptors based at Fort Greeley in Alaska and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The money that has been set aside for the first tranche of these missiles is already now producing the missiles to put in the first set of silos. We are now talking about the downpayment on the additional interceptors, No. 21 through No. 30. We have already cut the long lead procurement funding for interceptors No. 31 through 40. So we have already delayed that, which will make it much more costly.

The bottom line is, as we have been told by General Kadish—the general who runs this program—it will be much more time-consuming and expensive if we cut the money out of the budget this year to prevent the production of these missiles that are going to be needed both for operational testing, as well as to be prepared to defend against an enemy attack should it come.

The point I want to make today is this: The Soviet Union was brought to its knees because it believed President Reagan when he said we are going to develop a means of countering your most effective weapon, so you might as well not even try to spend the money and the effort and the time to create this program because we will be able to defeat you; we are not kidding.

It has been over 20 years since President Reagan made that announcement, and we still do not have the missiles in the ground. I am afraid some of our potential enemies are going to conclude that we were bluffing all along, that we do not have the will to spend the money and to put the program in place to provide this kind of defense.

The point of this defense is not just to be able to operationally test it and have it in the ground to stop a missile should one be launched against us, but to deter nations that might believe we are bluffing, to deter nations from spending the money to build these offensive weapons in the first place, to deter these leaders, these people in places such as North Korea and Iran, from concluding that if they will simply spend the money it will take to build the nuclear weaponry and the missiles to fire them, that we will somehow forget about developing missile defenses or conclude that it is too expensive, and the richest Nation on Earth, the Nation that has the financial capability of providing this kind of defense, will decide not to do it.

The point of our exercise today is to move forward with the bill that the committee has put before us. It is a good bill. The bill has an authorization for enough money to buy the next

group of missiles we need to put in the silos for testing purposes, for the purpose of shooting down a missile should one be launched against us—we do not have that ability today—and third, to deter countries that might be thinking they can go ahead with the development of this kind of a system because the United States will never get around to deploying an effective missile defense system.

Now is the time for us to act. It is not the time for us to blink in the face of these dictatorial countries. Should we support the amendment that would cut the heart out of missile defense funding for this year, it would send a signal to these countries that the United States has been bluffing all along. We were not bluffing when Ronald Reagan made that important announcement. The Soviet Union understood that. Can we do any less today than to make it crystal clear to our would-be enemies that we are not bluffing, that we mean what we say, that we intend to protect America, that we intend to protect others who are our allies, and that we will not permit an offensive ballistic missile to strike our land and kill our people? To do anything else would be morally irresponsible.

As President Reagan said, if we have the capability of defending ourselves and preventing this kind of conflagration, should we not take advantage of that wonderful capability? I am optimistic about our ability, and I am confident about the American people, and I am sure they want us to confirm to the world that we mean what we say, just as Ronald Reagan meant what he said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR pertaining to the introduction of S. 2516 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT ERICKSON H. PETTY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of a courageous Oklahoman who died saving the lives of his men. Staff Sergeant Erickson H. Petty grew up in Fort Gibson, where he graduated from high school in 1993. Eric, as he was known, aspired to military service early, enlisting in the Oklahoma Army National Guard when he was 17. Upon graduation, he joined the active duty Army, where he served for nearly 10 years.

Eric has an extremely successful career in the Army, serving as a recruiter for a time and as a scout in the 1st Armored Division. On May 3, Staff Sergeant Petty and his men were guarding a weapons cache in Salman Al Habb when they came under small arms fire. Petty ordered his soldiers into the protection of their Humvees, taking cover