

or medical technicians should their expertise be required in a war with mass casualties, or in any action with mass casualties.

All that being said, Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment due to its offsets. First, what may seem to be a small and innocuous \$5 million cut to FEMA's emergency management planning and assistance account will require reductions in response and recovery, emergency preparedness, fire prevention and important technology development.

Likewise, my friend from California proposes to take \$5 million from the emergency food and shelter program. The emergency food and shelter program, Mr. Chairman, is already severely strained, and such a cut would result in the following needs going unmet:

Just over 1 million fewer meals would be served at soup kitchens across this country with that cut; there would be 168,000 fewer bed nights at shelters and 23,000 fewer bed nights through short-term vouchers at hotels; and over 7,000 evictions would not be prevented if the gentleman's amendment were adopted and these offsets imposed.

Mr. Chairman, these are very real consequences that will be felt by very real people who happen to be in the greatest need in our country.

That is not the whole story. This amendment would take \$1.5 million from the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. This agency received its first year of funding just a few years ago and is already overburdened. In fact, I received a letter in late March from the Chairman of the Chemical Safety Board stating that the board does not have the resources to undertake further investigations this year. The 16 percent cut envisioned by the gentleman's amendment would ensure that this agency will not be able to meet the demands that it faces to fulfill its mission.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment will take \$5 million from EPA's science and technology account. Many of my colleagues know of my own personal differences with EPA on many policy issues, but never on the need for sound science. At a time when there is a debate on global climate change, arguably one of the biggest scientific challenges ever faced by this agency, we need sound science now more than ever.

While I recognize the importance of the Selective Service system and do hope that we can restore funding in conference or as this process moves forward, I cannot support doing so here with these offsets. Therefore, I would ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we thought very carefully when we went through the list on

potential offsets and tried to minimize. For example, the FEMA funding of \$5 million, the most it has ever been funded is \$10 million each year. This year it still leaves \$105 million, still an increase, but reduces it \$5 million. It is still more than the actual request.

The \$1.5 million from the chemical safety board, the board was funded at \$9 million. OMB only requested \$7.5. So this falls at level funding. The \$5 million for EPA science and technology leaves \$640 million left in that particular account. We feel that the deficit or lack of national security overrides the small offsets that we have in this particular bill.

I would also say to the gentleman, this gentleman is not hard on any one of these cuts. In conference I would be happy to work with the gentleman in the reduction in different areas. To me the reduction areas are not as important as saving Selective Service.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion about Selective Service, a good deal has been said about the fact that military enlistment is dropping and, therefore, the need for Selective Service is greater. But the fact is in the economy we currently have in a country where there is relatively low unemployment and high paying job opportunities, young men do not want to go in the military service because of the low pay and low standard of living that has been associated with the military in the recent past. That is something that Selective Service does not address, but it is something that the Congress is addressing and should address in terms of making sure the members of the military are well paid for the dangerous job that they do.

This is a matter of funds. We have a very difficult allocation, and we are talking about providing, or, if we honor the gentleman's request here, we would have to come up with \$25 million basically for a mothballed program that is not delivering at the current time any services to us. At a time when we have such difficult budget constraints, it does not make sense to mothball a program that we can deal with in the eventuality that there is the need to find people to serve our country.

The Congress spent months debating whether or not to go into Kosovo, and there would have been more than adequate time to go out and find the additional men, and we have not discussed women in the sense of Selective Service, but go out certainly to find men and women to provide service in de-

fense of the country in a situation like that or any other.

So I think this is the time in our history when we should use these funds to take care of the needs of the people of the country and stop paying to mothball this program.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to address this amendment. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), for deleting these funds, in this bill.

This to me is a heroic step in the right direction. We have an agency of Government spending more than \$24 million a year accomplishing nothing. We live in an age when we do not need a draft. We live in an age of technology that makes the draft obsolete. Not only is it unnecessarily militarily to have a draft, it is budgetarily not wise to spend this type of money.

More importantly, I rise in strong objection on moral principles that the draft is wrong. In most of our history we did not have a draft. The gentleman from California early on pointed out that essentially since World War I we have had a draft, and that is true. Since in this century we have seen a diminished respect for personal liberty with the growth of the state we have seen much more willingness to accept the idea that young men belong to the state.

That is what the registration is all about. I have a young grandson that had to register not too long ago, and he came to me and said, You know, "they sent me a notice that I better go register. Why do I have to register, if they already know where I am and how old I am?" That is the case. The purpose of registration is nothing more than putting an emphasis on the fact that the state owns all 18-year-olds.

The unfortunate part about a draft is that too often draftees are used in wars that are not legitimate. This is so often the case. If this country faced an attack, we should have volunteers. We should all volunteer. But, unfortunately, the generation of politicians who declare the wars too often never serve. Some of them have not even served in the past. But they are willing to start wars that are not legitimate, and yet they depend on the draft. They depend on the draft for the men to go out and fight and die.

The one really strong reason we should all reject the idea of the draft is it is so unfair.

□ 1415

Let us say an argument is made that it is necessary. I happen to believe it is

never necessary to violate somebody's liberty, but let us say there is a sincere belief that it is necessary to impose a draft.

There is no such thing as a fair draft. This is why the sixties were in such turmoil in this country, because the elite frequently evaded the draft. If they are smart enough to get a deferment, they got off. Who suffers from the draft? The poor and the less educated, the inner city teenagers. They end up getting the draft, and they do not get the deferments. They cannot avoid it.

It is very important that we consider not only this vote on fiscal reasons and where we are taking the money. Quite frankly, I would much rather see this money stay in the programs where, as a fiscal conservative, I would not have otherwise voted for those funds nay. But any funding of that sort is so much better on principle than voting to perpetuate a system that has no purpose other than to conscript.

Conscription is not part of the American dream. It is not part of the American philosophy. It is not part of liberty. It is a totalitarian notion. Congress has the authority to raise an army, but it does not have the constitutional authority to enslave a certain group to bear the brunt of the fighting. A society that cherishes liberty will easily find its volunteer defenders if it is attacked. A free society that cannot find those willing to defend itself without coercion cannot survive, and probably does not deserve to.

A free society that depends on the vicious totalitarian principle of conscription is, by its very nature, no longer free.

We gradually lost our love for individual liberty throughout the 20th century as the people and the Congresses capitulated to the notion of the military draft. The vote on the Selective Service System funding will determine whether or not we are willing to take a very welcome, positive step in the direction of more liberty by rejecting the appropriations for the Selective Service System.

There is no other vote that a Member of Congress can cast that defines one's belief and understanding regarding the principle of personal liberty than a vote supporting or rejecting the draft. This vote gives us a rare opportunity to reverse the trend toward bigger and more oppressive government.

Yes, preserving liberty is worth fighting and even dying for, but conscription is incompatible with that goal. We cannot make men free by first enslaving them and forcing them to sacrifice their lives and liberty for the policies conceived by misdirected politicians and international warmongers.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, again I thank the gentleman from New

York (Chairman WALSH). I know what a difficult time he has had. We happen to disagree on this issue; not only myself, but take a look at the supporters we have on this particular amendment.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs disagreed with the last speaker. The Secretary of Defense disagrees strongly with the last speaker, as does the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), chairman of the defense authorization committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Defense, opposes it.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, opposes, which is very difficult, opposes his subcommittee chairman on this particular issue; not the bill, but on this particular issue.

Also, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel; the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) opposes, and I could go right on down the line with the bipartisan support.

This is a controversial issue. This is the first time this has been debated. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has a full right to believe like he does. The independent view, however, is not the view, and the gentleman votes 99 percent against everything on the House floor. I expected no less. I would almost let him speak more because I think he makes our case.

This is a time-proven event. If we have a chemical or biological weapons attack on the United States, with the selective service the President designates those health care workers, and then the Selective Service System would go in and select those people that are necessary to protect American citizens. Any delay in that would be foolhardy and would be very, very dangerous. The GAO said if we cut this program it would take up to an entire year to establish a system.

I would tell my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), I hope we never have to go to a subscription program. I hope that that emergency and the conflict against the United States never happens to that point. I do not think it will. It could in the future. If that is necessary, then we have to provide that backup. Think of the consequences if we do not. Millions of people, American citizens, their lives would be lost.

This is a better insurance policy than we can have in almost any bill that we vote on. It is very important. It is the third tier to our active duty and our reservists.

Peace and freedom is elusive. It is very fragile. In the history of the

United States, in the history of the world, there has been conflict. Is there any Member here in this body that says that we will not be in another conflict in the next year? And with the threats out there that we have, we dare not not support this particular amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman has called attention to my voting record. I would say that if I could show the gentleman that I voted 100 percent for the Constitution, would the gentleman still complain about my voting record being 90 percent, 99 percent in opposition? Being for liberty is not a negative position.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim the balance of my time. I said the gentleman has the right to do so very much. I respect that. I just happen to disagree with the gentleman on this particular amendment. Mr. Chairman, to seek compliance in this, we are trying to let the potential registrars know what their requirement is so they do not break the law.

President Carter in 1980 asked Congress if we would allow women to register. The Supreme Court found that Congress could restrict that because at that time we did not have women in combat.

This issue has been debated five times, Mr. Chairman. Each time we have restored the Selective Service. We will restore it today, I am sure. I would also tell my colleagues who are opposed to this that in conference we will be happy to work off the different dollars in funding out of the different areas.

I am not hard and fast on any of the offsets. The more important factor to us is the reselection and readministration of the Selective Service System.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, as a former local draft board member, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from California. The most important decision Congress and the President can make is to send our young men and women to war. An all-volunteer military sometimes makes it easier for the President to use the military forces liberally. The draft and Selective Service ensure that we should only go to war when it is of vital concern to our national security.

At a time when our military services are failing to meet recruiting and retention goals, it is foolhardy and risky to eliminate the Selective Service System—a proven means of providing personnel to the Armed Forces during times of emergency. The men and women of our all-volunteer armed forces have performed superbly since its inception. The all-volunteer force is a strong force, but it is also a fragile force. It relies on recruiting and retaining quality people. Our armed forces have been reduced to the point where the military struggles to meet all the commitments we place on it. It should be noted that during the recent air war in Kosovo, the Air Force announced a “stop