

Congress—will think twice about supporting a war if they know their children may be called to fight.

This, of course, is not being genuinely debated here today. Instead this is a political charade that demeans the importance of this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 163, the “Universal National Service Act of 2003.” This legislation is being brought to the Floor by the Majority without holding any hearings which would provide for the necessary debate an issue this magnitude requires.

There is no doubt that the military is currently overextended worldwide. National Guard members and Reservists have been sent overseas for extended missions, leaving their families behind. While we are eternally grateful to them and all the members of the U.S. military for their bravery, I am sad to say that when they return home, they will discover that this Administration has cut many critical veterans’ benefits. The Department of Veterans Affairs and the health care system it oversees are not prepared for the numbers of new veterans who will need long-term care for their injuries. This Nation’s veterans deserve nothing less than the benefits to which they are entitled.

I think we can all agree that a strong military is critical to our Nation’s defense. However, I think that we can accomplish this goal by ensuring that those who are currently serving have the necessary equipment and resources to complete their missions and the benefits that they and their families deserve. If we need to increase the size of the military, there are ways to do it other than through a draft.

I hope that when we consider these issues in the future, the Majority will be more respectful of our service men and women.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 163. I do not believe that a reinstatement of the draft is necessary or desirable; nor do I believe that there is any support for a draft among my constituents or in the country as a whole.

This Nation has had an all-volunteer military for more than 30 years and the quality of America’s service men and women, their dedication, professionalism and commitment has never been greater. Public support for our men and women in uniform is also much higher than it was in the later years of the draft.

Today’s soldiers typically stay in the military 2 years longer than their predecessors did in the early 1970s. This reduced turnover has resulted in a more professional force that is able to take full advantage of the high-tech weaponry that is a key component of our military. The volunteer military’s lower turnover rate has also led to a reduction in training costs. In 1988, a General Accounting Office study found that the all-volunteer force was cheaper than a conscript force by \$2.5 billion per year—more than \$4 billion in today’s dollars.

Volunteers are more likely to seek promotion, and are likely to be more professionally motivated than draftees. In fact, current retention rates among deployed troops are higher than for forces based in the United States. Because volunteers are paid more and it is costly to train new soldiers, there is a greater incentive to use our troops wisely.

The military has also been successful in its efforts to increase the aptitude of recruits. Today’s military is better educated than the gen-

eral population. While more than 90 percent of military recruits have a high school diploma, only 75 percent of the general population does. Military recruits are also more likely to score high on aptitude tests than their civilian counterparts.

I was, frankly, surprised to see this bill on the suspension calendar for today. Typically, bills are brought up under suspension when they are non-controversial as a two-thirds vote of the House is required for passage. This bill, which enjoys virtually no support in the House, will be resoundingly defeated and I can only surmise that the Majority has only called up this bill in order to vote it down, and in so doing divert attention from the mistakes made by the Administration in overextending our forces.

We do have a military manpower shortage now, but the draft is not the answer. Over the objections of the Administration, the House has authorized the Army and Marine Corps to increase their active-duty end strength by 20,000 and 10,000, respectively. This will help to alleviate some of the strain on both the active and reserve components.

I hope that the Congress will focus attention next year on military manpower issues. We need to reconfigure our military and address the need for personnel who specialize in stability and post-conflict operations. Currently, most of the personnel who are expert in this area are in the Guard and Reserves and there are reports that re-enlistment rates in some units are down as a result of multiple extended deployments overseas.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have visited our troops on the front lines as often as possible. I am awed by their courage, their patriotism and their competence. We need to do more to support them and to ensure that they are not overextended, but reinstating the draft is not the answer. Better treatment of those who wear the uniform, and those who once served, is the more constructive solution.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. With the modern technology found in most weapons today, the U.S. military needs a more highly educated force than it needed years ago. Also, the United States does not need the large numbers of soldiers our armed forces required in previous large wars. Our all-volunteer military is working well, and we have raised pay and benefits up to higher levels than most would be making in the private sector.

Secretary Rumsfeld agrees. In recent testimony before the Armed Services Committee in the other body, he noted:

“We’ve got 295 million people in the United States of America. We need 1.4 million to serve in the active force. We have no trouble attracting and retaining the people we need.”

“We are not having trouble maintaining a force of volunteers. Every single person’s a volunteer. We do not need to use compulsion to get people to come in the armed services. We got an ample number of talented, skillful, courageous, dedicated young men and women willing to serve. And it’s false.”

Service in our armed forces is one of the most honorable ways anyone can serve this Nation, and our military is attracting very good people. However, in a society that prides itself on individual liberty and personal freedom, public service is not the only way to serve the common good. A free country should never force anyone to work for the government unless there is no other reasonable alternative.

We can teach our children to love and appreciate this country without forcing any young person to serve in the military against his or her will. There are plenty of professions where people honorably serve others, a good many of which are in the private sector.

Farmers serve this Nation well providing food for the people. Bankers serve the Nation well by creating the capital and financing for small businesses to create jobs and hire hard-working people.

Nurses and doctors serve the Nation well by working long hours protecting us from disease and injury.

Farmers, doctors, teachers, business people—these are just a few of the countless people in countless professions who work hard at honest jobs serving others in service to this Nation.

For every person we force into the military against his or her wishes, we are taking away the ability of that individual to fulfill the God-given right to pursue one’s own happiness, a right that Thomas Jefferson made the centerpiece of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that neither the administration nor the Republican leadership in Congress is willing to face the facts. The reckless rush to war in Iraq without being prepared to win the peace has put our troops seriously at risk. We have a situation that continues to deteriorate on the ground in Iraq. We are forcing young men and women to stay in the military and are exerting inordinate pressure to extend their enlistments. Finally, we are reducing the qualifications of new recruits into the military. This is all a desperate attempt to maintain our inadequate troop strength levels.

Rather than acknowledge the problems and deal with responsible proposals that have been offered by a number of our colleagues, the Republican leadership has instead advanced to the floor legislation to reinstate the draft which they do not even support.

It is time to stop playing games with the welfare of the young men and women that are serving us in Iraq and around the world. They deserve better. They deserve proper equipment and an increase in our overall troop level. They need leadership in the White House and in Congress to help stabilize and reverse the perilous situation into which they have been thrust, against the best advice of uniformed leadership.

I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation and to provide a responsible alternative to increasing the troop level and increasing the range and nature of support from other countries. Sadly, it appears that this White House, the current Secretary of Defense and the Republican leadership in Congress are not equal to the task at hand. Hopefully, after November we will be given a new opportunity to address these critical issues.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 163 in the strongest possible terms. The draft, whether for military purposes or for some form of “national service,” violates the basic moral principles of individual liberty upon which this country was founded. Furthermore, the military neither wants nor needs a draft.

The Department of Defense, in response to calls to reinstate the draft has confirmed that conscription serves no military need. Defense officials from both parties have repudiated the need to reinstate the draft. For example, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has said

that, "The disadvantages of using compulsion to bring into the armed forces the men and women needed are notable," while President William Clinton's Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera, in a speech before the National Press Club, admitted that, "Today, with our smaller, post-Cold War armed forces, our stronger volunteer tradition and our need for longer terms of service to get a good return on the high, up-front training costs, it would be even harder to fashion a fair draft."

However, the most important reason to oppose H.R. 163 is that a draft violates the very principals of individual liberty upon which our nation was founded. Former President Ronald Reagan eloquently expressed the moral case against the draft in the publication *Human Events* in 1979: ". . . [conscriptio] rests on the assumption that your kids belong to the State. If we buy that assumption then it is for the State—not for parents, the community, the religious institutions or teachers—to decide who shall have what values and who shall do what work, when, where and how in our society. That assumption isn't a new one. The Nazis thought it was a great idea."

Some say the 18 year old draftee "owes it" to his (or her, since N.R. 163 makes woman eligible for the draft) country. Hogwash! It just as easily could be argued that a 50 year-old chicken-hawk, who promotes war and places the danger on innocent young people, owes more to the country than the 18 year-old being denied his (or her) liberty.

All drafts are unfair. All 18 and 19 year olds are never drafted. By its very nature a draft must be discriminatory. All drafts hit the most vulnerable young people, as the elites learn quickly how to avoid the risks of combat.

Economic hardship is great in all wars and cannot be minimized. War is never economically beneficial except for those in position to profit from war expenditure. The great tragedy of war is that it enables the careless disregard for civil liberties of our own people. Abuses of German and Japanese Americans in World War I and World War II are well known.

But the real sacrifice comes with conscription—forcing a small number of young vulnerable citizens to fight the wars that older men and women, who seek glory in military victory without themselves being exposed to danger, promote. The draft encourages wars with neither purpose nor moral justification and that are too often not even declared by the Congress.

Without conscription, unpopular wars are difficult to fight. Once the draft was undermined in the 1960s and early 1970s, the Vietnam War came to an end. But most importantly, liberty cannot be preserved by tyranny. A free society must always resort to volunteers. Tyrants think nothing of forcing men to fight and serve in wrongheaded wars. A true fight for survival and defense of America would elicit, I am sure, the assistance of every able-bodied man and woman. This is not the case for wars of mischief far away from home in which we have experienced often in the past century.

A government that is willing to enslave some of its people can never be trusted to protect the liberties of its own citizens. I hope all my colleagues join me in standing up for individual liberty and to shut down this un-American relic of a bygone era and help realize the financial savings and the gains to individual liberties that can be achieved by ending Selective Service registration.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, it must be an election year, because the fear mongering is in full swing.

President George W. Bush has repeatedly said he doesn't intend to revive the draft, because he believes that the military is more effective and less expensive as an all-volunteer force than it would be under a draft. Yet that hasn't stopped his critics, who are waging a behind-the-scenes campaign to frighten the American people.

The truth is this: President Bush has no "secret plan" to reinstitute the draft, and the only measure that would do so is the one we are considering today—offered by members of Senator KERRY's party and cosponsored solely by the minority party.

I concur with the Pentagon's assessment that the all-volunteer force has provided a military "that is experienced, smart, disciplined and representative of America." Volunteer soldiers are more family-oriented, career-oriented and stay longer. Lastly, there is no need for a draft at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, and its overwhelming rejection today by the Members of the House will put to rest the spin that is being offered by those merely interested in frightening voters during an election year. I urge my colleagues to join me in denouncing these tactics and voting against this bill.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill to reinstate a military draft in the United States. It is unfortunate that we find ourselves in this position . . . but it is not a matter of needing a draft . . . this administration has not managed our resources and our troops well.

We went into the Iraq war with no exit strategy, and the current military reinforcements are coming from the administration's backdoor draft via calling the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) back into service. The IRR are those who have already fulfilled their active duty service requirement to the United States.

The Nation does not need a draft for an all-volunteer force. We need to wisely and effectively manage our troops and our resources in the theater. Charging into Iraq with insufficient troop numbers—against the advice of the Army Chief of Staff—and allowing an insurgency to fester, have combined to put our troops in far more danger than need be.

Even our distinguished former U.S. civilian administrator in Iraq, L. Paul Bremer, said just yesterday that the United States "paid a big price" for not having enough troops on the ground after we overthrew Saddam Hussein.

Bremer said when he arrived to head the U.S.-led Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad in early May, 2003, there was already "horrid" looting occurring. I agree with Ambassador Bremer when he goes on to say: "We paid a big price for not stopping it because it established an atmosphere of lawlessness. We never had enough troops on the ground."

Now, our current method of retaining a list of people for the Selective Service, for registration only, is important tool to retain should we ever need an enormous, rapid infusion of manpower in the military.

Let me say to my colleague from New York, Mr. RANGEL, our distinguished friend who introduced this bill to illustrate the point that many of our service men and women today are in the military because they have very few economic choices in their lives. I join you in

urging all the sons and daughters of America, rich and poor, to be part of the uniformed service. We cannot have one class of Americans to fight our wars and another class of Americans benefiting from those wars.

Freedom isn't free—for any of us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a politically motivated diversion. It is not well conceived . . . it did not get a hearing in our House Armed Services Committee and it's not a serious attempt—for if it were, it would have gone through our process here and would not be destined for defeat as a "non-controversial" bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration, H.R. 163.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 163.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have not voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 163, will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2929, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5011.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 2, nays 402, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—2

Murtha

Stark

NAYS—402

Abercrombie	Biggert	Burns
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Burr
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Burton (IN)
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Buyer
Allen	Blackburn	Calvert
Andrews	Blumenauer	Camp
Baca	Blunt	Cantor
Bachus	Boehner	Capito
Baird	Bonilla	Capps
Baker	Bonner	Capuano
Baldwin	Bono	Cardin
Ballenger	Boozman	Cardoza
Barrett (SC)	Boswell	Carson (IN)
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Carson (OK)
Barton (TX)	Boyd	Carter
Bass	Bradley (NH)	Case
Beauprez	Brady (PA)	Castle
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bell	Brown (SC)	Chandler
Berkley	Brown-Waite,	Chocola
Berman	Ginny	Clay
Berry	Burgess	Clyburn