I thank my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, it really depends on where you put the spotlight. The

spotlight has, unfortunately, been on some goals or a goal to redeploy

troops, when truth in fact the spotlight of this legislation should

have been and should be on the readiness of the troops of the United

States. I am truly concerned about the readiness, let me tell you.

In the last 30 years, there have been 12 military contingencies in

which the United States military has been involved. If this means

anything in the future, sure as God made little green apples, we are

going to have conflicts or concern, we hope none, but in the future.

Readiness is a major part of it. The testimony is that a large, large

percentage of our equipment, Active Duty, National Guard and Reserve

for the Army, is in the Middle East. It's not here; it's not available

for training. What is over there, of course, because of the sand, the

conditions and the usage, is getting worn.

I truly worry about the training and the equipment for our Army and

for our Marines in particular, because we don't know what the future

holds. That is where the spotlight ought to be on this legislation, the

positive aspects of it in preparing the readiness for tomorrow as well

as for the readiness of today for the groups that are going over time

after time, whether it be for 12 or for 15 months.

My hats off to those young people in uniform. It's our job to

maintain them and take care of them. This bill would have done that.