

With the statistics that I am enclosing the American farmer will not be able to stay in business. Therefore agriculture will not be one of America's major industries. We are fighting for our livelihood and need yours and Congress' help.

Does anybody care? Does anybody even know?

Regards,

DEE.

She also left me with a breakdown of their family farming operation, which I will place in the RECORD, but basically what it shows is their total production cost last year was \$375,000, including what they had to pay for running their land, the cost of producing corn, the cost of producing soybeans and wheat, however their total income was only \$317,430, leaving them with a negative income last year of \$57,570.

The question to be addressed is how today's or tomorrow's farmer is going to continue to produce food for a Nation in the world if he or she cannot purchase needed equipment and meet the costs of doing business. How many other Americans have to purchase equipment like combines which retail at \$211,000 minus dealer discounts equaling about \$168,000 less trade-ins on equipment. So that leaves them with about \$111,000 to finance for 10 years at 8.75 percent interest for an annual payment of \$17,204.

□ 1630

How will they continue to make that payment when their negative income prohibits them from showing any profit?

There is an increasing concentration throughout agriculture today. This concentration is severely distorting the market signals that farmers use to know what to produce, when to produce and how to make a profit. This concentration is hurting the marketplace and free competition. These market conditions are deeply hurting our family farms and threatening the economic stability of real communities across our country.

Dee asks, what can we do? First I say Congress, this Congress and this executive branch, must recognize the faces of rural America and understand the crisis out there. We must increase market transparency on prices and we should revisit freedom to farm and provide these farmers who provide our food with the safety net against these kinds of international market manipulations.

THERE IS A CRISIS ON THE AMERICAN FARM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for the comments she has just made regarding the crisis on the American farm. Representing the State of North Dakota in this body, a congressional district that

has more production acres for agriculture than any other district in the House of Representatives, I can only affirm all too well the truth of what she is saying.

There is a crisis on the farm. If we do not act as a Congress and act quickly, the face of farming in this country will be changed. We will move from agriculture production primarily based with family farmers to vast corporate farms, changing forever the way our food is produced and a way of life in much of our country.

The critical element that has made the low commodity prices so particularly hard on our farmers relates directly back to a change made by this Congress in the farm bill that we are presently under.

In 1948, Congress acted to establish some measure of price protection for farmers, recognizing that there is going to be great volatility in the prices commodities will bring given any number of circumstances, but more recently it has been the ebb and flow of demand in the global marketplace.

The prior policy for farm programs has been that the United States Government has got the capacity to backstop individual farmers to protect them from the worst ravages of loss when prices fall through the floor. The last farm bill changed all that. We no longer afford our farmers any price protection. We have protected the Treasury of the Federal Government but we have left the fortunes of individual families out there on the farmsteads completely exposed to the ebb and flow of market prices.

The Asia financial collapse has absolutely destroyed commodity prices in this country. Small wonder. Japan, our number one export market for small grains, down 10 percent; Korea, number 4 market, off one-third, and so it goes.

So we have much more supply relative to market and prices' fall, and this time without a safety net. Small wonder in year two of the new farm bill its critical weakness was already glaringly exposed and exposed to such a dimension that in a bipartisan way we had to quickly get some money out of the Treasury and commit it to farmers in the shape of a disaster bill passed last fall in light of the national dimensions of the crisis in agriculture we had seen.

We have more to do this Congress. Do not think for one second that that disaster bill passed in October forestalls a total catastrophe in farm country without further action.

The first thing we must do is pass the supplemental. The White House has advanced an appropriations request that will afford absolutely critically needed loan money and guaranteed loan money available so that a number of farmers can get in the fields this spring that otherwise will not have operating capital to do so and that for others still they will be able to restructure their financial situation in such a way

that they will be able to cashflow, whereas otherwise they would not be able to cashflow.

Let me say something about cashflow, however. In my neck of the woods, given the commodities we produce, primarily small grains, one can get in today's market prices enough at the elevator to cover the costs that have been invested in that product. Therefore, lenders this spring are engaging in what is called equity lending; equity lending.

It does not sound all that bad but let me say what it means. It means that farmers are reducing their net worth. They are having to capitalize their assets because they cannot even make enough on the sale of their crop for what it takes to grow the crop.

We need to come back and visit this whole safety net for farming issue. We need to make some changes in the farm bill. It has fallen short and we now see where. Farmers need price protection. We need to make certain that there is a measure of price protection restored. Otherwise, we are going to be in this situation spring and fall every single year. Mark my words on this. We are going to have emergency supplemental bills in the spring and we are going to have disaster bills at harvest time trying to prop up America's farmers.

Let us not leave them hanging on the next action of Congress acting in such an ad hoc way every spring and every fall. Let us restore a safety net for America's farmers. Anything else will be catastrophic for the family farmers of this country.

THE RUMSFELD COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this special order hour by the Republican majority is one occasion upon which we will take the opportunity to discuss the issue of national missile defense, particularly as it relates to legislation that is expected to pass on this House floor tomorrow, certainly to be debated, and we will kick off that event with an unprecedented joint bipartisan meeting on the House floor, at which we will receive a briefing and a report from the commission known as the Rumsfeld Commission.

The Rumsfeld Commission is one which was commissioned by this Congress to look into the issue of national ballistic missile defense, to ascertain the complexity of the threat that looms over the United States of America from a potential intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile attack.

Most Americans are unaware that the United States possesses no capability or capacity to stop a single incoming intercontinental ballistic missile. We cannot stop it. If any of the rogue nations that we are concerned

about were to launch an attack of a single missile against the United States, it would take approximately a half-hour for that missile to reach us and there is nothing we would be able to do to stop it. That is an alarming reality that the Rumsfeld Commission report exposed and used as a basis to warn this Congress that we must begin to move forward on implementing a national ballistic missile defense policy.

The report is also one that we took to Russia over the weekend. I am joined by one of my colleagues who was part of an 8-member delegation that left for Russia on Friday, had an opportunity to brief the Russian Duma on the status of nuclear missile threats from rogue nations and also to address some of the opportunities for misinterpretation, I should say, that should be expected by our Russian counterparts in the legislative branch in Russia.

Our purpose was to do three things. One was to walk them through the Rumsfeld Commission report, to give to them the unclassified version of the briefing that we will receive here tomorrow and to do that prior to the vote that takes place. That was remarkable in and of itself. I think the briefing went a long way to helping the United States and Russia maintain the strong bond of friendship that we have established but do so in a way that allows us to continue to move forward with protecting the American people.

The second thing we hope to accomplish, and I believe successfully did, is to suggest to the Russians that our efforts to move forward on a national missile ballistic defense program is not motivated by any fear or concern about the Russian people or any hostility by the country of Russia.

The third item that we focused on was to suggest to the Russians that in an age of rapid technological advances, there is much to be gained through cooperative efforts to try to reduce the missile threat around the world; to, in fact, move us to that day off into the future that we all envision where nuclear missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles, can one day become a thing of the past, where we can effectively, through the advances of technology, diplomacy and partnership, render nuclear missiles obsolete.

Now that is a distant dream but one that is imminently possible, and I think it was an important opportunity again, first of all, to explain our legislation to the Russians before we cast the vote on the House floor, and we actually accomplished that before the Senate voted just yesterday to pass their version of the measure off of the Senate floor, and finally to reassure the Russian Government and our counterparts in the Duma that the extension of friendship and partnership that we have really strived to establish since the fall of Communism in the old Soviet Union is something that we are serious about and we can maintain that friendship and, as I said earlier, go forward with establishing a missile defense program for our people.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to participate during the whole hour but I do want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), for entering into this special order. We are going to be joined by my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) in a few moments and perhaps others.

My friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) has made a number of very important points. We are going to have an important debate tomorrow afternoon in this House of Representatives on a real threat against the United States and against the citizens of our country, and I think the American people will be watching us in this debate. I want everyone in this body to understand how important it is.

Also, as the gentleman says, we have an opportunity as House Members, tomorrow morning at 9:30 eastern time, to have a very important briefing. It is a closed briefing, but I would say to my colleagues that are within the sound of my voice we may have constituents coming in, we may have subcommittee hearings, and I know that we will be pulled at from many, many areas, but there is no more important place that my colleagues could be tomorrow morning at 9:30 than to hear former Secretary Rumsfeld and the members of his bipartisan commission about the very real threat that we have from incoming intercontinental ballistic missiles where our United States cities, our United States citizens, now have absolutely no protection. Hear me. We now have absolutely no protection from these incoming missiles.

We now have a threat that has changed, the world situation has changed, and the briefing that we will have from Secretary Rumsfeld will be very important tomorrow.

As the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, he and I just returned last night from a long weekend trip to Russia, where we met with members of the Russian Government, members of the Russian parliament, the Duma, to brief them on the unclassified portions of this Rumsfeld report. We were joined on this trip by former Secretary Rumsfeld and two other members of his commission, former Director of Central Intelligence, the former director of the CIA under this administration, under the Clinton administration, Jim Woolsey, and former Under Secretary of State Bill Schneider, who served in the Reagan and Bush administrations.

This is a bipartisan delegation that represented the Rumsfeld Commission in Moscow just this past weekend, and the entire Rumsfeld Commission, consisting of 9 members, was bipartisan, patriotic Democrats and Republicans, who were unanimous, Mr. Speaker, unanimous in their bipartisan conclusions that the United States faces an

imminent threat from missiles coming in principally from rogue nations.

□ 1645

Nations like North Korea which has already shown us that they can launch a multi-stage missile. They have shown us in recent tests. Countries like Iraq and Iran whose stated policies are hostile to the United States of America.

So we do not need to be alarmists in this Congress, but we need to tell the American people the facts, and I think the American people who listen to our debate and the Members of Congress tomorrow afternoon who listen to our debate will conclude that this bipartisan commission of people who have been there, who know what they are talking about, who have been on the frontline in Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, protecting our Nation against foreign threats, these people are telling the truth. The threat is very real; it could come within 5 years, where cities are subject not only to intentional attacks from rogue nations, but accidental missile launches or unauthorized attacks.

So I am pleased to join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) in this discussion. As I say, I will probably not be able to be here for the entire hour, but I believe we have a message that perhaps has not sunk in with the American people. But there is a threat, and this Congress will act tomorrow to begin to answer this very real threat.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado, and I would echo the sentiments of both the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, in the beautiful preamble to the Constitution, a Constitution we have sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, there is the mission statement, if you will, to use the parlance of the late 1990s, that it is the role of we, the people, to provide for the common defense. And there is no clearer mission and no clearer mandate than the current world condition as explained by the Rumsfeld Commission.

The gentleman from Mississippi is quite right. Republicans and Democrats, acting foremost as Americans, evaluated the threat of rogue States such as North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and came away with the chilling evaluation, as widely reported in the press, though perhaps not with the emphasis in hindsight that should have been required, that within 5 years time, these rogue nations would have at their disposal weapons of mass destruction; specifically, intercontinental ballistic missiles, that could strike at the heartland of the American Nation, and this is what we confront.

My colleagues also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the assumption and the false impression that exists in the minds of many that the continental United

States and Alaska and Hawaii are already protected from such an attack. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, that is not yet the case. I should pause here, especially given the tenor of the times and the revelations of unauthorized transfers of technology to the Chinese government, and sadly, the alleged political misconduct of the Clinton-Gore administration, to underscore what has happened, because in the parlance of the politically correct, sadly, our commander in chief from time to time is factually challenged. Mr. Speaker, he stood here at the rostrum 2 years ago in his State of the Union message and said to the American Nation, who looks to its President for reassurance and truth, two qualities, Mr. Speaker, that sadly have been sorely lacking, the President offered a classic Clintonian statement when he said, quote, Tonight, no Russian missiles are aimed at America's heartland, or words to that effect.

That led the distinguished Democratic Senator from Nebraska, Mr. KERREY, in a subsequent appearance on NBC's *Meet The Press* to say well, yes, that is true, but those missiles can be reprogrammed in a matter of minutes.

I acknowledge that reality not to cast aspersions on the Russian Federation or members of the Duma with whom my colleagues met this weekend, but to point out that sadly, in this age of presidential leadership, all Americans have to parse the statements of our commander in chief.

So we are faced with this dilemma: How best to provide for the common defense and protect our citizenry from attack from any quarter, but especially the threat of rogue nations. And indeed, the headlines today ring out the irony of a curious state of conduct with the outlaw Nation that is North Korea.

Indeed, as the gentleman from Mississippi will recall, before we were sworn in to the 104th Congress, as part of this new common sense conservative majority, the then Secretary of Defense William Perry came to brief us at a breakfast sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I was privileged to ask the first question of then Secretary Perry, and I asked the Secretary why the Clinton administration was insistent on sharing any form of nuclear technology with the North Koreans. And to sum up the Secretary's reply to me: I needed a further briefing.

No, Mr. Speaker, I did not need a further briefing. It is common sense that if the stove is on, one does not put one's hand on the eye of the stove or one will get burned. One does not play with matches, one does not play with fire. And continuing this curious indulgence of the North Koreans is now the announcement heralded by this administration that the U.S., at long last, will be granted inspection of sites in North Korea. But, there is a caveat there, because the grand leader of the North Koreans, Kim Jong-il, has a Nation wracked with famine, and while

this great constitutional republic has proper humanitarian impulses to help feed people of the world stricken by disaster inside that closed and sadly retro Stalinist state, Kim Jong-il and his military leaders continue apace their development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and as my colleague from Mississippi pointed out, now the North Koreans possess technology that can strike America's heartland.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Arizona has made a number of absolutely correct statements about the missile threat, both from the former Soviet Union, now the Federation of Russia, as well as the rogue States. But it is important for our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and for all Americans to understand that the missile technology, the intercontinental ballistic missiles previously owned by the Soviet Union and aimed at us have not been utterly destroyed.

I think a lot of people perhaps even listing to the President of the United States in his speech from this very room might misunderstand the situation. Those missiles are still there, and they can be reprogrammed as the Democratic Senator, responding to the President of the United States, correctly pointed out. So that threat is still there.

Now, we have every reason to be optimistic about our new relationship with the Soviet Union. We have some joint initiatives with them on housing, hopefully which will constitute a win/win situation with the United States investment community, the Russian people, and stability worldwide. We are involved in some joint efforts with Russia on space technology, and I applaud that.

But the missiles are still there, and elections are going to be held in Russia in December of 1999 for the Duma, the Russian parliament. We hope that people who support our continued openness and steps toward friendship will be elected in December of this year, but we do not know that. Presidential elections will be held in the federation of Russia early in the year 2000. We do not know the result of that election. So we are still in a very dangerous world and the Russian missiles are there. But it is not because of the Russian missiles that the Rumsfeld Commission has come forward. And we were there, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) and I, and a bipartisan delegation from this body, we were there to point out the true facts to our colleagues from the Russian parliament, that the United States is threatened by rogue nations and perhaps by an unauthorized or accidental launch.

We also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, to our colleagues in the Russian Duma that we are asking for the very type of missile shield which Russia presently has around its capital city of Moscow. Russia presently has the technology that we are asking for to protect our cities, and it is only fair and only

right, and it is actually our constitutional duty, as the gentleman has already pointed out, to take the necessary steps under the changed world situation to protect Americans from whatever threats as they arise.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is something that of course our delegation knew, but I think it was reemphasized during this visit, is that the Russians have been engaged in an incremental strategy over the years of deploying ground-based radar stations, missile interceptors, as well as a civil defense network designed to protect the capital city of Moscow.

Now, this is really one of the weaknesses of the ABM Treaty that we are under, because we here in the United States, under that treaty, are restricted from constructing a missile defense system that is comprehensive in nature, that can protect the entire country. In Russia it is a very different story because the majority of the Russian people live in the capital city. In fact, the defense structure that they have established it is estimated can protect upwards of 70 percent of the Russian people. But the ABM Treaty only allows us to protect a point, a place. Would it be Washington, D.C., would it be New York, would it be Denver, would it be San Francisco, would it be L.A.? Imagine the political difficulty in deciding which part of the country we would defend in a similar way that the Russians are able to. It is a very perplexing question.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is saying that 70 percent of the population of Russia is now protected by a missile defense system and not one American city or citizen is protected by a similar system.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the case. It is only the reason why, as the gentleman from Arizona mentioned earlier, last summer it was when our satellites were beaming down immediate data to our analysts in the Air Force primarily, in the space program, they watched in almost horror as they were watching in real time data being transmitted on a missile launch that we detected from Korea that was of a heat signature we had never recognized out of North Korea. It was a trajectory we did not recognize. It was at a speed we did not recognize. They instantaneously realized and came to the conclusion that North Korea had a 3-stage rocket which had not been announced to the world. Our intelligence community had failed to warn the United States or even to detect that North Korea had this capacity. And with a lightweight warhead, that Taepo Dong missile, as it was soon to be called, has a radius capacity of about 6,000 miles. That means North Korea announced to the world that day the ability to land a missile on the North American continent within about a half-hour of launch time. Now, that shocked us because we cannot stop it.

But over in Russia, however, 70 percent of their people are potentially protected from that kind of a launch. And the North Koreans are not stopping at the Taepo Dong I missile. They are now working on the Taepo Dong II missile which will also be of similar design, a 3-stage rocket with a heavier payload, and continue to possess the ability of longer range and more precise targeting over time. That is a very real threat.

I might also point out that members of the Russian Duma had heard information before. They know, for example, that North Korea, Libya, Iran, Iraq are countries that are moving forward on development; they know that Pakistan and India have experimented with underground detonations, but they have never, as members of the legislative branch in Russia, they do not have the leverage that we do in the United States Congress to demand this kind of information to inform themselves about these threats.

The information we took over to the Russian Duma and delivered to the Russian parliamentarians was quite an elaboration that I do not think they were prepared to hear or expected to hear. I think in the long run, let us be frank, the Russian parliamentarians are not thrilled to see the United States move forward in a policy direction that would have us defend ourselves. They like the current imbalance. That is to their strategic advantage.

□ 1700

But I think we did a successful job, one of erasing some of the misinformation and the misinterpretation that is possible with the vote we are going to take tomorrow, and, secondly, alerting them to the very valid reasons that we as Americans have over the emerging threat of these rogue nations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and others, including our very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who lead the delegation to the former Soviet Union, the Russian Federation.

Again, I think it is important to underscore the unprecedented nature of such a visit, American legislators meeting with their Russian counterparts to explain and cut through the haze of disinformation and other impulses that may linger from the Cold War that, in the situation which we find ourselves, there is a legitimate stake in self-defense for this constitutional republic, for our American Nation, and for the American people.

I might also point out, as genuine as the threat is from North Korea, the area in and around the Persian Gulf remains an area of grave and great concern. Given the proximity of Israel to that region of the world, indeed given

the Scud attacks on Israel, this administration proposed a few years ago that the Israelis might want to have a missile defense.

That begs the question, Mr. Speaker, if it is good enough for the Russian people, and as my colleagues have pointed out, some 70 percent of the Russian population is effectively covered with this type of missile defense system, if our own administration and State Department, Mr. Speaker, would say it is good enough for the Israelis and they should work on a comparable system, then certainly the American people deserve such protection. We must underscore the fact that it currently does not exist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that there continues to be a somewhat curious debate in the realm of international law about enforcement of a treaty such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, or ABM Treaty, from more than a quarter century ago ratified by the United States Senate.

In our new world situation, we call that entity with whom we dealt at that time now today the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has ceased to exist and, indeed, in everyday parlance, just as marriage vows customarily end with the term "till death do you part," when one entity is dissolved, it is my belief, and I believe a reasonable test and a reasonable assumption and assertion, that that treaty likewise or at least the involvement with the Soviet Union and the strictures of the ABM Treaty ceases to exist because now we are dealing with a new Russian federation.

But, again, I want to salute my friends who took the time and had the courage to go talk to our Russian counterparts in a spirit of candor.

We might also point out, Mr. Speaker, as relevant again as today's headlines, there have been reports of the possibility of a similar computer crisis that we hear about in this country under the guise of Y2K. There are concerns about Russian computers.

We welcome the chance to break down the barriers and ensure that there would be no unintended launch from any type of computer malfunction. But if it were to happen, is it not the role of this Congress and the American people to make sure that this Nation is adequately protected? Sadly, on this day, at this hour, in this Chamber, we have to point out that, for the American Nation, no such missile defense exists.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to expound on the point of the relevance of the ABM Treaty to the vote tomorrow because the ABM Treaty has acknowledged weaknesses.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona has begun a discussion which I think will continue for months and even years in this Congress and in this

Nation concerning the ABM Treaty. I think he has made a very logical point in that the Soviet Union no longer exists.

Other very learned scholars who have looked at the issue have concluded that the deployment of our missile defense program in the United States would not violate the ABM Treaty. That is to be decided later.

We do need to point out for the sake of our colleagues that will be voting tomorrow that there is nothing in the legislation tomorrow that has anything to do with the ABM Treaty at all. Indeed, it does not discuss the ABM Treaty, yes or no. It simply says, very, very simply, in a very short piece of legislation, that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system.

I think it is also important for us to point out that, despite the niceties of the ABM Treaty, we are going to take steps in this Congress to protect our people, to protect the citizens and cities and communities of the United States and provide for the common defense.

If the ABM Treaty eventually has to be renegotiated, if there has to be further diplomatic conversations between these signatory parties or between new states that have sprung up in place of those signatory parties, we will do that.

But our first and foremost responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to realize the threat, as the Rumsfeld Commission is going to point out to us in our session tomorrow and as we will be learning in the debate and, having realized that threat, to do our duty, our duty to provide for the defense.

The gentleman from Arizona mentioned the Middle East and the very real conflict that we have seen there in recent years. Certainly we know we wish it were not so. But we know that Saddam Hussein is the sworn enemy of the United States.

Here is what Mr. Saddam Hussein had to say about the United States of America, "Our missiles cannot reach Washington. If they could reach Washington, we would strike if the need arose." Saddam Hussein, 1990.

Listen to this quote from Abul Abbas, head of the Palestinian Liberation Front: "Revenge takes 40 years. If not my son, then the son of my son will kill you. Someday, we will have missiles that can reach New York."

Mr. Speaker, this House, this Congress, and I hope this administration is going to take the necessary steps to answer these threats, to answer the very real facts which will be presented to us tomorrow, and to make sure that our people can live as safely as possible in this very dangerous world.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to add one more quote from an American. This is a student who just e-mailed me the following message yesterday, and I want to share it with my colleagues.

It says, "Dear Congressman SCHAFFER, I do not know if this has come up

to the floor yet," and how timely that it will come to the floor tomorrow. "I do not know if this has come to the floor yet. However, I have become aware of the existence of this bill and wish to encourage its support." She referenced the bill a little earlier. "The bill entitled the American Missile Defense Protection Act calls for enacting stronger measures to protect our magnificent country from missile attacks. Please research this issue and act and vote in support of it. Thank you. God bless."

This is a constituent from Fort Collins, Colorado, my district back home. This letter is indicative of what most Americans feel about this topic when they learn the details of our current state of military readiness and defense preparation, when they learn about the issues that are at stake, when they learn about the imbalance that is swiftly balancing against us.

I think these are the voices that need to be heard on this House floor, particularly tomorrow, over and above all of the hesitations, the concerns, the placations that are coming out of the White House right now and others throughout the country who believe that this defenseless posture that we are in today is something that should continue. We have the opposite view.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for sharing that message from his constituent in Fort Collins. Mr. Speaker, it points out the unique nature both of this special order and the ability that our constituents have, not only from our individual districts, but indeed from coast to coast and beyond to email, fax, phone their Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, Republican or Democrat, we are all Americans, to ask their Member of Congress to move forward with this missile defense system. It is vital. It is necessary. It is long overdue.

There is nothing better than the input of those concerned citizens rising to this cause, Mr. Speaker, and alerting their respective Member of Congress in much the same way as I would take this time, Mr. Speaker, again to invite Members from both parties tomorrow to listen to the classified briefing on this floor from former Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and others who join him on the Commission.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, re-claiming my time, I just point out the timeliness of the announcement we just heard from the Committee on Rules in bringing the bill to the floor for debate. This is very relevant matter that we are discussing here today.

Members of this Congress and citizens throughout the country need to come to grips very quickly with the question of what is it we are going to stand for as a country when it comes to defending our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for filing that rule so that that debate can take place on this House floor tomorrow.

The world remains a dangerous place. Even as media outlets such as the cable news network offer their, at times, controversial documentary treatment of the Cold War as if it is anachronism or a relic, the fact is the world does remain a dangerous place.

The rogue states, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) pointed out, the avowed enemies of this country who make no bones about their yearning, their desire to deploy weapons of mass destruction against the world's lone remaining superpower and the very ideals this constitutional republic embodies.

So, again, in full view of the oath we take to the Constitution of the United States and our trusted responsibility with the American people as their constitutionally elected representatives, we must answer this clarion call and make provisions for a missile defense system.

Because, sadly, again, as shocking as it may be to the American people, despite some flowery phrases, there is currently no such system. This Congress will have to take steps tomorrow.

I would also point out to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER), as he is well aware, the developments again echoing through the headlines of the major newspapers, the unlawful transfer of technology to the People's Republic of China, and the fact sadly that reports indicate the Communist Chinese have been only too eager to share this technology with rogue States.

Mr. Speaker, this time on the floor affords us not only the responsibility and opportunity to communicate with all of our constituencies, and indeed with the American people, but, Mr. Speaker, this also affords us the time to speak to those who monitor the proceedings on these floors who, quite frankly, wish us ill or fail to understand that the very freedoms we cherish in this society are not, in fact, weaknesses.

□ 1715

The despots of this world look at free and open debate as a form of weakness, a form of inertia, of immobilization that would somehow prevent or abridge our proper responses.

I think particularly of the Communist Chinese. I think of the bellicose threat from the Chinese defense minister of a couple of years ago with reference to the Taiwan question when the Chinese, in provocative fashion, as the Taiwan government was holding free and fair elections, the Chinese conducted exercises and shooting missiles just off the coast of Taiwan, and the provocative statement, Mr. Speaker, by the Chinese defense minister with reference to our great Nation, saying,

oh, well, we believe the Americans value Los Angeles more than they value Taiwan.

How are we to interpret that statement, Mr. Speaker? How can we interpret that but as a threat to this Nation?

As I explained to the consul for the Chinese government from Los Angeles, who visited Phoenix and sought me out for a meeting expressing his goal of friendship, I said, Mr. Speaker, to the consul, then let us speak as friends.

And let there be no mistake, none of our adversaries around the world, in any regime, in any place, should ever confuse the will and the resolve of the American people once fully informed and rallying to a cause. This is such a cause. This is such a moment, to take legitimate steps to protect our Nation.

And though at times, because of previous actions and whatever reluctance on the part of this administration to follow through effectively in dealing with foreign governments and others, make no mistake this Congress takes seriously, Mr. Speaker, its constitutional role and its oversight of the executive branch and the need to protect the American people. And this constitutional republic will prevail because we understand that in a free society the eternal price of liberty is vigilance.

I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman is precisely right about the importance not only of our efforts to contain the flow of technology and missile-related components in and among other countries, but it is our own participation in the proliferation of missiles which is something we should be concerned about as well.

Let me raise something that came up at the meetings in Russia just 2 days ago in Moscow. I was part of the delegation that was meeting with members of the Duma.

We had several meetings, but the most memorable one took place Monday afternoon, and we were talking about the concern we have for the transfer of technology from the Russians, either willingly or outside of their own laws, to some of these rogue nations. One of the scientists who was there said to all of us, well, it is our impression that it is the United States that is contributing to the proliferation of their own enemies and the enemies of Russia as well.

This took us aback for a moment, until we realized the validity of his concern. We could certainly understand his point of view. And this goes back, and it has actually been documented in the Rumsfeld report, goes back to February 15 of 1996 when a Chinese Long March space launch vehicle, carrying a western satellite, exploded. The post-failure review involving U.S. aerospace companies led to the transfer of sensitive information regarding rocket engineering.

That was an effort by the United States to send information to the Chinese to help them perfect their long-range launch capability.

It goes on to say that in the spring of 1996 the United States sold supercomputers to China's Academy of Sciences, which historically has participated in that country's effort to develop missiles. In 1996 we sold supercomputers to the Russians for a nuclear weapons design lab.

It was no surprise, I suppose, or should have been no surprise to our President that the symbolic gesture by the Chinese took place on July 1 of 1998, just last year, when China tested the motor of its new DF-31 intercontinental ballistic missile during the visit from our President. They tested the motor of this new-age missile while our President was there in a symbolic gesture to show that they are emerging on an international, and not only emerging, but they are moving forward very dramatically and drastically in the development of new missile defense technology.

I see I am joined by another member of our delegation who was there, and it might be instructive at this point to talk a little bit about the Russian Duma itself and the members of the Duma, how they relate to us as a country. Because for too long, frankly since the fall of communism, our relationships with the emerging republic of Russia have been at the executive level, our President and State Department relating directly with the Russian president, Boris Yeltsin and his administration, ignoring wholly the importance of the democratically elected members on a representative basis of the Russian Duma.

Now, in relation to what we understand and know here through our system, the legislative branch in the Russian government is less powerful and has less direct influence over the day-to-day lives and affairs of Russian politics, and there is tremendous strain between the presidency of Russia and the Russian Duma.

Our real hope, I think as Americans, for reaching out to the Russian people and forging a relationship that promotes free markets, that promotes true democracy, that promotes the kinds of economic reforms, such as property rights, homeownership and so on, is through a relationship with this body, the Congress of the United States, and members of the democratically elected Russian Duma.

The Russian Duma is where we will find the rising Democrats. This is where we will find the individuals who are in favor of these kinds of market driven reforms. It is also the place where we will find the folks who most vehemently reject the old ways of communism that we find so prevalently in the Russian presidency today. That is where many of the old Communists went after the Soviet Union fell apart.

It is the Russian Duma that really could use some support and assistance

in elevating the stature and their prominence in the role of Russian politics, and it is where we should look.

It is why, I think, the visit that we made, an historic visit, was so important. Because it really did involve the Russian Duma in an important national issue for themselves in a way that they have never been afforded before. And I think it will go further in our efforts as a country to assure the Russians that our desire for long-term partnership and friendship, and to see the Russians move forward in the economic reforms that will result in peace and stability are, in the end, not only in their best interests but in our best interests.

It is important to understand that within the context of this bill passing tomorrow that the President of the United States prefers to deal with the President of Russia and the old line Communists that are part of that administration, the old way of doing business in Russia, which is resented by the majority of the Russian people and rejected by the majority of the Russian people. Our effort in this Congress should be to reach out to those new Democrats, the new free marketeers that are getting elected with greater frequency in the Duma.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), who joined us in that delegation returning last evening.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his time and indulgence and the point he makes, along with the gentleman from Arizona, that this was truly an unprecedented journey and an historic journey.

As the gentleman pointed out, we are in the process of exposing the Russian Duma to more and more Members of Congress. This was my first time ever to visit that great country of Russia, to talk to them very frankly about our need to defend our people from a possible limited nuclear strike by some rogue nation.

It is as a result of our discussion with Duma members, by our recognizing the Duma and dealing with the Duma, who very similar to our House of Representatives are elected by democratic process by their constituents in their regions, and represented in other ways according to their constitution, which is vitally important, that we recognize the importance of a constitutional form of government and Democratically elected representations as a vital part of that government. The Duma can see, just like themselves, that we represent our constituents. We are representative of the individuals.

I tell people, when they ask me about this job, I tell them that if they want to know what America is like they should just look at the U.S. House of Representatives. We are a picture of America. And if we look at the Duma the same way we will see what Russia is like. And very many times, when we see this executive branch to executive

branch dialogue and discussion, we miss that from time to time by not seeing the elected representatives from the various regions.

The meeting was vitally important because it is necessary that the Duma understand our resolve to join them in the belief that it is the obligation of the Federal Government, both in Russia and in the United States of America, according to our Constitution, Article I, Section 8, to defend the United States of America. And that is what H.R. 4 tomorrow is all about, to make it the policy of the United States to develop and deploy a national missile defense system.

It is important to note, and I am sure the gentleman has already done this in this discussion, that Russia already has such a system that is ABM compliant, a ground-based system situated on the outskirts of Moscow, and that has the capability of protecting a majority of their citizens.

I made the point in our press conference yesterday, and the point has been made time and time again on this floor by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), whose single-handed activity in this area, with the support of a lot of the rest of us, and especially the chairman on the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and other members on that committee, that we have got to move to a situation where we at least do what the Russian government has done for their people, and that is to try to defend and protect American lives.

Not one U.S. citizen residing in the United States of America is protected at all from an accidental or other type of launch of a ballistic missile against the United States of America. Not one person. We do not have a system. The American people believe that we do.

One reporter asked the question, as the gentleman from Colorado remembers, at the press conference, the reporter from the Baltimore Sun asked the question that if Russia has this capability, and they have for years, and the United States of America does not have that capability, and it has been the policy of the United States of America and the Federal Government in the past to not protect our people from ballistic missile attack, who in the world made that decision?

It is this debate, this special order that is going to bring to light as we begin to head back to our districts during the April recess, where we get to talk about important issues that may be on the front page from time to time; the budget, which is vitally important, maintaining a balanced budget, reducing the tax burden on American families, doing the right thing with regard to Social Security, but adding another issue to the vitally important issues that we deal with in this country, to make sure that the American people know where we are and where we need to go from here.

I thank the gentleman for his time and hope to continue this dialogue.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Well, the press conference that we had yesterday was in Moscow, yesterday morning, 8 hours earlier than it is here. And the gentleman is precisely right, that is the ultimate question that the American people need to ask is, well, where was it along the lines we decided to stand back, while the Russians were able to see off into the future enough to construct a national missile defense system for approximately 70 percent of their people, that we decided to do nothing?

It is faith that has been placed, for about 6 years in Washington now, in the notion that our intelligence gathering capacity and our diplomatic cooperation with other countries was all we needed to prevent these kinds of hostilities from taking place. But it was the five detonations in Pakistan, when we were looking right at the site and our intelligence community had no idea that those detonations were about to take place; the inability for us to prevent similar kinds of retaliatory tests in a friendly country, India, the largest democracy in Asia, when we could not stop that; and then also, on top of that, the launch that we spoke about earlier, the Taepo Dong missile from launch out of North Korea, which we had no idea even existed. Those events, stacked upon one another, opened our eyes in America.

□ 1730

That is what my colleagues will find in the Rumsfeld report that shows very clearly that we significantly, as a country, underestimated the threat of these rogue nations, we have severely misrepresented the threat to the American people and understated the threat that confronts us.

Frankly, if we had started this project back when President Reagan suggested it, deploying a national missile defense system would have been cheaper, first of all, and it would have been in place today with technology that is superior to all, second to none. And we do not have that now. Here we are, in 1999, headed into the new century with, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) mentioned, the ability for us to stop not a single intercontinental ballistic missile.

Yesterday it was announced by the White House that they changed course and are willing to support a ballistic missile defense system as designed by the Senate. This is a remarkable change. The President did stand up at the roster right behind the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) just earlier this year and said, "we need a national missile defense program," but he has opposed early drafts of our versions here to at least set a policy to actually move the country in that direction, move beyond the hollow words that can so easily be spoken during a short visit.

I ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), what do you make of the traumatic transformation, the

turnaround of the President of the United States, as the Senate overwhelmingly adopted on a bipartisan basis the Senate version of a missile defense policy bill?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let my say to my colleague the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), Mr. Speaker, that we welcome this intellectual elasticity within the administration. We saw it a couple of years ago with reference to historic welfare reform. We saw it last year when it came to the Taxpayers Bill of Rights and cleaning up through oversight the Internal Revenue Service that indeed 30 minutes prior to the Secretary of Treasury coming to our Committee on Ways and Means, on which I serve, that the administration changed course.

And we welcome it. We understand that the burden of international leadership rests uneasily on the shoulder of this President. Perhaps it is because so often his rhetoric fails to square with reality. But we welcome this change of heart, even if it is what is in essence the last nanosecond of the eleventh hour.

But while we welcome that, let us also reassure the American people, Mr. Speaker, that we offer these grim realities not to promote panic or fear but a policy change and a conviction that we must adequately defend our Nation against all threats but especially the growing threat of a rogue state or an accidental launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

And so it is in that spirit, even given the dramatic changes in attitude from the administration, perhaps also prompted in the wake of media revelations about the problems in China, we welcome this change and we look forward to working with all Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, to act first and foremost as Americans and provide for the common defense of.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in the final few minutes I have left, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) to sort of wrap up our special order and I will close in the last few seconds.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would just add that the journey that several of us made, a bipartisan delegation to Russia, to talk about these issues is vitally important. Because, as the point was made, that when the former Soviet Union decided to deploy such a missile, they did not, neither were they obligated to come to the United States of America, to Washington, D.C., to sit down with Members of the House of Representatives, sit down with Members of Congress, to inform us that they were going to do it and why they were going to do it.

That is what this Congressional delegation did just this past week in taking

members of the Rumsfeld Commission, Chairman Rumsfeld, former CIA director James Woolsey, and Dr. Bill Schneider to show the Russian Duma, and therefore the Russian people, that we want to be open with them because we see tremendous opportunity, tremendous prospects and potential for a growing relationship, both economic and otherwise, with the people of Russia.

And the way that we are going to do that is to be more open with them. But while we are more open with them, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) so appropriately pointed out, we are to remind them that it is our obligation to follow the Constitution of the United States and defend the people of the United States against any threat that may be over the horizon. That is our foremost obligation according to the Constitution.

Plurality of the delegated powers of Congress deal with that national defense. We will do that and we will do that, hopefully, with the cooperation and understanding of our friends in Russia. But we will do it nonetheless.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for this opportunity to talk about this vitally important issue not only to us today but to our children tomorrow.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I will close with the following thought and in an effort to urge our colleagues, all of our colleagues, to be here on the House floor tomorrow morning for an unprecedented briefing on the nature of the missile defense or the threat to the United States and say that the administration has dramatically changed its perspective when confronted with the truth and the facts of this report.

The same administration which opposed a national missile defense program just this year said the following, the Secretary of Defense: "There is a threat and the threat is growing, and we expect it to soon pose a danger not only to our troops overseas but also to Americans here at home."

That change of heart was inspired by the Rumsfeld Commission report, which can be summed up in the following way: "Concerted efforts by a number of hostile nations to acquire ballistic missiles with biological or nuclear payload pose a growing threat to the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies." That is the seminal statement of the report of the Commission to assess the ballistic missile threat to the United States, which was unveiled July 15 of 1998.

This is a vitally important issue. This is one of the most critical issues confronting our country. It is one that I call upon all Members to view and to consider with great seriousness and in great detail before casting not only the vote to establish policy, which we expect to accomplish tomorrow, but to then be prepared to follow up with the secondary and tertiary steps of moving this country forward toward providing the same kind of defense that the Russian people have seen fit to provide for

themselves, a national defense program to protect the American people.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, DECLARATION OF POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. SCHAFER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-69) on the resolution (H. Res. 120) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE WOMEN OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Democratic women of Congress are so concerned about the potential for harming Social Security that we will see during this hour a number of us come to the floor to alert our colleagues and the women of our country about the very high stakes for them as to what we do with Social Security.

Let me emphasize that this is the highest stake game, if I may call it that, of all during the 106th Congress because we have a chance to protect and secure the most popular and one of the most important programs that our country has ever had the good sense to create.

I approach this issue from the peculiar perspective of an official who served as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under President Carter, a post that gave me a very special concern about the gap between men and women's wages.

When we are speaking of Social Security, of course, we are speaking first and foremost of women who have smaller wages than men and, of course, women who have no wages whatsoever. For that reason, we have introduced a resolution in the Congress that recognizes the unique effects that proposals to reform Social Security almost surely will have on women.

Three-quarters of unmarried and widowed elderly women rely on Social Security for over half of their income. So when we deal with Social Security, when we tamper with it, who should be in our mind's eye first and foremost are women because they are so disproportionately affected.

Everyone is aware of the low statistic that is used over and over again that we who are women are, according to what year you look at, in the 1990s, 70 percent, 74 percent, 72 percent of

men's income. I want my colleagues to look at the 1997 figures. \$24,973 for full-time, year-round wages for women, compared to \$33,674 for full-time, year-round wages for men. Those figures are very important for what women can do with their disposable income today.

But I want to focus us on what that means for women 20 years from now, 30 years from now, and longer. Because it translates directly into too little money to live on when they are elderly; and for that reason, it means that today, at least, those women can count on a progressively structured Social Security system that will keep them from abject poverty. And in case we believe that that is crying wolf, let us not forget that most of the credit for cutting poverty for the elderly really belongs to Social Security.

As recently as 1959, 35 percent of the elderly were poor. By 1979, we had gotten it to only 15 percent. And in 1996, it was 11 percent. And when we say the elderly are poor, who we are really talking about are elderly women.

I have given my colleagues the wages for full-time, year-round workers. But only 56 percent of women are in this category at all. Seventy-two percent of men are in this category. And we can see how that would translate into retirement income.

In essence, we are not talking about retirement when we talk about Social Security; we are talking about a family protection system. Because not only are the main beneficiaries women who have almost no work history, but they include disabled family members and deceased family members.

For all of the talk about private accounts, there is almost no talk about how to deal with people who have no accounts or people whose accounts would be very shallow because they have so little work history.

We need to protect Social Security in the name of America's women, not change it. We need to shore it up, not shift it. It is structured now to help the elderly who fit the profile of the average elderly woman. That is who we have in mind. That is why it is progressive. That is why it is inflation adjusted. That is why it has lifetime benefits. That is why it has dependent benefits.

The shift to personal accounts, of course, takes away the progressivity that has been critical to lifting elderly women out of poverty. And in personal accounts they get what they put in, if that, plus what the market gives them, if anything.

Let us start with where women are. Women put in less as workers or of course as housewives, where they stand to lose altogether. The progressive formula now in place for Social Security means higher benefits to low earners. That translates into women.

I do not think we want to say to America's women we want to have them depend on the market when we consider the fluctuations up and down in their income. If we say that to

women, we in effect are saying to women they lose.

□ 1745

And homemakers, above all, beware, because this system has you in mind even before it has working women in mind of any description, including those who work part-time. It is homemakers, women who have spent their working life caring for a family, who are the major beneficiaries of the present structure of the Social Security system. Above all, we should remember that the market has no spouses or widows benefits.

Women have two characteristics that mean that they must insist that any new system retain them when any new structures are put in place. One, of course, is less earnings. And the other is living longer. Imagine, living longer can hurt you. It certainly can hurt you if you have a system that is different from our own because you could exhaust your retirement income. You can never exhaust your Social Security income. Moreover, less earnings is going to be true for the foreseeable future. We hope not forever. Women spend 15 percent of their careers out of the labor force.

Finally, let me say that I am sorry to inform you that the gap in life expectancy between men and women is not likely to decrease. By the year 2030, for example, the actuaries tell us that there will be almost no decrease in that gap, which means that women are going to continue to live longer. Men may live longer as well, but this gap is going to be here and that gap translates into a need for income from somewhere. We are not going to get it from the market. We do get it now from Social Security.

Any change in the Social Security system ought to, therefore, be sure to bear in mind that it is a system that involves your mothers and your grandmothers, your aunts and your female cousins. We want to protect men every bit as much, but the demographic facts of life, the actuarial facts of life, are that it is women who stand to be the biggest losers.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I last rose to speak, I told you a little bit about my district. I represent southern Nevada which is Las Vegas, Nevada. I represent the fastest growing district in the United States. I have the fastest growing veterans' population. I also have the fastest growing population of women seniors in the country.

Women comprise over 60 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries. Therefore, women in Nevada would feel significantly the impact of any changes to the current Social Security system. It is my job, it is my responsibility to ensure that their financial security is not undermined. Instead, that it is strengthened.

Like most Nevada women, I fear that privatization of the Social Security