

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly obvious that those who have obstructed the deployment of a missile defense system have seriously miscalculated the risks to our Nation.

Hostile, often referred to as rogue, nations now possess the technology to threaten our neighborhoods and our cities and our towns with advanced weapons and advanced delivery systems.

Yesterday, we saw a shift. Senate Democrats, who had previously obstructed a missile defense system, have now finally seen the light and have come to their senses recognizing that risk. I welcome their belated support, I only pray that it is not too late.

Our first and foremost duty to our constituents is a strong national defense. Let us hope that those in this House who have obstructed a national defense system will join their Senate colleagues and come to their senses too, recognizing that we must fulfill our constitutional duty to defend the Nation.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of March 22 to grant a rule which will limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the budget resolution for fiscal year 2000. The Committee on the Budget ordered the budget resolution reported last night and is expected to file its committee report sometime over the next few days.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by 4 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23.

As it has done in recent years, the Committee on Rules strongly suggests that Members wishing to offer amendments offer complete substitute amendments.

Members should also use the Office of Legislative Counsel and the Congressional Budget Office to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and scored, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

□ 1215

DECLARATION OF POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 120 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 120

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting H.R. 4 with Senate amendments thereto, it shall be in order to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and request or agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a closed rule for H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense bill. The rule provides for 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides that it will be in order, upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting H.R. 4, with Senate amendments, to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and request or agree to a conference with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a simple, one-sentence bill declaring that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. During remarks at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in my home State of New York, President Ronald Reagan said that "a truly successful army is one that, because of its strength and ability and dedication, will not be called upon to fight, for no one will dare provoke it."

Indeed, President Reagan's policy of peace through strength was the beginning of the end of the Cold War and established the United States as the world's only remaining superpower.

But the end of the Cold War did not bring about the end of a lasting threat to our Nation's security and our people's safety, which is why I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4, which will establish a national missile defense system.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, "eternal vigilance," wrote Jefferson, "is the price of liberty." Yet our current national missile defense has neither the ability nor the technology to ensure that either our safety or our liberty is held in the United States.

Even as we sit at the dawn of the next century, the United States could not defend itself against even a single incoming ballistic missile.

Mr. Speaker, that fact bears repeating. Our current national defense could not shoot down even one incoming ballistic missile let alone the thousands that stand ready to point toward our Nation's borders.

According to the Rumsfeld Commission, the threat to America and her people from a ballistic missile attack is not only very real but even greater than once expected. Besides thousands of nuclear warheads on ballistic missiles maintained by Russia, China has more than a dozen long-range ballistic missiles targeted at the United States, and countries like North Korea and Iran are developing ballistic missile technology and capability much more rapidly than once believed.

Another astonishing fact is that the overwhelming majority of the American people, some 73 percent, is unaware of the threat to their country, their homes, and their families. They believe we already have the technology to knock down and defeat a ballistic missile attack. We do not.

The American people are entitled to know the truth, just as they are entitled to us doing something about it to ensure their safety and their lives. They are also entitled to know the facts about the cost of a national missile defense. And the facts are that the current national missile defense plans account for one-half of 1 percent of anticipated defense spending from fiscal year 2000 through 2005 and less than 2 percent of the Department of Defense's entire modernization budget during these years.

The threat of a ballistic missile attack is real, as real as our resolve must be to protect all Americans by deploying a national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, President Reagan taught us that we could be victorious against the Cold War threat of nuclear annihilation by adopting a policy of peace through strength. Now we must be victorious against the threat of a ballistic missile attack by adopting a policy of peace through security, the security that a national missile defense will provide our country and our citizens.

I would like to commend the Committee on Armed Services chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, for their hard work on this very important measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule. The Committee on Rules has reported a series of bills to the floor under open rules in the last couple of months. But if the truth be told, Mr. Speaker, those bills could have been considered under the suspension of the rules and did not really have to come to the floor at all.

Now, when the House is about to consider legislation that is of paramount importance to every man, woman, and child in the country, the Republican party has reported out a closed rule.

What we heard earlier today during our closed session reinforces the significance of this issue. Yet we are being asked to consider it under a closed rule. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority refuses to allow even one amendment on this bill. We asked for an additional hour of debate on the bill but that was not allowed. What is at stake here, Mr. Speaker, is the future and well-being of this Nation. Yet my Republican colleagues do not want to take the time to fully debate and air this issue.

I cannot support this closed process, and I strongly urge every Member of this body who supports the democratic ideals of free and open debate to oppose this closed and unfair rule.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services yesterday indicated that, while he is opposed to the amendment that was proposed by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), he felt that the amendment should be considered by the House. The Allen amendment seeks to clarify that any national missile defense system must be proven to work before it is deployed and that any deployment decision must be weighed against other military as well as civilian priorities.

Allowing the House to consider an amendment like the Allen proposal is really not too much to ask, Mr. Speaker. Yet my Republican colleagues seem to think that allowing an alternative to their proposal to be heard on the floor is indeed too much to ask.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican Party is really interested in changing the atmosphere in this House, we do not have to go up to a mountainside and smoke

a peace pipe. All we have to do is be fair about the rules and allow the Democrats to participate on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I see little evidence of that on this rule, and I urge my members to defeat this unfair, closed rule so that we can have an open debate on the entire issue.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the ranking member that yesterday the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) outlined that there would be more than ample debate in the hour that we have on the rule now, in the two hours of debate, and the hour on consideration of the conference resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York, a new member of our committee and a valued member of our committee, for yielding me this time.

Today we embark on a crucial debate directly relevant to the lives of all American men, women, and especially our children. I would argue that the Congress of the United States has no more significant duty than to ensure the greatest level of protection for our national security.

With the dawn of the next century just a few short months away, we face a future that is bright with opportunity and promise, some of which we are realizing today, but a future that is also vulnerable to attack, including specifically missile attack, by those who would do us harm.

And let us be clear. Those who would do us harm inhabit many quarters of this ever-shrinking world. Many are actively seeking to develop and deploy the technology to provide themselves a ballistic missile capability to use against the United States of America.

We do not pursue this debate today to scare people, but rather to engage them in an open-eyed assessment of the world as it is. We all might wish to believe President Clinton's pronouncement that no American child is currently being targeted by a missile, but that is unfortunately not exactly a true statement.

Sadly, the 1964 election year Johnson campaign ad of a little girl playing in a field of flowers backdropped by an atomic cloud is still vivid and still a sickening possibility in today's world. Beyond the state of affairs today, there is also the reality that the world's bad guys are moving quickly and with the sense of purpose toward a tomorrow when they can wreak havoc and cause damage with weapons of mass destruction or mass casualty targeted against Americans and our interests.

I have always advocated investment in the eyes and ears capabilities of U.S.

intelligence so we can have as full a picture as possible about the threats we face as we develop policies to protect ourselves. We need not only to know about the missiles but also about the plans and the intentions of the Saddam Husseins and Khadafis, Khomenis and Kim Jong Ils of the world today.

Some might say that since the Cuban missile crisis we have not focused enough on these threats in recent years, perhaps because the policymakers did not want to see the dangers. But, Mr. Speaker, our intelligence says unequivocally that the threat is real, growing, and much more immediate than some had thought. So I strongly believe we must commit ourselves to putting in place a missile defense program as soon as practical.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a deceptively simple bill. Its entirety is only one sentence. But the 15 words that comprise the operative text of H.R. 4 speak volumes to the entire planet that we will not shy away from the tough challenge of making America and her people safe from a missile attack.

Support this rule and vote for H.R. 4 and do America a favor.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the American people may be surprised to know that although we have not declared it our policy to do so, we have already spent \$120 billion of taxpayers' money for a nuclear umbrella which does not exist for a threat which has never materialized.

I propose that we can save the taxpayers at least another \$120 billion by announcing to the world that we already have a nuclear umbrella. Who is going to know the difference? Lately Dr. Strangeloves are running around the Capitol today saying the sky is falling and we ought to buy a net to catch it. Save the taxpayers money.

Here is a prototype nuclear umbrella. This has about as much of a chance of repelling raindrops as the real thing would have in stopping nuclear missiles if scientific evidence is to be believed. Now, if we buy into the fear mongering, what is next? Duck-and-cover drills? Loyalty pledges? Red scare number 2? The second Cold War?

We have already proven that we can leave the post-Cold War world in peace not through preparing for war but through dedicated nuclear non-proliferation.

□ 1230

Let us work for peace and let us be brave and strong and true in defense of democratic values here at home and around the world.

Vote against the rule and vote against H.R. 4.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This debate today is going to be a serious debate. I think we ought to set the tone early. I reject as a Member of this Congress trivializing this issue with an umbrella, because 28 young Americans 8 years ago came home in body bags because we had no system to defend against. And to say that somehow an umbrella with nothing there is the way we are going to discuss this issue is absolutely disgusting to me because half of those young men and women came from my State. It is not a joke to hold an umbrella up with nothing there and say this is what we are doing.

We have no defense today against any missile system. It is a national priority that this Congress needs to address. And to trivialize this debate as has been done in this body for 30 years has got to come to an end. I think we should treat this debate with more sincerity and dignity than that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, even though I have opposed it in the past, I will vote for a missile defense system today. The first reason is the Russian spy who defected to America warned us that China is determined to destroy America. Since then, China has stolen our military secrets and China has missiles aimed at America. Russia has missiles that could reach America. North Korea has missiles that can reach America. India, Pakistan, Iran, all have nuclear capability.

But the main reason for my vote here today is very simple: Our misdirected foreign policy. It is so misdirected that if you threw it at the ground, it would miss.

Check this out. Most-favored-nation trade status for China is debated on economic merits. Beam me up. With a \$70 billion trade surplus, China is buying nuclear attack submarines and missiles with our money and has them aimed at American cities. How stupid can you be, Congress? How stupid can we be?

I have no choice today. I do not believe Congress has a choice. These policies have placed America in great danger and these policies have placed my constituents, my neighbors, my family, my friends at great risk.

Let me say one last thing. National defense and security is our number-one priority, and you cannot protect America with the neighborhood crime watch. I am changing my vote. I am voting for the missile defense system for the United States of America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman

from Pennsylvania who spoke that this debate should not be trivialized. That is why I deplore seriously the refusal of the Republican leadership to make this open to amendment.

Yes, this is a serious subject and it ought to be given full discussion and not trivialized. But what trivializes this more than the arrogant refusal to allow any amendment? The question is not simply a missile defense or not but what sort? Under what circumstances? With what tradeoffs? With what information?

The Republican leadership ran for office to take over the House a few years ago with a long list of ways in which they were going to be better, more democratic. What we have seen since is a systematic striptease in which the Republicans have systematically discarded every pretense to ethical superiority in running the House. Term limits was, of course, one of the first to go as a serious effort. But now we have a pattern. We saw it last year when we debated impeachment. We see it now that we are debating a missile defense. The more important the subject, the less there will be democratic debate on the issue.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Rules pointed out, on non-controversial measures of little significance, the Republicans are willing to give us open rules. They would undoubtedly be willing to give away ice in February—in Alaska—but when it comes to fundamental issues of great importance, political advantage and partisan maneuvering displaces commitment to democratic ideals.

The gentleman from Maine has a thoughtful alternative to the Republican proposal. It will be able to be brought up in the recommitment, because they have not yet figured out a way to snuff that one out, but there might have been other amendments. The recommitment, you only get one. There might have been other variations.

There are a number of important issues here. One is, what are the costs of this? Yes, there are people who are worried about a threat from missiles from overseas. There are 75-year-olds worried because they cannot afford to pay for the medicine that would keep them alive. There are people who live in neighborhoods who are afraid they do not have enough police protection; people who are afraid of unsafe transportation; people who are threatened by environmental hazards. We are operating in an era of limited resources. Billions and billions of dollars that go for this system are billions that will not be spent for other matters.

There are Members in this House who have told people they want to increase housing, they want to improve environmental conditions, they want to work harder to provide prescription drugs for people on Medicare. Yet they are going to vote today for a measure that might preempt all of those and not give us a chance to debate them. Where are the chances to have amendments?

The gentleman from New York who is presiding for the majority pointed out to the gentleman from Massachusetts, he quoted the gentleman from California, there are going to be 4 whole hours of debate. The gentleman's generosity is unbounded. We can debate it. But no amendments are in order. So I guess I congratulate the majority for not having abrogated the first amendment to the Constitution. They will let us talk. But where are the amendments? Where is the legislative process? No, it should not be trivialized.

By the way, this whole bill, so-called, as the gentleman from Florida said, it is a one-sentence bill. This one-sentence bill in and of itself it seems to me is of some dubious value, but even if it is simply a statement of policy, if that is considered important, why can we not debate what the impact would be on other forms of arms reduction treaties? Why can we not debate what the opportunity costs are in other funding? Why can we not debate whether or not we should do more of a study about technical feasibility?

Are we talking about protecting every inch of the United States? Well, how much is that going to cost? How feasible is it? What are the chances that money spent there will be successful as opposed to money spent in fighting disease, in fighting crime, in fighting in other theaters with conventional research?

North Korea is a threat. We have ground troops in North Korea who are at risk. Would this money be better spent in beefing up a conventional capability? Those are all significant subjects, none of which can be part of this debate. I take it back. They can be part of the debate. I do not mean to be ungracious. The gentleman from New York has kindly allowed us to talk about them. But an amendment to affect the bill, an effort to write them into policy, no, the Republicans will not have that, because it would spoil the partisan nature of this event.

The question is not simply yes or no on missile defense. That is wholly unintelligent. The question is what kind of missile defense? Under what circumstances? Is it feasible? At what cost? The Republicans quite carefully made sure that none of those could be the subject of an amendment. Because what they want out of this, apparently, is a political statement, not a genuine democratic debate.

By the way, I hope the argument is not that, "Gee, we don't have time." This House has been languorous. We have not done very much. We could debate more of these things. But it is a refusal on the part of the majority to allow serious issues to be debated.

What we have, yes, is a trivialized debate. It has been trivialized by the calculated decision of the majority to make this a political exercise and to refuse to allow any amendments which will raise any of the serious issues that ought to be debated. And so in advance

they have devalued the statement they hoped to get because they have deprived us of the chance to do it.

Unfortunately, it is not an isolated incident. We could not debate censure versus impeachment. We cannot debate the specifics of the decision factors that go into this whole question. This is a group apparently that is determined to leave as its legacy in running the House of Representatives a refusal to allow the most important questions to come before the public to be debated in a serious and thoughtful fashion. So they will get their political victory today, but it will come at the price of an informed effort to try and come forward with a policy that truly deals with the complexities and the specific questions involved.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), one of the leading experts on our Nation's defense.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

My colleagues, we have a time in the oversight committee when the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs appear before the House Committee on Armed Services as they appear before a number of committees.

Sitting there with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the other members of the committee, I usually ask as a first question, this question of our Secretary of Defense. I ask, "Could you stop, could the United States of America stop a single incoming ballistic missile today should it be coming in at an American city?" The answer is always "no." And yet most Americans think that we do have some kind of a defense.

Interestingly, if the Russian defense minister was sitting there at the witness table, he would be able to say "yes," because the Russians do have missile defenses. They have the defenses that are allowed by the ABM treaty. They have interceptors which are tipped with nuclear devices that can go off when incoming missiles come in proximity of their cities that they have decided to protect under the ABM system. They also have what are known as SA-10 and SA-12 missile defense systems which they advertise in open literature as having capability against not only airplanes but ballistic missiles.

They, like a lot of other people in the world, understand something that the Weldon bill tries to make us understand, and that is this: We live in an age of missiles. Back in the 1920s, Billy Mitchell tried to prove to us that we lived in an age of air power. To do that, he sank a number of ships, American ships, and I believe one large German ship that had been captured. It infuriated the U.S. Navy because the U.S. Navy wanted to live in the past and they did not want anything that

threatened the funding for their battleships and they thought that air power would do that. And so Billy Mitchell was a great advocate for air power. He argued for the development of air power by the United States, we refused to develop it in a timely way, and we paid to some degree the price for that in World War II. But his argument to some degree did get a few wheels spinning and we had more in World War II than we would have had if Billy Mitchell had not gone out there, ultimately getting court-martialed for the crime of saying that the United States was not ready for a conflict.

Well, today we live in an age of missiles. And for my friends that act like it is an impossible thing to shoot down a missile with a missile, that is not true. The missiles that came in on the American troops in Desert Storm and killed a number of them were ballistic missiles. They were slow ballistic missiles. But we did shoot down some of those ballistic missiles with our Patriot missile batteries. We have now upgraded those. So we have shot down the slower ballistic missiles. Our adversaries are making faster and faster missiles. My point is that we have shot down already the slower ballistic missiles and, yes, we do have the capability, if we decide to deploy.

Now, the other side throws this back at us. They say we have spent \$120 billion and we have not deployed anything. Well, that is because we have always spent that money under the condition that nothing could be deployed and now it is thrown back in our face that we have not deployed. The Weldon bill mandates deployment. It puts us all on the same page, it gives us a national purpose, and hopefully we will move forward and defend America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the bill, H.R. 4. I would have preferred the opportunity to debate an amendment that outlined what criteria and conditions need to be met before we pursue a policy to deploy a national missile defense system, an amendment like the one my colleague from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) wanted to offer. That opportunity has been denied by this closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, today we are rushing to embrace a bad idea. Today we are debating the deployment of a national missile defense system that does not work, costs too much, undermines and violates our arms control treaties, is aimed towards the wrong threat, will make us more vulnerable, not more secure, and will likely lead to a new arms race. A lot of figures regarding the cost of a national missile defense system will be thrown around in today's debate, but what is not in dispute is that over 40 years we have already spent over \$120 billion in trying to develop a

missile defense, 70 billion of that since President Reagan announced his Star Wars program in 1983, and we still have absolutely nothing but a failure to show for those tax dollars. This technology has failed 14 out of 18 tests for problems far less sophisticated than what is required by national missile defense. In short, we have a \$120 billion failure on our hands. General Shelton of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said just last year spending more money on national missile defense will only amount to a rush to failure, and yet the supporters of H.R. 4 want us to throw good money after bad and spend, at minimum, another 10.5 billion on this failed project.

At a time when we are struggling to find money for Pell grants and Federal aid to send our kids to college, when we are struggling to find money to fully fund the Federal share of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, when we are struggling to find funds to protect our environment, to repair our infrastructure and to revitalize our neighborhoods, cities and towns, we seem to have no problem finding enough money for this fabulously expensive project.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are expressing our reservations about this system are not trivializing this issue. We are raising legitimate concerns about the technical feasibility of this project, the costs and the implications of a national missile defense system. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is fiscally responsible to support H.R. 4. I think this is a bad idea. I think this could have a destabilizing effect on our national security. I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule and to oppose H.R. 4.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the American people want to hear procedural arguments or partisan jockeying. What they care about is our national security, and that is why I rise today in strong support of this rule and strong support of H.R. 4. I do so for one reason. I believe it must be our policy to deploy a national missile defense.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the real surprise today is not the bipartisan support that I believe will emerge in this House later on but that took us so long to get here. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened when I saw the results of a recent poll conducted by the Center for Security Policy. Their survey of 800 registered voters revealed a number of very troubling public misconceptions. When asked hypothetically about a ballistic missile system and if it were fired at the U.S., 54 percent of those polled believe we could destroy that missile before it caused any damage. Over half of those polled believe we were capable of protecting ourselves from a ballistic missile attack, and of course the sad reality is that we cannot. And when respondents

learned this fact that we could not, 19 percent were shocked or angry, 28 percent said they were very surprised, 17 percent said they were somewhat surprised.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what I find more troubling, the fact that so many people incorrectly believe that we can protect ourselves from missile attack or the lack of outrage on the part of so many leaders of the fact that we cannot.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is overwhelming, the threat of attack is increasing. Concerns over Russia's control over its nuclear arsenal continue to grow. China continues to develop weapons of mass destruction. North Korea recently demonstrated that its missiles are capable of striking Alaska and Hawaii. And as we know, Iran and Iraq are working to develop missile technology that will threaten the Middle East and southern Europe.

We are no longer in the era of two superpowers kept in check by mutually assured destruction. The threats of today and tomorrow come from rogue states, in some cases nations with arsenals controlled by persons who we have to admit are blind with their hatred of the U.S. The harsh reality is that we are vulnerable. It is time that this Congress and this President got serious and made it the stated policy of our government to deploy a missile defense system. It would be reckless for us to stick our heads in the sand, it would be reckless for us to ignore the threats we face today, and worse yet, the threats we will face tomorrow if we fail to act. Let us make it this country's stated goal that we will deploy a national missile defense system that will protect us from those who seek to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, to support H.R. 4.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. Sixteen years ago Ronald Reagan stood in this Hall and articulated a vision. We, the United States, or Luke Skywalker? And the Soviet Union was the Evil Empire, and we were going to build a Star Wars system, an umbrella over this country that would render the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union useless, impotent and obsolete, in his words. And of course the whole scheme was concocted by ET, not the cuddly little alien from the Spielberg movies, but the original ET, Edward Teller, his vision. In the years since then Star Wars went from the star dust and moon beams of Reagan's rhetoric to become a giant pork barrel in the sky. In fact, we have spent approximately \$50 billion on missile defense over the last 15 years with virtually nothing to show for it.

But I have some good news for my colleagues on the other side of the

aisle. The Cold War is over. We won. The Soviets never used their weapons.

Now it was not because of Star Wars, because of course there was no Star Wars in the 1980's, and there was no Star Wars in the 1990's. The reason that we won was that we had a superior political and economic and military strategy apart from Star Wars because it never existed, and now, since their internal contradictions have led to the collapse of the Soviet system, for some reason or another the majority believes that we should take up the Star Wars prequel 3 months before the new George Lucas film hits the theaters. This resolution gives us a preview of things to come, and we need to give it two thumbs down. According to the GOP script, despite the end of the Cold War we are still going to deploy missile defenses. Why? Because, we are told, there are new ballistic missile threats from North Korea, and Iraq or China because, we are told, we need to defend against accidental nuclear war at a cost of tens of billions of dollars.

This is a bad idea. The North Koreans are starving to death, and we routinely bomb the heck out of Saddam Hussein with impunity. Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons. Did he use them against us when our troops were heading towards Baghdad? No, he did not. Do my colleagues want to know why? Because we would wipe him off the face of the earth, that is why. We have overwhelming massive retaliatory capacity. If either side, any country, ever used weapons of mass destruction against us, we would destroy them. The greater threat from Korea, the greater threat from Iran is that they will put a nuclear weapon onto a freighter, put it right into the Seattle or the Boston or the San Diego port and just detonate it. We will not know where it is coming from, and we will not be able to identify the source. That is our greater threat by far, and if at any time they want to use any other means, then we will be able to give massive retaliatory response capacity to that problem.

The problem with the Republicans is, yes, the Cold War is over, but they still want Star Wars. They have arms race amnesia. They have forgotten everything but their favorite weapon system. But the real danger from the Republican plan is not the tens of billions of dollars which we are going to waste, but rather that it could touch off a new arms race between us and the Russians or the Chinese.

As the Duma meets to determine whether or not they are going to ratify the START II treaty which would result in the elimination of 3200 strategic weapons, do we really want to be talking about the deployment of a ballistic missile system that would make them even more vulnerable to a first strike from the United States? Do we want the Chinese to think that we are going to build a defensive system that allows us to attack them and they cannot attack us back? Do we not think that

they are going to go to a new round of offensive weapons by an emboldened right wing military in both countries and other countries around the world that will result in us having to spend tens of billions of other dollars? When we make a step like the Republicans ask us to do today, we not only waste tens of billions of dollars, but we wind up ultimately undermining our security because of the investment made by our potential enemies in weapons which could actually hurt the United States of America.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my Democratic colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) in the House Republican majority's continued spirit of bipartisanship.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House who has done more to promote the rights of fairness to the minority than the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and I commend him and thank him for that, but on this issue on this day I respectfully part company with him. I think this rule strikes the appropriate balance in the tension between the powers of the President as Commander in Chief and our powers and duties to set broad policy for this country. I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to micromanage a serious military strategy issue like this, and I believe that an open rule in this sort of circumstance would invite that kind of micromanagement.

I also believe that it would be an equally serious mistake for us to abrogate our responsibility and not take a position as to where our country should go in this issue. The process that begins with this legislation on this day gives us that opportunity beginning with our opportunity to offer a motion to recommit today, but, more importantly, after today, after today when decisions about how to deploy, what to deploy, when to deploy, under what circumstances to deploy will be debated and worked out in the actions of the House Committee on Armed Services, in its bills that come to this floor over the next several years and probably decades.

I certainly understand and revere the rights of the minority, but in this case I believe that the essential constitutional balance prevails, and that balance calls for us to set broad policy, which we will do in this bill by casting our vote and for the President, as our Commander in Chief, to execute that policy as he or some day she sees fit.

I support the rule as I will support the bill in the debate hereafter.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the assistant to the Democratic leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule essentially because the rule prohibits amendments

which, if adopted, will strengthen the bill and our Nation's long term security.

Yesterday in the other body, in the Senate, it unanimously passed its national defense bill with two important amendments. It conditioned a national missile defense deployment on annual authorizations and appropriations, it affirmed the United States policy to seek further cuts in Russia's nuclear arsenal. This was the right thing to do. It was a responsible thing to do.

The gentleman from Maine has authored a thoughtful amendment which should be debated in this body. That is what our responsibility is as a legislative body.

I support the Pentagon's plans to consider a national missile defense system at the turn of this century. We need to plan to guard against future long-range strategic missiles and a possible laser attack, but any system must be both affordable and capable of protecting all of our national security interests.

□ 1300

Pentagon leaders have emphasized over and over again that a rushed job would be, and I quote, a rush to failure that would cost taxpayers millions of dollars, jeopardize U.S. national security.

General Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said just last month, and I quote, that the simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense. He went on to say, and I quote, the Chiefs question putting additional billions of taxpayers dollars into fielding a system now that does not work or has not proven itself, end quote.

Our first priority must always be the long-term safety and security of American families. Without a guarantee of success, our national missile defense system may not be able to protect Americans from the threat of ballistic missiles that rogue nations like Iran and North Korea are expected to have developed by 2002.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule or to allow for this body to take up thoughtful amendments on this very critical and important issue. Oppose rash legislation that threatens to jeopardize our future national security.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and the rule. As this resolution states, the U.S. must deploy now and not just develop a national missile defense system but deploy it. This resolution and debate hopefully will spur the deployment because, as has been noted so forcefully here today, we are now defenseless against a single ballistic missile launched against American soil.

Defending our Nation against attack is so fundamental a responsibility of ours and the stakes that we are talking about are so high, that I think it is im-

portant that we better understand how our country, with its great military, has gotten into our predicament of being defenseless.

The American people need to know. The answer is that since Ronald Reagan introduced the idea of missile defense over 15 years ago, every reason in the world has been found to delay. For one, we have heard the threat discounted. In 1995, the administration predicted that no ballistic missile threat would emerge for 15 years. This past August, the administration again assured Congress that the intelligence community would provide the necessary warning of a rogue state's development and deployment of a ballistic missile threat to the United States. Then that same month, that same month, North Korea test-fired its Taepo-Dong missile. The sophistication of this missile unfortunately caught our intelligence community by surprise.

North Korea, impoverished, unstable North Korea, a regime about which the Director of Central Intelligence recently said that he could hardly overstate his concern over and which in nearly all respects, according to him, has become more volatile and unpredictable, may soon be able to strike Alaska and Hawaii, not to mention our allies and U.S. troops in Asia.

Ominously, North Korea is continuing its work on missile development. This is the very threat that was supposed to be 15 years away. Even before this rosy assessment last July, Iran tested a medium range ballistic missile. Iran is receiving aid from Russia. Not surprisingly, the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission recently concluded that the threat posed by nations seeking to acquire ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction, quote, is broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than has been reported in estimates and reports by the intelligence community.

The fact is that we live in a world where even the most impoverished nations can develop ballistic missiles and warheads, especially with Russia's aid, and thus I ask the Members to support the rule and this resolution.

This by no way is said to disparage our intelligence efforts. Instead, we just need to appreciate that these threats are difficult to detect, and that we need to react in defense. Pearl Harbor caught us by complete surprise. We have no excuse with today's missile threat.

The second excuse to delay is the ABM Treaty.

Faced with the very real threats we've heard about, I'm at a complete loss as to why our country would let an outdated treaty keep us from developing a national missile defense system. Essentially, this Administration has allowed Russia to veto our missile defense efforts. This is the same country, Russia, that is contributing to missile proliferation by working with Iran.

Fortunately, Secretary of Defense Cohen has suggested that we would not be wedded to the ABM Treaty (Jan. 20)—that this treaty

would not preclude our deployment of a defensive system. But this is only a step toward the deployment we need, and others in the Administration persists in calling the ABM Treaty "the cornerstone of strategic stability" (Berger, Feb. 8 letter).

I believe we need to get beyond a treaty that keeps us from defending our territory in the face of a very real threat—a treaty, I might add, that the Soviets secretly violated. And negotiating this treaty in a way that still precludes us from deploying the best missile defense system we can—allowing for a dumbed-down system—which is what the Administration is suggesting, is simply not acceptable.

The fact is that the Russians have nothing to fear from us. The United States doesn't start wars. To forgo defending our territory because we're afraid of what the Russians or others may say about our defensive actions is indefensible.

Third, we hear that a national missile defense system is too costly. Yes, we have made an investment in missile defense since Ronald Reagan launched his initiative, though this has been a small fraction of what American industry invests in research each year. But let's be honest here, defense is not free. And there have been some failures. But since when does success come without failure? Entering the twentieth century, the United States is the wealthiest, most technologically advanced country in the history of the world. There is no reason beyond the ideology of arms control, complacency or worse not to deploy a national missile defense now.

Before World War II, many people were stuck in a similar mindset. Leaders in England and elsewhere didn't want to develop advanced defensive weaponry. One leader stood alone though, pushing for England to develop its technology, including radar, in the cause of its national defense. His efforts encountered much resistance. Many said that there could be no defense against air power. There was some outright opposition from those who favored disarmament, including Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, seeing disarmament as a way of better dealing with Germany. Well, history has told us that the dark days England soon after suffered through would have been much darker if England had not had Winston Churchill. Radar, by the way, which Churchill tirelessly pushed, was critical to winning the Battle of Britain.

Sometimes it's not easy exercising foresight and taking preemptive action. But I cannot think of a more pressing issue for this Congress to address than defending our nation against the emerging threat of ballistic missiles. I commend the authors of this important resolution and hope it receives overwhelming support from this body.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution but I am going to oppose the rule because I think the Allen amendment should have been put in order. I wish we would have had an opportunity, like the Senate did, to take

amendments on this important national security issue.

Having said that, I do want to compliment my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and those people who have tried to work to make this into a bipartisan issue. I want to remind my colleagues, I have been on the Subcommittee on Defense for 21 years. I was there in 1983 when Ronald Reagan announced his effort to build a national missile defense system.

I happen to believe that we always have to have defense priorities. My number one defense priority today is theater missile defense. When we deploy our troops in all these countries, whether they are in the Middle East or whether they are in Saudia Arabia, wherever they are, Bosnia, we want to be able to have a credible theater missile defense system in place.

It was not until just this week that Patriot 3 had its first success. So as we come to this decision on national missile defense, I must point out to my colleagues that we still do not have the technology in place to deploy such a system, and that is why we are going to have to continue the research, continue to look at this on the year-by-year basis and, again, my hope is that the first thing we get done is theater missile defense to defend our troops.

I do believe there is a threat out there and I do believe that warning times are less than they used to be and many countries are proliferating and building ballistic missiles.

We are also going to have to work out a relationship with the Russians. This is not going to be accepted by them. We are going to have to negotiate with them. So hopefully, if we can deal with these issues, then we can go forward and have a system like this. I think we have to go into this with our eyes open.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in strong support of the underlying piece of legislation. I represent the area of Florida that includes Cape Canaveral and the issues of ballistic missiles and space technology and aerospace technology is of tremendous interest. I ran in 1994 originally for Congress in support of deploying a missile defense system.

To those people who would say right now that we do not have something

that is technically capable, I would say to them it depends on how one wants to define that. The Russians have had a missile defense system for 30 years. We currently have the Patriot system online. The technology is there. The debate is over how good it will work.

In my opinion, we should deploy the best system that we are capable of deploying now. After seeing the Rumsfeld report and personally reading the Cox report, I would say we need to make a commitment to not only deploy the best system we are capable of deploying now but to plan on upgrading that system within the next 10 years to a better, more sophisticated system, because the threat is real and the threat is great.

As parents, we are responsible for taking care of our kids and making sure they have good manners and making sure they get fed, but it would be very irresponsible if we left the front door unlocked and the window open every night allowing somebody to come in to rob, steal and commit mayhem.

What good is it for us in this country if we are going to do all of these wonderful things for Social Security and for education in America and all of the other proposed good things that we are going to do while we leave New York, Los Angeles, Boston, Miami, Philadelphia and all the great cities of this country vulnerable?

The Chinese have already said that we would not be willing to risk those cities in defense of Taiwan, and we already know, from reading the New York Times, that the Chinese have acquired the most sophisticated weapons systems.

Support the bill. Support the rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who I have had the occasion to recognize as one of the leading experts on missiles.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my distinguished colleague for his leadership on the rule. I also want to pay my respects to my good friend, the ranking Member on the Committee on Rules, who is a real gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want this debate to be focused on factual information and not rhetoric and so I am going to go through the comments made by my colleagues in opposition to this rule one at a time.

We heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts. He said this was a Republican partisan effort. When I introduced this bill last August, I reached out to the Democrat side. The bill had 24 Democrats and 24 Republicans when I dropped the bill in, because I did not want it to be a partisan battle. There were some in my party who criticized me for that.

When I introduced the bill in this session of Congress, Mr. Speaker, it had 28 Democrats and 30 Republicans. In fact, when it passed the Committee on Armed Services, the vote was 50 to 3, with Democrats joining Republicans in

support. This has been a totally bipartisan process.

Mr. Speaker, amendments could have been offered. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) could have offered an amendment. He chose not to. Now, are we being unfair, Mr. Speaker?

At the Committee on Rules yesterday there were two people who wanted amendments, one Republican and one Democrat. I opposed both because each would have taken the bill to an extreme position that perhaps would not have been the clear-cut debate that we need on this issue, which is whether or not to move forward.

Some say there has been no debate. Mr. Speaker, in the 5 years I have controlled the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, there have been over 60 hearings, briefings, classified sessions. For someone to say there has been no debate is just a case where they do not understand what in fact has transpired.

One of my colleagues on the other side said the cost. Let us look at the cost, Mr. Speaker. We have spent \$9 billion in Bosnia already. The administration's estimate for the cost of NMD is \$6 billion. So we are going to spend more to protect peace in Bosnia than we are to protect our own people.

In fact, we are spending \$10 billion this year on environmental cleanup, \$10 billion on environmental cleanup versus the administration's estimate of \$6 billion for an NMD system.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) said this is going to jeopardize our relationship with Russia. I say hogwash. If one wants to know what is going to jeopardize our relationship with Russia, Mr. Speaker, ask the administration why they cancelled the funding for the only joint Russian-American missile defense initiative that we have last October, the Ramos project.

When we were in Russia this past weekend, that is what the Russians were concerned about, that this administration cancelled all the funding for the only joint program to build confidence that we have.

Ask the administration why they cancelled the Ross-Mamaedov talks back when they took office in 1993. It was President Bush who started those talks because Yeltsin said, let us work together. What did this president do? When he came into office in 1993, he cancelled the talks and said, no, we are not going to work together in missile defense.

If one wants to talk about instability, ask the arms control crowd. The arms control crowd who was arguing against our bill today, and I am glad they are because this is what they are, this was a chart that they had inserted in a national magazine on the debate about missile defense. One of my Russian friends read this to me and he said, "Curt, I understand what you are trying to do but this is what is going to be all over Russia."

The arms control crowd, the Natural Resources Defense Council, has a chart

saying destroy Russia, killing 20 million people. This is the kind of rhetoric that inflames the Russian side, not what we are doing. I ask my colleagues to support the rule and to support the bill in a true bipartisan fashion.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the producer of the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this House should defeat this rule. It is a closed rule that silences an important voice in the national missile defense debate, and that voice is the voice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Hugh Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House last month that, and I quote, the decision to deploy a national missile defense system will be based on several factors, the most important of which will be assessments of the threat and the current state of the technology.

□ 1315

H.R. 4 does not address threat or technology, or cost, or arms control. I asked the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment I drafted, but that request was denied. The amendment provided that it would be the policy of this country to deploy a national missile defense that is proven to be effective. In other words, the system needs to work.

Second, that it would not diminish our overall national security. We have the task of making sure that we develop and we proceed with strategic nuclear arms reduction talks with Russia. Third, that it would not compromise other critical defense priorities. We have to pay attention to our troops, and as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) said a few moments ago, a theater missile defense to protect our forward-deployed troops is vitally important.

This is the position, the amendment I proposed, I believe is the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and I am dismayed that their views were shut out.

Now, H.R. 4 came up in the Committee on Armed Services, but it is interesting. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, said I did not offer this amendment in committee. Well, the truth is, I did not offer the amendment in committee because we had not even held a hearing with General Lyles. This bill was marked up in committee before we heard from General Lyles on that day.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Did the gentleman have an opportunity to offer an amendment in committee?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly did.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. But I chose not to exercise that right, because I wanted to hear from the military as to their opinions.

Does it make sense for us to commit to a program before we hear from the office that executes that program?

H.R. 4 would deploy a national missile defense system before we have tested the system, before we know whether or not it works. My amendment, however, was not designed to kill this system. On the contrary, it was designed to make sure that a national missile defense system would work.

First, national missile defense must be demonstrated to be operationally effective against the threat as defined as of the time of the deployment and as we can project for a reasonable time into the future. Does anyone disagree that we should test national missile defense before we buy it?

Second, national missile defense should not diminish the overall national security of the United States by jeopardizing other efforts to reduce threats to this country, including negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. Does anyone disagree on seeking further Russian disarmament?

Third, national missile defense must be affordable and not compromise readiness, quality of life of our troops, weapons modernization, and theater missile defense deployment. Does anyone disagree with these critical defense priorities?

H.R. 4, however, is silent on each one of these priorities. We should defeat this closed rule and allow Members the opportunity to vote to recognize that there are real world considerations for national missile defense deployment. That is the opportunity the Senate had; that is the opportunity that we should have in this House and well. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, because I just want to comment on the strangeness of my colleague from Pennsylvania's understanding of parliamentary procedure.

My objection was, and my assertion that this has been made partisan, was due to the refusal to allow the gentleman's amendment to come up on the floor of the House, the House of Representatives, the whole body, the body that represents the people.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania's answer, was well, he could have offered it in committee. That is another one of those gracious concessions that is offered only because it could not have been withheld. There are under our rules no way to stop an amendment from coming up in committee.

But the notion that because the rules allow amendments to be offered in

committee, and the gentleman said he withheld because there had not yet been a hearing held that he wanted have to take place, that that is some justification for shutting off discussion of this amendment and a vote on this amendment as an amendment, not as a recommittal, on the floor of the House, makes no sense.

This is the place where the ultimate Democratic decisions are made, and the notion that oh, okay, one could have offered an amendment in committee, committees are not wholly representative of the House. They are not supposed to be. This is the body in which public policy is supposed to be discussed, and the majority's refusal to allow a fair debate and vote as an amendment on the gentleman's proposal is what makes this unduly partisan, in my judgment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker I rise in strong support of this rule, and I would like to begin by complimenting the newest member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), who I think in a tough situation has done an extraordinarily good job in dealing with this in, as he pointed out when he recognized the gentleman from New Jersey, in a very bipartisan way. I am very encouraged by that.

I also want to say that as we look at this issue, it is obvious to me that we have a number of experts; Mr. WELDON has done a wonderful job on this, I think about the U.S. Constitution. There are no more important words in the U.S. Constitution than the five words in the middle of the preamble: "Provide for the common defense."

In light of that, it seems to me that a 15-word bill, which is exactly what this is, is the right thing for us to do. One is either for it, or one is against it. That is really what it comes down to.

So I think that we have had full consideration in committee. Both the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking minority member talked about the debate that took place in the Committee on Armed Services, and my friend from Massachusetts is right. There should be the opportunity on this floor for the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) to offer his amendment. And guess what?

Back in 1994 when we won this majority, we very proudly made an important change in the Rules of the House. Now, he and I came together in 1980, and on numerous occasions, at least a couple of times a year, the opportunity to offer a motion to recommit was in fact denied to us when we were in the minority. When we made this rules

change in 1994, we decided that it would be, in fact, a rule of the House that the minority would have an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit. And guess what? The Allen amendment can be made in order under the motion to recommit that we have.

Now, we have this hour of debate on the rule; we are going to have, in fact, 3 hours of debate.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is the chairman of the Committee on Rules telling us that in his judgment now, the motion to recommit, which has 10 minutes of debate and which is often cast in a very partisan way, and it is better than nothing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I was just going to say that we are going to have 3 hours of debate. Now, if the decision is made at this moment that the motion of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is the one that the ranking member of the committee wants to offer as a recommitment motion, for that entire 3 hours of debate, the opportunity is there, the opportunity is there for a full and open discussion on this issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the Rules of the House as I understood them, if the amendment of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) had been made in order, we could have had debate on that amendment, and then we would have also had a motion to recommit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I apparently misunderstood the gentleman saying that he would yield. I thought the gentleman said he would yield.

Mr. DREIER. May I reclaim my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I apologize for misunderstanding when I thought the gentleman said he was going to yield.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I did yield. The gentleman said that he wants to have a debate, and we are going to have debate. In fact, 3 hours of debate can take place on the Allen amendment if you all so choose. So the idea that the opportunity to offer it has been denied is crazy, because we changed the rules in 1994 to make that order.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I make a couple of points as we conclude this debate on the rule?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, of course the gentleman may conclude. He controls the time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

What I want to say is if we look at the report that has come forward from the Rumsfeld Commission which was presented to us on the House floor today in a closed meeting, the declassified segment of that makes it obvious. It says, the Rumsfeld Commission, the ballistic missile threat to the United States is broader, more mature, and evolving more rapidly than reported in estimates and reports in the intelligence community.

Now, what does that say? It says that as we look at this threat that is there from Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Russia, China, it is obvious that this is the most responsible thing for us to do. So that is why I will say again, one is either for it or one is against it. This reminds me of the debate that we had in the 1980s.

Again, I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for the great job that he has done on this.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern that the majority is not allowing amendments on this important legislation. Yesterday the Administration and the Senate were able to compromise on a similar measure, simply because the Senate Majority Leader provided the room to compromise. Unfortunately, such leadership is absent today in the House.

I don't have to remind my colleagues of the importance of this decision today. As most of you know, I am the youngest member of the House. Many people have tried to find a name for my generation, because in earlier times there was the World War I generation, the World War II generation, and the Vietnam Generation. There are no wars to name us by.

Why is that? Because we have learned how to work with other nations to reduce the threat of armed conflict between the great powers. We have learned that effective diplomacy, backed by the threat of the use of force, can help defuse this threat among members of the international community.

Of course, the threats posed by rogue states such as Iraq and North Korea—who have been ostracized by the international community—have dramatically changed the rules. I believe that we need to prepare for the asymmetric threats posed by nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. However, we should not act impetuously.

The Administration has requested that we amend H.R. 4 in order to make clear that the decision to deploy a missile defense system is contingent on a variety of factors, including an assessment of the costs and feasibility of the project. The rule, however, prevents us from taking this sensible step. Instead, it asks that the House make the decision for the President after 2 hours of debate, without any consideration of what such a project entails.

The rule also prevents us from reaffirming our commitment to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. It jeopardizes the adoption of the START II treaty by the Duma in Moscow. Indeed, the Russian parliament is also addressing concerns over weapons of mass destruction. To show our support for strategic arms reduction, we ought to demonstrate our commitment, yet we are unable to do so because of this rule.

As the legislative branch, we have a right to be involved in foreign policy decisions. Yet we need to use this right responsibly.

We learned in the 1980s that relentlessly pursuing the goal of a national missile defense system without any realistic assessment of the costs involved is a bad way to make foreign policy.

By not allowing amendments, the majority is again acting in their own political interests, not the interests of sensible, prudent policy. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	Dickey	Hyde
Andrews	Doolittle	Isakson
Armey	Doyle	Istook
Bachus	Dreier	Jenkins
Baker	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Ballenger	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Barcia	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Barr	Ehrlich	Kasich
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Kelly
Bartlett	English	King (NY)
Barton	Everett	Kingston
Bass	Ewing	Knollenberg
Bateman	Fletcher	Kolbe
Bereuter	Foley	Kuykendall
Berry	Forbes	LaHood
Biggart	Fossella	Largent
Bilbray	Fowler	Latham
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	LaTourrette
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Blunt	Galleghy	Leach
Boehlert	Ganske	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Gekas	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Gibbons	Linder
Boyd	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Bryant	Gilman	Lucas (OK)
Burr	Goode	Manzullo
Callahan	Goodlatte	McCollum
Calvert	Goodling	McCrery
Camp	Goss	McHugh
Campbell	Graham	McInnis
Canady	Granger	McIntosh
Cannon	Green (WI)	McIntyre
Castle	Greenwood	McKeon
Chabot	Gutknecht	Metcalf
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	Mica
Chenoweth	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Collins	Hayes	Moran (KS)
Combest	Hayworth	Morella
Cook	Hefley	Murtha
Cooksey	Herger	Nethercutt
Cox	Hill (MT)	Ney
Cramer	Hilleary	Northup
Crane	Hobson	Norwood
Cubin	Hoekstra	Nussle
Cunningham	Horn	Ortiz
Davis (VA)	Hostettler	Ose
Deal	Houghton	Oxley
DeLay	Hulshof	Packard
DeMint	Hunter	Paul
Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson	Pease

Peterson (PA)	Scarborough	Tancredo
Petri	Schaffer	Tauzin
Pickering	Scott	Taylor (MS)
Pickett	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)
Pitts	Sessions	Terry
Pombo	Shadegg	Thomas
Porter	Shaw	Thornberry
Portman	Shays	Thune
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Tiahrt
Quinn	Shimkus	Toomey
Radanovich	Shows	Turner
Ramstad	Shuster	Upton
Regula	Simpson	Walden
Reyes	Sisisky	Walsh
Reynolds	Skeen	Wamp
Riley	Skelton	Watkins
Rodriguez	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Rogan	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Rogers	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Rohrabacher	Souder	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Wexler
Roukema	Spratt	Whitfield
Royce	Stearns	Wicker
Ryan (WI)	Stenholm	Wilson
Ryun (KS)	Stump	Wolf
Salmon	Sununu	Young (AK)
Sanford	Sweeney	Young (FL)
Saxton	Talent	

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Moore
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Baird	Hill (IN)	Napolitano
Baldacci	Hilliard	Neal
Baldwin	Hinchee	Oberstar
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa	Obey
Becerra	Hoefel	Olver
Bentsen	Holden	Owens
Berkley	Holt	Pallone
Berman	Hooley	Pascrell
Bishop	Hoyer	Pastor
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Phelps
Borski	(TX)	Pomeroy
Boswell	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Boucher	John	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rothman
Capps	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kildee	Rush
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Carson	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Clay	Klecza	Sanders
Clayton	Klink	Sandlin
Clement	Kucinich	Sawyer
Condit	LaFalce	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lampson	Serrano
Costello	Lantos	Sherman
Coyne	Larson	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Levin	Snyder
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Strickland
DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Stupak
DeGette	Luther	Tanner
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Tauscher
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	Martinez	Thurman
Dingell	Mascara	Tierney
Dixon	Matsui	Towns
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Traficant
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (CO)
Edwards	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Engel	McGovern	Velazquez
Eshoo	McKinney	Vento
Etheridge	McNulty	Visclosky
Evans	Meehan	Waters
Farr	Meek (FL)	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Filner	Menendez	Weiner
Ford	Millender	Weygand
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Wise
Gejdenson	Miller, George	Woolsey
Gephardt	Minge	Wu
Gonzalez	Mink	Wynn
Gordon	Moakley	
Green (TX)	Mollohan	

NOT VOTING—9

Archer	Buyer	Frost
Boehner	Clyburn	Myrick
Burton	Coburn	Payne

□ 1343

Messrs. BOSWELL, KLECZKA, MATSUI, BISHOP, HINCHEY and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 57 on H. Res. 120, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 120, I call up the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 4 is as follows:

H.R. 4

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to House Resolution 120, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, before beginning, I would like to remind all Members who attended this morning's briefing with the Rumsfeld Commission that the briefing was classified. Accordingly, during the next several hours of debate, Members should take extreme care not to discuss any of the details or specifics of what they heard.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a 15-word bill stating, and I quote, "That it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense." The bill is clear in its intent, elegant in its simplicity and reflects a bipartisan belief that all Americans should be protected against the threat of ballistic missile attack.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest frustration of my life, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has been to persuade our own government to protect our own citizens from nuclear attack. This is a threat that is not sometime in the future, it is a threat that is here this minute. As a matter of fact, the threat has already passed.

There is a scenario about President Yeltsin of Russia getting on the hot line to our President and saying the following: "Mr. President, some dumb fool has pushed the wrong button over here and we've got an intercontinental ballistic missile with 10 multiple re-entry vehicles on it heading your way. We can't call it back, we can't shoot it

down, and thought you ought to know about it."

The President calls over to the people in the Pentagon and tells them what he has heard and tells them to take care of it. They have to tell him, "Mr. President, we can't defend against that one intercontinental ballistic missile launched by accident."

That is not way out. That could happen. It could have already happened. As a matter of fact, a few years ago, the Norwegians launched a weather rocket in Norway. The sensors in Russia mistook that launch for a launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile from us on them, and they were literally minutes away from launching an attack against our country in retaliation; minutes away before they had it sorted out and called it off. That is what we are facing today. That is the threat. It is right here.

We have been trying to warn this administration and the American people of the dangers we face. I think back in history of all the many warnings that we had before Pearl Harbor. Those warnings were not heeded, and we see what happened. We have had many warnings to date on all sides of the many threats we face from throughout this world, of all kinds. The warnings are not being heeded.

We tried to pass a national missile defense back in 1995, the 1996 Defense Authorization bill. The President vetoed it. We have tried to do some other things since that time. We have had to try to take one step at a time to bring the administration to the realization of what is happening and what we need to do to properly defend this country.

After the President vetoed that bill, he said that there was no threat facing this country; we did not need a national missile defense. As a matter of fact, he even had the CIA issue a National Intelligence Estimate which politicized the issue and was phrased this way: "Aside from the declared nuclear powers, it will be 10 or 15 years before rogue nations, other nations, will develop a capability." I said to myself, "That is misleading. These other countries can buy the capability from the countries which have it right now. They do not have to do it as an indigent thing on their part."

I remember calling up the Director of the CIA at that time and trying to get him to change that National Intelligence Estimate to more clearly reflect the true state of affairs. He would not do it. So we had to appoint this Rumsfeld Commission, a bipartisan commission, to study the question and come back and give us an independent assessment of the threats we face.

After studying the seriousness of the question over a period of about a year, they came back, in a bipartisan way, unanimously, and said that instead of us having to be concerned about 10 or 15 years away from the threat, we would have little or no warning of a system deployed somewhere else that could impact on us in that way.

Even after the report came out, the administration still maintained that they would go on with the 3-by-3 policy they had, which meant they would study the question for 3 more years and, at the end of that time, if the threat was real, then we would decide whether or not to deploy the system.

So here we are today, after all this time, one step at a time, now trying to get them to utter that one word: Deploy.

North Korea's launch of a 3-stage ballistic missile last August was one of a number of disturbing events that confirmed the Rumsfeld Commission's findings and compelled the Administration to concede that the threat was not a decade away. Earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Cohen publicly confirmed the Administration's updated perspective on the threat in stating [quote] "that there is a threat and the threat is growing." [unquote]

Technology has matured to the point where it is feasible to move forward with plans to deploy a national missile defense system. There will always be test failures and there will always be technological challenges. But Americans have never shied away from a challenge, and this is certainly no reason not to proceed in the face of a threat that gets worse by the day. And as this week's successful PATRIOT missile test demonstrated, missiles can intercept other missiles.

Even with Congress adding funding to missile defense programs during the past four years, the Administration has just recently recognized that its own budgets were inadequate. To its credit, the Administration has budgeted, for the first time, a level of funding intended to support an initial deployment of a national missile defense system. And just to put cost in perspective, the cost of a national missile defense system, by the Administration's own estimates, will comprise less than one percent of the overall defense budget, and less than two percent of our military modernization budget over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, national missile defense is necessary, feasible, and affordable. But in spite of the growing consensus that the threat is real, progress on technology development, and increased funding, the Administration has steadfastly refused to commit to actually deploy a national missile defense. H.R. 4 fills this void and will put this House on record making an important commitment to each and every American that they will be defended.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) be recognized to manage, at the end of my statement, the balance of the time on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, a bill to declare it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

Many of my colleagues know me as a strong advocate for a strong national defense, maybe even doctrinaire when

it comes to taking care of our troops. Fair enough. As my colleagues should also know, my support does not extend to all things defense, nor is it without qualification. Today's topic, national missile defense, is a case in point.

For some 15 years, I have been concerned that various proposals for deploying a national missile defense system were unjustified and too expensive. Further, I believe that any effort to do so would siphon needed resources from what I considered to be higher priority defense needs. Thus, I have not been among the voices advocating deployment of a national missile defense system. Instead, while others have been speaking passionately on the subject over the years, I have been listening.

I am persuaded by the facts from current intelligence estimates and the events of the past year, Mr. Speaker, that the technology needed to develop an ICBM capable of delivering a warhead of mass destruction against large portions of the United States is today in the hands of at least one so-called "rogue" actor. Worse, much of the needed technology has been demonstrated. And, as my good friend and former colleague, Ron Dellums, would say, "I can see lightning and I can hear thunder." Accordingly, I now believe it is not only possible, but probable, that significant portions of the United States will be threatened by ICBM delivered warheads of mass destruction sometime before the year 2005; time the administration now says it needs to deploy a suitable, limited national missile defense system.

I also believe that \$6.6 billion included in the administration's fiscal year 2000 future years defense plan for national missile defense deployment related activities recognizes this threat development and tacitly acknowledges that the administration also views the ultimate deployment of a limited national defense missile system as inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not just about a national missile defense system, nor can it be. To successfully defend America from an ICBM delivered threat, we need to act on a potential threat of a missile over its entire life; not just the last 15 minutes to do so.

Priority must be given to our first line of defense: Aid and diplomacy, counterproliferation programs, and arms control agreements. Although not perfect, these programs work and are relatively cheap. More importantly, by reducing or preventing the number and sophistication of ICBMs that might threaten us, they make national missile defense system technically feasible. Deterrence also works, and since these forces already exist, it is the logical second line of defense.

□ 1400

Finally, I now think deployment of a limited national defense system, as a third and final line of defense, is as advisable as it is inevitable. At the same time, however, I believe we must guard

against the national missile defense program that undercuts the first and second lines of defense.

This brings us to H.R. 4, a simple declaration that we are committed to ultimately deploying a national missile defense, period. It is an opportunity to move past the philosophical debate that has divided us, to move past who is and who is not willing to defend America. Therefore, I must admit to my disappointment with the administration for considering this legislation to be unnecessary and withholding their support on that basis. Nevertheless, it is significant that its concerns do not rise to the level of a veto threat. Thus, I would ask my colleagues to keep this fact in mind during deliberations here today.

In my opinion, H.R. 4 does not go beyond the administration's program for a limited national missile defense in any way. According to the Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 4 will not increase missile defense costs one cent. More importantly, it does not compel a national missile defense system architecture that is incompatible with the ABM Treaty. Equally important, Mr. Speaker, it does not mandate a deployment date or condition. Thus, it does not generate a rush to failure by calling for deployment of an inadequately tested or ineffectual system.

The new reality is that a lot has changed since the strategic defense initiative debate was joined some 16 years ago. A lot has changed since last year, and yesterday's truths are no more. So I ask my colleagues to approach H.R. 4 with an open mind, try to consider it as a good-faith effort to establish a bipartisan consensus, and I will repeat this, a bipartisan consensus on defending America. That is what I believe it is.

Mr. Speaker, our most distinguished colleagues on the subject of missile defense, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), two respected Members who have in the past been disagreeing on this issue, have joined together in a significant collaboration to provide us with a rare and distinct opportunity to rise above our differences and move the national missile defense debate forward on a less philosophical and less partisan basis. For the good of the country and for the good of this institution, I believe in the strongest possible terms that we should seize this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and pass H.R. 4.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for coming together to write and draft H.R. 4 and provide us with this historic opportunity.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 4, "A bill to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense." Let's face the fact that the ballistic missile threat is not, I repeat, is not decreasing, it's here now and growing. The deployment of a national missile defense system is necessary for protection from rogue nations such as North Korea and Iran.

Alaska is still on the front line, as it was during the cold war, but today's threat is from the increase of important military technology, including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missiles. In recent years, ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction technologies have increased at an alarming rate. In fact, rogue states such as North Korea and Iran have arsenals which are growing by the day. Alaska is within the sites of these rogue nations.

Residents of Alaska are concerned about the fact that there is no protection from the threat of a ballistic missile attack. The Alaska state legislature recently passed a resolution calling on the President and Congress to provide for the common defense of our nation and the deployment of a national missile defense system. We not only owe it to Alaskans to protect them from the threat of a ballistic missile attack, but to the entire United States.

Today, we can deliver on a policy that will move the defense of our nation forward. I urge your support of H.R. 4.

Mr. Speaker I include for the RECORD a copy of the Alaska House Joint Resolution.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8 IN THE
LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

A resolution relating to a national ballistic missile defense system.

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the collapse of the Soviet Union has rendered obsolete the treaty constraints and diplomatic understandings that limited the development and deployment of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems during the Cold War; and

Whereas the world has consequently witnessed during this decade an unprecedented proliferation of sophisticated military technology, including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missiles; and

Whereas the United States has recognized that it currently has no means of protecting all of its citizens from attack by these new threats and has initiated a program to develop and deploy a national ballistic missile defense system; and

Whereas four locations in the state are currently being considered as sites for deployment of the intercept vehicles for this system; and

Whereas each of these locations provides the unmatched military value of a strategic location from which Americans living in all 50 states can be defended as required by the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, throughout Alaska's history as a territory and a state, Alaska's citizens have been unwavering in their support of a strong national defense while warmly welcoming the men and women of our armed forces stationed here;

Be it resolved, That the Twenty-First Alaska State Legislature calls upon the President, as Commander In Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, to provide for

the common defense of our nation by selecting an Alaska site for the deployment of the national ballistic missile defense system.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Floyd D. Spence, Chair, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable John Warner, Chair, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I want to thank both him and our distinguished ranking member the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their leadership in working to bring a solid bipartisan resolution to the House floor.

I want to set the tone, Mr. Speaker, for the debate and why we are here, so I want to outline for my friends why we are offering this bill at this time.

It was back in 1995, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States vetoed our Defense Authorization bill; and in his veto message, one of the key elements that he referred to was that our intelligence community does not foresee a missile threat in the coming decade. This is President Clinton. And he went on to say that we should not force an unwarranted deployment decision then, which we had in our bill, again with a bipartisan vote, and so he vetoed the legislation.

Since that point in time, Mr. Speaker, the intelligence community, in support of the Rumsfeld Commission's findings, which were briefed to Members of Congress on the House floor today in an unprecedented 90-minute closed session, has stated the threat is here now.

In fact, the intelligence community publicly has said that North Korea, with their test of a three-stage Taepo Dong rockets on August 31 of last year demonstrated that it can put a small payload with a chemical or biological or small nuclear warhead into the heartland of the U.S., not to just Alaska or Hawaii, but to the heartland of the U.S. That is the first time we ever faced such a threat.

With the Rumsfeld Commission and intelligence community now in total agreement on the threat then, the question is, let us make a deployment decision so that we can move forward. Unfortunately, the administration has chosen not to do that. This is the statement of Defense Secretary Bill Cohen on February 1 of this year. This statement says, and I would ask my col-

leagues to look at this, "If the President decides that the deployment should go forward," if he decides, "next June the President would make that decision."

This bill, make no mistake about it, is a clear and definitive difference between the administration's policy of waiting a year until June and us making that decision right now. We need to make that decision now. It does not mean we know the architecture, how long it will take. It does not mean that we should immediately abandon the ABM Treaty or have the Russians in fact think we are trying to back them into a corner. Because some who will support this bill want to keep the ABM Treaty until we can negotiate with the Russians. So the bill was written in such a way as to allow a number of Members in each party to support it.

Let me talk for a moment since we have now identified the fact that the threat has been verified by the intelligence community. Some would say, what about the cost? As I mentioned during the debate on the rule, we have today spent \$9 billion on Bosnia protecting the Bosnians and the people in the Balkans.

This system the President is proposing would be less than or, at most, equal to what we will spend in the Balkans, less than what we spend each year on environmental cleanup, less than one half of one percent of our total defense acquisition budget.

The third issue that is raised is this will destabilize our relationship with the Russians. We heard that repeatedly. This past weekend, eight of us, two Democrats and six Republicans, along with Don Rumsfeld, former Defense Secretary, the former CIA Director Jim Woolsey for President Clinton, and Bill Schneider, former Deputy Secretary of State, traveled to Moscow and we briefed the Duma on why we are doing this. This is not about destabilizing our relationship.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution and vote "yes."

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4. Simply stated, this bill is wrong. It does nothing to advance our technological capability to protect America. And even worse, it could reverse ongoing efforts to dismantle Russia's nuclear arsenal.

Today's vote would wager America's national security. Our Nation would be dependent on a nonexistent system that has failed 14 out of 18 recent tests. If this bill actually becomes law, it will lock us into automatic deployment of a national missile defense system without regard to cost to our taxpayers or the system's effectiveness or its impact on relations with our allies.

This bill is a blank check to defense contractors and a hollow promise to

Americans who are rightly concerned about our national security. However, instead of spending billions of dollars committing to deploy a system that is unlikely to work undermining our national security, we should focus on defense initiatives we know will make American families safer, conducting tougher arms control and verification measures, continuing the dismantling of Russia's nuclear weapons, engaging in a coordinated effort against terrorism, and making sure our troops have the training, equipment, and quality-of-life programs that they need and deserve.

Finally, this vote really sends the wrong message at the wrong time. Why, Mr. Speaker, are we pushing this vote just days before the Russian Prime Minister is set to arrive in Washington in the midst of U.S. efforts to negotiate modifications to the ABM Treaty and just as the Russian Duma has asked President Yeltsin to start the ratification process for START II?

We must be vigilant in our attempt to keep efforts on track to reduce nuclear weaponry. We must not allow this bill to turn back the clock on these efforts. For these reasons, I urge the House to reject H.R. 4, reject the automatic deployment of weapons derived of latter-day Star Wars mentality, and, if necessary, call on the President to veto this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to very much express my appreciation to our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for the wonderful work they have done. And congratulations to both the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4. This morning prior to the start of this debate, every Member had the opportunity to be briefed on the growing threat to Americans from ballistic missiles. What is extremely alarming is the emerging threat posed by North Korea and Iran. As we know, both countries are of particular concern because they are actively seeking to develop medium- to long-range ballistic missiles. In fact, with regard to North Korea, the Rumsfeld Commission issued a clear warning. Their report said:

There is evidence that North Korea is working hard on the Taepo Dong 2 (TD-2) ballistic missile . . . the TD-2 could be deployed rapidly . . . This missile could reach major cities and military bases in Alaska and the smaller, westernmost islands in the Hawaiian chain. Light-weight variations of the TD-2 could fly as far as 10,000 km, placing at risk western U.S. territory . . . from Phoenix, Arizona, to Madison, Wisconsin.

The actual launch of a three-stage Taepo Dong 1 in August 1998, just a month after that

report was issued, served as unambiguous demonstration of North Korea's capability. The threat emanating from unfriendly rogue nations like North Korea is why I strongly support this legislation.

Unfortunately, opponents of this bill argue that the U.S. is not ready to deploy missile defense and that the system is not technically mature. Others will say, the system is too costly and that the bill mandates deployment and ignores important issues such as the threat environment, ABM treaty implications and START agreements. To those who oppose this legislation on these grounds, I say the language of the bill is simple. It states: "That it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense."

What is important is that it does not say that missile defense should be deployed before it is ready or technically mature. It does not say that the U.S. should deploy a missile defense system regardless of cost or that policy makers should ignore the threat environment. Perhaps most important, the bill does not say that the U.S. should abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty nor does it say the U.S. should abide by the treaty.

H.R. 4 simply says the Congress and the Administration are committed to protecting American citizens against ballistic missile attack.

The White House says that it wants to protect the American people against the emerging long-range threat and asserts that the decision to deploy National Missile Defense will be based on four factors: (1) the threat environment; (2) the cost of the system; (3) treaty implications, and; (4) the technology and operational effectiveness of the system.

If handled in an expeditious manner, it is my view that this is not an unreasonable list of considerations. In fact, as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense I will be very interested in the cost of the system.

Therefore, I believe this bill is an opportunity to get bipartisan agreement on a critical policy and yet it is flexible enough to allow for continued discussion on matters concerning cost, technology and treaty implications.

The time is right to secure an agreement on the policy of protecting our citizens against a potential limited ballistic missile attack. I commend Mr. WELDON for introducing this legislation and I strongly urge Members to vote for the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a scripture that I believe in that goes this way: It says, "If you are prepared, you shall not fear."

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the Cox Commission, and a former member of the Committee on Intelligence, I find this a very interesting debate that we find ourselves in.

I remember the early 1980s we were standing here debating something called the MX missile. I noticed how many people stood up and said, this will enhance the risk and buildup and

we should not do it. That did not happen. Then later on we got into something we called "nuclear freeze," and some people stood on floor and said, if we do that, the other nations will have to go along with this, as the Soviet Union. Fortunately, we did not do that one either.

Then we got into something called Krasnoyarsk, and that is where many people were saying they do not have that radar in violation of the treaty. It turned out they did. And when they came down, they even acknowledged that they did.

Now we find ourselves in a position where people are standing up and saying, Mr. Speaker, the Cold War is over. There is nothing more to worry about. Where have they been? What about Iraq, Iran, China, Korea, all of these particular areas that are still doing these things?

I think it interesting as we hear the President and other dignitaries stand up and they say there are no missiles pointed at the United States. Past Director of the CIA, Jim Woolsey, stood up at one time and made this statement. "How long would it take to reprogram those missiles?" He used this example. He said, "As long as it takes my arm to go from here to there." So big deal that they are not programmed at us. Basically, they think that we think that they are.

Does anyone in their right mind actually think Saddam Hussein if he had these weapons of mass destruction would not use them against the United States of America? What is it they need? The weapon of choice in a rogue nation happens to be a missile. They do not need big armies. They do not need big navies. They do not need a big air force. So what do they need? They need a missile. And we know they have a missile. They need a warhead. And we know that they have a warhead. And we know that they have a guidance system.

I would urge my colleagues to support the resolution and this bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans have lived their entire lives under the threat of nuclear Armageddon. At the conclusion of the Cold War, many hoped that threat would subside. But today rogue states are developing ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

China has at least 18 ICBMs capable of hitting the United States and is stealing our nuclear secrets. Russia has thousands of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, and that society is fraying at the edges in its ability to control each military unit that possesses nuclear weapons and to control each of its scientific institutes is not assured.

Further, in addition to the risk of ICBMs, smuggling things into the United States is demonstrably easy. A nuclear weapon is smaller in many cases than a child. And one could only

imagine a Saddam Hussein holding a press conference in Los Angeles where one of his agents unveils that they have snuck into my city a dummy nuclear weapon while, God forbid, holding a press conference in Baghdad displaying a real nuclear weapon.

Missile defense can be one element of our security, and this bill is broad enough to encompass a cost-effective approach toward missile security. But it is also broad enough so that it could be interpreted as spending all of our available security resources on missile defense. We instead must devote some of those to diplomatic efforts to ensure international support of nonproliferation.

□ 1415

We must spend resources on counter-intelligence. We must spend resources on domestic security so we are confident that biological poisons cannot be surreptitiously entered into our water supply. We must spend funds on border security so that the chance that a nuclear weapon that is sought to be smuggled into America is caught in that process is at least as good as the possibility that an ICBM aimed at America would be destroyed. We must cooperate with Russia as well.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the adoption of this resolution and its reasonable interpretation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and commend the leadership for bringing this issue to the floor today. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will have the courage to vote to declare it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, Colorado Springs is ground zero for the missile launch warning and tracking system for the United States military. I have visited the incredible facilities at NORAD, Cheyenne Mountain, the U.S. Space Command, and Schriever Air Force Base on many occasions.

In fact, on one occasion when I visited NORAD, they put me in front of a monitor and they simulated an attack on the United States. A missile came over the polar region from the Soviet Union and they told me what that missile was, what its explosive power was, where it was going to hit, and I said, "This is magnificent. This is state of the art. What do we do now?" And they said, "Nothing." They said we might be able to warn, give a short warning to some of the people that are going to be killed by it, but not enough warning for them to escape. We can do nothing. I do not think most of the American people realize that.

I wonder how it sits with the American people. I wonder how my colleagues who are opposed to this policy

can look their constituents in the eye and say, "We shouldn't try to build a system to protect you and your families."

I have listened to the arguments coming from the President over the years who has opposed this and others and they make some points. We need to consider all of these points. But, Mr. Speaker, to not even try sickens me. I hope all Members will, when considering their vote on H.R. 4, think about the people that sent them here to represent them but also sent them here to protect them from things like this.

That building across the river over there that we call the Defense Department, I have always thought it curious that we called it the Defense Department but it cannot defend us against the number-one threat to America today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for their bipartisan and tireless effort to bring this legislation to the floor and thank our committee leadership, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for giving us this opportunity.

The Constitution says that one of our foremost responsibilities is to provide for the common defense. I do not think there is a Member here who does not hold in his or her heart that responsibility very highly. But there will be those who argue that this is not the right way to provide for the common defense. I respectfully submit that they are wrong. This is the right way to provide for the common defense. Some say that the risk is not there or we are exaggerating it. I believe that our best judgment from our best intelligence compels us to conclude otherwise. Some say the technology will not work yet. They are right. But the technology for virtually every major weapons system did not work in the early stages. The technology for our space program did not work in the early stages. The technology of corporate America rarely works in the early stages. Technology never works if you do not try. This is about trying to make this technology work.

Others will say that other priorities should take precedence over this provision for the common defense. There are other important priorities. There is no priority more important than defending this country from attack. Because nothing else we do is possible if we fail to defend the country from attack. And how much are we asking to invest in this? Over the next 5 years, we will spend about \$10 trillion of the tax-

payers' money to develop this country on education, health care, transportation, all the other things that we do. This program will spend about one-tenth of 1 percent of that amount of money. The other 99.9 percent will be otherwise spent.

This is a wise choice. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security for yielding me this time and for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

I am pleased to express my strong support for this important legislation, H.R. 4, a bill which declares our Nation's policy to be able to deploy a missile defense.

Each of us, after hearing this morning the findings of the Rumsfeld Commission, more fully understands the extensiveness and the seriousness of our national security concerns. Each of us understands that the ballistic missile threat is growing and presents not only a danger to our men and women deployed overseas but also now to our citizens here at home. Each of us understands that today our Nation does not have the capability to defend ourselves against a ballistic missile attack.

Today, we take important action to address this threat. Coupled with the vote in the Senate yesterday, we can now assure the American people that we are moving ahead with the deployment of an appropriate national missile defense shield.

Today's vote is timely for another reason. Just yesterday, a senior White House official concluded that Chinese espionage at our U.S. nuclear labs facilitated their efforts to modernize China's nuclear capability, thereby improving the ability of Chinese missiles to strike American cities.

Even more alarming is the possibility that China will pass on nuclear secrets to other nations, such as Pakistan and North Korea, as it has repeatedly done before.

Many deserve credit for this vote today, but I want to single out the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) who has tirelessly and steadfastly worked to educate all of us and the American people on the necessity to deploy a ballistic missile defense system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a simple, straightforward, 15-word bill. But its simplicity belies the profound implications it has for our Nation. Accordingly, I urge all Members to fully support this legislation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress and as a mother and as a grandmother, I take deadly seriously the decision to commit the United States to the deployment of a missile defense system. I see

this proposal as nothing more than the beginning of Cold War II. And for me it is not just about the money, and it is not just about whether an antimissile defense system works, although we have already spent \$55 billion and we still have not developed a technology that will work, and it is not just about whether it is truly defense. The fact is that America's borders and ports are open to penetration at much less cost and much less risk. So even if we could develop a bullet that could hit a bullet, it still remains not the best and most direct route from here to security.

We should begin that journey by canceling plans to proceed with the deployment of a national missile defense system, because it is in our security interest to do so. Then we could put more emphasis on measures to reduce strategic arsenals around the world. For example, we could apply some of those billions of dollars to programs like the Nunn-Lugar program to assist the Russians in dismantling nuclear weapons. Make no mistake about it, a military buildup, which is what this is, brings us closer to war.

My granddaughter, Isabelle, celebrated her first birthday this week. For her sake, we must put our energy, our resources, our intelligence and our dollars into actively, proactively pursuing peace.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one thing that housewives and our other citizens across the Nation need to know, because I have sat in focus groups and listened to them say over and over again that they thought that there was a defense. And interestingly, the mothers of this Nation seem to be the most outraged when the moderator tells them, no, there is no defense. They say, "Well, that's outrageous. Of course our country has a defense against incoming ballistic missiles."

Now, it has been argued over and over that we have spent \$120 billion and we have not produced or built any system. Well, that is because every bill that we have put forward that has authorized expenditure of money has specifically kept that money from going toward production. We have said in every authorization bill and every appropriation bill, you can research, you can do all kinds of analysis, you can't build anything. So now the opponents of national missile defense say, well, we haven't built anything. Well, that is right, and that is why the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is on the floor today, to move the country forward in a unified manner and build something. And for those folks like the gentlewoman who just spoke who say that they will rely on mutually assured destruction, the problem that we have now is that it appears that there are certain people on

this globe like Mr. Khadafi who will take that bet. They will go along with mutually assured destruction. Mr. Khadafi has said that if he had the missiles when we backed him down in the Gulf of Sidra, he would have fired on New York City. Unfortunately, because of arms sales and the proliferation of missile technology, Mr. Khadafi may well soon have the ability to carry out what he has stated that he will do.

Now, can we hit a bullet with a bullet? Well, yes we have done that. In fact, when Adolf Hitler fired the first missiles, those slow cruise missiles that he called buzz bombs at London in World War II, within a few weeks we designed a system to hit those slow-moving bullets with other bullets, with real bullets, and shoot them down. When we had American troops shot at by those Scuds, which are ballistic missiles, we hit those bullets with bullets, albeit slow bullets, we shot them down. Can we shoot down faster bullets? Absolutely. With a computing power that is millions of times above what it was just 10 or 12 or 15 years ago, of course we have that capability. But as long as we have conditions in our authorization bills that say you can research and develop forever but don't ever build anything, of course we never will build anything.

Finally, every time a threatening system has come before this country, has faced this country, whether it was the advent of the machine gun, or the tank, or radar, or enemy aircraft, we have built defense against those systems to protect our people. If we do not build a system to defend against incoming ballistic missiles, we will have turned down that most important duty for the first time in our history.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4. I think we all know and I think the American people know that the issue before us is as much about politics as it is about a meaningful debate over national security policy. It appears to me that the Republican Party views missile defense as a good issue for the year 2000 elections. How else could we find ourselves in the sorry position of being asked to write a blank check to build a system that is unproven, that threatens to undermine the arms control efforts of the last six administrations, that could easily be thwarted, that could lead to a second nuclear arms race, and would divert billions of dollars from other neglected defense and nondefense programs?

This is certainly a prime example in my opinion of dumb public policy. Apart from squandering billions of dollars on a system that has not been successfully tested, this proposal poses a threat to our national security in three other ways: First, it provides a false sense of security while doing nothing to combat perhaps our most pressing security threat, which is terrorism. A

rogue state or a terrorist group is far more likely to deliver a bomb or a chemical or biological attack in a suitcase, a subway train, as was done in Japan, or in a Ryder truck.

Second, it will divert resources from other neglected defense programs. Over the past several months, we have heard compelling and professional testimony from the heads of all uniformed services on many other emerging threats to our armed forces, from laser technology that can blind our pilots to sophisticated computer attacks. And every one of the service chiefs has spoken of the immediate need to provide adequate pay and benefits for our most important military asset, our people in the military service, thousands of whom still depend on food stamps to provide for their families.

□ 1430

Instead of addressing these issues today, here we are debating spending billions and billions and billions of taxpayers' dollars for the return of Star Wars.

Third, deploying a national missile defense system jeopardizes the START process.

To quote one commentator: "The only thing this national missile defense system is ever likely to intercept is billions of taxpayer dollars."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4, and I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor.

As my colleagues know, I grew up at a time when we had a worldwide threat. I can remember when I was going to school and our teachers would call drop drills, and we had to dive under our desk and turn away from the windows. We lived in constant threat of nuclear attack. Lately that threat has seemed to have disappeared, and the President said in the State of the Union that we were safe, that we were not under any threat of nuclear attack, and polls say that 70 percent of the people of our country feel that we are safe from nuclear attack.

But I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for making the truth known and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for joining him in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, we do not live in a safe world. The defense of our Nation, which is one of our fundamental responsibilities in the Constitution, is an issue that should unite all Americans regardless of ideology. Less than 1 percent of our defense budget is spent on research to develop a national missile defense capability, yet the threat we are facing is growing. Russia and China are selling missile technologies to nations such as Iran and North Korea bringing these last two countries closer to producing their own missiles.

The threat to our national security and the security of our citizens is real. We do not have drop drills now, but perhaps we should until we get this missile defense system deployed.

H.R. 4, which was passed overwhelmingly by the House Committee on Armed Services, is an appropriate response to this threat. I urge a yes vote on H.R. 4.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, maybe I am just too simple, but today's debate, today's argument for an extended missile defense system, takes me back to the 1950s when I was in school. At least weekly while I was in grade school every student and our teachers went under our desks to practice protection against the atom bomb. Mr. Speaker, I can assure my colleagues we have a false sense of security, and it all came from these exercises. Now I question just how safe we could be with this missile defense technology against rogue States.

Mr. Speaker, what are we really investing in? I fear what we will be investing in is a false sense of security. I would suggest that instead we invest in true security. We can spend our scarce Federal dollars on technologies to protect us from the unknown, or we can use these scarce resources to keep our country secure by investing in humanitarian relations with other nations around the world.

For example, if we want to get serious about our nation's defense, we should be investing in programs that will prepare us to confront the international challenges we actually face and keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists and rogue nations. This is a more effective tool for non-proliferation than Star Wars will ever be. This is where we should be investing our scarce dollars.

There is an even greater way that we can invest and that we can ensure national security. We can invest in our children. Education is truly the cheap defense of our Nation and all nations. By investing in education of our children, we will ensure that they are prepared for a high-tech global economy, they will be prepared to work for peace, and they will know that weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles can destroy every human being on this Earth.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), others and the Rumsfeld Commission, no one seriously questions whether we are threatened today by the spread of missiles, nor does anyone question

whether that threat is going to grow in the future. No one seriously questions whether the American people want and in fact demand a defense against those missiles, which even the administration now seems to acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, if the national security is the first responsibility of the Federal Government and if protecting the homeland of the United States and the people of the United States is the first job of national security, then I do not know of any program that ought to be higher on the priority list than this one. The question is do we in Congress and does the administration really mean what we say in this resolution? Are these words merely a way to try to deal with a political problem and the polls, or do they mean something, and are they going to be backed up with action?

Since 1983, we have heard a million excuses about how we could not do this or we should not do this. Even today we hear excuses. But we cannot give Russia or anyone else a veto over our right to defend ourselves, we cannot be afraid of test failures, and we certainly cannot be fooled by those few people who say that by weakening ourselves we are really making ourselves stronger.

Mr. Speaker, the time for excuses has ended. The time for action is now. The time to back up these words with real actions that protect the American people is today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is about whether, after spending \$140 billion on missile defense programs over the last 40 years, we continue to spend billions more. But this debate is about much more than that. Given the fact that there is a limited amount of funds available for our needs, let me tell my colleagues what this debate is also about. This debate is whether millions of senior citizens today who cannot afford the prescription drugs they need to ease their pain or stay alive are going to get those prescription drugs or whether we continue to spend even more on the military. That is what this debate is about.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I attended a committee meeting with representatives of all of the veterans organizations, and they said what is absolutely true, that this Congress has been disgraceful in ignoring the needs of our veterans and our Veterans Administration hospitals, and they are begging us for a few billion dollars more to protect our veterans so that we do not turn them away from our VA hospitals. But over and over again we hear there is no money available for our veterans; but, yes, there is \$150 billion more available

over the next 5 years for military spending.

And we have young families all over America who look forward to sending their kids to college; no money available for Pell grants, yet more money available for Star Wars, for B-2 bombers, for every defense system that the military industrial complex wants.

Now I have heard that we are spending very little so far on defense, on understanding, on research for the missile defense program. If we have \$300 billion in the defense budget now and we do not even have a Soviet Union out there to oppose us, why do we not take some of that money rather than asking us for more? The United States today spends \$300 billion, NATO spends \$200 billion, North Korea spends less than \$3 billion.

Take what we have and spend it wisely.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, most Americans believe the United States military has the ability to defend our country against a ballistic missile attack. However today the United States does not have the capability to shoot down one single ballistic missile.

Mr. Speaker, I ask why have we failed to develop this capability? Is it because the threat of a ballistic missile attack disappeared with the fall of the Soviet Union? Absolutely not. Since the end of the Cold War, the threat of a ballistic missile attack against the United States has become more serious and more difficult to anticipate. Through the continued proliferation of key missile technologies by China and Russia, rogue nations around the globe have acquired long-range ballistic missile technology that now puts the United States in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 the current administration did not foresee a long range ballistic missile threat for at least a decade. The administration's opinion has now changed. General Lester Lyles, the Pentagon's Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, confirmed the threat to the American people by saying this, and I quote:

We are affirming the threat, it is real today and it is growing.

Mr. Speaker, these are not reassuring words, and they are disturbing words that relay a disheartening message to the American people. Detractors of a missile defense system spread the rumors and the myths that a national missile defense system would cost too much to deploy. It has cost this administration an estimated \$19 billion over 6 years to support its peacekeeping missions. Compare that to the estimated \$10 billion that it will cost the United States over the next 6 years to protect American lives from a long-range ballistic missile attack.

Mr. Speaker, China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya have all acquired the

technology to deploy ballistic missiles against the United States. H.R. 4 is the first step that must be taken if the United States wishes to protect its population against an existing ballistic missile threat.

I commend the diligent work done by my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4 and urge its support by my colleagues. This is a simple resolution that above all else is a statement about the reality of the world in which we live. I was pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), my colleague on the other side, in a very important trip to Russia this past week-end with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), who will speak on this issue as well. We delivered a message to the Russian Duma about ballistic missile defense and the fact that we will protect the shores of this country. This is not a violation of our treaty with Russia.

The Cold War is over, but the threat is there. Listen to the words of the Rumsfeld Commission. We have invested billions of dollars in technology to try to protect the shores of this country. The only responsible thing to do is to now deploy. To vote for deployment is to begin to protect the shores of this country from missile threats from rogue nations. It is our responsibility to do so.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their leadership, and I urge Members to support H.R. 4.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Cold War is over, and yet America is less safe. Here are the facts. Iran conducted its first flight test of a medium range ballistic missile last year, an entire year earlier than the intelligence community had predicted. North Korea continues to develop and test a ballistic missile with long-range capabilities that would pose a direct threat to much of the continental United States. In 1996, a Chinese general threatened the destruction of Los Angeles, and today China has 13 of its 18 missiles pointed at United States cities.

Mr. Speaker, our national security is threatened, and to the surprise of most Americans our United States military cannot destroy one, not one incoming missile.

Americans are just now learning the frightening truth. The Clinton administration has lulled the United States citizens into a false sense of security. How can we afford to send U.S. troops to Bosnia and now Kosovo, but we can-

not find the money to protect America against a missile attack? The fact is the costs to deploy a national missile defense capability will amount to less than the amount this administration has spent on peacekeeping deployments over the past 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for H.R. 4 is a vote to protect and defend the citizens of this great Nation.

□ 1445

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one out of every five children lives in poverty. Over 40 million Americans have no health insurance. One out of every three public schools is falling apart. Spending billions of dollars on missile defense does nothing to solve these problems.

In the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

President Eisenhower, a Republican, had the experience and the wisdom to appreciate the cost of the military to our society. It is the price we paid during the Cold War because we had to.

Mr. Speaker, that threat is no more. There is no need for a missile defense, for spending billions of dollars on some pie in the sky boondoggle.

This May, the sequel to the film *Star Wars* will be released. It is called *The Phantom Menace*.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating whether to build a sequel to Ronald Reagan's *Star Wars* system. It too should be called *The Phantom Menace*.

This *Phantom Menace* defense system will cost at least \$20 billion and protect us against a threat that simply does not exist.

It is time to recognize the peace dividend, to redirect our priorities and invest in our people, not in weapons.

Make no mistake, a dollar more for missile defense is a dollar less for health care, for education and for food. This *Phantom Menace* missile defense system will not educate the unlearned. It will not provide hope for the hopeless, food for the hungry or medicine for the sick.

I urge my colleagues, do not choose bullets over babies, bombs over books, missiles over medicine.

Let it be the policy of our great Nation to beat our swords into plowshares, to invest not in the instruments of war but in the dividends of peace, in education and health care, in hope and opportunity, in our children, our families and our future.

Vote no on the remains of a bygone age. Vote no on this resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 4. Recent showdowns with Iraq and North

Korea are a stark reminder that the fall of the Soviet Union has not led to an absence of threats to our national security. Indeed we still live, and as people have said, in a very dangerous world. We must continue to make this Nation's defense our number one priority.

While the United States has conducted research on missile defense for years and possesses the technology to protect the American people from a ballistic missile attack, most Americans are outraged to discover that political foot-dragging has prevented such a defense system from being put in place.

Clearly, it is time for Congress and the President to make a commitment to deploy a national missile defense. Additional excuses and further delay will only weaken our national security and endanger American lives.

With rogue nations like Iran, Iraq and North Korea working feverishly to develop weapons of mass destruction and the missile technology to deliver them inside the United States, there is simply no justification for leaving the American people vulnerable any longer. Cast votes in favor of a strong, secure America. Vote for H.R. 4.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 11 minutes.

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I have followed this issue for a long time, since chairing a panel of the Committee on Armed Services in the mid-1980s on SDI for 4 years, and I want to put this whole matter in some context, explain to my friends who do not understand why I am supporting this simple bill.

In March of 1983, Ronald Reagan launched the strategic defense initiative, and with it a charged debate. The arguments over the old perennials of the Cold War, the ASATs and the B-2 and the MX, ended long ago but this one smolders on. Unlike any other weapons system I have seen in the time that I have served here, this one has become a political totem. Its advocates not only disagree with its opponents but they accuse them of leaving the country vulnerable to missile attack. They diminish the fact that deterrence worked for all of the Cold War and they act as if missile defenses were almost off the shelf, available to shield the country, the whole country, from attack, when this capability is far from proven and may never be attained.

On the other hand, opponents accuse the advocates of firing up the arms race again. They give too little credit to the advantages of defending ourselves against nuclear attack and moving away from massive retaliation, mutual destruction, complementing deterrence with defense.

Today, the House takes up that missile defense debate again, this time with a resolution that is notable for its brevity, if nothing else, that it is the

policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system. Of course the United States has deployed a national missile defense system.

We spent \$15 billion in today's money building Sprint and Spartan and setting up Safeguard at Grand Forks, North Dakota, only to shut the system down in 1976. Even then the Pentagon did not quit spending in missile defense.

In the year Reagan made his speech and launched SDI, the Pentagon put \$991 million in its budget for missile defense and that sum was budgeted to rise annually to \$2.7 billion by 1988, most of it to go for protecting MX missiles in their silos.

After the eighties, the mid-eighties, the defense budget, as all of us know, barely kept up with inflation. With Ronald Reagan pushing it, SDI kept on increasing, rising so fast that within 4 or 5 years of his speech SDI was the largest item in the defense budget, a big defense budget.

At nearly \$4 billion, SDI was getting almost as much as the entire research and development account of the United States Army.

Sixteen years have passed and the Defense Department has spent some \$50 billion on ballistic missile defense and has yet to field a strategic defense system. Now by anybody's reckoning, that is real money.

It is hard to claim, with this much spent, that the absence of a deployed system is due to the lack of commitment. The problem is more lack of focus than a lack of commitment or lack of funding. Plus the fact, the plain hard fact, that this task is harder than Ronald Reagan ever realized.

Early on, the architects of strategic defense decided that it had to be layered; one layer would not do. The system had to thin out some missiles in the boost phase as they rose from their silos. It had to take out some reentry vehicles in the mid-course as they traveled through space, and the remainder had to be taken out as they descended in the atmosphere to their targets.

So the Pentagon developed a whole family of systems. There was the Endo-atmospheric interceptor, and Exo-atmospheric interceptor, a terminal interceptor. There was Space-Based Kinetic-Kill Vehicles which later became Brilliant Pebbles. All of those were kinetic killers, which meant they were designed to collide head on with their targets.

Since hitting a target that is moving 7 kilometers a second is a daunting task, to say the least, SDI put some money into an alternative technology: Directed energy.

At one time, the SDI program supported five different laser systems, space-spaced and ground-based. Since missile defense requires better acquisition of targets, better tracking, and a means of discriminating real targets from decoys, SDI had to put money into those systems, too. We developed a pop-up system, known as the GSTS. We

developed space-based infrared sensors first known as Space and Missile Tracking System, now known as SBIRS Low and SBIRS High.

We even went into interactive discrimination with an esoteric technology called the neutral particle beam, which would have been based in space.

Now let me emphasize, not all of these pursuits took us down blind alleys. Not all of this money was wasted, not by any means. The ERIS, for example, was bypassed for a better interceptor but the projectile that the Army developed for the ERIS, the Exo-atmospheric interceptor called the LEAP, is now on the top of the Navy's upper tier system. It has been used there.

The Army has a system called the THAAD, which intercepts in the atmosphere. In the atmosphere, there is a lot of friction. That system, the THAAD, has a sapphire window aperture on it developed for the HEDI.

So we have used the technology for other systems and it has evolved forward. We have made progress with this \$50 billion.

After the Gulf War, SDIO eventually evolved into BMDO, and BMDO had theater missile defense and strategic defense, a bigger plate and less money. It decided it had to put its money where it would pay off so it started taking assessment of what worked and what did not work. The first thing they did was discard lasers because lasers were too futuristic. Ground-based lasers are hard to propagate in the atmosphere without distortion. Spaced-based lasers in fixed orbits are easy to counter attack, hard to power. They were discarded.

Boost-phased interceptors are also vulnerable to attack if they are in fixed orbit in space, and given the fact that there have to be so many on target on station all the time, we need thousands of them, literally thousands launched to do the job.

Even if all of these problems could be overcome, for boost-phased interceptors they could still be outrun by missiles like the SS-24 which had a boost-phase burnout time of 180 seconds.

Why go through all of this? Because it shows the frustration of these efforts. We are not here today because we have not had the will to do it. We have spent the money. We have pursued these things. We simply have not yet been able to prove that the system can work.

Where we have ended up is with ground-based interceptors, mid-course interceptors. These have the merit of being treaty compliant. They are technically mature. They are clearly the best candidate to go first, but nobody should think that they answer Ronald Reagan's dream. The first problem they face today and 15 years ago is countermeasures in the form of decoys and chaff and RVs that are attached to and enveloped in balloons which lure the interceptors off course.

The next is a limiting condition that the SDIO acknowledged in the 1992 report. Because of the radiation and the heat and the electromagnetic effects that are generated when an RV is destroyed with a nuclear warhead inside it, SDIO decided that it could not postulate the destruction of more than 200 oncoming RVs at any given time.

If we were attacked by an adversary as sophisticated as Russia, with an arsenal as large and diverse as theirs, the first wave attack could easily exceed 200 RVs. So nobody should assume that we are anywhere close to protecting the whole American continent from ballistic missiles. We are not even close to that.

Now, H.R. 4 says it is our policy to develop a national missile defense. The mid-course interceptor is clearly the candidate for this mission. This is not a system, however, that will render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete. If we have learned anything over the past 16 years, we have learned that a leak-proof defense is so difficult it may never be attained.

H.R. 4 calls for a national missile defense, but the committee report acknowledges that this is a system that will protect us against limited strikes. By limited strikes what we mean is up to 20 oncoming RVs.

There is a legitimate concern, I think, that Russia may react adversely to this but, in truth, Russia has nothing to be concerned about here because this system would not begin to defend us against the threat that the Russians still pose to us. That is why we should not push too hard. That is why we should not be talking about breaching the ABM Treaty, because START II and START III are still more important to us, to our security, than launching this NMD system with its limited effectiveness.

The merit of this bill to me is, as I have said, not what it says but what it does not say. It is simple. It does not say that the technology is in hand. It does not try to prescribe what we should do. It leaves that to be worked out in time. It just commits us, focuses us on a deployable system.

It does not mandate a date for deployment. It does not call for the revision of the ABM Treaty. It simply says, let us focus on getting something done. Let us see if we cannot bring to fruition a system that will at least give us limited protection against a ballistic missile attack.

Then we can, first of all, reap some return on the \$50 billion we have spent. Secondly, with a treaty complaint system we can tell what its potential is, test its practical potential. That is the only way we can find out if we can overcome the countermeasures of decoys and balloons and all the other things that can lure these interceptors off track.

□ 1500

Thirdly, this technology that we are talking about is not on a continuum

with theater missile defense, and we all agree in this House that that is something we should do, having seen the consequences of it in the Gulf War.

Finally, if we do this, we will have a system, if it has proven its mettle, that may give us some protection against an accidental strike, which could happen; against a rogue attack, which could be threatened. It may give us some protection, and it will certainly give us something that we can learn from and build upon and, as I said, reap some investment.

I support this bill finally in the hope that we can put BMD on a bipartisan footing. Theater missile defense enjoys bipartisan support, we all support it. National missile defense has been a bone of contention. What we sought in this bill was something that we could all come to common ground on. I am not just advocating that we build anything. National missile defense needs to stand the test of any weapons system. It ought to be put to rigorous testing, made to prove that it can hold this country harmless against a limited missile attack. If a strategic defense can rise to this mettle, I think we should buy it and deploy it. If it cannot, there is nothing in this bill that says we should buy a dud.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Russia where I joined a bipartisan delegation of my colleagues in communicating the intent of H.R. 4 to members of the Russian Duma.

Although Russia is skeptical of America's intent to deploy a national missile defense, I can tell my colleagues that a limited national missile defense would not undermine Russia's nuclear deterrent. In fact, Russia still has a strategic nuclear arsenal of over 7,000 warheads. Even if Russia ratifies and complies with START II, they will still be able to sustain a strategic force of 3,500 warheads. If the U.S. had a national missile defense system similar to what Russia already has deployed outside of Moscow, Russia's strategic missile force could still overwhelm such a defensive U.S. system.

The fact is, we have no missile defense system to defend against any incoming ballistic missile, whether that missile is part of a limited or accidentally launched attack from a rogue nation such as North Korea or Iran, or an accidental launch from Russia or China. Russia, not the U.S., is the only country that currently maintains the world's only operational ballistic missile defense system for their country.

Even if the 1972 ABM Treaty were still legally valid, it at least allows for deployment of a limited national missile defense system at a single site in the U.S., a deployment that this administration has consistently opposed,

up until recently, through and through. I find it shocking, though not really surprising, that Russia has the only real missile defense system, and that they do not really want to change the ABM Treaty, and yet the U.S. gets criticized for not cooperating with Russia.

The fact is, our bipartisan delegation to speak to the Russian Duma this past weekend was all about the U.S. Congress taking the initiative to cooperate with and give advanced notice to Russia regarding our intent to enact a national missile defense policy for the United States, a national missile defense system to protect our cities, our businesses, our families, our children, from a missile carrying a nuclear, chemical, or biological warhead that could flatten an entire metropolitan area with one strike.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the full Committee on Armed Services, for advancing the goals of the Constitution: to provide for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The consideration of this bill is the story of an overwhelming, but rather hollow, victory, and a total policy failure. This Star Wars scheme is, first, a technological failure, failing one test after another, again and again. This system assumes the capability, as U.S. Air Force General Lester Lyles said, of "hitting a bullet with a bullet" in outer space. And indeed, it would be not one bullet, but many bullets, coming down over this entire 50 United States. That would be a challenge even for Superman.

Well, the system has failed to do that. It represents more political mythology than technological reality.

Star Wars is, secondly a failure for the taxpayer a failure of over \$100 billion wasted on this program. And now our Republican friends tell us that for a mere \$184 billion more, we can deploy this defective system. They are wrong. It is wrong to assume that if we waste enough taxpayer money, we can purchase absolute security.

For indeed, this Star Wars scheme represents a failure also for true national security. It diverts very precious resources away from other military needs and other nonmilitary needs that are at the heart of maintaining ours as the most powerful country in the world. More importantly, this scheme jeopardizes our efforts to reduce nuclear armaments and endangers those agreements we have already negotiated, such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Our paramount security goal should be to reduce the nuclear threat, not to

raise false promise that we will live happily ever after in the event of a nuclear attack. Forsaking that paramount goal constitutes a tragic failure by this Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4.

This morning, this House received a top secret briefing from the independent commission to assess the ballistic missile threat to the United States. Now, maybe my colleague who just spoke from Texas was not at that briefing and if he was not, then I recommend he go read that report, because they discussed the findings that led them to conclude unanimously that ballistic missile threats from North Korea, Iran, Iraq, China, have developed far more rapidly than predicted in recent years by our intelligence community, and pose a serious threat to the United States.

Now, while many of us in this House have long championed deployment of a national missile defense capable of defeating at least a limited or accidental attack on our Nation, this legislation represents this Congress' first concrete expression of support for such a deployment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question the threat is real. Last August, North Korea flight-tested a 3-stage Taepo Dong I missile. Though the missile's third stage failed, the launch raised serious concerns. Our intelligence community revised its previous estimates of North Korea's capabilities, concluding that with the resolution of some tech issues, the next generation of the North Korean missile, the Taepo Dong II now under development could soon target not just Alaska and Hawaii, but could reach the rest of the United States, depending on the size of its payload. Meanwhile, North Korea has gone ahead actively pursuing nuclear weapons.

It is no small matter that the same regime that launched this missile has simultaneously allowed hundreds of thousands of its own citizens to perish from famine. That shows the regime's desperation to develop this capability and should raise concerns here about their willingness to use it. Unfortunately, today we have no capability to defeat the threat from missile threat.

Secretary Cohen has called the launch in North Korea another strong indicator that the United States in fact will face a rogue nation missile threat to our homeland against which we will have to defend the American people.

I congratulate my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their efforts, and I urge my colleagues' support of this bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of this legislation, and I want to say at the outset that I commend my chairman the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) of the Committee on Military Research and Development for his leadership in this area. I was very pleased that this legislation passed the Committee on National Security by a vote of 50-to-3.

This legislation is one that received a boost and a wakeup call this last August when North Korea launched a missile containing a third stage. We know from the reports of the intelligence community that North Korea is working on a missile that has the capability and will have the capability of reaching the continental United States. In July, the Commission to assess the ballistic missile threat to the United States, the Rumsfeld Commission, concluded that rogue nations like Iran, Iraq and North Korea are moving much faster than we had previously known in the development of intercontinental ballistic missile capability.

The risk of inaction is unacceptable. One thing that we have always done as Americans is stood strong in terms of making America the strongest nation in the world. It is unacceptable to know that within a short period of years, the Second Congressional District of Texas could be 32 minutes away from the delivery of an intercontinental ballistic missile from North Korea. The time for action is now.

The development of a missile system, a defensive missile system will take many years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has wisely in this bill simply stated, "It shall be the policy of the United States to deploy a missile defense system." The timing, the technology, the cost is left yet to be determined. Now is the time for action. The price of peace and security is high, but the cost of inaction and the cost of vulnerability is much higher.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for their leadership in this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mrs. BONO), a member of our committee.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4. As a cosponsor of H.R. 4, I want to give my colleagues the reasons why I support this important legislation.

First, the threat to the United States of a ballistic missile strike is real, according to the findings of the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission, and the President's own Secretary of Defense said that the ballistic missile threat is real and growing.

Second, we are on the way to developing a technology for national ballistic missile defense. This legisla-

tion does not say what technology is to be used or implemented. Current technology relies on mature ground-based methods. All we need to do is to have the political will and courage to perfect this technology so that it be counter a limited ballistic missile strike.

Third, we can afford to do this. The current budget picture shows that for \$10 billion we can implement a national ballistic missile defense which would counter a limited strike. I think this is a small price to pay to help ensure that Americans sleep better at night.

Fourth, we are no longer bound by the 1972 ABM Treaty. When this treaty was signed, it was signed with the former Soviet Union. That union no longer exists, making the agreement moot. However, let us assume for the moment that the ABM Treaty was still in effect. The treaty was signed to deter both countries from implementing a ballistic missile defense on the premise that if both countries were defenseless to a major ballistic missile attack, neither country would strike. All we are asking for in this bill is to make it the policy of the United States to counter a limited missile attack from a rogue state. We still will not have the defenses to protect us from Russia's 7,000 strong nuclear arsenal, even though I would argue that ought to be our policy. These are just some of my reasons for supporting this bill.

However, the most important reason why I am supporting this bill is because today's world is more hostile than it was 20 years ago. Twenty years ago, we knew who our enemies were and containment was possible. Today, with the end of the Cold War, former Soviet nuclear scientists market their skills to rogue nations so that they can survive. North Korea has demonstrated that they have long-range missile capability which threatens the U.S. territory, and of course Iran.

These are not safe times, and for those who would argue that a nation would be stupid or insane to launch a missile at the last remaining superpower, I say to them, do you want to make that bet on behalf of the American people?

No, Mr. Speaker, the vote we cast today sends a clear message to those rogue nations who would do our people harm. I cast this vote for the people of the 44th Congressional District, for my family, and my country.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. At the outset let me say how much respect I have for the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and my friend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

I have, in light of their support of this proposal, examined my position, which has been in opposition over this

during the years that I have been in the Congress, and I have not been able to bring myself to support this, having reviewed the literature on this leading up to our debate today.

A national missile defense system, an impenetrable shield, a marginal line in the sky. Well, the simple fact is, any anti-missile shield can be overwhelmed even if it works perfectly, which we do not know that it does work perfectly. In fact, all the evidence speaks to the contrary. The latest testing that we have on this indicates the success ratio is very, very marginal. But even if it works perfectly, we design it to shoot down 10 missiles simultaneously and an enemy can render it useless by launching 20. If we design it to shoot down 100 missiles, then they will launch 200.

□ 1515

In the end, spending tens of billions of dollars to build a missile defense shield makes about as much sense to me as erecting a chain link fence to keep mosquitos out of one's backyard.

But today we are being asked to sign a blank check for a Star Wars system that could cost tens of billions of dollars according to the Congressional Budget Office. My colleagues on this side of the aisle primarily have said and argued that we need this, but, yet, we cannot afford in the budget debate that we will have in just a few days on this floor \$5 billion to fix our national schools. They say we cannot afford to help seniors pay for costly prescription drugs.

They even go so far as to say that we cannot afford to buy weapons, weapon-grade plutonium from the Soviet Union to keep it from falling in the hands of terrorist or rogue states. I want to repeat that again because I think that is terribly important. In next week's supplemental appropriation that we will bring to the floor, the Republicans plan to cut funding to buy up to 50 tons of plutonium from the Russian's nuclear stockpile.

So I ask my colleagues, does it make more sense to prevent the spread of this material now while it is still on the ground rather than to wait for it to be turned into missiles and then to spend billions of dollars trying to catch it while it is hurdling through the sky? I think not.

We ought to redesign, make sure our computers work well, take care of the Y2K computer bug problem first and then deal with this in the future. I hope my colleagues will vote against this.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say I am proud of what the Congress is doing this week. Like the balanced budget agreement, like the first tax cuts in 16 years, like the real welfare reform, like all the other elements in the contract with America, we are here once again taking the lead

on an important issue. Only this one may be the most important issue of them all.

Some happy day in the future, when we are all elderly and retired, we will find ourselves tucking a grandchild in for the night. Unlike our own generation, when we were young, that child will be going to sleep in his bed safe from any foreign attack because this Congress made the decision to deploy a national missile defense.

We are going to be able to smile and say to that child, "we gave you a defense that defends." The best anyone could give us was the advice to duck and cover.

But missile defense is about more than making American children safe in their beds. I believe it will advance the cause of freedom around the world. It will do so by taking away one of the most horrible props that modern dictatorships use to intimidate their own people, the terror weapon.

Missiles today are prestige items. Any dictator that owns them can appear more powerful and enduring. If he cannot win the affection of his own people, his missiles can at least instill in them a measure of respect.

A dictator knows that, by making the world quake before his ability to attack foreign cities, his own people will look on him with fear and awe. He also knows that he and his regime can thrive in the atmosphere of international tension that he himself creates.

In this way, having a crude but invincible missile can help a dictator maintain control over his own people, even if he threatens far away American civilians.

If our goal is to transform dictatorships into democracies, we must deny them the ability to build effective terror weapons. Once they realize they cannot get respect by threatening acts of war, they may choose to win respect in the old fashioned way, through the simple dignity that any government earns when it is freely elected by its own people.

Mr. Speaker, radical rogue regimes are the greatest threat to our security today. Whether they are driven by insane ideologies or ethnic rage, they share intense anti-Americanism. Mr. Speaker, they hate us. They hate us not only for our success and our power, but even more so for our democracy. They know that our ideals of freedom and individual rights are poison to their petty little tyrannies.

These regimes are nasty enough when armed with car bombs. Imagine them armed with nuclear-tipped ICBMs.

As I said during last week's Kosovo debate, we need an entirely new policy for dealing with these pariahs. The administration's approach of containment, engagement, arms control and negotiation is not working. Like the Reagan doctrine of the 1980s, we need a policy dedicated to replacing these regimes with democratic alternatives.

Missile defense, because it takes away a prop dictators can use to survive, is part of that policy. That is one reason I support it today.

Mr. Speaker, just as that grandchild in our future should sleep soundly in the knowledge that American technology has made him safe from these evil threats, the otherwise intimidated citizens of tyrannical regimes should take heart as well. They should know that, thanks to America, the military delusions of their misguided leader are as obsolete as their political theories. From this, these oppressed people can take courage to resist and to seek their own freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, a question.

Mr. Speaker, this is the budget resolution that the Budget Committee passed out yesterday. It provides \$205 billion less than the President requested. It is essentially flat from 2004 to 2009, the very period and years when this system will be purchased and deployed. How can we pay for it with a cut like that?

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will just say that I appreciate these numbers. I studied them. While on the surface our numbers may seem smaller than the President's, I take greater confidence in our budget committee's numbers because they are real.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

(Mrs. TAUSCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

While developing a national defense system should be a priority, we need to ensure that any potential system is dependable, reliable, and fiscally responsible. More importantly, we need to also step up our investment in nuclear nonproliferation programs.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to stop a ballistic missile attack is to stop the missiles from being developed and deployed in the first place. We need a balanced approach to protect American families. We need increased investment in nonproliferation programs like nuclear cities and IPP to prevent attack and investment in systems like national missile defense to ensure our survival if prevention programs fail.

I will vote for this legislation. But before we spend billions of dollars of American taxpayer money to deploy it, we must have proof that it is going to work.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just on the budget issue, we

really ought to deal with it. My colleague made a good point here. Let me also add, and my colleague is well aware that over the past 4 years, it was this Congress, this Republican Congress, who gave the Defense Department over \$20 billion more than the President asked for because of the gross underfunding of the budget.

It is easy for a President to project a massive increase when he is no longer in office. After he has decimated defense spending for a continuing period of 6 years, it is easy for him to say, well, when I am out of office, we are going to increase the top number by a significant margin. He is not going to be here to be held accountable.

The fact is that this Congress, and I might add, in a strong bipartisan vote, Democrats were adamant in supporting our position, increase the defense budget over the past 4 years by almost \$25 billion more than this administration requested.

Now that is not pie in the sky pipe dreams after the President is out of office. That is, in fact, what we did.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I brought with me a potential terrorist weapon of mass destruction delivery device. It might be classified. Close your eyes. Here it is. A briefcase like this was brought into a hearing by a biological weapons expert in the Rayburn Building, full of aerosol canisters, capable of deploying anthrax, killing everybody on Capitol Hill, many people in Washington, through security 2 weeks ago.

There are other probable terrorist or rogue state delivery devices. If it is a nuclear threat, it will probably be a truck coming across the Mexican border, maybe like the two tons of cocaine that come across every day in trucks. Or it might be a ratty old freighter that is registered anonymously in a Third World country like Panama under a flag of convenience that steams into New York Harbor with a stolen hydrogen bomb.

The question is: Will the future leader of the rogue state assure the annihilation of his or her people for all time by launching a single or even a dozen or two dozen missiles at the United States of America? Within 30 seconds, we know where the missile came from, and they are targeted within 3 minutes by the most massive nuclear force on earth. They will be destroyed.

That is the power of our proven defense, the ability to withstand the attack of any aggressor and respond with awesome force. It worked against the Soviet Union for 30 years with thousands of hydrogen bombs. It certainly will deter the pathetic tiny unproven arsenals of North Korea and other

rogue states. Do not waste billions on fantasy protection. Vote no.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, a bill that declares as our policy the deployment of a national missile defense. Without national security, there can be no Social Security or education opportunity.

I want to commend my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, many of whom I serve with on the Committee on National Security, for their commitment to the strong national missile defense and for bringing it to the attention of the American people. They have pressed forward over the last 7 years and remain scorned by an administration message that preys on our Nation's false sense of security. Today my colleagues' efforts are about to pay off as we establish a policy to defend our Nation and her people from a missile attack.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the very telling vote taken on missile defense in the Senate yesterday. Ninety-seven Senators supported this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what strikes me as odd is that this same body, no different in political composition, failed to reach cloture on missile defense legislation a mere 6 months ago. Mr. Speaker, why the sudden change? What are we to believe?

Has the threat to our national security grown so ominous in 6 months that the left and the administration believe the moment is right to embrace a policy of national missile defense? Or has the President been playing politics with the security of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, from one end of my district to the other, my constituents are concerned with our national defense, and they know there is no function in the Federal Government more important than ensuring our Nation's security.

I am pleased that the President and his allies have joined us in a policy that assures all Americans and American generations to come that they can sleep safer under a blanket of missile defense. Mr. Speaker, the administration's actions speak louder than words. Delays in the past have been irresponsible. Delays in the future are simply dishonest and unacceptable.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned today that Congress is being asked to make a significant policy change, committing billions of dollars to unproven technology at a time when there are a le-

gion of serious questions that have been raised about many aspects of our defense preparedness and national security.

We live in a dangerous world beset with economic, social, political, and religious unrest. We are the most powerful Nation in the world and the most technologically advanced. Yet we simply cannot do everything.

Security for Americans at home and abroad and keeping peace around the world involves making difficult choices. Rushing through this proposal, one whose costs and consequences are understood by no one, and is not integrated with all our other military and foreign policy needs, is not a policy I can support.

□ 1530

This bill hardly seems the right thing to do in terms of using our defense dollars in the most effective way possible, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, this Member rises in support of the resolution. If this Member can bring any special relevance to the debate it is probably through my focus on missile development and threats from and for Asia through my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, and through the background gained as a member of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

The latter puts limits on what I can say here today, but it surely reinforces my support for the resolution. However, I support this measure because the threats from a limited missile attack are here, now, very real, and potentially very disastrous for our citizens, who are right now undefended against this threat.

Contrary to what over 70 percent of the American people believe, we and our forces abroad do not have defense capabilities against even a single ballistic missile. Let me say it again, this U.S. does not have defense capabilities against a single ballistic missile.

Is an NMD technologically possible? Yes, it clearly will be technologically feasible. Just 3 days ago, in the skies over New Mexico, the U.S. Army successfully, in effect, hit a bullet with a bullet.

This NMD proposal is not about a rehash of former President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense proposal, a nation-wide ballistic missile defense system proposal that some insisted on negatively labeling as "Star Wars." This defense system would offer protection against an accidental or unauthorized ICBM launch or against a limited ICBM attack by a rogue nation.

The Center for Strategic and International Studies reported that the third stage of the North Korean Taepo Dong missile launched on August 31, 1998, travelled over 3,000 miles. Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, a major source of U.S. oil, is within that range. The Washington Times reported that a newer missile under development, the Taepo Dong-2, will have a range greater than 6,000 miles and could be deployed soon after the turn of the century. Several hundred thousand of the nine million people living in Los Angeles, California SMA, for example, are within that range and would die.

Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware of the bottom line in the Rumsfeld Commission Report and recent North Korean missile tests. The possibility of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), North Korea, using an ICBM to threaten U.S. interests is real. Parts of Alaska, Hawaii, and U.S. allies in the Pacific are vulnerable, now. Today, we need to be concerned about what a North Korean ICBM, armed with just a conventional warhead, would do to Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, a major source of U.S. oil. The 48 contiguous states of the U.S. will also become vulnerable to this threat by 2002. By 2002, our concern will be about what a North Korean ICBM, armed with a weapon of mass destruction—nuclear, biological, or chemical weapon—would do to hundreds of thousands of people among, for example, the nine million people living in Los Angeles SMA. It is only a matter of time until that vulnerability exists unless we act and even if we act now and technological hurdles are handled, there will be years of unprotected vulnerability.

For those of you who still question the threat, this Member would remind you that Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen has confirmed that North Korea had demonstrated that it has achieved long-range missile delivery system capability and that it appears that North Korea is not complying with the freeze imposed on its nuclear weapons development program. He also acknowledged that Russia's aging and sporadically maintained missile systems create the nightmarish possibility of an accidental launch. Former Commander in Chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific, Admiral Joseph Prueher, has confirmed that North Korea is developing a capability that could potentially reach the western-most reaches of the U.S. with an ICBM. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry, the President's special advisor on North Korea, states that North Korea is moving forward with its nuclear weapons program. Japan's Defense Agency believes North Korea has already deployed some of at least 30 medium-range ballistic missiles. It is only a matter of time.

Some of you will argue that a National Missile Defense (NMD) system will do nothing to deter less traceable means of delivering a weapon of mass destruction, such as a suitcase or truck bomb. While that may be true, our law enforcement agencies serve admirably as our defense against and deterrent of close-in terrorist attacks. Contrary to what over 70% of Americans believe, we do NOT have defense capabilities against even a single ballistic missile. Let me say that, again. The U.S. does NOT have defense capabilities against even a single ballistic missile. There is no secret, silver bullet in our arsenal that will stop an ICBM, and there is no alternative to NMD to effectively deal with a limited ICBM threat.

NMD, like its antithesis—ICBMs, is less about launching than it is about basic deterrence. It removes from the negotiating table what might otherwise be a trump card that could lead to extortion, if not outright blackmail, by a rouge nation. NMD counters this eventuality. As a world leader, we owe this to our allies. To the rogues we owe nothing.

Hoping, or expecting, that a "disarmament solution" or "containment" will eliminate or protect us against the emergingly diverse missile threat just isn't realistic; it holds out a very dangerous false hope. The world and technology are not standing still, and no amount of "hoping" on our part will make it so. There are no indigenous ballistic missile development programs. In fact, there is substantial cooperation among developing countries, themselves. Even if all the help from the U.S., Russia, China, Europe, and Asia were ended, developing countries would still move forward toward ballistic missile capability. The West, alone, is educating nearly 100,000 foreign graduate students, most of them in technical fields. In the process, we are educating cadres of essentially all the countries of the world; some of them surely do have the increased capacity to develop ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. Intelligence collecting is getting more difficult and intelligence compromises continue to occur. We must recognize that we will not be successful in plugging every hole and we cannot ignore the reality that increasingly sophisticated threat will confront us in the 21st century.

We are in an environment, potentially, of little or no warning. Meanwhile, the Administration has reluctantly begun to acknowledge the threat while simultaneously throwing down obstacles, such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, and changing their 3 plus 3 policy to a 3 plus 5 policy. NMD deployment might occur in 2005, even in the face of claims that the threat will extend beyond Alaska and Hawaii to the 48 contiguous United States as early as 2002 (three years before the possibility of NMD deployment).

To those that say that NMD is destabilizing, unannounced missile launches, especially those with aggressive trajectories, are even more destabilizing. Further launches will be further destabilizing, long before the Administration's current 2005 projected NMD deployment date.

This Member is not advocating blindly stepping up the time line, would that be possible. In fact, there are significant hurdles to overcome, just from a technological perspective. Hitting a missile traveling at about 15,000 miles per hour, or somewhere between three to five miles per second, is certainly an impressive challenge. However, this Member certainly believes that the technical difficulties can be overcome. Many of the impossibilities of the past have yielded to imagination and innovation. The academic critics are not entertaining practical solutions to their willing despair, not because they are unable to but, because they do not want to and because it is not being demanded of them. To those that question the technological feasibility of this effort, this Member would remind them of the following from the late President John F. Kennedy:

We choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not only because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and

measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win. . . .

Iran, with more than 66 million people and the proud heritage of the Persian Empire that once ruled everything from Libya to India, today is using its oil wealth to build a new center of power in the Middle East. Teheran has been boasting for two years that it already has the most powerful missile force in the Middle East.

Last July, the Rumsfeld Commission concluded that the extraordinary level of resources Iran is using to develop its own ballistic missiles poses a substantial and immediate danger to the U.S., its vital interests and its allies. The Rumsfeld Commission reported that Iran is making "very rapid progress" on the Shahab-3 medium-range ballistic missile. That was July 15, 1998. One week later, on July 22, 1998, Iran conducted a flight test of the Shabab-3, continuing an ambitious missile development program that was initiated and pursued during Iran's war with Iraq during the years 1980 to 1988. Not waiting for more tests, President Mohammed Khatami ordered 15 Shabab-3s to be produced by the end of March 1999. The mobile launchers are ready and Iranian soldiers have been training for months to deploy the missile, which is expected to become operational this year. Iran's next missile, the Shabab-4, which is modeled on the Russian SS-4 intermediate-range ballistic missile, is projected to have a range of 1,300 miles, reaching southern and central Europe. U.S. and Israeli officials estimate that, with continuing help from entities in Russia and China, the Shabab-4 could be in service by 2001. Work also is under way on a long-range missile that with a nuclear warhead could be a serious threat to Western Europe and the United States. The Rumsfeld Commission noted that advance warning of such a missile may be zero.

Iran has chemical weapons, is conducting research in biologicals, and is pursuing a very aggressive nuclear weapons program that is close to success. The Rumsfeld Commission reported that, because of significant gaps in our human intelligence efforts, the U.S. is unlikely to know whether Iran possesses nuclear weapons until after the fact. This is reminiscent of the surprise nuclear detonations that occurred in India and Pakistan. Iran is expected to be the next declared nuclear state.

Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, has warned that Russia is backsliding on commitments to the U.S. to curb the transfer of advanced missile technology to Iran. Especially over the past six months, Russia has continued to assist the Iranian missile effort in areas ranging from training to testing to components. Iran's ability to take advantage of its existing ballistic missile infrastructure to develop more sophisticated and longer-range missiles is being aided by the crucial roles being played by Russia, China, and North Korea.

Would Iran resort to extortion? This Member need only remind you of the Iranian hostage crisis of 1979-80.

While Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji scoffed at some Western reports claiming a major economic crisis is brewing in China, he acknowledged that the East Asian recession had affected China more seriously than expected.

Former Commander in Chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific, Admiral Joseph Prueher acknowledges that China, with its shaky economy, growing unemployment and burgeoning military might, has problems. Prueher views China's latest crackdowns on dissidents as symptoms of weakness rather than strength.

During the March 1996 Taiwan straits crisis, China fired short range missiles north and south of Taiwan. In late 1998, China's army conducted military exercises with simulated missile firings against Taiwan and also, for the first time, conducted mock attacks on U.S. troops in the region. With respect to the most recent overt threat to Taiwan, the Chinese protest is disingenuous on its face. The Chinese Government knows that we should no more apologize for the theoretical consideration of including Taiwan in plans for missile defense than we did for including South Korea in similar plans. Our having agreed in principle that Taiwan might someday rejoin China does not mean that we would ever allow such a unification to be coerced.

Taiwan claims that China has deployed more than 100 additional ballistic missiles in PRC provinces close to the Straits of Taiwan. This would more than triple the number of missiles previously positioned in that area. China must understand that the use of "coercion," missile rattling, to bring Taiwan and PRC together will not work. Likewise, the U.S. is sensitive to concerns that a "shield" might embolden Taiwan to avoid serious negotiations with the PRC. At this time, there are no firm U.S. plans to provide Taiwan with a full-scale missile defense system of its own, but we must not be intimidated from actively considering a Taiwanese inquiry or request under the threatening circumstances developing across the Taiwan Straits.

Mr. Speaker, the North Korean missile launch adds credence to allegations that China has not done everything in its power to discourage North Korean effort to develop weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile capability. When we complain, China criticizes our concern. Nevertheless, China, more than any other country, can exert more influence over North Korea to dissuade it from further development of these weapons. China's own recent aggressiveness toward Taiwan and its apparent ineffectiveness in discouraging North Korean nuclear and missile development programs have not only raised our legitimate concerns but also sent alarms around the world. Our friends and allies recognize the reality of the threat from and for the Asia Pacific region.

Controversially, President Clinton's comments that the Administration views China as a strategic partner in the Asia Pacific region is particularly unsettling. If Chinese moves are left unchecked, the possibilities of misperceptions regarding American intentions—even by China itself—will multiply. These kinds of misperceptions can cause wars, as when, many suggest, during a January 1950 speech to the National Press Club, Secretary of State Dean Acheson unwittingly encouraged the attack that began the Korean War by failing to specify that South Korea was inside the American zone of interest. Contrary to internal issues like human rights and gray areas like assisting Pakistan, Chinese bases in the Paracels and the Spratlys are clearly matters with international implications. The United States should lose no time in examining China's expansion of its installations on

these islands and, if appropriate, questioning Chinese intentions. The Administration should keep in mind that the consequence of not confronting China expansionism today is very likely to lead to a far more dangerous world in the years to come.

China's own recent aggressiveness and its apparent ineffective efforts to discourage North Korean nuclear and missile development programs have sent alarms around the world. This Member can personally attest that, everyday, in the Taiwanese media, there is discussion of the need for ballistic missile protection. These concerns are a ground swell from the Taiwanese citizens in the streets and from the media, not generated entirely, by any means, by the Taiwanese Government. Taiwanese demands for U.S. ballistic missile defense assistance are directly attributable to China's reluctance to influence North Korea. They also trace to recent allegations about Chinese espionage successes, to Chinese military construction activity in the South China Sea, and, as reported in the New York Times, China's actions to dramatically increase the number of short-range ballistic missiles along the country's coastline near Taiwan. With respect to increased interest in ballistic missile defense systems in Japan, Taiwan, and the Republic of Korea, which the Chinese threaten, China has no one to blame but itself.

The greatest threat to peace and security in Asia is Kim Jong-il's DPRK, North Korea. North Korea remains the country most likely to engage in bloody extortion or to involve the U.S. in a large-scale regional war over the near term. Kim Jong-il's regime's foremost concern is self preservation. He appears to have increased his reliance on the military and draconian security measures to maintain his position and control of the populace. If he is willing to do this to his own people, how can you doubt that he would not hesitate to resort to extreme measures, even against South Korean, Japanese, or U.S. citizens?

Gen. John Tilelli, Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command and of the U.S. Forces in Korea, concurs with the CIA Director's recent remarks to the Senate Armed Services Committee that "... concern for North Korea can hardly be overstated and that ... in nearly all respects, the situation there has become more volatile and unpredictable." In his view, the Kim regime will sacrifice everything to keep itself in power. We remain in a situation wherein Kim Jong-il could decide at any moment his prospects are so bleak that his best chance for survival is to use his military rather than risk losing that capability, forever.

The North Korean military—the fifth largest in the world—is the embodiment of North Korea's national identity. Without the military, the regime is simply not viable. Over the last four decades the leadership has specifically designed and tailored the size, organization, equipment, and combat capabilities of the military to support attainment of their reunification goal. With military expenditures at 25% of GDP, the North Korean People's Army includes an air force of over 860 combat jet aircraft, a navy of more than 800 ships, over 1 million active duty soldiers, over five million reserve troops, a huge artillery force, tremendous special operations capabilities, hundreds of theater ballistic missiles, (primarily Scuds), and weapons of mass destruction.

How does the DPRK reconcile widespread famine with "gross" levels of spending to sup-

port the lavish lifestyle of the DPRK leadership and defense? Its citizens don't matter, except as pawns of the leadership and the military.

The greatest threat is the possibility that the Kim regime will couple its ballistic missile program with an unchecked nuclear program. The possibility of a successful North Korea nuclear break-out strategy is too dangerous to risk. Unchecked, the Kim regime's missile program will ultimately threaten U.S. vital interests in other parts of the world as North Korea sells its only viable export to hostile nations. It is believed that Pakistan has already been a customer, purchasing missile know-how from North Korea for its medium-range Ghauri missile, which was test fired for the first time last year. The Ghauri has been described as closely resembling the North Korean Nodong missile.

We will not pay tribute to the modern-day Barbary pirates in North Korea. The Clinton Administration has fallen into the dangerous pattern of accepting the extortion demands made during the negotiations with the North Koreans. Despite the gravity of the situation, this Member is forced to conclude that the Administration's response to the military threats of the North Koreans to extort money, humanitarian aid or other concessions is a shameful, un-American violation of this country's principles. Unfortunately, North Korea has learned that irresponsible behavior and confrontation results in U.S. humanitarian aid and other benefits. That rogue country is now the largest recipient of U.S. aid in Asia.

Fueled by its own paranoia and fear, the DPRK claims that a "passive" NMD is a sign of U.S. movement toward a goal of "global domination." This Member would say to the DPRK that, simply by virtue of being the only superpower, much of what the U.S. does ends up being perceived as dominating, even though the U.S. has no such intentions. If there are concerns about global intentions, this Member believes they should be focused on the DPRK. The DPRK Korean's People's Army gathered in late February to renew their loyalty to Kim Jong-il by declaring an oath that "under the leadership of the supreme Commander Kim Jong-il they would ... make the glorious Kim Jong-il era shine all over the world with arms." This followed an event earlier in the month where DPRK citizens were told they should defend Kim with their lives and "prepare themselves to be heroes through human bomb attacks and soldiers ready for suicidal explosion." The Clinton Administration is perpetuating, if not aiding and abetting, a regime that is clearly hostile. We went down this path in the late 1930s, reaching that path's bitter end on December 7th, 1941. This Member expects that we would not be so naive, again.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion this Member supports H.R. 4 for several reasons. First, H.R. 4 signals the Department of Defense (DoD) and those involved in the ballistic missile defense program that they should pursue NMD, in earnest. It raises the relative importance of NMD among the many DoD projects, enabling higher prioritization of resources and increasing the focus on research, development, test and evaluation activity.

Another factor influencing this Member's support for NMD is that there is no higher responsibility placed upon Congress by the U.S. Constitution than providing for the defense of the United States, its territory, and its citizens.

The possibility of a small-scale missile attack upon the people and territory of the United States is real, and significant. The lack of any U.S. capability to defend against such an attack is equally real, and significant. With regard to a limited intercontinental ballistic missile attack, the U.S. is defenseless! Maintaining the defenseless status quo can only lead to one place, and is not acceptable.

This legislation neither imposes deadlines, for either development or deployment, nor alters the position of the Administration. It does nothing to abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty or to alter the foundation of the U.S. policy—dissuasion, denial, deterrence, and defense—regarding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In fact, it leaves open the possibility to develop a complementary NMD/ABM relationship, as well as the potential to explore cooperative missile defense and non-proliferation efforts with Russia. Yet, this bill provides a clear and necessary policy and announces America's resolve, to develop its missile defense capabilities, to America's friends and foes, alike.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today I will vote for H.R. 4, which declares that it is the policy of this country to deploy a national missile defense system. I am concerned that this bill is too narrow and could have been much better.

I believe, in declaring this national policy, we must also consider the following: Secretary Cohen has stated that a national missile defense deployment might require modifications in the ABM Treaty. Such a modification may upset our delicate diplomatic balance with the Russians, who have already indicated opposition to such a move.

We must be in a position to continue negotiations with Moscow to cut our nuclear arsenals, and amendment to the ABM Treaty would threaten that effort.

A national missile defense policy must also not undermine or compromise the military preparedness of our troops or the planned deployment of theater missile defense systems by redirecting much needed resources.

Mr. Speaker, this body should have had an opportunity to debate those issues. We must have sufficient defense for our borders. As North Korea and Iran expand their capabilities, we must be prepared, but we must not let the steps we take, designed to bolster the security of this country, undermine the delicate international security balance at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be the policy of this country to deploy a national missile defense. This bill should have gone farther to address these additional concerns. The safety and security of this country depends, in large part, on how well we are prepared to deal with decentralized military power as well as with a number of

rogue states. A policy supporting a national missile defense is a step in the right direction.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, we have no ballistic missile defense system. The administration opposed it; vetoed it.

Before World War II, many people were stuck in a similar mindset. Leaders in England and elsewhere did not want to develop advanced weaponry. One leader stood alone, though, pushing for England to develop its technology, including radar, in the cause of national defense. His efforts encountered much resistance. Many said that there could be no defense against air power. There was some outright opposition from those who favored disarmament, including Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, as a way of dealing with Germany.

Well, history has told us that the dark days England soon suffered through would have been much darker if England had not had Winston Churchill and had not developed radar. Radar, which Churchill tirelessly pushed, was critical to winning the battle of Britain.

Sometimes it is not easy exercising foresight and taking preemptive action, but I cannot think of a more pressing issue for this Congress to address than defending our Nation against the emerging threat of ballistic missiles.

I commend the authors and especially our chairman for this important resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4 because the legislation fails to acknowledge that the choice to deploy a national missile defense system is an extraordinarily complex one. It must be based on effectiveness, threat, cost and other efforts to reduce threats to this country.

Some say a national missile defense system should be deployed as soon as possible, no matter what the consequences are. There are others who say that a national missile defense should never be deployed, no matter what the threat is. All I am saying here is that the system should be deployed only if it is proven to work, if the threat truly warrants it, if the cost does not undermine our ability to train and equip our troops, and if it does not prevent further reductions in offensive nuclear weapons arsenals.

Some of the proponents today here are saying we have to decide now, and they have cited other weapon systems. But with other weapon systems we test them before we fly them. We test them before we buy them.

This is not just my view. This is the view of the our Nation's top military

leaders. In speaking earlier today, I mentioned General Shelton and Secretary of Defense Cohen. Let me quote General Lester Lyles, who is the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. He said at the time of a deployment decision we will also assess the threat, the affordability of the system, and the potential impact on treaty and strategic arms reduction negotiations.

Congress trusts the Joint Chiefs on readiness, we trust them on troop pay, so why do we not trust them on national missile defense?

H.R. 4 is only 15 words long. We can vote for these 15 words and feel good, but the promise is a hollow, empty one. Fifteen words cannot solve the immense technological challenge of hitting a bullet with a bullet. Fifteen words cannot make hit-to-kill technology hit the target more than 26 percent of the time and only 13 percent of the time in outer space.

The era of budget deficits is over, and so must be the era of avoiding tough choices. We must be honest with the public on what it will take to deploy a national missile defense. How much will it cost to test, build and operate over a period of years? Will it improve our security or lead to a dangerous new arms race? Will it work?

I had an amendment that recognized these important considerations, but it was denied by the Committee on Rules. Some Members here today have said the only thing standing between today and deployment is political will. One Member said the problem is political footdragging. I disagree. The problem is more than that. It is technology, it is physics, it is money, it is the real world.

I am under no illusion about what the outcome of this debate will be today, but I ask Members to think about this decision; think about at the end of the day whether these 15 words will do anything to solve the immense technical challenges of national missile defense. We cannot afford this bill. I urge Members to vote "no".

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of establishing a national missile defense system.

We live in a new foreign policy world where uncertainty instead of order reigns. That uncertainty has been exacerbated by the mismanagement of our foreign affairs by this Administration.

The Clinton Administration has failed to develop and implement a comprehensive, long-term strategy of advancing American interests. The lack of such a policy has allowed the world's tyrants to increase their military capabilities, especially in the area of developing the ability to deliver offensive ballistic missiles against our nation, against our interests, and against our allies.

It is foolish to think our nation can stand pat on our ability to defend our nation and our interests against such threats.

Refusing to develop a missile defense for our nation would not be a mistake, it would be malfeasance of office.

We have been elected to protect our citizens and our nation. Passing H.R. 4 will begin the process of developing the proper missile defense system.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Fort Worth, Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old axiom that says it is good to be forewarned and forearmed because preparation is half the battle. Today, as America stands at the threshold of a new millennium, we must prepare ourselves for a new century, new challenges, and, yes, new dangers.

Today, America stands as the world's lone superpower; victorious in two world wars, several regional conflicts and a Cold War. Yes, America is winning the battles, but the war has yet to be won; the war against terrorism, the war to keep America safe from attack in an increasingly unsafe world. It is a war we cannot afford to lose.

The single most important step we can take to ensure our national security is to make a full commitment to ballistic missile defense. So long as there is one nuclear weapon anywhere in the world, America must be prepared to defend herself.

H.R. 4 takes an important step in the struggle to keep America safe and secure. This legislation simply states that it will be the policy of the United States to develop and deploy a missile defense system as soon as possible. No more delays, no more demagoguing.

Fifteen years ago, critics told Ronald Reagan that a ballistic missile defense was not possible. Every time someone would tell President Reagan we were years away from having technology, he would say, let us get started.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, we should update ourselves; update ourselves on the facts, update ourselves on the arguments. Conditions change. The Rumsfeld Commission report, which was a bipartisan report, tells us of the threat. We had a very thorough briefing this morning in this room.

The North Korean missile launch across Japan this last August is a fact that we need to consider. Current intelligence estimates from the intelligence community of our country tell us that we need to update our thoughts. That is why the arguments of today must be updated. We are not giving this debate in yesteryear.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will not increase missile defense costs a penny, it will not compel a national missile defense architecture that is incompatible with the ABM Treaty, it does not mandate a deployment date or condition. We must, we must, pass this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the last 3 days I have attended two really historic events.

For the first time in our history, Members of the Congress, and I was privileged to be one of them, went to Russia to brief members of the Duma there. We briefed them on the emerging missile threat and we took with us three of the top members of the commission.

Just this morning I attended another really historic event. For only the third time in the last two decades we had a classified briefing in this chamber. Again, it was on the emerging ballistic missile threat.

For too long our citizens have been unprotected, totally unprotected. Even a single intercontinental ballistic missile could not be shot down. We cannot leave our people unprotected any longer. It is incumbent on us that we proceed with all due haste to develop a ballistic missile defense system that many of our people think we now have in place, and which, as a matter of fact, the Russians do have in place such a system, fairly robust system, that will protect about 70 percent of their people.

It is high time we get on with the task of protecting our people. I rise in strong support of this bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting situation we find ourselves in. A closed rule with no opportunity for amendment, a bill that is barely several lines, and a policy that is ready to jeopardize a consistent process of containing a threat which has 6,000 to 8,000 missiles that could rain down upon the United States, jeopardizing ABM, jeopardizing START, in order to prepare for potentially a threat if the North Koreans could develop a missile that could get to our shores.

Now, I think we ought to prepare for that. Estimates vary. We have spent \$77 billion, we have gone through Brilliant Pebbles, we have gone through a number of different machinations. We do not have anything that works. So rather than a policy and an honest debate, we come here today to ram through a line, giving no opportunity for amendment, with a statement, as the Russians today consider START treaties, consider reduction, not theoretical or potential weapons against the United States, but as they consider reducing the number of actual warheads pointed at the United States.

Russia today is a partner in that reduction. I do not know what happens 1 year or 2 down the line in a Russia that has been so rocked by economic calamity. Let us not forget the main issue here. Six thousand to eight thousand warheads in the former Soviet Union and Russia, and possibly, maybe,

maybe in 1 year, maybe in 2 years, we will have a technology that maybe will be able to prevent it. And for that, we may jeopardize cutting a deal with the Russians.

I think this is a grave mistake. Give us a chance to amend this, to include that we stay within the guidelines of the treaties that we have signed. If the Russians were here today violating treaties they had signed, every Member would be in this well objecting.

On the other hand, we have language here today the people feel, well, the Russians will have to learn. We may learn the wrong lesson from this action.

□ 1545

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, most Americans think that we have the ability to defend ourselves against incoming missiles. America has no ballistic missile defense capability. None. Today we take the right first step to address that extraordinary vulnerability.

I just want to take a minute to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and that band of dedicated Members who over many years now have focused on America's need for a missile defense system. It is too bad they were not heard sooner.

Now rogue nations do have intercontinental missile capability. Easy-to-have chemical warhead capability. Not hard for some to reach biological warhead capability. And soon it will be nuclear. Too bad we did not hear sooner.

I urge strong support for this legislation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that exactly the point is that we do not have a capable national missile defense, one that works. We do not have that. And everybody readily admits it is not the lack of money and not for lack of will. We have spent billions and billions of dollars on research and development and testing to get to the point where we still do not have a system that works.

It is not in the best interest of the national security of this country to prematurely deploy or make a decision to deploy a system. It does not work. There is no prospect that it will work any time soon. There is no prospect that a high-speed missile at a high altitude is going to be hit by another item, or bullet, as they call it.

The fact of the matter is that to decide to deploy now, as opposed to decide to continue to research and test

until we know we have something that works, sends the wrong message. We should be about nonproliferation. We should be about making sure that Russia decreases the amount of missiles that it has. We should be about bringing other people into the nonproliferation regime and making sure that we defend our country, we have no national security interest, and ignorant children, unhealthy families, or seniors having an undignified retirement.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to commend the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their long-standing work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the threat for ballistic missiles is clear and present. The current administration has finally admitted that the United States is facing a very current, very real threat. However, waiting too long to deploy a missile defense system poses a risk to the American people that is unacceptable.

How many ballistic missiles, either with or without biological, chemical or nuclear warheads, have to be targeted at American cities or American forces overseas before we take action?

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill which commits the United States to deploying a national missile defense system. Given the demonstrated threat here and now, I do not believe that we should delay the deployment of a missile defense system any longer than necessary. We must do all we can to protect America from ballistic missile threat, and this bill puts us on the right track.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding.

I rise to oppose H.R. 4. The national missile defense as proposed would not be effective. It would be costly to deploy and easily circumvented.

My colleagues, we do not have to read much history to be reminded of the Maginot Line, the so-called impenetrable wall that has become the symbol of misguided defense policy.

The proposed missile defense system probably would not work as designed, and wishing will not overcome physics. It could be confused with decoys. It could be bypassed with suitcase bombs and pickup trucks and sea-launched missiles. It would be billions of dollars down the drain. But it is not just a diversion of precious resources that we are told are not available for health

care, for smaller class sizes, for modern school facilities, for securing open space for taking care of America's veterans.

No, it is worse than a waste. Simple strategic analysis will tell us that provocative yet permeable defenses are destabilizing and they lead to reduced security. In fact, the more technically affected the system turned out to be, the worse the idea would be because of its increase in instability and the damage done to our efforts to reduce Russia's weapons.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I also commend the chairman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and others who have worked so hard to bring this to the floor.

During these and other debates in Congress, essentially what we are doing is establishing priorities. Make no mistake, the number-one priority of this Congress should be to maintain our national security and a strong defense.

Today there is an emerging ballistic missile threat to our Nation, and, in plain English, too many nations will soon have the ability to reach our shores with weapons of mass destruction.

We must stand firm and we must stand united to defend ourselves in face of this real threat. To do otherwise simply will be to ignore history, to misunderstand the nature of tyrants, to play a game and a major role I believe in weakening our national security.

Right now, America cannot defend itself against a ballistic missile attack. This resolution, while long overdue, is right for a safe and secure America. I urge its strong support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

(Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I emphatically support H.R. 4 as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The bill is simple in its articulation that Congress take the lead on this important issue and declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the sole represent-

ative of the people of Guam, our fellow American citizens who are today directly threatened by missiles in East Asia, I am continually aware of the dangers faced in our uncertain global environment. The U.S. does not currently have a system in place to defeat any inbound ICBM or, for that matter, defend a strategic theater against such a threat.

We know only too well the potential for destruction these weapons hold. This last August, when North Korea sent a three-stage Taepo Dong I over the Japanese homeland, a wakeup call was heard loud and clear here in Washington. Finally, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and I introduced a resolution condemning this event. For many years, our intelligence community underplayed this event. And thanks to the work of the Rumsfeld Commission, we now have indeed confirmed some of our worst fears.

Mr. Speaker, the threat against our Nation from missiles is here today, and the people of Guam today are at risk from the wrath of rogue states and the accidental launch. This bill is sound in that it will allow our Nation to seriously confront this issue in terms of policy as well as in our laboratories.

The development of a national missile defense does not violate the ABM Treaty because the system envisioned cannot deflect against a massive strategic attack of thousands of missiles. The national missile defense is meant to protect the national homeland against accidental launch or a limited attack by a rogue nation. This is the system I support.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4 because it cuts to the core of the issue. It honestly recognizes that there is a threat facing our Nation, States, and territories today and we are finally going to do something about it. On behalf of the people of Guam, I support this bill for the safety and defense of all Americans.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues in support of H.R. 4 this afternoon and thank the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for the work they have done on this bill.

No one wants a nuclear version of the shocking surprise attack that America suffered on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor. I am glad, then, that on a daily basis the administration is moving closer to support for deployment of a national missile defense system. We use the words like "limited" and "rogue" nations. However, there is no official list of so-called "rogue" nations.

Any deployment plan that does not protect us against all known current weapons is a roll of the dice with our national security. If we are serious about deployment, here is one litmus test. We must start testing major sys-

tems frequently, three or four times a year. Slipping into a schedule of once every 9 to 12 months is not acceptable.

Let us give our program managers the funding and political freedom to try and fail and then try again quickly. We must get serious about this. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH).

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act.

First of all, contrary to public opinion polls, we are completely defenseless against a missile attack in this country. It is not good news that we bring to the American people, but the American people deserve to know where the rubber really meets the road on this issue. We have absolutely no system in place, and the public must be aware of this. Now, these same polls show that that same American public believes that our first dollar should go to defend against a missile attack.

Secondly, contrary to what President Clinton said in his speech before this Congress 2 years ago, in which he wrongfully stated that no missiles were pointed at our children, our Nation is indeed in danger of ballistic missile attack.

A recent report, the executive summary of the Rumsfeld Commission, has confirmed that this threat is "broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than reported. . ." and moreover that the United States would have "little or no warning" to counter a missile attack.

Even the President's Secretary of Defense William Cohen has publicly stated that "the ballistic missile threat is real and is growing."

Finally, contrary to arguments on the Floor today, a ballistic missile defense system is not a budget buster. The cost to deploy initial missile defense capability will amount to less than the amount that we have spent on peacekeeping deployments over the past six years. Moreover, considering the real risk of mass destruction and loss of life that we would eliminate, the cost for a missile defense system is small.

Mr. Speaker, in the current reality, it is unconscionable to continue without a declarative national policy calling for the deployment of a missile defense system. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President keeps vetoing missile defense systems as unwarranted. He says a missile defense system would waste billions of dollars.

It is the duty of this Congress and the President to provide protection against rogue nations who have delivery systems and nuclear weapons, and

it is not a waste of money. What most Americans do not know is that we have no defense. Right now we cannot even stop one incoming missile.

North Korea, China, Iran, Iraq are true threats today. How many more missiles need to be pointed at our cities, our homes, and our families before the administration decides the threat is real?

Mr. Speaker, every American must be protected from the threat of missile attacks. They have the right to feel safe. That is what freedom means. That is what America is all about. And it is the duty of this Congress to protect our country. That is why we must pass this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act. In the past, our Nation relied on its oceans to protect it from threats from Europe or Asia. In the more recent past, we relied on the strategy of mutually assured destruction to prevent missile threats from the Soviet Union. Neither of these deterrent options are available today.

□ 1600

Today, a number of rogue terrorist states are working to build intercontinental missiles that will be able to reach America's heartland from the farthest reaches of the earth. As more and more nations like Iraq and North Korea rush to develop the capability of launching not only nuclear but chemical and biological weapons into America's heartland, it is imperative that we develop a defense against them. We avoided nuclear war with the Soviet Union through a policy of deterrence. But the world knows that we have no deterrent today. We spent billions developing and researching a national missile defense system. It is time to stop studying the problem and begin deploying the system.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, national missile defense is essential, especially after the Communist Chinese have availed themselves of America's most deadly nuclear weapons secrets and, of course, upgraded their rockets with American technology. Yet this administration still labels the Communist Chinese as our strategic partners and continues its closely held policy, its plan, for extensive military exchanges with Communist China. Even after their espionage ring was at long last revealed, the Peoples's Liberation Army delegation is still scheduled to go to Sandia nuclear weapons laboratory. Despite the opposition of the United States Army, a Chinese military delegation will observe their training exercises of the 3rd Infantry Division and the 82nd Airborne Division.

The Communist Chinese are engaged in an unprecedented modernization of their military and a missile buildup. There are those who would leave us defenseless to the Communist Chinese and turn a blind eye to this threat. This administration cannot be trusted to protect the United States. We must act and do it here in Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 4, because the threat of a missile attack against the United States is real, it exists today, and it will grow in the future. It is crucial that we defend Americans in their homes, children in their schools, men and women at their workplaces against a ballistic missile attack.

H.R. 4 is a vital first step toward protecting our own citizens here at home, but in addition to the commitment to deploy, we need to deploy as soon as technologically possible. There is no other legitimate reason to delay deployment.

The administration and some of my colleagues have proffered only very weak objections. They cite obsolete and irrelevant treaties. They question whether there even is a threat in the face of obvious threats. Some worry that the cost of a missile defense system might crimp other programs as though we should spend money on the program of the day rather than protecting American lives.

Mr. Speaker, the threat is real, the time is now, we must commit to deployment as soon as technologically possible. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill and to continue to take the steps necessary so that we in fact deploy a system to protect Americans in our homeland.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our Top Gun, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), someone who knows something about missiles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, why is this important now? In 1995, they found out there was a mole in our national labs. He had been operating during Carter, during Ronald Reagan and George Bush and also Bill Clinton. In 1996, the President was told of this. Nothing has happened. The mole was just arrested last week. That is a national security threat.

Even worse, the White House, against the insistence of the National Security Agency, DOD and DOE, let China have three capabilities which are very important to this country and others as well. One was missile boost capability. North Korea and the nations that proliferate like China and Russia give this to Iran, Iraq and North Korea. They can now reach the United States. The second is MIRV. The Chinese stole small nuclear capability, and now they can put it on the tip of a missile in multiple launch. Targeting is also very

deadly. They can hit the fourth apartment on 332nd Street in New York City now.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4, cosponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). Like many of my colleagues, I support this bill both for what it says and for what it does not say. This bill does not say when a national missile defense system must be deployed nor how a national missile defense system would be deployed nor where it would be deployed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from South Carolina have very intelligently left those decisions for the future.

Some critics of deploying this system argue that the technology is not proven. National missile defense will use the same hit-to-kill technology, the equivalent of hitting a bullet with a bullet which was proven on Monday as one of DOD's hit-to-kill missile defense programs, the PAC-3, successfully showed that this technology can work. The PAC-3 interceptor successfully destroyed its target over White Sands Missile Range last Monday.

I hope the President signs this bipartisan bill. We need to send a strong message to our citizens, to our troops, to our allies and especially to our enemies that we are serious about national missile defense.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of thank-yous to go around: The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and all the people who forged this bipartisan bill. There is a wave of bipartisanship sweeping the Congress for our military. It is long overdue. It is something to be proud of. It is something to congratulate each other over. The President is going to sign the bill. This is what the American people want, addressing real needs and real threats. It is a real threat to this country.

Other speakers have spoken of threats in terms of terrorist activity. They are real, too. We need to do more. We have cut our military by 40 percent in personnel and equipment. We need to do more to counter those threats. But this is a real threat.

Another threat is having quality men and women manning these systems. We have done a lot to deter people from staying in the military. We can come together in pay and benefits in a bipartisan fashion to make sure that not only we have a missile defense system but we have the quality people that we need to maintain these systems in the next century. That is the challenge for

this Congress. Let us rise to the occasion. I hope there is more of this over time where we come together to make sure America is strong.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly close by giving everyone the reasons that I support this bill. First of all, it allows us to realize a return on the investment of more than \$50 billion that we have already sunk in ballistic missile defense.

Secondly, it supports ground-based interceptors, the best candidate. They are treaty compliant and they fit very easily into the infrastructure of radars that we have already got that will need to be upgraded that are basically already installed, and also into the infrastructure of space-based sensors, SBIRS Low and SBIRS High, that we are going to build, anyway, and deploy because they are a complement to theater missile defenses. They help them acquire and track their targets better.

Thirdly, it will focus our efforts on completing the one form of strategic defense that can be developed and deployed in the short run. In doing this, in making this investment, we will be making an investment on technologies that are common to theater missile defense which are also kinetic-kill interceptors like the interceptor we will be building. It will also promote the THAAD and the Navy's Upper Tier.

Finally, if it is proven capable, these ground-based interceptors will give us a defense against rogue attacks and accidental attacks. I think that is a threat that exists and is emerging and possibly expanding. It will give us also a working system that we can learn from and build upon. But I want to stress "if proven capable." It has not been done yet. NMD, national missile defense, needs to be put to the test, rigorous testing, made to prove that it can hold this country harmless against a limited missile attack. If it can do that, then I think it is worth buying. If it cannot, I would emphasize there is nothing in this bill that requires us to develop and deploy a system that will not protect us.

I would say one final thing, because yesterday we marked up the budget resolution in the House Committee on the Budget. Next week it will be on the floor. This system will not come cheap. It does have the advantage of being an incremental investment on top of a huge investment we have already made, but I am really dubious that the budget resolution coming to the floor next week has enough room to accommodate the cost of this system and at the same time buy an F-22 and a Joint Strike Fighter and V-22 and the Comanche and all the other procurement items that will be coming to fruition at the same time that this bill would call for deployment of a ballistic missile defense system.

On the evening of March 23, 1983, President Reagan went on television to marshal support for his defense budget. His words would be forgotten, except for a question he popped at the end:

What if . . . people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest on the threat of instant retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, but that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our own soil or that of our allies?

Reagan answered that question by launching the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), and with it, a charged debate. The arguments ended over the old perennials of the cold war—the MX, ASATs, the B-2—years ago, but the argument over missile defense smolders still. Unlike any other system, missile defense has become a political totem. Its advocates not only disagree with its opponents; but thinking they can score politically, they accuse them of leaving the country vulnerable to missile attack. They diminish the fact that deterrence worked for all of the cold war, and act as if missile defenses are available to shield the whole country from attack, when this capability is far from proven and may never be attained. On the other hand, opponents accuse advocates of firing up a new arms race. They give little credit to the advantages of defending ourselves from attack and moving away from massive retaliation and mutual destruction, and complementing deterrence with defense.

Today, the House starts the missile defense debate again, this time with a resolution notable for its brevity. It consists of a single sentence stating: "That it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense."

The United States has deployed a national missile defense system. We spent \$15 billion (in today's money) building Sprint and Spartan and setting up Safeguard at Grand Forks, ND, only to shut the system down in 1976. Even then, the Pentagon did not quit spending on missile defense. In the year Reagan launched SDI, the Pentagon put \$991 million in its budget for missile defense, and that sum was budgeted to rise annually to \$2.7 billion by 1988. Most of it was for terminal defenses to protect MX missile silos.

After the mid-1980's the defense budget barely kept up with inflation. But with Reagan promoting it, SDI kept on increasing, rising so fast that within 4 years of his speech, SDI was the largest item in the defense budget. At \$4 billion a year, SDI got almost as much as the Army's entire account for research and development.

Sixteen years have passed, the Defense Department has spent almost \$50 billion on ballistic missile defense, and it has yet to field a strategic defense system. By anybody's reckoning, this is real money. It's hard to claim, with this much spent, that the absence of any deployed system is due to a lack of commitment. The problem is more a lack of focus than funding—plus the fact that the task is tougher than Reagan ever realized.

Early on, the architects of strategic defense decided that it had to be layered. The system had to take out some missiles to the boost phase, as they rose from their launch pads; some re-entry vehicles in the mid-course, as they traveled through space; and the remainder in the atmosphere as they descended to their targets. So, the Pentagon sank money into a family of systems: the High Endo-atmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI); the Exo-atmospheric Re-entry Vehicle Interceptor System (ERIS); and two boost-phase interceptors, one known as the Space-Based Kinetic-Kill Vehicle (SBKKV), the next more cleverly

called "Brilliant Pebbles." All of these were "kinetic killers," designed to collide with their targets. But since intercepting a target moving 7 kilometers per second is a challenge and subject to countermeasures, SDI supported directed energy as an alternative. In fact, SDI was at one time funding at least five different lasers, ground-based and space-based.

Missile defense demands earlier acquisition and better tracking of targets and a means of discriminating real targets from decoys. So, SDI put money in popup infra-red sensors known as the Ground-Based Surveillance and Tracking System (GSTS) and space-based infra-red sensors known as the Space and Missile Tracking System (SMTS) and now known as Space-Based Infrared Sensors (SBIRS) Low. It even tried interactive discriminators as esoteric as a neutral particle beam, based in space.

Not all of these pursuits were blind alleys, and by no means was all of the money wasted. The ERIS, for example, was by-passed for a better interceptor. But the projectile built by the Army for the ERIS was adopted by the Navy for its theater missile interceptor. By the same token, the Army's theater missile interceptor has a sapphire window, developed for the HEDI as a heat-resistant aperture to see within the atmosphere, where friction produces terrific heat.

After the gulf war, SDIO evolved into BMDO (Ballistic Missile Defense Organization), and its charter was broadened to include theater defense as well. With billions of dollars spent on research, BMDO began to assess what was feasible. Laser systems were deemed futuristic, too far over the horizon. Ground-based laser beams were hard to propagate through the atmosphere without distortion, and space-based lasers were hard to power and protect from attack. Boost-phase interceptors orbiting in space were also vulnerable to attack, technically challenging, and expensive to deploy, given the number needed for enough always to be on station. Even if all these problems were overcome, boost-phase interceptors could be outrun by missiles with fast-burn boosters, like Russia's SS-24, a mobile missile with a booster burn-out time of 180 seconds.

Emphasis shifted, therefore, to the ground-based systems. Since interdiction in the atmosphere is hard to do, the endo-atmospheric interceptor was sidetracked, and the whole mission devolved to mid-course interceptors. These have the merit of being treaty-compliant and technically mature, and are clearly the best candidate to go first. But no one should think they answer Ronald Reagan's dream. The first problem they face are countermeasures in the form of decoys, chaff, and re-entry vehicles (RV's) enveloped in balloons, which lure the interceptors off course. The next is a limiting condition SDIO acknowledged in a 1992 report. Because of the radiation, heat, and electromagnetic effects generated when RV's are destroyed and exploded, SDIO decided that it could not postulate the take-out of more than 200 re-entry vehicles by mid-course interceptors. If our country were attacked by an adversary with an arsenal as large and sophisticated as Russia's, the first wave could easily include more than 200 warheads, and even with a smaller attack, the same problem could thwart tracking with infrared sensors and radar.

H.R. 4 says that it is our policy to deploy a national missile defense. Although not identified, the mid-course interceptor is the clear candidate for this mission. This is not a system, however, that will "render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete," in the words of President Reagan. If we have learned anything over past sixteen years, we have learned that a leak-proof defense is so difficult, it may never be attained. H.R. 4 calls for a "national missile defense," and the committee report makes it clear that this means system to protect us against limited strikes. By "limited" strikes, the committee report means that the objective system should take out up to 20 oncoming warheads. This is the near-term goal, and even it is not ready to deploy.

There is legitimate concern about how Russia may react to this push for deployment. In truth, the system this bill anticipates will not defend us against a concerted attack by a nation with an arsenal as large and diverse as Russia's, not in the near future anyway. If it can be shown to work, it should defend us against rogue or accidental strikes and some unauthorized strikes, and Russia should have no objection to that.

This level of missile defense seems to be within our reach, but it is not yet within our grasp. Secretary Cohen has just added \$6.6 billion to BMD recently and put his support behind national missile defense (NMD), but he warned that the technology is "challenging" and "highly risky." Look at our experience so far with theater missile defense (TMD) systems. They are not comparable one-to-one to NMD, but when the Army's Theater High Altitude Area Defense System (THAAD) is 0-5 in testing, and the Navy's Upper Tier is 0-4, we should be wary of just presuming that a ground-based interceptor can travel thousands of miles into the exo-atmosphere and hit an RV four feet long.

The merit to me in this one-sentence bill is not what it says but what it does not say. It recognizes that the technology of missile defense has yet to be tested and proven, and it does not presume to say what will be deployed, when it will be deployed, or where it will be deployed.

This bill does not mandate a date certain for deployment. There is no threat now that requires us to rush development and testing or to settle for a substandard system just to say we have deployed something. In 1991, the Senate imposed on us in conference a "Missile Defense Act" which made it a national "goal" to deploy a missile defense system by 1996. It is now 1999, and nothing has been deployed, which shows the folly of legislating deployment dates.

This bill also does not mention the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Everyone knows that we are developing ground-based interceptors that are treaty-compliant. This bill does not specify the number of interceptors or where they will be deployed, and it does not need to—not yet. We will not enhance our security by pushing NMD so hard that we derail Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) II and doom START III. Unlike past bills, H.R. 4 also does not tell the Administration what it must negotiate with the Russians, and it should not. For now, compliance with the ABM Treaty is necessary to ratifying START II and negotiating START III. If we are concerned about the spread of nuclear weapons, or the risk of unauthorized or accidental attack, or

the cost of maintaining our strategic forces at START I levels, both treaties are important—probably a lot more important to our near-term security than a limited missile defense system. The treaties are important also to the long-run role of the missile defense, because nuclear warheads in the United States and Russia must be lowered to a couple of thousand on each side if national missile defense is ever to become an effective complement to deterrence.

If this bill's attraction is its brevity, it's fair to ask, "What purpose is served by passing it?" I know some think this bill is to stiffen the resolve of the Clinton administration, but I don't think that's necessary. The Clinton administration has put a billion dollars a year into developing a ground-based system, and for the last several years, Congress has generally acquiesced in that level of spending. This year the President's budget includes funds for deploying an NMD which amount to a plus-up to \$6.6 billion or a total of \$10.5 billion over FY 1999–FY 2005. That sounds like a system taking shape to me, and that's one of the reasons I support deployment as our objective. At this level of effort, we should be thinking about a deployable system, and not more viewgraphs to go on the shelf.

If anything, it may be the House that needs to check its resolve. Yesterday, the House Budget Committee reported a Budget Resolution that takes \$205 billion out of the President's defense budget for the years 2004–2009. This is the very time period when the system this bill supports will be ready to deploy, along with a host of others: the Army's THAAD, the Navy's Upper Tier, PAC-3, the F-22, the F-18 E & F, the Comanche, the V-22, and the JSF. You cannot load on to this full plate ballistic missile defense—ground-based interceptors, SBIRs Low and SBIRs High, radar upgrades, and BMCCC—and pay the billions it will cost with a defense budget that's flat-funded for six years, from 2004–2009.

I think there is an emerging threat and there are good reasons for developing ballistic missile defenses, but let's not fool ourselves. Like all weapon systems, missile defense will not come cheap, and when the time comes to buy it, rhetoric won't pay the bills.

In summary, here are my reasons for supporting this bill:

(1) It allows us to realize a return on the investment of nearly \$50 billion made already on ballistic missile defense.

(2) It supports ground-based interceptors that are treaty-compliant and fit easily into an infrastructure of ground-based radars that are already installed and space-based sensors (SBIR's Low and High) that are already being developed for targeting theater missile interceptors defenses and tactical intelligence.

(3) It focuses BMDO on completing the one form of strategic defense that can be developed and deployed in the short-run, and further develops technologies on a continuum with theater missile defense systems, particularly THAAD and Navy Upper Tier.

(4) If proven capable, ground-based interceptors will give us some defense against rogue and accidental attacks and a working system to learn from and build upon. The best way to find if midcourse interceptors can discriminate decoys from real RV's is to build and test the actual interceptors and the target and guidance systems.

(5) Finally, I support this bill in the hope that we can put BMD on a bipartisan footing. TMD enjoys bipartisan support; NMD has been a bone of contention. Now that the technology is taking shape and showing promise, NMD needs to stand the test of any weapons system. It ought to be put to rigorous testing, and made to prove that it can hold this country harmless against a limited missile attack. If strategic defense can prove its mettle, I think we should buy it and deploy it. If it can't, nothing in this bill requires us to buy a dud.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), coauthor of this bill who is mainly responsible for us being here today.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to applaud the level of debate today on this issue and thank Members from both sides for their diligence in focusing on this issue. I want to applaud the integrity of the opponents of this issue. And I want to point out the difference between the opponents in this body who stood up and focused on their opposition and the opponents in the other body who twice stopped a similar bill from getting up to a vote and then had the audacity to change and vote for it on the Senate floor yesterday. So I applaud the opponents who have a logical and philosophical difference with what we have done here and I applaud them for taking the steps to oppose it, even though I disagree with them.

I do take issue with those who say that we do not care about human concerns. Mr. Speaker, I am a teacher. I spent 7 years teaching in the public schools of Pennsylvania and for 3 of those years I ran a chapter 1 program serving those children with educational and economic deprivations. I support education. I support human services and needs. But what do we tell, Mr. Speaker, the families of those 28 young Americans who came home in body bags? They were hit by a missile. Do we tell them that we are not going to pursue a defense? Do we tell them that there is some other more important priority after they volunteered to serve our Nation?

We have no choice but to pursue missile defense, Mr. Speaker, because that is the weapon of choice by rogue nations. I do take issue with those who say that we are trying to harm our strategic relationship with Russia. For the last 20 years since graduating from college with a degree in Russian studies, I have focused on Russia. I have been there 18 years and I have been focusing on ways to provide more economic stability with that nation. That is not a reason for us to deny protection for our people. We need to provide this system to protect Americans. It is time for us to vote. Not to provide cover for Members.

If Members support the President's policy of waiting a year and then deciding whether or not he should deploy,

vote against this bill. But if they feel as we do, it is time based upon the threat and based upon the changing world to move in a new direction, where instead of threatening each other with long-range missiles, we begin developing a new relationship where we defend ourselves and our people and our troops. I happen to think as a teacher and a person very concerned about human issues that that is the right thing to do as we approach the new millennium.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and support this bill to provide protection for our people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4, the Missile Defense Bill. I think we all agree that this is a vitally important issue to the American people. That is why I am disappointed by the Republican Leadership's decision to deny any member the basic right of introducing an amendment to this bill so we may have a full and open debate.

For example, the closed rule under which we are debating this bill blocks the amendment from my good friend from Maine, Representative ALLEN. The Allen amendment proposes ideas I believe my Republican colleagues would support. The Allen amendment specifies that the United States deploy a National Missile Defense that is operationally effective and that a National Missile Defense System not jeopardize other efforts to reduce threats to the United States. If we can not agree on these points, then I fear we are farther apart than I imagined.

The future of this country depends on a strong economy and a strong military. Neither is possible without an educated populace. That means that everyday, we have to make difficult decisions about where we spend our money and that we must be wise when deciding such matters. Therefore, we must not rush to deploy any missile defense system that will not guarantee our protection.

This debate involves many complex issues. Lest some of my colleagues have forgotten, one of our potentially most significant foreign relations accomplishments over the last 30 years was our agreement with the former Soviet Union to reduce the size of our nuclear arsenals. I am talking about the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the START II and III nuclear arms reduction proposals. And I say they are potentially significant because I worry that if we pass the current version of H.R. 4, we would be in violation of the ABM Treaty and force the Russian Duma to fail to ratify START II. Additionally, as far as Russia is concerned, do we really want to put pressure on a country trying to stabilize its fragile economy by tempting it to respond to our actions.

I agree with my colleagues who believe that a new threat to our security has emerged and that we have a responsibility to address that threat. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I know as well as anyone that the potential for a rogue state to strike our shores may exist in the near future. However, it would be irresponsible for us to rush to meet that potential threat by spending money on something that one, is not even technologically possible and two, even if it were possible, would not end the threat.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need a missile defense. If we need anything, we need a strong

non-proliferation policy. If my colleagues only want a missile defense, then they will have the chance to vote for that today. However, if they truly want to protect the American people, then they will only settle for something that also attempts to stop other, more realistic, threats to our safety, such as cruise missiles or smuggled bombs. The missile defense systems being considered do not adequately address these possibilities. The remarks of Secretary Cohen are very poignant here. The Secretary acknowledged that the Joint Chiefs of Staff worry more about a suitcase bomb going off in one of our cities and that very few countries would launch an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile aimed at the United States, knowing that they would face virtual elimination.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 4.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I support of H.R. 4 and would like to discuss one of the most important issues currently facing our nation. Many rogue states have already proven their ability to attack the United States via long-range missile capability or nuclear-weapons program and others are known to be close to obtaining this capability.

The United States cannot fully prevent other nations from obtaining missile technology, allowing them the capability to launch missiles that may reach our borders. During their recent dispute with Taiwan, China threatened to bomb Los Angeles; North Korea recently launched a three-stage rocket over Japan; and a published CIA report determined that they will soon have the technology to reach the west coast of the United States. Knowing that the Chinese have the capability to attack my district in California, and that the North Koreans are not far behind, compounded by the fact that we have nothing to protect us from attack, strikes fear into the hearts of my constituents and me.

For the Clinton Administration to have delayed making a National Missile Defense System a top priority is a tragic mistake. To rely on the ABM Treaty, an archaic, outdated agreement with a country that does not even exist any longer, shows that our nation's security needs are a low priority for this Administration.

Our federal government is responsible for the general defense of our nation. The post-Cold War world is littered with dangerous, rogue nations that either possess or are pushing toward development of nuclear weapons. North Korea and China have already illustrated the capability to threaten the U.S., but they will not be the last. If we have one Saddam or bin Laden with nuclear missile capability, they could kill millions of American citizens under our current defense security posture.

Right now, Mr. Chairman, we can insure that this nightmare never becomes reality. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this important bill and make it a priority to deploy a national missile defense system. It is my personal belief that such a system should play to our technological strengths and should include a sea-based element. Sea-based anti-missile systems would provide flexibility to protect our forces around the world as well as the 50 states.

Further, we must have the courage to modify, or even scrap, the ABM Treaty when it is in our supreme national interest to do so. Mr.

Chairman, defense is never provocative and weakness is never wise. We must pursue a national missile defense immediately.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is very simple and straightforward. H.R. 4 states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system. Most Americans would be puzzled by this, because it is a widely held misconception that we have an anti-ballistic missile defense system in place to protect the United States from any incoming missile; either an accidental launch from Russia, or an intended launch from China or any number of rogue nations.

Yes, we spent \$40 billion in the 1980's for research and development of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). However, liberal naysayers and the media criticized the program for being a threat to the former Soviet Union, while trivializing and demonizing the program as "Star Wars." Once the Berlin Wall fell and the Soviet Union collapsed, the collective wisdom of liberal policy makers convinced the public that such a missile defense system was no longer needed; the program was allowed to fade into a meager research effort.

Unfortunately, here we are today still facing a formidable nuclear weapons arsenal of more than 7,000 warheads in the former Soviet Union. Moreover, the development of a ballistic missile capability in China, coupled by the intent of North Korea, Iran and Pakistan to briskly pursue advanced ICBM programs places the United States and the world at great risk. In addition, rogue states led by Iraq, Libya and Syria are pursuing ambitious ballistic weapons programs of their own. These sobering realities were again presented to each of us this morning by the threat analysis of the Rumsfeld Commission.

However, President Clinton is opposed to this bill. According to the Statement of Administration policy, the Clinton Administration opposed this resolution for two reasons; they oppose the commitment to deploy a missile defense system and they are concerned about violating the Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. I cannot understand this Administration's reluctance to fully defend the American people, nor their concerns about complying with a treaty that we made with a country that no longer exists.

Mr. Speaker, it's high time that the policy of the United States is to fully defend our nation from all threats, including incoming ballistic missiles. We are very close to achieving the technological challenge and capability of a "hitting a bullet with a bullet." We must not allow the Administration's reluctance to get in the way of protecting Americans; let's support this legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to American families. Tonight, as you sleep, we cannot adequately protect you and your children from a ballistic missile attack from rogue nations, let alone Russia or China.

We simply must protect American families. It is our duty—that is why we are here today. Deploying a national missile defense to protect American families simply makes sense.

The Administration's current arms control strategy has failed miserably, while rogue nations progress in developing long-ranges missiles capable of carrying nuclear, chemical, or biological warheads.

In addition to the established nuclear powers of China and Russia, the Administration

has tried, and failed, to prevent Russia from aiding Iran's progress in missile technology and guidance systems. The Administration has failed, too, in Iraq and North Korea. India and Pakistan have established themselves as members of the nuclear club, and Cuba is now being helped by Russia with its own reactor.

According to the Rumsfeld Commission, rogue nation like North Korea and Iran will be able to inflict major destruction on the U.S. within about five years of a decision to acquire such a capability. Further, rogues can import technology from Russia and China and greatly decrease acquisition times and increase secrecy.

Today, rogue nations don't need to develop weapons of mass destruction, the merely need to purchase it.

Despite the overwhelming evidence of the rogue nation threat, the Administration continues to downplay the threat, delay funding and deployment of a national missile defense, and risk the life of every American. This is unacceptable.

It is time for the Administration and Congress to make preserving our security and our freedom a priority. It makes no sense at all to grant Russia or China a say in our policy to defend ourselves.

We have the technology, designs, and intelligence. All we need is the straight forward policy, and we can begin to deliver on our constitutional duty to adequately defend American families.

We can no longer afford to follow the Administration's policy of mutual assured destruction. Rather, we must have a policy of defending American families.

Vote for H.R. 4 today, and support a policy that will provide for deployment of a national missile defense.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing a matter of national security and national protection. H.R. 4, calls for the prompt deployment of a national missile defense system. This legislation is long overdue.

According to a congressional advisory panel report from July of 1998, missile threats are widely and drastically underestimated. Our enemies are working aggressively to develop ballistic missile systems capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction. Iran, North Korea, China, and others are all developing missile systems for one purpose: to target the United States. We cannot afford to let this threat go unchecked.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is worth more than the safety of our citizens. Yet our critics claim that development of a national missile defense system is too costly. Nothing could be further from the truth. The cost to deploy an initial National Missile Defense capability will amount to less than the amount the United States has spent on peacekeeping deployments over the past 6 years.

In 1995, President Clinton vetoed legislation similar to that which we are debating today. In his veto message, the President called the deployment of a national missile defense "unwarranted." Today, the President has indicated that he will sign our legislation. I am relieved that the President has finally agreed with my Republican colleagues and I on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which should need little debate. I urge my colleagues to support a national missile defense and vote in favor of H.R. 4.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, when John F. Kennedy committed our Nation to sending a man to the moon by the end of the 1960s, he was not ambiguous and he did not hedge. He committed this Nation to a hard-to-reach goal with the knowledge that American ingenuity and hard work could get the job done. He was right then and we are right now to set this goal before us.

The spread of ballistic missile technology—combined with the spread of chemical, biological, and potentially nuclear technology—to nations openly hostile to the United States and our allies has introduced a new threat and new dimension to American security.

The spread of this threatening technology has occurred at a rate faster than was predicted just recently by our intelligence community. This fact requires an immediate response to protect our Nation sooner rather than later.

The technology underpinning a national missile defense system is unproven today. Much work remains to be done before a working system can be deployed. However, unless we treat this threat and our response seriously and proceed with a firm commitment to deployment, we will leave ourselves vulnerable to our most dangerous and unpredictable enemies.

Protection from this threat must be treated with the highest degree of seriousness. National missile defense must be undertaken in conjunction with other defense needs. Failure to commit to the deployment of this protection for our Nation will mean that it is undertaken with too little funding and too little attention to deploy a missile defense system in time to respond to existing and emerging threats.

Our first priority must be to ensure the protection of our Nation and our armed forces defending American interests abroad. Some have said that this system might not stop all attacks. Should our response be to provide no protection? Of course not. I do not agree with that response and neither should you. Vote for H.R. 4 and protect our citizens from the actions of irresponsible nations.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should wholeheartedly support House Concurrent Resolution 42, a resolution to support the sense of Congress that the President is authorized to deploy U.S. troops as a part of a NATO peacekeeping operation to implement a peace agreement in Kosovo.

I am very disappointed in Congress' reluctance to commit an American contingent of 4,000 troops to serve as peacekeepers in an attempt to stabilize the region. At the same time members of Congress are debating the U.S. position, American negotiators are in France struggling to negotiate a settlement palatable to both sides. Although I do believe that an open debate about troop deployment in Kosovo before the American public is necessary, now is not the appropriate time to carry on such debate, given the extreme fragility of the peace process.

Indisputably, peace in the region is in the best interests of the United States. Noncompliance with our obligation to the organization and lack of support for our European allies, may in turn lead them to forgo the peace process as well, a move that will negatively affect our relationship with Europe, as well as future joint military endeavors.

Although NATO was originally established for the purpose of deterring Soviet aggression in Europe, the Alliance is still a necessary ve-

hicle to neutralize aggressors on the continent. This is especially true in the context of leaders such as Slobodan Milosevic, whose political ambitions have the potential to disrupt regional political, social, and economic harmony. Indeed, even though political changes brought about by the end of the cold war have altered NATO's original purpose, the organization still plays a meaningful role in the region by promoting political, social, and economic ties among European nations. Certainly, the United States, as a major participant in the organization, has a strategic and humanitarian interest in preventing the conflict from spinning out of control.

Undeniably, there is ample evidence to demonstrate that if the situation is left untended, the conflict in Kosovo will draw in Albanians from four surrounding regions—Macedonia, Montenegro, northern Greece and Albania—further destabilizing the region, increasing the number of refugees, infecting Greek-Turkish relations, and souring relations between member countries of NATO. One cannot profess concern about the future of NATO and the stability of Southern Europe, while standing idly by, declining to react to this alarming state of affairs.

If members of the KLA eventually accept the terms laid out by European and American negotiators, I believe without reserve that America should participate by contributing peacekeeping troops. Since the deal calls for the Europeans to commit 25,000 troops, and the U.S. only 4,000, it is they who are assuming the majority of the responsibility, which, in and of itself, is in the best interests of our country. The U.S. is, and must remain, an influential player in Europe, and therefore cannot remain entirely aloof from taking on a major role in the brokering of a deal between the warring parties. Unquestionably, the contribution of 4,000 troops is within the means and the interests of the United States.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this legislation that will push the United States down a slippery slope and lock us into an automatic deployment of a national missile defense system. This system is a highly speculative policy with regards to cost and effectiveness. The best defense is a smart defense. The U.S. needs not just smart weapons, but smart soldiers. This decision contributes to neither. H.R. 4 will siphon off important resources that should focus on ensuring that our troops have the equipment and the training they need to maintain our security. The advocates for "Star Wars" or strategic defense initiatives can change the names, but not the facts! What kind of message are we relaying to our constituents back home? Congress should not be in the business of writing a blank check for yet another version of "Star Wars." A pipe dream which commits to spending over \$100 billion without any assurance of success and evidence that such action will erode effective disarmament and weapons agreements such as the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM). Today, there is a long agenda of real needs. Too many schools are crumbling down and overcrowded, much environmental cleanup is needed, veterans are in need of adequate health care and the future of the Social Security and Medicare Insurance are crying for attention. Investments in our people today must surely take priority over such questionable spending policies that is intended by this

version of the national missile defense measure.

Why rush to give blanket authority for deployment of a national missile defense at an unspecified cost? The United States has already spent over \$120 billion on missile defense research and development, including \$67 billion since President Ronald Reagan's "Star Wars" initiative. Recent systems tests have failed 14 out of 18 times and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General John Shelton recently stated that the United States does not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense. In addition, the Clinton Administration recently proposed spending \$10.5 billion over the next five years to step-up research of a workable system. Furthermore, many scientists inside and outside of the government testify that any system, no matter the sophistication, would be relatively easy for an enemy to circumvent at far less cost. And worse yet, this initiative would lead to a renewed qualitative arms race to defeat such a national missile defense system.

Nonetheless, H.R. 4, a 15-word measure, would give blanket endorsement by the House, mandating automatic missile defense deployment without regard to taxpayers, regardless of its impact on global stability and regardless of whether or not it actually would be effective. This bill will provide a false sense and illusion of security and waste important tax dollars that could better serve people programs or even real defense needs.

Clearly, this 15-word bill would fundamentally undermine international arms control and disarmament agreements which have effectively preserved and advanced U.S. and global security over the past three decades. Furthermore, this bill sends the wrong message to Russia and other nations at a crucial time. It would seriously damage relations with Russia, violate the ABM, jeopardize the ratification of the START II Treaty by the Russian Duma and undermine decades of efforts to advance national and international security through arms control and disarmament agreements. This could stimulate an escalating nuclear arms race with China which would view such a deployment as a threat to its current limited nuclear deterrent. An end to Russian nuclear disarmament, the decommissioning and disassembly of nuclear weapons and a nuclear arms race with China and others would undermine U.S. security far more than the alleged threat from rogue nations such as North Korea or Iran. H.R. 4 will reverse the ongoing successful arms reductions initiatives and in fact reverse U.S. policy that has been in place for 4 decades.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate I've heard many, too many different explanations of what these 15 words mean, I guess that they mean whatever an individual may claim, but I've no doubt that this action will be interpreted as the green light to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to in fact move forward beyond the \$10 billion that is already planned by the Clinton administration. This is not a benign matter, it is the renewal of a path to policy well traveled. An engraved invite to develop, spend and undercut existing treaty agreements. The wrong policy path.

The recent threats we face from North Korea and other rogue nations do not require the deployment of a national missile defense system. The United States has faced the threat from long-range missiles for 40 years.

We should continue to do what we can to control the spread of this technology and to gain agreements, such as the nuclear power accords achieved with North Korea in the last 4 years. But, it is much easier for a terrorist group or rogue nation to smuggle nuclear devices or biological weapons across our borders than to develop huge ballistic missiles under the watchful eye of our satellite systems. Locking-in deployment does nothing about the real threats we face today. A missile defense looks up at the sky for missiles when we should be looking on the ground for terrorists in a panel truck.

Technology for a national defense system is actually more sophisticated, not less than some other forms, because of the shortened timeframe, low trajectory, and limited ability to detect such weapons deployment and activation.

This total initiative seems to cast Congress and this issue into a political ploy more designed for emotion than rational decision making. Frankly, the spread of knowledge of weapons of mass destruction is in fact the real world that we must live with. The United States of America has, in many instances, been the source of that knowledge. Isn't it time to stop or at least slow down the merry-go-round? Maybe it is time to review the film, "Dr. Strangelove." As many of you know, this film addresses the consequences and results of actions such as this. The basic problem is changing mindsets and attitudes to realize that we share vulnerability, not to pretend and falsely promise what cannot be achieved. We live in a interdependent world. The path to more security is found in addressing the problems, not pretending that we can build a wall around the United States and be isolated and impervious to events and developments in other nations.

I urge all members to vote no on H.R. 4.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the development of a national missile defense is vital and I support this resolution. The bottom line is that this is a natural evolution for our defense.

Once upon a time, our ancestors built walls of stone to defend themselves from swords and arrows. As military weapons have evolved, so must our defenses. While some in this chamber raise legal, treaty-oriented objections to this bill, we know that the reality of our age is that a missile attack on U.S. soil by some rogue nations may soon be technically achievable and perhaps politically desirable.

We don't have to go far back in time to understand this. We all know that the single bloodiest moment for American servicemen and women in the Gulf War was the moment an Iraqi Scud landed on the barracks occupied by our forces.

If anyone doubts that a despotic leader would take an opportunistic chance to launch a missile attack at American soil—even as merely a demonstration strike or as a symbolic strike, consider the SCUD missile attacks on Israel. While there was clearly no military advantage to be gained through that action, Saddam Hussein launched those attacks to prove that he could, and to see if it would rouse support from other nations.

Given those circumstances, we have no choice but to embrace the policy declared in this bill and move forward with the development of a national missile defense system.

This is not a threat that will pass. The Rumsfeld Commission has opened our eyes

to the reality that this is not a situation we can postpone. The responsible action at this moment in history is to rally the political support necessary to make a national missile defensive system available to protect the American people as soon as possible.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, in May, George Lucas will release the next Star Wars sequel. I can hardly wait to see it. Apparently I am not alone, since today we'll vote on our own sequel to Star Wars. Unlike Mr. Lucas an 20th Century Fox who can be confident it will be a hit and a money maker, all we know is that our Star Wars sequel will cost a lot of money—\$50 billion and counting. As for whether it will be a hit, hit-to-kill technology is nowhere near feasible.

Now when 20th Century Fox makes a big, expensive movie they usually go with a proven formula for success. When they gamble, they may end up with *Waterworld* or *Ishtar*. The United States cannot afford an expensive flop.

When 20th Century Fox isn't sure they have a hit, they bring in focus groups and maybe edit or reshoot some footage. It usually won't cost too much. We won't have that option.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4, a bill that would make it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system. I do not know if it should be the policy of the United States to deploy such a system. I think few of us do. Because we have not had a national debate yet.

We don't know what it will cost.

We don't know what the impact will be on our future nuclear arms reduction negotiations with the Russians.

We don't know the impact on Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

And we don't know if it will work.

We need a national debate on a national missile defense. A couple of hours today will not engage the American people in this important debate.

I wish the majority had allowed a genuine floor debate on the Allen Amendment to establish the criteria for deployment. If the House is going to establish this policy, we need to have clear deployment criteria. We should not take this step until National Missile Defense:

(1) has been demonstrated to be operationally effective against the most significant threat identified at the time of such deployment (and for a reasonable period of time thereafter);

(2) does not diminish the overall national security of the United States by jeopardizing other efforts to reduce threats to the United States, including negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces; and

(3) is affordable and does not compromise the ability of the uniformed service chiefs and the commanders of the regional unified commands to meet their requirements for operational readiness, quality of life of the troops, programmed modernization of weapons systems, and the deployment of planned theater missile defenses.

We are doing the American people no favor by rushing this bill through the Congress so that we can say we're addressing the perceived threat. Let's take our time, get it right, and use our constituents' tax money wisely.

That will make our Star Wars the kind of blockbuster that every American will want to see.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express support for H.R. 4, and I will vote

in favor of this legislation. We certainly should not fail to explore the possibilities of protecting the United States from missile attack from enemies across the globe.

But, we must also make a realistic assessment of the threats we face and consider how we can best use our resources. While the threat of a hostile missile attack exists, the far greater threat comes from terrorism, whether domestic or international, and whether sponsored by rogue individuals, organizations or states. The weapons of mass destruction I most fear are not intercontinental ballistic missiles traveling through the stratosphere, but those coming across our land and sea ports and delivered by an aerosol can, suitcase or panel truck.

To protect against such asymmetrical threats we must devote appropriate resources to Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and even the Coast Guard. These agencies are our nation's first line of defense along our borders and major ports of entry. More personnel and better technology are needed if we want to defend against terrorists trying to smuggle into the United States weapons of mass destruction. We want more commerce with our neighbors and international trading partners, yet we do not provide adequate resources to the very agencies tasked with managing the trade.

Just this week federal authorities, including the INS, arrested 15 people on charges of operating an immigration fraud ring that helped members of an alleged Iranian terrorist group enter the United States illegally. Several years ago, a cargo ship owned by a Chinese shipping company and destined for the United States was boarded off the California coast and a cache of firearms was discovered. With current resources and technology are we able to stop an illegal weapons or known dangerous persons from entering the United States?

The administration has included in its budget \$10.5 billion for fiscal years 1999 through 2005 for national missile defense. I say in addition to this money we devote more resources to those dedicated individuals on our nation's borders and ports of entry who manage our international trade and face potential threats everyday.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, each day, Members of this House debate how to save Social Security and Medicaid. How to cut taxes. How to stay within mandated spending caps. All to make sure that we only spend tax money on things we need—and things that work.

Now comes the missile defense bill. Before casting this vote, let's review what we know—and what we don't know—about this proposal.

We do know that we already have a national missile defense—the threat of swift and disproportionate retaliation with our own nuclear weapons.

We don't know if an anti-ballistic system will work—which is why almost no-one will attest to its reliability. Even the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has said that “we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense.”

We do know that an anti-ballistic system cannot defend against the most probable form of attack. The likeliest 21st-century enemies will use cheap, hard-to-trace methods to kill Americans, like gassing subways or poisoning reservoirs.

We do know it would be expensive. We've already spent \$120 billion, and estimates now approach \$200 billion more.

But we don't know where this money will come from. Do we sacrifice veterans' benefits, or home health care? Education or environmental protection?

We do know that this bill undermines years of progress with the one country whose missiles actually pose a threat—Russia. For decades, we've negotiated to reduce Russia's nuclear arsenal. The Russian parliament is considering deeper cuts. But Russia sees an American missile defense as a direct threat to its own deterrent and a reason to abandon nuclear arms reductions.

We don't know if Russia can even maintain its current force level without an accident—Besides setting back years of diplomacy, this bill could actually increase the risk of an accidental launch as Russia tries to manage a missile force with its crumbling infrastructure.

We do know that this bill could begin a new arms race. Other nations may feel so threatened that they will seek to develop weapons to counteract our missile defense.

In short, we are asked today to authorize enormous sums of public money to nullify years of arms control. To risk re-igniting the arms race. All for a defense system that may not work. To protect us from a threat that may not materialize.

It doesn't take New England frugality to recognize that we can do better, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “no.”

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against H.R. 4, a bill committing the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as a matter of national policy.

I will not repeat the arguments against passing the bill, since such arguments have little impact on most Members. Frankly, leaders on both sides are supporting the bill largely because they think that it is a good political strategy or that failure to do so may be used against them in the next election. These are not ignoble motives. In fact, concern for our national defense is a very noble motive, and I deeply respect those of my colleagues who express this concern.

However, during the 1960's and 1970's when similar arguments were made to deploy an ABM system, or to escalate the Vietnam war, Presidents and their advisors made the same supportive arguments aware that they could not be justified. They reversed themselves, recanting their former words only when the American people came to understand the unwinnability of a ground war in Asia in a situation where no vital U.S. interests were at stake and the futility of a missile arms race, either offensive or defensive, against the U.S.S.R. In the face of great odds both the United States and the U.S.S.R. moved toward arms control and reduction and toward cooperation in a growing number of economic and political areas.

I am confident that the leaders of the nations of the world have passed the era of even considering nuclear war as a viable option. For a rogue nation or a terrorist group to deliver a nuclear device by means of a ballistic missile, whose launch point can be precisely detected, amounts to national suicide, even if it were to evade the proposed U.S. missile defense system.

Our efforts today should be focused on eliminating the causes of war, of which the

largest is economic inequality and endemic poverty around the world. A small fraction of the cost of the missile defense system would give us a good start on such a program.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to recommit. H.R. 4 is a bill whose time has not come. It is a bill whose time, arguably, may never come. As General Hugh Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in February of this year, “The simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense. We have, in fact, put some \$40 billion into the program over the last 10 years. But today we do not technologically have a bullet that can hit a bullet.” General Shelton, testifying only 44 days ago before the House Armed Services about this issue, continues: “The technology to hit a bullet with a bullet remains elusive.”

Yet today the House is considering legislation that presumes this technology does exist, when it in fact does not. H.R. 4 presumes this missile defense system can be developed and deployed, when in fact after tens of billion dollars in research, in General Shelton's words, it “remains elusive.” If General Shelton's summation is not simple enough, I offer an analogy which easily explains my opposition to H.R. 4: the cart should not be put before the horse. The decision to deploy a National Missile Defense system should not be made until there is a clear capability to address a potential national security threat.

How many times has a defense technology been rushed to the field in a spectacular shower of funding from Congress, only to be declared obsolete on the day when the last bolt is tightened or just as a system is declared “fully operational”? With all the good intentions of this Congress to take steps to preserve national security, there are too many questions regarding the readiness of this technology to consider beginning deployment of a National Missile Defense.

Let our research scientists, engineers and military commanders finish their job, first. If there is a national security threat that can be addressed with a proven national missile defense technology, bring that evidence before Congress, and then let's decide whether or not it makes sense to deploy such a system. But until then, I urge my colleagues to not get ahead of the horse.

Equally as troubling to me is the fact that H.R. 4 in its brevity fails to recognize the arms control gains we have made under the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The deployment of a system as prematurely proposed by this bill may in fact put us in noncompliance with this treaty, a treaty that has slowed arms development for nearly 30 years. I worry that this bill could send the wrong message to Russia and China, who might likely see it as a signal to start the arms race again. It might also be viewed by other nations as an invitation to join in.

As H.R. 4 is silent on these issues, it provides an oversimplified policy for an extremely complex, interdependent group of concerns. The 15-word, one sentence policy statement in H.R. 4 grossly trivializes the importance of this issue of national defense. Without serious consideration of the full ramifications of this policy, and without the opportunity to amend this bill to do justice to this national security issue, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of H.R. 4 the Weldon-Spratt National Missile Defense bill. I am a cosponsor of the bill and urge my colleagues to support it. At the same time, I strongly support the amendment offered by TOM ALLEN, which was not allowed on the floor, which clarifies that we will not deploy a system unless we know that it works. The Allen amendment also makes clear that the readiness and Theater Missile Defense (TMD) of our troops is our top priority. We may have an opportunity to vote for this sensible alternative as a motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Even as we pass this bill we need to come clean with the American people. We have not been able to make National Missile Defense work, and at this time, we don't have a system to deploy. We are developing this system as fast as we can, in fact, we may be pushing the technology too hard. But significant challenges remain. We have experienced a series of failures with our medium-range THAAD system. If we can't even do THAAD, how are we going to do National Missile Defense, where the targets are much faster and much more sophisticated? The Army successfully tested the shorter range PAC-3 missile defense system this week. And we all hope that THAAD will get back on track with a successful test next month. But we shouldn't kid ourselves here. We have a long way to go to get a National Missile Defense system. Fortunately we have good people working on the problem.

We should also be honest with the American people on what we are talking about deploying. This will not be the leak proof missile defense shield that Ronald Reagan dreamed of when he founded the Strategic Defense Initiative. We are no closer to achieving a leak proof defense against Russian missiles today than we were in 1983. Instead, we are developing a system designed to deal with the limited and relatively unsophisticated threats presented by countries like Iran and North Korea. I believe developing a defense against these threats is necessary and appropriate. And by voting for H.R. 4, Congress will signal its intent to deploy such a system if it works.

But it will not change the fact that Russia, the old Soviet Union, maintains thousands of nuclear weapons, which they can launch against the United States at will. And for this reason, I cannot support those who advocate abandoning the ABM treaty which has been the cornerstone of strategic arms reduction. Deploying a National Missile Defense system will improve our national security, but nothing can compare to the importance of implementing START II, and negotiating a START III agreement with Russia. We should not abandon the ABM treaty in our haste to protect against the North Koreans of the world.

Missile defense has proved to be a tough nut to crack. We have been trying to deploy a workable national missile defense system since the 1960's and have spent tens of billions of dollars, without success. This bill today signals that Congress is deadly serious about solving this problem. But it will not change the fact that national missile defense is difficult. And it should not push us to abandon arms reduction with the Russians.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act, and to thank my colleagues CURT WELDON, JOHN SPRATT, and Chairman FLOYD SPENCE for their leadership on this

issue. It is important that the House consider this bill today in an effort to educate America as to why this issue is so important to our future.

Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that the security of the American people is the primary and most important responsibility of the Federal Government. In recent years we have learned that one of the biggest threats facing that security is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and more importantly the dissemination of sensitive missile technology into the hands of our potential adversaries.

Recent polls indicate that many Americans think our military forces can currently shoot down any missile fired at the United States. Well, Mr. Chairman, as the debate has pointed out here today, this is not the case. The United States does not have a missile defense system today and we won't have a missile defense system tomorrow unless this Congress acts responsibly to direct our military to develop one. H.R. 4 is the first step towards beginning this process.

If there is one thing I have learned since being elected to Congress is that many nations, large and small, are developing their own weapons of mass destruction and are moving ahead with potential use. Just last year, two new countries entered the nuclear arms race. Pakistan and India. And, many more nations much less friendly towards the United States continue to pursue the ability to launch weapons of mass destruction.

As this technology spreads throughout the world, the need for a national missile defense is increased. The United States can not sit by and wait for the next country or terrorist organization to threaten the United States. We must be proactive and develop our own system to combat that threat.

According to the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission the ballistic missile threat to the United States "is broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than reported in estimates and reports of the intelligence community." Even more alarming is that the simple fact that the United States may have "little or no warning" before a ballistic missile threat materializes. To quote Secretary Cohen, "the ballistic missile threat is real and is growing."

As a member of the National Security Appropriations Committee, I have learned first hand that we must act now. The cost to deploy an initial National Missile Defense should not deter us from our responsibility. It has been estimated that, in reality, this initial step will amount to less than the amount the United States has spent on peacekeeping deployments over the past six years. A national missile defense is an investment worth making. If we can spend over \$11 billion on a "peacekeeping" mission in Bosnia over the past four years, we can surely establish a proper missile defense.

In closing Mr. Speaker, the ballistic missile threat to the United States is real. It is not 5 years away. Congress needs to move forward and deploy a National Missile Defense system to provide the fundamental security that Americans deserve. H.R. 4 provides that framework and I urge all my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. From the end of World War II to the end of the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Wall, our generation has been witness to some of the greatest social changes and

upheavals in history. We no longer face a world fenced off by two superpower nations. Today we are a global community facing a new and real threat from small rogue nations and their ability to launch an attack directly on American soil.

I support this proposal because I want to protect my three young children. However, my support comes with certain reservations. If we can stand together to support this proposal to protect our children, we must also stand together and enact legislation to provide our children with access to technology in the classrooms, as well as the training and education in our public schools to ensure they remain competitive in the new digital economy. As the 21st Century approaches we are facing the uncharted territory of the information age. We must do all we can for this next generation of Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). All time for debate has expired.

The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 120, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALLEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it is the policy of the United States to deploy a ground-based national missile defense, with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense, that—

(1) has been demonstrated to be operationally effective against the threat as defined as of the time of such deployment and as projected for a reasonable period of time thereafter;

(2) does not diminish the overall national security of the United States by jeopardizing other efforts to reduce threats to the United States, including negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces; and

(3) is affordable and does not compromise the ability of the uniformed service chiefs and the commanders of the regional unified commands to meet their requirements for operational readiness, quality of life of the troops, programmed modernization of weapons systems, and the deployment of planned theater missile defenses.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending both the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the work they have done on this issue. This is a case where there are some of us who respect and admire their expertise in this area but do disagree on the substance of the policy, that it is the right one for this country. It is certainly true that the threat that has evolved with rogue nations is different from what it was perceived to be a number of years ago, and it is appropriate to consider the responses to that. But I would point out that couple of facts.

One is that even the system that is being proposed today is a very limited defense system that would only deal, as a practical matter, with the threat from rogue nations and not provide the broader security that perhaps some believe.

But the objection that I have primarily is this:

This system has not been tested. We do not know whether or not it will work, and I believe that the decision to deploy should follow and not proceed; the testing, that would show whether or not we have a viable system here.

The motion to recommit has three parts. The motion provides that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a ground-based national missile defense that, number one, has been demonstrated to be operationally effective against the threat as perceived at the time we come to a decision on deployment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) said the President's policy, and he is correct, is to deploy some time next year after we have had some tests. Let me first mention a couple of things:

We need to know we should not commit to deploying a national missile defense until we know it works. This is extraordinarily difficult technology, hitting a bullet with a bullet. The first intercept test will be held in the summer of 1999, this year, but the first fully integrated test of the entire system will not be held until the winter of 2001. That is a long time off, and a lot can happen during that time. Missile defense has been a program where we have run the risk of rushing to rush ahead with the system before it is fully tested. There are new tests that have been added which are appropriate, but we still, I think, need to wait and to see how the test works before we move ahead with the decision to deploy.

The second part of the motion provides that the motion to the committee would provide that the system would not be deployed if it would diminish the overall national security of the United States by jeopardizing other efforts to reduce threats to the United States including negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. We really need to make sure that we handle this matter appropriately so that the great threat of all of the nuclear weapons still available in Russia are managed and controlled and that we do not do anything to jeopardize our ability to deal with that task.

The third part of the motion is that the system must be affordable and not compromise readiness quality of life, weapons modernization, and exceedingly importantly, theater missile defenses needed to protect our troops and our war ships that are forward deployed. The costs are, as my colleagues know, subject to great debate, but last year in June the GAO estimated the cost of 18 to 28 billion to develop, produce, deploy and operate a national missile defense system through 2006. The truth is we really do not know how big a cost we have, but it is in the amount of billions and billions of dollars.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is my hope that colleagues will want more detail, want more testing, want more understanding, that they will support the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to recommit, and I would just like to remind our colleagues that our Nation must maintain a defensive posture, but not at any cost.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have pleaded for increased funding for spare parts, training, troop and quality of life initiatives . . . not deployment of a national missile defense.

And if we look at the requests from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, those requests are that this Congress funds spare parts, training of troops and quality of life initiatives.

As my colleagues know, this Congress has not yet supported the bailout funds for the disaster in Central America, and I was just there a week ago, and I want to remind this Congress that 21 nations responded to that, including ours, but we have not sent one dime of assistance, Mr. Speaker. No missile defense system will ever protect this country from a nation in poverty.

We have not yet saved social security, we have not reduced class size, we have not provided for health care for all Americans, Mr. Speaker. In our zeal to protect our democracy we were actually jeopardizing our democracy by failing to protect our domestic tranquility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I began my remarks today by pointing out the frustrations I have in trying to protect our people, the frustrations of having to fight our own people to protect our own people. That frustration has carried over today on the floor of this House. We have people who resist the temptation to protect our own people. We are trying to drag people, screaming and yelling, to that point where they will have to protect our own people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to my

friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). What he does not tell our colleagues is that we have spent \$19 billion in contingency funds out of our defense budget for deployments that were never budgeted for over the past 6 years. Nineteen billion dollars, all over the world, \$9 billion in Bosnia; all of that money came out of a defense budget that was already shrinking. So, we have made a commitment.

We should oppose the Allen motion to recommit. H.R. 4 is a simple, straightforward bill with bipartisan support; the Allen motion is not. It is complicated, it is hard to understand. H.R. 4 does not mandate a system architecture which is why the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I worked together. His amendment would, in fact, say we must have a ground-based system. It precludes a system that perhaps one day could use our AEGIS technology. H.R. 4 addresses the serious threats we face today, not unknown threats that may emerge down the road. We cannot predict what they will be. Operational effectiveness should be key in determining. The Allen motion mandates operational effectiveness prior to establishing a policy. Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous. If we had done that, we would not have the Poseidon program, we would not have Trident, we would not have the AIM-9 side winder, we would not have AMRAAM, we would not have the Hawk. What a ridiculous way to try to fund defense needs by saying we are going to have the operational effectiveness prior to establishing a policy.

The Allen motion also could give Russia a veto over our own NMD policy. No foreign Nation should have the ability to have a veto over us. If an arms control agreement gets in the way, then we have got to renegotiate that treaty or we have got to do what is best for our people, not allow another Nation to hold us hostage.

H.R. 4 establishes and indeed is a high priority, it is got bipartisan support, and it is time for us to vote on this issue, to cut through the rhetoric; yes, if my colleagues are in favor, no, if they are not. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Allen substitute and to vote in favor of H.R. 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 152, nays 269, answered "present" 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—152

Ackerman Gephardt Mink
 Allen Gonzalez Moakley
 Baird Gutierrez Morella
 Baldacci Hall (OH) Nadler
 Baldwin Hastings (FL) Napolitano
 Barrett (WI) Hill (IN) Neal
 Becerra Hilliard Oberstar
 Bentsen Hinchey Obey
 Berkley Hinojosa Oliver
 Berman Hoeft Owens
 Berry Holt Pallone
 Blagojevich Hooley Pastor
 Blumenauer Inslee Payne
 Bonior Jackson (IL) Pelosi
 Borski Jackson-Lee Pomeroy
 Brown (CA) (TX) Price (NC)
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Rahall
 Brown (OH) Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Capps Jones (OH) Rivers
 Capuano Kanjorski Rodriguez
 Cardin Kaptur Rothman
 Carson Kennedy Ruybal-Allard
 Clay Kildee Rush
 Clayton Kilpatrick Sabo
 Conyers Kind (WI) Sanchez
 Cooksey Kleczka Sandlin
 Costello Klink Sawyer
 Coyne LaFalce Schakowsky
 Crowley Lampson Serrano
 Cummings Lantos Sherman
 Danner Levin Skelton
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Stabenow
 DeFazio Lofgren Strickland
 DeGette Lowey Thompson (CA)
 Delahunt Luther Thompson (MS)
 DeLauro Maloney (NY) Thurman
 Dicks Markey Tierney
 Dingell Martinez Towns
 Dixon Matsui Udall (CO)
 Doggett McCarthy (NY) Udall (NM)
 Dooley McDermott Velazquez
 Edwards McGovern Vento
 Engel McKinney Waters
 Eshoo McNulty Watt (NC)
 Evans Meehan Waxman
 Farr Meek (FL) Weiner
 Fattah Meeks (NY) Weygand
 Filner Menendez Woolsey
 Ford Millender Wu
 Frank (MA) McDonald Wynn
 Frost Miller, George
 Gejdenson Minge

NAYS—269

Abercrombie Clement Gillmor
 Aderholt Coble Gilman
 Andrews Collins Goode
 Archer Combest Goodlatte
 Arney Condit Goodling
 Bachus Cook Gordon
 Baker Cox Goss
 Ballenger Cramer Graham
 Barcia Crane Granger
 Barr Cubin Green (TX)
 Barrett (NE) Cunningham Green (WI)
 Bartlett Davis (FL) Greenwood
 Barton Davis (VA) Gutknecht
 Bass Deal Hall (TX)
 Bateman DeLay Hansen
 Bereuter DeMint Hastings (WA)
 Biggert Deutsch Hayes
 Bilbray Diaz-Balart Hayworth
 Billirakis Dickey Hefley
 Bishop Doyle Herger
 Bliley Dreier Hill (MT)
 Blunt Duncan Hilleary
 Boehlert Dunn Hobson
 Bonilla Ehlers Hoekstra
 Bono Ehrlich Holden
 Boswell Emerson Horn
 Boucher English Hostettler
 Boyd Etheridge Houghton
 Brady (PA) Everett Hoyer
 Brady (TX) Ewing Hulshof
 Bryant Fletcher Hunter
 Burr Foley Hutchinson
 Callahan Forbes Hyde
 Calvert Fossella Isakson
 Camp Istook
 Campbell Franks (NJ) Jenkins
 Canady Frelinghuysen John
 Cannon Gallegly Johnson (CT)
 Castle Ganske Johnson, Sam
 Chabot Gekas Jones (NC)
 Chambliss Gibbons Kasich
 Chenoweth Gilchrest Kelly

King (NY) Pascrell Skeen
 Kingston Paul Slaughter
 Knollenberg Pease Smith (MI)
 Kolbe Peterson (MN) Smith (NJ)
 Kucinich Peterson (PA) Smith (TX)
 Kuykendall Petri Smith (WA)
 LaHood Phelps Snyder
 Largent Pickering Souder
 Larson Pickett Spence
 Latham Pitts Stearns
 LaTourette Pombo Stenholm
 Lazio Porter Stump
 Leach Portman Sununu
 Lee Pryce (OH) Sweeney
 Lewis (CA) Quinn Talent
 Lewis (KY) Radanovich Tancredo
 Linder Ramstad Tanner
 Lipinski Regula Tauscher
 LoBiondo Reyes Tauzin
 Lucas (KY) Reynolds Taylor (MS)
 Lucas (OK) Riley Taylor (NC)
 Maloney (CT) Roemer Terry
 Manzullo Rogan Thomas
 Mascara Rogers Thornberry
 McCollum Rohrabacher Thune
 McCrery Ros-Lehtinen Tiahrt
 McHugh Roukema Toomey
 McInnis Royce Traficant
 McIntosh Ryan (WI) Turner
 McIntyre Ryan (KS) Upton
 Metcalf Salmon Visclosky
 Mica Sanders Walden
 Miller (FL) Sanford Walsh
 Miller, Gary Saxton Wamp
 Mollohan Scarborough Watkins
 Moore Schaffer Watts (OK)
 Moran (KS) Scott Weldon (FL)
 Moran (VA) Sensenbrenner Weldon (PA)
 Murtha Sessions Weller
 Nethercutt Shadegg Wexler
 Ney Shaw Whitfield
 Northup Shays Wicker
 Norwood Sherwood Wilson
 Nussle Shimkus Wise
 Ortiz Shows Wolf
 Ose Shuster Young (AK)
 Oxley Simpson Young (FL)
 Packard Sisisky

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Spratt

NOT VOTING—11

Boehner Coburn Myrick
 Burton Doolittle Stark
 Buyer McCarthy (MO) Stupak
 Clyburn McKeon

□ 1642

Messrs. BISHOP, TAUZIN, CONDIT, EHLERS and Ms. LEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PALLONE, KIND, RAHALL, OWENS AND MS. KILPATRICK AND MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 58 on the Allen motion to recommit with instructions, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, due to District Business, I missed rollcall No. 58. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sununu). The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 317, nays 105, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—317

Abercrombie Franks (NJ) Matsui
 Aderholt Frelinghuysen McCarthy (NY)
 Andrews Frost McCollum
 Archer Gallegly McCrery
 Arney Ganske McHugh
 Bachus Gekas McInnis
 Baker Gibbons McIntosh
 Ballenger Gilchrest McIntyre
 Barcia Gillmor Menendez
 Barr Gilman Metcalf
 Barrett (NE) Gonzalez Mica
 Bartlett Goode Millender-
 Barton Goodlatte McDonald
 Bass Goodling Miller (FL)
 Bateman Gordon Miller, Gary
 Bentsen Goss Mollohan
 Bereuter Graham Moore
 Berkley Granger Moran (KS)
 Berman Green (TX) Moran (VA)
 Berry Green (WI) Murtha
 Biggert Greenwood Nethercutt
 Bilbray Gutknecht Ney
 Billirakis Hall (OH) Northup
 Bishop Hall (TX) Norwood
 Blagojevich Hansen Nussle
 Bliley Hastert Ose
 Blunt Hastings (FL) Oxley
 Boehlert Hastings (WA) Packard
 Bonilla Hayes Pallone
 Bono Hayworth Pascrell
 Borski Hefley Paul
 Boswell Herger Pease
 Boucher Hill (IN) Peterson (MN)
 Boyd Hill (MT) Peterson (PA)
 Brady (TX) Hilleary Petri
 Brown (FL) Hinojosa Pickering
 Bryant Hobson Pickett
 Burr Hoeft Pitts
 Callahan Hoekstra Pombo
 Calvert Holden Pomeroy
 Camp Horn Porter
 Campbell Hostettler Portman
 Canady Houghton Price (NC)
 Cannon Hoyer Pryce (OH)
 Capps Hulshof Quinn
 Cardin Hunter Radanovich
 Castle Hutchinson Ramstad
 Chabot Hyde Regula
 Chambliss Inslee Reyes
 Chenoweth Isakson Reynolds
 Clement Istook Riley
 Coble Jackson-Lee Rodriguez
 Collins (TX) Roemer
 Combest Jefferson Rogan
 Condit Jenkins Rogers
 Cook John Rohrabacher
 Cooksey Johnson (CT) Ros-Lehtinen
 Cox Johnson, Sam Rothman
 Cramer Jones (NC) Roukema
 Crane Kanjorski Royce
 Cubin Kasich Ryan (WI)
 Cunningham Kelly Ryan (KS)
 Danner Kennedy Salmon
 Davis (FL) Kildee Sanchez
 Davis (VA) King (NY) Sandlin
 Deal Kingston Sanford
 DeLay Kleczka Saxton
 DeMint Klink Scarborough
 Deutsch Knollenberg Schaffer
 Diaz-Balart Kolbe Scott
 Dickey Kuykendall Sensenbrenner
 Dicks LaFalce Sessions
 Dixon LaHood Shadegg
 Dooley Lampson Shaw
 Doolittle Largent Shays
 Doyle Larson Sherman
 Dreier Latham Sherwood
 Duncan LaTourette Shimkus
 Dunn Lazio Shows
 Edwards Leach Shuster
 Ehrlich Lewis (CA) Simpson
 Emerson Lewis (KY) Sisisky
 English Linder Skeen
 Etheridge Lipinski Skelton
 Everett LoBiondo Smith (MI)
 Ewing Lucas (KY) Smith (NJ)
 Fletcher Lucas (OK) Smith (TX)
 Foley Maloney (CT) Smith (WA)
 Forbes Maloney (NY) Snyder
 Ford Manzullo Souder
 Fossella Martinez Spence
 Fowler Mascara Spratt

Stabenow	Thompson (CA)	Watts (OK)
Stearns	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Stenholm	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Stump	Thune	Weller
Sununu	Thurman	Wexler
Sweeney	Tiahrt	Weygand
Talent	Toomey	Whitfield
Tancred	Traficant	Wicker
Tanner	Turner	Wilson
Tauscher	Upton	Wise
Tauzin	Visclosky	Wolf
Taylor (MS)	Walden	Young (AK)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (FL)
Terry	Wamp	
Thomas	Watkins	

NAYS—105

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Allen	Gejdenson	Neal
Baird	Gephardt	Oberstar
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Obey
Baldwin	Hilliard	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Owens
Becerra	Holt	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hooley	Payne
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
Brown (CA)	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rangel
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rivers
Carson	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kucinich	Rush
Clayton	Lantos	Sabo
Conyers	Lee	Sanders
Costello	Levin	Sawyer
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lofgren	Serrano
Cummings	Lowey	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Luther	Strickland
DeFazio	Markey	Tierney
DeGette	McDermott	Towns
Delahunt	McGovern	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	McKinney	Udall (NM)
Dingell	McNulty	Velazquez
Doggett	Meek (FL)	Vento
Ehlers	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Engel	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Eshoo	Minge	Waxman
Evans	Mink	Weiner
Farr	Moakley	Woolsey
Fattah	Morella	Wu
Filner	Nadler	Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Boehner	Coburn	Myrick
Burton	McCarthy (MO)	Ortiz
Buyer	McKeon	Stark
Clyburn	Meehan	Stupak

□ 1701

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, due to district business, I missed rollcall No. 59. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 59 on H.R. 4, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 58 and No. 59, on H.R. 4, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 58, a motion to recommit with instructions. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 59, final passage of H.R. 4.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes 58 and 59 on March 18, 1999, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on roll-

call vote 58, "yea" and on rollcall vote 59 "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 472, LOCAL CENSUS QUALITY CHECK ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act.

H.R. 472 was favorably reported by the Committee on Government Reform on Wednesday, March 17.

The Committee on Rules may meet next Tuesday to grant a rule which may require that the amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this case, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted to the Speaker's table by the close of legislative business next Tuesday, March 23. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Government Reform, a copy of which may be obtained from the Subcommittee on the Census.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules to the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify as long as the amendments comply with House rules.

A "Dear Colleague" letter announcing this potential amendment process was mailed to all Member offices today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire about next week's schedule, and I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. There will be no votes tomorrow, Friday, March 19.

On Monday, March 22, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for a pro forma session. Of course there will be no legislative business and no votes that day.

On Tuesday, March 23, the House will meet at 9:30 a.m. for the morning hour

and 11 a.m. for legislative business. Votes are expected after noon on Tuesday, March 23.

On Tuesday, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices.

Also on Tuesday, March 23, the House will take up H. Res. 101. It is a privileged resolution on committee funding.

On Wednesday, March 24, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider the following legislative business: H.R. 1141, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations; H.R. 472, the Local Census Quality Check Act; and the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we expect to conclude legislative business by 2 p.m. next week on Friday, March 26.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my friend, for yielding to me.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York. If I could just ask in terms of a little more specifics, will we definitely be in next Friday, or is it possible we would conclude the business earlier than that?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that, right now, it appears that we will be in on Friday, particularly because we are taking up the budget resolution this week, and it looks like that will be taken up on Thursday. Right now it looks like the votes very probably are going to be on Friday, but we should be out by 2 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let me ask in terms of the legislative business, the supplemental, the census, the budget bill. Does the gentleman have any more specifics in terms of when he would expect each of those to be considered on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, or the order?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we will have the committee funding resolution up on Tuesday. We expect on Wednesday we will have H.R. 1141, the supplemental will be up on the floor, and we expect that to be voted on Wednesday.

On Thursday, we expect the budget resolution to be up and possibly the census legislation, the Local Census Quality Check Act. We expect right now, again, to conclude business by 2 p.m. on Friday with votes probably on the budget on Friday.

Mr. PALLONE. On Friday. Mr. Speaker, one more thing. In terms of any late nights, is the gentleman from New York expecting any late nights?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, right now it is very difficult to tell. I think, if there are any late nights, it probably will be Thursday evening because of the budget resolution and the possibility of the census.

So Thursday, right now, it looks like it is the only late evening. But of