it happen. I know and the gentleman knows that we can do something about it and we can put a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. I think it is really a disgrace to have a budget coming before this Congress tomorrow, the conference committee report, without having in it a clear set-aside of the money necessary to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit for our seniors. It is going to be an empty promise in that budget; there is no doubt in my mind about that.

The Senate debated it. They had a vote on putting $300 billion or more in the budget. That vote was 50 for and 50 against, with the Vice President voting no and defeating the amendment. But we are coming close. We are getting closer, and we are going to get there; and I am just very hopeful that at some point in this session of the Congress the President and the leadership of this Congress will step forward and do the right thing, provide a meaningful press drug benefit under Medicare.

There are some here who advocate it, but they say we are going to do it after we reform Medicare. Now, I am a little unclear about reforming Medicare. I think Medicare has worked very well for our seniors. Most of the seniors that I talk to got upset when we started seeing this Congress a few years ago, before the gentleman and I arrived, change Medicare so that seniors could go through an HMO and get their Medicare coverage. They were enticing seniors to sign up with all kind of add-ons, like a little prescription drug benefit; and the first thing you know, all those HMOs decided to cancel their coverage and left literally thousands of seniors all across this country without any prescription drug coverage, which was the very reason they had signed up with an HMO in the first place.

So I do not know what Medicare reform is. Does the gentleman have a feel for what that means? I do not know. And I know the gentleman has worked on this issue, as I have. Everybody says, well, we will provide prescription drug coverage when we reform Medicare. Has anybody told the gentleman what reforming Medicare really is going to be?

Mr. BERRY. Well, if the gentleman will yield, I am afraid it is going to be that buckeye in that rainbow stew I referred to earlier.

As best I am able to determine what the plan by the party across the aisle and by the administration currently is, it is to force our seniors into a managed care plan. And the only way they will be able to get a prescription drug benefit is to accept this managed care plan as a substitute for Medicare. It will have the same result that the gentleman just referred to; it will be an insurance company effort that the insurance companies will pull out of, ask continuously for more money, and we will be spending our Federal dollars for insurance companies rather than for health care for our seniors.

Mr. TURNER. That is what I was afraid of. Our time has expired; but, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for joining me.

DEFENSE OF AMERICA'S HOMELAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to focus on an issue that is dominating the front page of every newspaper in America today and that is the defense of America's homeland. President Bush gave a major speech yesterday where he outlined a commitment to pursuit of a national missile defense and provide a protection for this Nation from the bully pulpit leadership that he can provide, which has not been there for the past 8 years.

Tonight I will talk about that issue in depth. I will talk about the objections that are being raised by some; why we need this kind of capability; what the current system capability is that we are developing. And I am going to respond to criticisms that this will start a new arms race.

But let me also start by saying that we have had some absolutely overwhelming success, Madam Speaker, in a program that actually you helped us put forward this year to provide support for our domestic defenders in America, our Nation's fire and EMS personnel. For the last 220-some years in America we have not done anything in Washington to support those brave men and women in 32,000 departments across this country, 1.2 million men and women, 85 percent of whom are volunteers, who protect our towns and cities.

As Madam Speaker knows, last year the defense authorization bill, and she lobbied for this as a candidate in West Virginia, and I appreciate that leadership, we in fact were able to successfully put in place a program that provides grants for these individual emergency response departments nationwide on a competitive basis. The time period for applying for the grants was 30 days, and it ended today.

Now, some said there would not be much in the way of requests because there is not much need. The preliminary results at FEMA are in. Madam Speaker, over 20,000 grant application requests were received in 30 days, and the requests will total in excess of $2 billion. There is a significant need out there for America to respond to help for our first responders, especially as it relates to homeland defense. We only have $100 million to allocate this year, but it is my hope that with the support of Members on both sides of the aisle we can continue to increase that funding availability.

Madam Speaker, my real topic tonight is to focus on the missile defense speech that President Bush presented yesterday at the National Defense University. He said that we need to change the basic parameters which we live under and deal with in our relations with Russia and other countries relative to the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty, which was negotiated in 1972, allows both the United States and the former Soviet Union to rely on deterrence so that neither country would attack the other for fear of retaliation.

In addition, that treaty says that each country can have one missile defense system, one ABM system. The Russians chose to deploy such a system around Moscow, which protects about 75 percent of their population. America chose not to pursue any system, because it was politically impossible in America to choose one city over another and leave the rest of America vulnerable.

Today, Madam Speaker, America is totally vulnerable. If an accidental launch occurred of one missile from Russia, from North Korea, which we know now has the long-range capability, or from China, we have no capability to respond.

Now, is that such a far-fetched idea or notion? Well, Madam Speaker, let me document for our colleagues what occurred in January of 1995. As we know, the Russians have hundreds of missile launchers, all of which can reach any city in America within 25 minutes, and all of which have nuclear warheads on top of them.

Now, there is a very sophisticated command and control system on those missiles, as there are on our missiles; but a significant number of Russia's missiles are on mobile launchers. They are called SS–25s. If my colleagues saw a photograph of one, it would look like it is on the back of a tractor-trailer truck. But that missile, even though it can be transported any place over an open road area, can travel the necessary distance to hit any city in America and devastate that city. Each of those SS–25s are controlled locally, even though they have to have the command authorization of the central Russian Government.

Let us look at what happened in January of 1995. Norway was going to launch a rocket into the atmosphere to sample weather conditions. So Norway contacted Russia and told the Russian Government not to worry when we launch this three-stage rocket; it is simply for us to gather more information about weather conditions affecting our country. Now, because Russia's military has been in a state of disarray, they have not been able to invest and reinvest in improving their conventional alert systems and their intelligence collection systems. So that when Norway launched that three-stage rocket, the Russian intelligence agencies misread it as an attack from an American nuclear submarine.

Boris Yeltsin acknowledged the week after that incident that Russia had, in fact, for one of only three times that we know of, put their entire offensive

ICBM system on alert, which meant, Madam Speaker, that Russia was within 15 minutes of launching an ICBM with a nuclear warhead against an American city. With 7 minutes left, Boris Yeltsin overruled the other two holders of what we call the black boxes, or the chegets, in the Russian command and control structure, the general in charge of their command staff and the defense minister, Paval Grachev and General Kolesnikov. With 7 minutes, left Boris Yeltsin overruled them and called off the response against an American city.

Now, Madam Speaker, for just one moment let us imagine that one of those missiles is accidentally launched, which are preprogrammed to hit a certain spot in America, and all of their missiles are preprogrammed, as ours are preprogrammed. What if that occurred and what if President Putin then realized Russia had made a grave mistake; that they accidentally allowed, either because of a lack of control of a command unit, who may have gotten the launch codes, or because of some other glitch, Russia accidentally launched one missile against America? What would the phone conversation be like between President Putin and President Bush?

Well, it might go something like this: ''President Bush, I am sorry to tell you we have made a tragic mistake. We have accidentally launched a missile against one of your cities. We did not mean to do it, but our command and control system failed.'' What would be President Bush's response? Would he then call a national press conference and tell the people of that target city that they have 25 minutes to move? Because, Madam Speaker, we have no defense today against a ballistic missile launch against America. We have no defense system in place.

For the past 6 years, Madam Speaker, I have chaired the research and development committee for national security. I have been on the security committee for 15 years. So I work these issues. The possibility of an accidental launch is not very high, but it does exist.

□ 1830

And the fact is that today America has no defense against such a launch. There is no system we can put into space, there is no plane we can send up that can shoot down an incoming ICBM at the speed it would be traveling.

The same thing occurred in 1991 when in Desert Storm Saddam Hussein decided that he wanted to harm American soldiers. He could have put a bomb on a truck, and he could have had it driven into Saudi Arabia where our troops were headquartered. But he did not do that. Saddam Hussein chose the weapon of choice, a low-complexity Scud missile with a conventional bomb on top of it and fired that missile into an American barracks in Saudi Arabia. We could not defend against that missile, much like we cannot defend against a missile that would be launched against an American city.

As a result of the launch of that Scud missile by Saddam Hussein, 28 Americans came home in body bags because we let them down. America had no system in place to defend against that kind of a missile attack, even in a small area the distance between Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

The sad part, Madam Speaker, is that 9, 10 years later we still do not have a highly effective system for missile defense to protect our troops and allies and our Nation. Part of the reason is because President Clinton and Vice President Gore consistently opposed missile defense, and consistently found ways to avoid America moving forward in developing successful and reliable systems.

So the first reason we need missile defense is to protect us against an accidental or deliberate launch. The CIA has now documented that North Korea, an unstable nation, in August of 1998 test-launched a three-stage Taepo Dong II rocket that traversed into the atmosphere. It did not complete its line of flight, but the CIA estimated if it had, it would have been able to reach American soil, the West Coast of California, parts of Alaska and parts of Hawaii.

That allowed the CIA to say publicly that North Korea has the ability to launch from its soil a long-range, three-stage missile that could deliver a light payload against an American city. That missile might not be very accurate, they might aim for Los Angeles and hit San Francisco, but if you are a resident of San Francisco, it does not matter where they aimed.

The point is, North Korea has a capability that they never had. Unlike when the ABM Treaty was developed, you only had two major countries with this kind of ability, the Soviet Union and the United States, and we could respectfully agree that neither would attempt to attack the other for fear of retaliation. Also, when the Soviet Union was in fact a coherent country prior to 1992 before the breakup, the Soviet military was well-paid and well-fed. They had discipline. They were well-respected in Russia. Today, there are severe internal problems and stability problems within the Russian military.

Therefore, because of those problems, there is a greater likelihood of a problem potentially occurring, as there is with the possibility of North Korea or China threatening a launch against the U.S.

Madam Speaker, it is not just whether or not they would launch a missile against us, because the opponents of missile defense will say, wait a minute. Does anybody really believe that North Korea is going to fire a missile against the United States? We would wipe them out. We would wipe China out. That is not the issue, Madam Speaker.

The problem is that we now know North Korea has the capability. We also know that North Korea is developing a nuclear weapon, if they do not already have one, which could be placed on a missile.

Let us take a scenario for a moment. Let us suppose that North Korea would invade South Korea, which they have talked about off and on for years. The U.S. would, because of our relationship, probably come to the aid of South Korea. And what if North Korea's leadership then, and they have certainly indicated unstable decision-making processes in the past, suppose they said to America, If you do not pull your troops out of South Korea, we are going to launch our long-range missile at one of your cities.

Now, unlike in the past, we know North Korea has that kind of very rudimentary capability. Do we then attack North Korea preemptively? Do we wipe out any capability they might have? Do we bomb their cities?

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow a rogue state to have the potential for causing problems in the decision-making process of our President and command officers because of the potential for a launch, illogical launch as it might be, against our sovereign Nation or our allies.

The idea of a missile defense system under George Bush is not what Ronald Reagan proposed, and there will be some in this country who say, there goes George Bush trying to restart the Cold War, trying to bring back Star Wars, or the Strategic Defense Initiative.

That is not what President Bush was talking about yesterday. No one is proposing that we attempt to build a shield over America that could stop Russia if they wanted to attack us with all of their missiles. That is not the idea being discussed. And most experts agree that would be technically and financially impossible to achieve. We are only talking about a limited capability, a system that would give us the ability to defend against a small number of missiles, an accidental launch or a deliberate launch of perhaps 1 to 10 missiles, that we could defend against. This does not destabilize our relationship with Russia because Russia knows full well that they could launch hundreds of missiles at America and very easily overcome the kind of system that President Bush is talking about.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, it is important that America provide a defense for our people.

The interesting thing is that some of the opponents of missile defense have consistently opposed all research in this area. And I would say to our colleagues, as I did several years ago when we voted on H.R. 4, my missile defense bill in the House, and we pulled more Democrats with us than President Clinton did, 103 Democrats voted in favor of H.R. 4, 102 Democrats voted against it and all but two Republicans voted in favor of that bill, giving us a veto-proof margin. Our goal is to give us the capability that every nation in the world is now pursuing.

Israel is one of our key allies. Israel needs missile defense to protect her people from the missile technology that Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya now possess. We are working with Israel helping to fund the Arrow program and the theater high-energy laser program, giving Israel a capability they did not have in Desert Storm.

The Patriot program was not designed to shoot down missiles in Desert Storm. It was a system developed by our Department of Defense to shoot down airplanes. But when we knew that Desert Storm was going to take place, and we knew that Saddam Hussein had missiles, we had to help Israel defend herself, and so we gave her a system designed to shoot down airplanes, and we asked the contractor in this country to provide a more robust engine to make that missile move more quickly.

It was not the answer, and it was not successful. Only 40 percent of the attempted launches or the successful launches of the Scud missiles by Saddam Hussein were stopped by the Patriot systems. We need to do better, and that is why for the past 10 years we have used our tax dollars in cooperation with Israel to help her build missile defense systems.

We have also helped the Europeans. We are working on a program called MEADS, the Medium Extended Air Defense System, which is a cooperative program between the United States, between Italy and Germany. The program is designed to give those countries a missile defense capability in all of Europe. We do want to cooperate with our allies. This is not just about protecting America.

In fact, we proposed the same kind of assistance to our friends in the Far East, and we have also proposed to cooperate in the same way with our Arab friends in the Middle East. The goal that President Bush laid out for the world is that we need to change the dimension. It should no longer be a policy of mutually assured destruction.

Now, to me as a teacher, it is outrageous that we would base our foreign policy with Russia on mutually assured destruction. You attack us, we will annihilate you. We attack you, you will annihilate us. That is a crazy way to have a world order, especially when you have other nations that are not in any way, shape or form anywhere near as reliable as the Soviet Union was during the Cold War, and we did not have the instability that we now have inside of Russia with the problems, internal with their military and the command and control and alerting problems that they have in reading what is happening in terms of rocket launches around the world.

So for all of these reasons, President Bush has proposed a new dynamic. I call it asymmetric deterrence, and that means that we continue to negotiate with our allies and friends and countries like Russia, and we continue to rely on deterrence as the ultimate threat to an attack on our homeland, but we now begin to allow missile defense systems.

Now, the question is, why would America pursue missile defense, it is only going to back Russia into a corner. That is not true. The fact is that Russia believes in missile defense, as does America. They believe in deterrence, as does America. The Soviet Union developed the only operational ABM system around Moscow. That system has been upgraded four times, and it still exists today.

When I have been in negotiations with my Russia friends, and I have gone to Russia 23 teams, I speak the language, I formed and I chair the Interparliamentary Commission with the Russia Duma and the Federation Council. When I travel to Moscow and meet with my Russian friends and we talk about missile defense, I candidly ask them, If you really believe in deterrence alone, take down your ABM system. Be as vulnerable as America is, and have no system and rely on deterrence.

They look at me and smile and laugh and say, You know we will never do that.

The point is that the Russians believe in missile defense. They have aggressive and very capable theater missile defense systems. They have the SA–10, the SA–12, the S–300, the S–400. They have now been trying to sell a system to both Greece and Israel called the Anti-2500 system. It is a very capable, mobile system that can be used by any Nation to defend against missile attack.

In fact, Russia's systems are comparable to systems that we are building. So it is not a case of America pursuing missile defense and embarrassing Russia because they do not have any systems; they have some of the best systems in the world available today.

Why then, Madam Speaker, would Russia not trust us? Why then would the Russian leader publicly express his concerns about the President's speech? Why would Russian leaders and European leaders express concern about moving forward with missile defense?

Let me say this, Madam Speaker. If I were a Russian today and if I had witnessed what the Clinton administration did in terms of cooperation with Russia, I would not trust America in the area of missile defense either.

□ 1845

Let me give you the reasons why I say that, Madam Speaker. We have sent mixed signals to Russia for the past 10 years. The first one came in 1993. In 1992, Boris Yeltsin challenged George Bush, Sr. to work together on missile defense, to have Russian scientists and American scientists cooperate and explore ways that we could work together. George Bush, Sr. accepted that challenge. The two Presidents of the two countries involved the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Russia with the State Department in the U.S.

Two high ranking officials were empowered by our two governments to negotiate and look at ways that we could cooperate together in missile defense in 1992. Those meetings, entitled the Ross-Mamedov talks took place on an ongoing basis. In 1993, when Bill Clinton and Al Gore came into office, they had opposed missile defense. Without consulting with the Russian government, they abruptly canceled the Ross-Mamedov talks. We sent the first signal to the Russians that we do not want to cooperate with you on missile defense. We do not want to be your partner in looking at ways to change the dynamic of our relationship.

The second signal was sent to the Russians in 1996 and 1997. We had in fact funded one joint program between our Defense Department and the Russian defense department in the missile defense area called Ramos. Ramos was designed to build two satellites, one controlled by Russia, one controlled by the U.S., identical in operation, so that each country would get the same identical information when a rocket was launched someplace on the surface of the Earth, so we would have the same alert mechanism. It also was designed to build trust between our countries in the area of missile defense. The program was supported aggressively by the Congress. In fact, as the chairman of the Research Committee, I put Ramos in as a line item in the defense budget. In 1996 and 1997 with no advance notice to the Russians nor to the Congress, the Clinton administration decided to cancel the Ramos program. When the Russians found out about this, they were livid. I got three phone calls and faxes and e-mails at my office from senior Russian leaders.

They said, ''Congressman WELDON, what is going on? We thought America wanted to work with us in finding ways to cooperate.'' I said, ''Well, that was our thought and that was our idea.'' I then called Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre and I called Leon Fuerth, Vice President Gore's defense adviser. I said, ''What is going on here? What you are doing by canceling this program is you are undermining confidence in Russia that we are trying to build.'' I then went over to the Senate and enlisted the support of Democrat Senator Carl LEVIN who agreed with me as the top Democrat on the Armed Services Committee in the Senate. He and I worked vigilantly with our colleagues, and we overturned the administration's decision. The program is still funded today. But the damage was done. Because for the second time, the Clinton administration told the Russians, ''We do not want to cooperate with you.''

The third time occurred in 1997. At a time when most people in the world and in this country were acknowledging that the ABM treaty had outlived its usefulness because we were no longer in a bipolar world with two countries, the Soviet Union and America. We now had other countries with

long-range missile capability, China and North Korea and Iran moving in that direction. At a time when most in this country were saying, let us provide some flexibility in the way this treaty is being interpreted, what did the Clinton administration do? They sent our U.S. negotiators to Geneva where we were in ongoing discussions with the Russians over the ABM treaty.

Instead of trying to find ways to make the ABM treaty more flexible, the Clinton administration was negotiating a tightening up of the ABM treaty, contrary to the thought of almost everyone in this country. I for the life of me could not understand what the Clinton administration was doing. When I read about these discussions with the Russians, I heard about this plan to multilateralize the treaty, bring other countries in, even though they did not have long range missiles, and I heard about this artificial demarcation, differentiating between theater and national missile defense, Madam Speaker, I did something that no other Member of Congress did.

I went to Geneva. I got the approval of our State Department, and we set up a negotiating session. The chief U.S. negotiator was on my side, Stanley Rivales and the chief Russian negotiator was sitting across from me, General Koltunov. We talked for 2½ hours about the administration's negotiations for these two ideas of tightening up the ABM treaty. So I inquired of General Koltunov, ''General, why do you in Russia want to bring more countries in as signatories to the ABM treaty?'' Only two nations were the original signatories, the Soviet Union and the U.S. Why did you pick three former Soviet states, Kazakhstan, Belarus and Ukraine, to become equal partners to the U.S. and Russia? That will make it more difficult to amend the treaty. And none of those three countries have long range missiles. They have all been returned to Russia after the breakup of the Soviet Union.

General Koltunov looked at me and he said, ''Congressman WELDON, you are asking that question of the wrong person. We didn't propose to multilateralize the treaty. The person sitting next to you did.'' Meaning that our government was trying to push the Russian government into expanding the treaty to include three former Soviet states. Why would you do that especially when none of those three countries had long range missiles, unless your purpose was to make the ABM treaty more difficult to modify?

The second question dealt with demarcation. I could not understand how we could negotiate with the Russians an artificial differentiation between a theater missile defense system for a given area and a national missile defense with longer range. So I said to the chief Russian negotiator, General Koltunov, ''General, explain to me, how did you arrive at these numbers of interceptor speed and range?'' If I am in a small country like Israel, a theater program like THAAD is a national program to Israel because it can cover their entire territory. In America, a program like THAAD would not be a national missile defense because it could not cover all of our territory. ''How did you determine the difference?''

General Koltunov told me, after thinking for a few moments, ''Well, Congressman, there were serious negotiations between our scientists and your scientists, and they arrived at these numbers.'' But he did not give me any justification. Well, I was not satisfied. I came back to the United States. We concluded those negotiations in Geneva. President Clinton sent the signal to Russia that America was supportive of tightening up the ABM treaty. So the Russians again for the third time took us at our word. But the Clinton administration knew, Madam Speaker, they could not get either of those two changes to the treaty through the U.S. Senate, even though the U.S. Constitution requires any substantive change to any treaty to be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent.

For 3 years, from 1997 to the year 2000, actually to the year 2001 because that is today, until the end of the Clinton administration, the administration failed to submit either of those two changes to the ABM treaty to the Senate as required by our Constitution so the Senate could debate them. I am convinced the reason the administration did not do that was because they knew that neither one of them would pass the Senate. They could not even get a majority of Democrats in the Senate to support those two changes. They were not in America's best interests. So for 3 years, the Russians had been convinced by Clinton that we were supportive of tightening up the ABM treaty, even though the administration knew the Senate and the American people would not support those changes.

Last May, when the Russian Duma was considering ratification of the START II treaty, a treaty which our Senate had already passed years ago, the Clinton administration, I am convinced, convinced the Russian leadership to have the Duma add those two changes to the ABM treaty onto the back of the START II treaty. Why would they do that? Because they knew the START II treaty had already been ratified by the Senate and because they knew they could not get those two ABM changes through the Senate, so they said if the Russians add them on, then the Senate will have to accept them when the treaty comes back to us for re-ratification. So when the state Duma in Russia ratified the START II treaty last spring, they added those two Geneva protocols on the START II treaty, it then came back to the U.S., and what did our Senate say? ''No way are we going to pass the START II treaty.''

So the Russians for the third time saw America going back on what they thought was our word. Three times in 8 years we sent mixed signals to Russia about missile defense. It is no wonder that the Russians do not understand what America's real intentions are in terms of missile defense. Now, they understand my intentions, because I have a good solid relationship with them. They know that I want us to be involved with Russia. The Russians know that we want to be partners with them. We want to find common ground.

In fact, the weekend before our vote on H.R. 4 which this House passed overwhelmingly, I invited Don Rumsfeld, our current defense secretary, who was chairman of the Rumsfeld Commission; Jim Woolsey, who was Bill Clinton's CIA director; and Bill Schneider, a Deputy Secretary of State, to travel with me to Moscow. I took several Members of Congress from both parties along. We went to Moscow before the vote here so that we could reassure the Russians that our intent in moving forward in missile defense was not to back the Russians into a corner. We did not see Russia as the enemy. We were not doing this to try to create an advantage over Russia. And that we wanted to work together with Russia.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced through my contact with Russian leaders that they can and will understand that America's intent on missile defense is not to create an arms race. The Russians believe in missile defense because they know the threats are real. We believe in missile defense because the threats are real. For those who say the threats are not real, I say, tell that to the families of those 28 young Americans who were buried in this country because we could not defend against that missile attack in 1991 in Saudi Arabia.

Madam Speaker, with the Russian leaders that I work with, people like Dr. Yevghenie Velakof who heads up the Kurchatov Institute understand what we are trying to accomplish. In fact Dr. Velakof and I coauthored an op-ed 3 years ago that was entitled ''From Mutually Assured Destruction to Mutually Assured Protection.'' Dr. Velakof understands what George Bush is trying to do. When Russians understand that we are serious and want them involved and that we are not playing games, they will cooperate with us.

But, Madam Speaker, I have to tell you, there is one other group in this country who is causing the feeling of instability in Russia. There is one other group in this country who will be vigorously against missile defense, who are actually causing more unrest among the Russian people than the missile defense idea itself. Who are those people, Madam Speaker? They are some of the very arms control organizations in this city that claim to be for peace, that claim to be for stable relations.

Why do I say that, Madam Speaker? Let me tell you what Yevghenie Velakof told me 2 years ago. At the

height of our bill being passed by the House and the Senate, Yevghenie Velakof came in for one of his regular meetings at my office. He brought with him a Time magazine edition, I believe it was February 25, I believe it was in 1998.

There was a two-page feature in Time magazine on missile defense. It was written about the new plan being pushed by the Congress to give America the protection that George Bush outlined yesterday. They called the plan Star Wars II, or sequel to what Reagan had done, which is a misnomer. But the idea was to lay out for the American people the idea of what we are talking about with a limited missile defense system. In one corner of that article, taking up almost one-half of one page was the chart I am going to present that I have had blown up. In a story about missile defense and how America was trying to pursue protection for our people was this chart. Let me read the top and the bottom opening sentences.

''Destroying Russia. Arms control advocates map the Pentagon's top secret plan for waging war. 1200 warheads hit 800 targets.'' This is a map of Russia. They have got locations where we supposedly have a top secret plan to destroy Russia. Across the bottom is the following statement. ''Killing zones. The vast spread of radiation will wipe out more than 20 million people in Russia.'' Dr. Velakof said to me, ''CURT, I know what your intention is with missile defense. It is to protect your people. But this is what the Russian people will see.'' They will see an article in Time magazine with a chart produced by the Natural Resources Defense Council, an arms control group, that is trying to say that our real intent is to kill 20 million Russian people.

□ 1900

That is why the Russians are concerned about missile defense. It is not because of the system. It is because of an inconsistent, incoherent, roller coaster foreign policy where three times in 8 years we sent mixed signals to Moscow on missile defense. It is because of the arms control crowd that tries to scare the Russian people into thinking that somehow our real intent is to wipe them out and dominate them. That has to be dealt with in this debate that began yesterday.

We have to put the facts on the table. Our goal is not to wipe out Russia. Our goal is not to kill 20 million Russian people. In fact, our goal is to work with Russia; it is to work NATO; it is to work with Ukraine; it is to work with Canada; with the European countries to develop something we have not had before, an ability to shoot down offensive missiles.

Mr. Speaker, over 70 nations today in the world have missiles that they control. Countries like Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, India, Pakistan, North Korea and a whole host of other countries all have missiles. Some have conventional weapons on them. Some have the potential to put a chemical or a biological agent on them, but they all have missiles and they all have launchers.

Mr. Speaker, today in the world over 22 nations can build missiles and are building them, and they are selling them to other nations. Missiles are out of control. We did not expect this threat to come from unstable nations for another 15 to 20 years, but over the past 10 years we have lost control of proliferation. Because of Russia's instability and because of China's lack of compliance, Russia and China have allowed technology to flow to unstable nations which then have given those nations abilities in missile technology that we did not think they would have for at least 15 years.

Let me talk about that for a moment, Mr. Speaker, because that has a direct bearing on why President Bush yesterday said we have to have missile defense now, because the threats are here today. Iran now has a Shahab III system they are working on. The Shahab IV and Shahab V, which are medium-range missile systems, can kill tons of people all throughout Europe and can hit Israel directly. We know Iraq has missiles. We know all these countries have missiles.

How did they get this technology, Mr. Speaker? Unfortunately, because of America's lack of enforcement of arms control agreements.

Two years ago, I asked the Congressional Research Service, an independent, bipartisan research arm of the Library of Congress, it is not partisan, all of our colleagues use it, I asked them to do a study for me of how many instances of arms control violations had occurred in the 1990s. I put that report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year.

The answer is that up until 1998, we had evidence that Russia and China had illegally transferred technology, much of it missile technology, to unstable nations in violation of arms control agreements 38 times; 20 times by the Chinese, 18 times by the Russians. The arms control agreements are supposed to have sanctions applied when we catch other countries in violation. Much like if we catch an American company illegally selling technology to a foreign nation that they should noting selling to, we arrest their officers. We fine them and, if necessary, we put them in jail. Thirty-eight times we caught the Russians and Chinese illegally giving technology to our enemies. Only two times out of 38 did we impose the required sanctions when we caught the Chinese transferring M–11 missiles to Pakistan, when we caught the Chinese transferring ring magnets for their nuclear program to Pakistan. The other 36 times we turned our head.

Let me give a real example, Mr. Speaker, for our colleagues to remember. I was in Moscow in January of 1996. The Washington Post had just reported in December a front page story, above the fold: ''U.S. Catches Russia Transferring Guidance Systems to Iraq.'' That was the headline. I was in Moscow, so I went to our embassy and I met with Ambassador Pickering, who most recently was the number three person in the State Department under Bill Clinton.

I said, Mr. Ambassador, what was the Russian response when you asked the Russians about the illegal transfer of technology to Iraq?

He said, Congressman WELDON, I have not asked them yet.

I said, why would you not ask them? That is a violation of the missile technology control regime, an arms control agreement between us and them and other countries.

He said that has to come from Washington. It has to come from the White House or the Secretary of State.

So I came back to America, and I wrote President Clinton a letter, a 3-page letter, asking him to respond to the allegation. In March of that year, President Clinton sent me a letter, which I still have; and in the letter he said, Congressman WELDON, I share your concern about the allegation that Russia may have transferred guidance systems to Iraq that would improve their missile systems; and I can say if it occurred and we can prove it, we will take aggressive action. But, Congressman WELDON, we do not have any evidence. Yes, we have allegations, but we cannot prove that Russia transferred guidance systems to Iraq.

So, Mr. Speaker, I brought the proof today. For the past year, Mr. Speaker, I have taken these devices around the country with me. This is an accelerometer, a very high-priced device that controls the speed of a missile. This is a gyroscope. This system locks into a satellite GPS mechanism to control the accuracy of where the missile is going. When one puts these two devices in a missile, they make that missile very accurate.

Iraq cannot build these devices. They are too sophisticated. Only the U.S., Russia and China, because they got the technology from us over the past 5 years, can build these devices. It is illegal to give these devices to unstable nations.

These devices have Soviet markings on them. These devices were clipped off of SSN–19 long-range Soviet missiles. These devices used to be in missiles in Russian submarines aimed at U.S. cities, but because of treaties, when Russia discarded these old missiles they were supposed to destroy these, but they did not do it. We caught the Russians three times transferring not one set of these devices, but over 100 set of these devices to Iraq.

What would Iraq want with them? Iraq would want them to put in their missiles like the one they sent into Desert Storm that killed 28 young Americans to make their missile more accurate. We allowed the technology to flow, and we did nothing about it.

Here is the evidence, Mr. Speaker. I cannot say where I got them, but I can

say agencies of our Government have over 100 sets of these devices. And let me say, my guess is there are probably thousands of these devices that were illegally sent from Russian entities to Iraq and Iran.

Now, do I blame the Russian Government? Not necessarily. It is caused by instability in Russia, but we in America had an obligation to enforce arms control agreements. Now, why would President Clinton not want to enforce an arms control agreement? We caught them red handed. We have the evidence.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, lies in the fact that the Clinton foreign policy for 8 years was a personal friendship between Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin. As long as those two people were friendly and in power, President Clinton assumed that our relationship with Russia would be stable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted Yeltsin to succeed as much as President Clinton; but our goal in Russia should not have been to support a man. It should have been to support institutions: the institution of the presidency, whoever that might be; the institution of a free parliament and Duma, whoever they might elect; the institution of a legal system, of an economic framework.

We should have been supporting institutions of democracy as opposed to a personality, because as Boris Yeltsin lost the vigor that he first brought to his job, he began to surround himself with corrupt individuals. In fact, he named the oligarchs that ended up running Russia's banks. These Russian oligarchs, many of whom were crooks and thieves, were ending up taking billions of dollars of foreign money, IMF and World Bank money, that was supposed to help the Russians rebuild their economy, rebuild their schools, their roads and their communities. But instead, the friends of Boris who controlled the economic institutions in Russia diverted that money to illegal operations, to Swiss bank accounts, to U.S. real estate investments. In fact, our Justice Department issued indictments against five Bank of New York officials just 2 years ago.

The allegation is that they were involved in corruption with Boris Yeltsin's friends in diverting up to $5 billion of money that was supposed to help the Russian people.

What did we do? We went like this and like this. Just as we did with the arms control violations, we pretended we did not see them. We pretended we did not have evidence. We knew 5 years ago that there were corrupt Russians working with corrupt Americans, stealing money to benefit the Russian people. Do we wonder why now the Russian people do not trust our intentions?

When Yeltsin was about to leave office, his popularity in Moscow was 2 percent. Ninety-eight percent of the Russian people felt he was corrupt and had become a drunk, but there we were still supporting Boris Yeltsin. We wonder why the Russian people do not trust our intentions. If I were a Russian then, I would not trust our intentions either. We blew it to some extent, Mr. Speaker.

The visual image Americans had in 1992 was Boris Yeltsin standing on a tank outside the Russian White House, openly defying Communism, 20,000 people around him. As he stood on the tank and said Communism is dead, the Soviet Union is over, we are in a new strategic alliance, Russia and America together, that was 1992. 1999, what was the visual picture on CNN in the fall of 1999? Ten thousand, 15,000 young Russians outside the Embassy of the United States in Moscow, clogging the street, throwing paint at our embassy, firing handguns at our embassy and burning the American flag, because we had been supporting corrupt institutions and people in Russia. We had been denying reality, and the Russian people lost faith and confidence in what America was really all about.

In fact, it was about that time I had a Russian Duma member over here. He did a national press conference and this is what he said to the American people on national TV. He said, you know, the Soviet Communist Party spent tens of billions of dollars over 70 years to convince the Russian people that America was evil and Americans were evil, and they failed. Your government has managed to do in a few short years and months what the Russian Soviet Communist Party could not achieve in 70 years.

The last formal request of Boris Yeltsin, before he left office for his hand-picked successor, was a commitment he received from President Putin to pardon him and his family. The first official action of President Putin, when he took office, was to pardon Boris Yeltsin and his family, including his daughter Tatyana, from crimes committed against the Russian people, that America knew about and pretended we did not see. That is why the Russians do not trust our intentions.

The biggest challenge for President Bush is rebuilding the trust of the Russian people and its leadership that America wants to be a stable trading partner with Russia. We will not tolerate proliferation. We will not tolerate giving foreign unstable nations illegal technology, but we want Russia to succeed. We want to help them create a mortgage program for their people, which is my number one priority. We want to help their defense industry get back on its feet and produce other products. We want to engage their military with our military. We want to help them solve the problem of nuclear contamination in the Arctic, a big issue for the Russians. We want to help Russia succeed and become a trading partner of the U.S.

□ 1915

Missile defense is not the reason that Russia is concerned, it is the lack of trust and confidence in what America really wants that has the Russian leadership and the Russian people concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move forward with missile defense in cooperation with the Russians and the rest of the peace-loving people in the world. I cannot, for the life of me, as a teacher, understand how those in this country still want to rely on offensive weapons to kill each other, as opposed to defensive weapons to protect our people. That does not make sense to me.

We can achieve what President Bush wants.

Now, it is a tough task, because you are talking about hitting a bullet with a bullet, stopping a projectile in the atmosphere that is moving very quickly, and stopping it with another bullet. And you cannot hit that projectile when it is on the way down or it will rain terror on the people in that country, in this case our people.

That happened in Israel when those Scud missiles kept landing. Even though the Patriot system may have hit it, the debris kept coming down on the Israeli people. We need technology, as President Bush rightly outlined, to hit the missile in the ascent phase, as it is on the way up. It is called boost-phase intercept. The reason why that is important is, you knock that missile out on the way up, and the only people harmed are the people who launched the missile against someone else.

What President Bush is saying is, we need to develop a new capability, using technology with our allies, to give us that kind of protection; and he has proposed for the first time in the last 10 years that he will use the bully pulpit to move the technology forward.

Are we prepared today? No. There still is additional testing. Have we had success? Absolutely. Out of 31 attempts, we have been successful in over half of them. Our THAAD program has had intercepts, successful ones. Our PAC–3 program has had five successful intercepts. Our National Missile Defense program has had one successful intercept. We know the technology is achievable. It is an engineering problem to integrate the systems, and that is the challenge that we have to help the President overcome.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that those of our colleagues in this body and the other body who supported missile defense last year and the year before will again come back and support President Bush. This is not a partisan issue. The battle for missile defense in America was not a Republican battle; it was won by a bipartisan effort with Democrats and Republicans coming together, understanding that threats were emerging quicker than we thought they would emerge.

We need to work together to give the President the kind of support he has outlined in his vision for a new world order, one where we focus cooperative efforts together. The Europeans can cooperate with us, as they are already doing. In fact, I am hoping right now to establish a meeting, an unofficial

meeting, in one of the Arab countries, where I will plan to invite the Israelis and the Russians to sit down and have a conversation about how we can jointly pursue missile defense cooperation in the Middle East, with Jews and allies working together, with Americans and Russians.

On Friday of this week, Mr. Speaker, I will travel to New York City, where I will give a major foreign policy speech at the World Russian Forum, and I will tell the leaders of Russia, I will tell the business leaders in Russia, that we want to work together, George Bush wants Russia to be our friend and partner. There is no reason why we cannot achieve that.

I will then come back to Washington and next week will sponsor with the Free Congress Foundation, with Paul Weyrich, a bipartisan conference on the Hill with Russian leaders. The chairman of the International Affairs Committee for the Russian Duma, Dmitrii Rogozin, will be here, and he and I and others will come together and talk about cooperation. We will then travel to Moscow and we will have a conference in Moscow on missile defense cooperation. We will work together to find common ground, to build confidence among both countries to move forward together.

We need to put away the arguments and the petty wars of the Cold War era. Relying on mutually assured destruction is not the answer. Working together for peaceful protection of our friends, our allies and our neighbors, is the solution of the 21st century. That is what George Bush outlined for us yesterday. He is on the right track. He did not say we have all the answers, because we do not, but he did say, together, there is nothing we cannot accomplish.

I was a young kid in school when John Kennedy made a very famous speech in 1960. He said ''I challenge America to land a man on the moon within this decade.'' I can tell you, people laughed at him. They thought, this guy is crazy. Here is President Kennedy saying we are going to land on the moon? We cannot even get our planes to fly totally safe in the atmosphere. How are we going to land on the moon? He challenged America to land on the moon, to explore outer space technology.

You know what happened, Mr. Speaker. Nine years later, in July of 1969, we landed the first human being on the moon. It was an historic event that showed that America can accomplish anything.

There are those who will say, there are a few of them, who will say this is not technologically possible. Mr. Speaker, that is hogwash. In fact, to counter those, we have put together a task force of professors. None of the professors we have on this ad hoc committee are working for any contractor. They are all professors.

I am going to be inviting all of my colleagues in Congress to ask those professors, one at a time or as a group, to come into your offices. They are not doing any contract work with defense contractors. They are not on the Pentagon's payroll. They are from universities, like Texas A&M, like some of our major engineering schools, who understand the physics is achievable.

They will be available as we begin this debate to counter those who will simply try to use their doctorate titles to convince us that somehow we cannot accomplish this.

I asked the head of the Boeing program in a hearing last year, a fellow by the name of Dr. Teller, how difficult it was to achieve the result of missile defense for America and its people. He said, ''Congressman WELDON, I have been assigned to this all my life.'' He said managing the Space Station was a tougher challenge than building missile defense.

Together, Republicans and Democrats, allies and our own people, we can create a new world, a safe world, where all of our people can be protected from what happened to those 28 Americans in 1991.

PAKISTAN: DEMOCRACY AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, A STATE OF SHAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to denounce the Pakistan Ruling Army's dictatorial and wholly unacceptable treatment of nonviolent political activists as they assembled yesterday to demand a return to democracy.

May 1, International Labor Day, has historically been a day when rights of those unrepresented and under-represented have been fought for around the world. The political workers and activists of Pakistan had announced May 1 as their day of peaceful assemblage, asking for return to civilian government. General Musharraf, the chief executive of the country, has completely clamped down on the very basic civilian right of the people to assemble. In his own words, ''Once we have said there will be no political activity, there will be no political activity.''

General Musharraf has called these protestors and democracy fighters ''useless politicians.'' This reign of terror by the army has to be stopped, Mr. Speaker, and we must denounce it in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan is taking a wrong path. Since the October 1999 coup d'etat in Pakistan, the army government has flagrantly violated basic civil rights of the people. The state of the press is severely threatened. Journalists are routinely harassed and their offices ransacked regularly. The constitution has been abolished.

The erstwhile political parties of Pakistan have been demanding a return to democracy ever since the October 1999 coup d'etat by the military. The Musharraf government has outlawed public rallies of any kind ever since President Clinton's visit to the region in March of 2000. In addition, this government has become increasingly hostile and has created a security threat to the United States and the South Asia region by supporting the Taliban and the Osama Bin Laden network logistically, figuratively, financially and otherwise.

In the most recent U.S. State Department's annual report on global terrorism, which was released Monday, Secretary of State Colin Powell stated that Pakistan's military government, headed by General Pervez Musharraf, has continued previous Pakistani government support for several groups responsible for attacks on civilians in Kashmir. The report also states that the Harkat ul-Mujahideen, the HUM, a designated foreign terrorist organization, continues to be active in Pakistan without discouragement by the Government of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and its members, as proponents of democracy, have an overarching moral obligation to show solidarity with each struggle for democracy around the world. Expressing shock, the Pakistan People's Party senior representative Khohru said, ''They,'' the army, ''have totally clamped down. We are trying to march but obviously every place is a jail. The whole city is under siege.''

Mr. Speaker, if I could say, we must not let political repression go by unnoticed. We must go on record publicly expressing the strong opposition of the United States Congress to the military coup in Pakistan and call for a civilian democratically elected government to be returned to power in Pakistan.

FIGHTING THE HIV-AID PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to talk about an issue that is causing great human devastation internationally and that continues to be a major health and quality-of-life problem domestically.

The HIV-AIDS pandemic that now we refer to has deeply impacted the African continent, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely affected by AIDS than any other part of the world. In 16 countries, all in sub-Saharan Africa, more than one in ten adults is infected with the HIV virus, affecting some 25 million people.

According to the joint United Nations program on HIV and AIDS, three-fourths of all deaths caused by AIDS are in sub-Saharan Africa since the beginning of the epidemic. It is estimated that one-half or more of all 15-year-old children may eventually die of AIDS in