

27TH ANNIVERSARY OF TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join my other colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), on the House floor to remember a horrific act taken by Turkey against the citizens of Cyprus 27 years ago.

On July 20, 1974, the Nation of Turkey violated international law when it brutally invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus. Following the Turkish invasion, 200,000 people were forcibly displaced from their homes and a large number of Cypriot people, who were captured during the invasion, including five American citizens, are still missing today.

Earlier this year, the Turkish government was rebuked by the European Court of Human Rights when the court overwhelmingly found Turkey guilty of massive human rights violations over the last 27 years in a scathing 146-page decision. In the case of Cyprus versus Turkey, the court concluded Turkey had not done enough to investigate the whereabouts of Greek-Cypriot missing persons who disappeared during life-threatening situations after the occupation.

The court also found Turkey guilty of refusing to allow the return of any Greek-Cypriot displaced persons to their homes in Northern Cyprus. Families continue to be separated by the 113-mile barbed wire fence that runs across the island. The court found this to be unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I was also troubled by the court's findings on the living conditions of Greek Cypriots living in the Karpas region of Northern Cyprus. Residents in this region face strict restrictions on access to religious worship, no access to appropriate secondary schools for their children, and no security that their possessions will be passed on to their families after their death.

By disregarding international law and order, and by defying democratic principles, Turkey has over the past 27 years remained an anachronistic hostage to the past rather than choosing to look to the future with renewed vitality for cooperation and development.

Since the invasion, all efforts towards finding a just, peaceful, and viable solution to the problem have been constantly met with intransigence and the lack of political will by Turkey. The United States, which is trusted by all sides in this conflict, has the ability to help move the peace process forward. We must continue to support the United Nations' framework for negotiations between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities. But currently peace negotiations are at a standstill.

Over the years, I have become quite familiar with the Turkish side's of

well-known negotiation tactics. The Turkish side agrees to peace negotiations on the Cyprus problem only for the purpose of undermining them once they begin and then blames the Greek Cypriots for their failure. Once again, face-to-face negotiations that were scheduled for January have never occurred because Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash refuses to attend.

Mr. Speaker, while the U.S. should do everything possible to restart the U.N. negotiations, it should be made crystal clear to the Turkish leadership and Mr. Denktash that their unacceptable demand for recognition of a separate state in order to return to the negotiating table are completely unacceptable. No effort should be made to appease the Turkish Cypriot leader in order to return to the negotiating table.

And not only should Mr. Denktash return to the negotiating table, but he should negotiate in good faith in order to reach a comprehensive settlement within the framework provided by the relevant United Nations Security Council's Resolutions. These resolutions establish a bizonal, bicomunal federation with a single international personality and sovereignty and a single citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, for 27 years now, the people of Cyprus have been denied their independence and freedom because of a foreign aggressor. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in remembering what the Cypriot people have suffered and continue to suffer at the hands of the Turks. I also urge my colleagues to join me in pressuring the administration to focus American efforts to move the peace process forward on the Turkish military, which has real and substantial influence on decision-making in the Turkish government.

MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to spending this evening talking to my colleagues about an issue that I think is fundamentally important to not only this generation in America but to every future generation in America, at least as far out as we can see. It is also an issue that is absolutely critical for our friends and allies throughout the world. It is missile defense.

Now, I hope this evening to be joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), and the two of us will go through missile defense and talk a little about the necessity for it.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric here in the last few weeks about how missile defense is going to set off an arms race, about how missile defense does not make any sense, about how missile defense is not technologically feasible. But tonight I want to go to the facts,

to cut through the rhetoric, and I want to get right to the meat. Because this issue is so critical for us, we cannot afford to let the substance be diluted by the rhetoric. Again, do not let the substance of missile defense for this country be diluted by rhetoric, because all of us lose.

I was at the World Forum in Vail, Colorado 2 or 3 years ago. Vail is in my district out in Colorado. And the World Forum, put on by President Gerald Ford, was a fabulous thing. Leaders from all over the world came there. Margaret Thatcher spoke. And when Margaret Thatcher spoke, you could almost hear a pin drop at this World Forum. She got up and said in response to a question on missile defense, she said to the leaders of the United States and to the leaders of the United Kingdom, you have an inherent responsibility. Now, remember, her whole sentence I am about to cite, her whole answer is maybe two or three sentences. But her response was that you have an inherent responsibility to the people that you represent to protect them, and failure to do so would be dereliction of your duty. Now, that is a summary of what she said. Failure to do so would be dereliction of your duty.

We have a known threat out there. We know there are missiles aimed at the United States of America. We know that there are other countries, and not just what used to be the Soviet Union, which was the big threat in my generation.

When I was a young child I remember my mom and dad telling me, during the Cuban missile crisis, that we were probably going to go to war in the next few hours. I remember the fallout shelters. And as I grew up, everything was Russia; the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union is going to launch an attack. And, of course, we in the mountains of Colorado were worried because we had Cheyenne Mountain, the headquarters for NORAD over in Colorado Springs.

But has the threat subsided? The threat has not subsided. I do not understand the reasoning of some of these people who are trying to convince the American people that the threat of a missile attack has subsided. In fact, I would venture to say that the threat of a missile attack has actually increased, because we now have a multitude of nations that have tested nuclear weapons. We know there are a multitude of nations out there that have missile technology.

We know, for example, that when the Soviet Union was the Soviet Union they had very strict control over their weapons. Today, we do not know what kind of control they have over their weapons. We know that we have China that is attempting to build up its military. And, frankly, I think China and Russia, as it now is, are more manageable than say a North Korea or a Pakistan or an India or over in the Middle East or some terrorist group.

And, God forbid, what if we had an accidental launch against the United

States of America? What if somebody did not want to destroy the United States, what if somebody just launched by accident a nuclear missile for New York City? How strong do my colleagues think their rhetoric would stand up the day after that missile hit, or the minute after that missile hit, after standing on this floor and saying that we should not have a missile defense; that a missile defense is going to start off an arms race; that we should not defend our people; we should stick to an old treaty, a treaty that was drafted in 1972, 30 years ago.

How many of my colleagues are driving a 30-year-old car today? How many people do that? How many of my colleagues are using 30-year-old technology in their offices? How many people use 30-year-old technology in their airplanes? We do not do that, and we should not use that kind of technology to defend this country.

Now, what am I talking about? What treaty am I talking about? It is called the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Let us talk about the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. First of all, let me say to my colleagues that the theory of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was about really only two countries. There were two nations in the world that were capable of any kind of significant missile launch against somebody else in the world. One, the United States of America, and two, the Soviet Union. These two superpowers possessed not only the knowledge of nuclear weapons, but they also had the capability of delivering these weapons, and delivering these weapons in multitudes and with deadly accuracy.

So the theory of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1968, 1969, and 1970, was, hey, look, Russia and the United States, and by the way I do not agree with this theory, but the theory was the best way for the United States not to attack Russia and the best way for the Soviet Union not to attack the United States was for both of them to agree not to build a defense. Because if these two countries have a missile, theoretically, and each knows it could be destroyed by that missile because it cannot defend against it, then each country will be less reluctant to fire their missiles. That is the theory of what happened.

Now, what does this treaty contain? Let us take a look at a little of what the treaty says, because it is important. I will refer to my poster here to the left. Article I: Each party undertakes to limit anti-ballistic missile systems and to adopt other measures.

And I will just summarize some of these. There is no need to go through each sentence. Each party undertakes not to deploy anti-ballistic missile systems for defense of the territory.

Now, remember, as we go through this treaty and as I talk tonight, I am not talking about the development of offensive weapons. The United States has significant offensive weapons.

□ 2130

I am talking about defensive weapons. I am not talking about firing a missile against another country, I am talking about defending the United States of America. So my discussion tonight is not as an aggressor. My discussion this evening with you is as a defender. A defender of the territory of the United States of America. And by the way, we should expand that as a defender of our allies in this world.

For the purpose of this treaty, an ABM system is a system to counter strategic ballistic missiles. Each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy a defensive system which is sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based.

So in this treaty, the United States of America agrees with the Soviet Union, which as my colleagues know, the Soviet Union no longer exists. It has been broken into a number of different countries. Each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy a defensive weapon system. That is what that paragraph says. To ensure assurance of effectiveness of the ABM, each party undertakes not to give missiles, launches, or radars, other than ABM interceptor missiles, et cetera, or their elements in flight trajectory, and not to test them in a mode.

That says you cannot test. If the United States determines that they want to test some type of system to defend our country, we cannot do it under this treaty. This treaty is not cloudy. It is black and white. It is very clear in its definitions. If you want to build a defensive system for your Nation, you are not allowed to under this treaty. There is no way around it. This treaty is totally incompatible with our Nation or any nation, well, our Nation or the Soviet Union because there are only two parties to this agreement, the Soviet Union and the United States.

It is totally incompatible with this treaty for the Soviet Union or the United States to build some type of defense to protect their country from an accidental launch or an intentional launch of a missile against their country as long as this treaty exists.

They understood that this treaty may not be good forever. In fact, they put provisions in the treaty. They had the foresight, they had the foresight to put provisions in this treaty which would allow the parties to the treaty, again the Soviet Union and the United States, which would allow these parties to leave the treaty. To go out of the treaty.

I have heard recently and when I have read some of the press, some of you off this floor, frankly, who have made announcements that the United States would break a treaty. What would give any Nation the desire to make a treaty with the United States if the United States broke their word and broke these treaties.

We are not breaking the treaty. The treaty has contained within its four corners, within the four corners of the

document, it has contained provisions of how to withdraw from that treaty.

So any representation by anyone that the United States of America through the Bush administration, which I commend for their leadership on this issue, any representation that withdrawal from this treaty is a breaking of the treaty is incorrect. The treaty itself contains provisions that allow withdrawal from the conditions of this treaty.

Again to my left on this poster, this is the article. This treaty shall be of unlimited duration. Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty. It is a right. It is a right we retain for ourselves. It is a right the Soviet Union retained for themselves, and that is the right to be able to withdraw from this treaty. You have the right to withdraw from this treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interest. It shall give notice to the other party 6 months prior to the withdrawal from the treaty. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events of the notifying party in regards as having jeopardized its supreme interest.

Do we have circumstances which would justify extraordinary events? You know something, that is the easiest question of the night to answer. Have events occurred that are extraordinary in their nature which would allow us to withdraw from a treaty which prevents the United States from defending itself against missile attacks?

Number one, the Soviet Union is not around any more.

Number two, it is called Russia, Ukraine and other nations. The Soviet Union at that time in 1968, 1970, when these treaties were being negotiated, there was only one other country that had the capability to deliver missiles to the United States of America, and it was the Soviet Union.

Let me show you today what we have got. It is no longer just Russia. Look at my poster to the left. It is no longer just Russia. No longer just the Soviet Union. Today North Korea has the capability to hit the West Coast with their nuclear missile. Pakistan has nuclear capability and missiles.

India has nuclear capability and missiles. Israel has nuclear capability and missiles. China has nuclear capability and missiles. How much further do I have to go to justify extraordinary circumstances? Just one more nation other than the Soviet Union, in my opinion, justifies extraordinary circumstances.

Let me go on. And other countries have all successfully detonated nuclear weapons, in addition, Iraq, Iran. Do those strike some kind of familiar sound? Do my colleagues remember a war not too long ago? In addition, Iran, Iran and Libya all have ballistic missile technology that they could use to

deliver either a chemical or a biological attack.

So we are not just talking about a nuclear warhead on top of one of these missiles. We are talking about the capability to deliver a biological weapon, some type of chemical weapon. These countries can destroy large portions of the United States of America; and we on this floor and our administration down the street, and the Senate on the other side, we have, as Margaret Thatcher has said, we have an inherent responsibility to protect the citizens of this country.

So how can anybody stand on this floor and say we should not have a missile defense or the President is wrong because he said this ABM treaty, you cannot have the ABM and the missile defense both. The treaty does not allow for it.

What the treaty does allow, it says in the treaty. The treaty says if you want to build a missile defense, you can withdraw from the treaty. We are not breaking the treaty, we are exercising our rights that we negotiated 30 years ago. That is to pull out of the treaty and build a defensive system for this country.

By the way, the President just recently returned from Europe, and I have seen a lot of press about how the Europeans are opposing President Bush and his missile defense. He is some kind of roving cowboy.

In Europe in the last few days, people are beginning to say, their leaders are saying, that George W. Bush is on to something. Somebody could launch a missile against Italy. Somebody could launch a missile against Spain, against London. We do not want to offend our other European brothers, but maybe we ought to look at it and see what Bush has in that bag.

The United States, by the way, is going to make it technologically feasible; and I will address that in a few minutes. The Europeans are saying, I know what everybody is saying on the podium, and I know what the European press is saying, but frankly as a leader of my country, I have an obligation to defend it.

So guess what happened last weekend? Italy's premier came out and said in a very aggressive nature, we support a missile defense system, and we encourage the United States of America to rapidly develop the technology to protect countries in this world from attack by a missile containing either biological, chemical or nuclear weapons.

Italy, the second one to jump on board. Our good friends, the United Kingdom, who have been wonderful allies, are on board. Guess who else? Spain. Spain is out there saying it is not such a bad idea. Maybe the best way, maybe the people that are most opposed to weapons in my opinion should be the strongest proponents of this.

What is the best way to make a missile ineffective? It is the capability to defend against it. Whether it is in Eu-

rope or the United States of America, those people that oppose the development of missiles that are opposed to any kind of violence, they ought to be the first ones signing on the bottom line. They should say the United States has come up with a pretty good idea.

Let me tell you that iron wall in Europe in opposition to American development of a missile defensive system, is showing significant cracks. It is my opinion, and the French usually lag behind, but it is my opinion that most of the European allies of ours and NATO over time will adopt the policy of the United States, and that is to defend their country from a missile attack.

Let us talk just for a moment about what happens if we do not, just to give you an idea.

On a Trident submarine, and the United States has Trident nuclear submarines. We have the most powerful military in the world. In fact, we have the most powerful military in the history of the world. We ought to have.

I had kind of a fun thing happen the other day. I love high school students to stop by. The 4-H students stop by. The Boy Scouts stop by. We have some leadership programs back in Washington stop by. Usually we have groups, and I open it up for questions. One of the questions was from one of the students, and these questions are bright questions. This generation coming out, they are a bright generation. I have a lot of hope for the future of this country just based on these young people I have had the opportunity to meet. But back to the question.

A high school student asked me, he said, Why do we need the CIA? Why do we need spies? My teacher, he implied his teacher thinks our country is being bad in essence because we have spies.

I said, Let us answer that question. How many of you in here play high school sports? Almost everyone raised their hands. I asked one of the young ladies what sport she played. She said, I play basketball.

I said, Tell me this. Before you play an opposing team, do you know the height of the person you are going to guard? Yes.

Do you know how many baskets that lady made in the previous games? Yes.

If it is a championship game, does somebody film them playing a prior game? Yes.

I said, That is gathering intelligence. By gathering intelligence, you are able to disarm, dispose of the threat before the threat becomes destructive. That was one point.

The second point, somebody asked why do we need such a strong military. I said it is very simple. This young man's name was John. I said John, if you were a black belt in karate and everybody in your class knew that and everybody knew if they tried to take your lunch or take something of yours, you would break their neck, how many fights do you think you would be in? John answered correctly, probably none. That is right.

By having a strong military, and my theory, by having a strong military defense for your country, by defending the citizens of your Nation, you will avoid violence. You do not bring on violence, you avoid violence because the people who decide they want to undertake a violent act against you understand that there are repercussions that have a deadly impact. Or if we put up a missile defense system, they understand that they may not be able to produce any type of weapon that could give that harm to a missile. It makes a lot of sense for the United States to have a strong military.

□ 2145

It makes a lot of sense for us to be able to defend this country. Let us take a look at what happens.

Let me step back just for a moment. The Trident submarine, nuclear launching base. We probably have 18 or so of those out there. I am not giving you anything that is classified, obviously. We probably have 10 or 12 of them at sea at any given time. Do you know that one Trident submarine, one nuclear submarine of the United States, has more firepower than all of the countries combined for all the years of World War II? That is how powerful. A nuclear submarine can launch 195 nuclear warheads. We have a powerful force out there.

But the other side has got a powerful force, too. And no matter how many submarines you have out there, you have got to have the capability not to just fire a missile if that, God forbid, ever became necessary, you have got to have the capability to stop an incoming weapon. Because if you do not, the odds of you having to fire your missiles out of one of those deadly submarines becomes much higher. If somebody shoots a missile at the United States of America and we are able to intercept it on its launching pad through a space intercept method or we can intercept it in space, we could prevent a war.

Let us say, for example, that somebody launches a missile by accident, an accidental launch. Let me tell you, it happens. We have planes that crash by accident. As we all know the tragedy, we lost a spacecraft by accident. Accidents happen. It is logical to say that, at some point in the future, there might be an accidental launch of a nuclear weapon or an accidental launch of a weapon containing chemical or biological elements that would be devastating to this country. If we knew we had an inbound missile coming in and we did not have the capabilities to stop it, we may very well go to war with that country. If that missile hit, for example, New York City or if it hit Washington, D.C., or it hit Orlando, Florida, we may very well go to war instantaneously. Our retribution would be quick, and it would be decisive.

But what if we found out later that the launch was by accident? What the missile defense system allows us is if the missile defense, if we have got that

capability and there is an accidental launch that comes over and we are able to successfully stop that missile from hitting the mainland United States, we may have an allowance of time to find out that it was not an act of war, that it was an accident and because we had a missile defense system in place, we stopped the next world war. That alone justifies what President Bush is attempting to do and that is build a missile defense system for the United States.

Do we have the technological capability? Of course we do. We do not have it all in-house today, but about 2 weeks ago, remember, we did a test. We have had four tests. Two of them have failed. Two of them have been successful. Remember that when the Wright brothers flew their airplane or when we ran the car, any other major invention, the first time, how many space missions we had to have before we could finally figure out and how much money we went through, how to land on the moon or how to fly an airplane or how to make a car.

We are going to have failures. This technology is advanced. Remember that in order to intercept a missile in the air, en route, somebody told me one time it is the equivalent of throwing a basketball from San Francisco and making it through the hoop in Washington, D.C. This is tough technology.

Two weekends ago, the United States of America fired a missile. That missile was traveling 4½ miles a second. Imagine, a bullet, 4½ miles a second inbound. We fired a missile to intercept it, and it was traveling at 4½ miles a second. 4½ miles, 4½ miles, and we have got to bring the two together, and they cannot miss by that far. They cannot miss by a foot. They have got to hit. Guess what happened? We brought the two missiles together. We intercepted.

We will have the technology. We will have the technology to make a missile defense system in this country possible. We have an obligation to put on an expedited basis the necessary resources that it is going to take to bring us that technology.

Let me give you an idea of what just a couple of missile heads would do if we do not defend, for example, and somebody fired a two-warhead attack on Philadelphia. Two warheads, one-megaton devices, detonating the results. If they fired one warhead with two heads on it, just one, with two on it, we would have 410,000 people killed like that.

Some of my colleagues and some of the scholars in this country are saying and criticizing this country for saying that it should develop a system that will stop an inbound missile, that will stop a two-headed missile from wiping out 410,000 people in Philadelphia. What do we do today? If some foreign country, just so you know where we are today, one, we have a treaty that says we cannot defend ourselves with a mis-

sile defensive system. And, two, we today have a detection unknown before in the history of the world. It is called NORAD. It is located in Colorado Springs, the district of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), Colorado Springs, Colorado. NORAD has the capability to detect a missile launch anywhere in the world, and they can detect it within a few seconds.

So our country today, within a couple of seconds, can detect a missile launch anywhere. We can tell you within a few seconds more where that missile is going, at what speed it is going, the likely type of missile it is and where its target is.

But after that today, what can our country do? We can call up Philadelphia and say, you have an inbound missile, it has got, we think, two warheads, a minimum of two warheads on it. It is going to hit in 16½ minutes. That is all we can tell you. There is not anything we can do for you. We will pray for you, and we have alerted the White House so that we can prepare to go to war immediately. The President is prepared to launch an all-out nuclear retaliatory attack.

Why should we have to go through that? Why should we have to go through what at some point in the future is not going to be a test but is going to be a realistic either accidental or an intentional missile launch against the United States of America when we do not have to do it, when we can stop it? This may very well be the secret to stopping a war in the future.

So why would any of my colleagues oppose the President's position, number one, that the treaty, the anti-ballistic missile treaty is not valid. You cannot have that and a missile defense system at the same time. Do not think there is a way to tiptoe around the treaty. Do not think there is a way to talk fuzzy, warm talk and pat the Russians on the back and tell our European friends that, okay, we will do this, water it down a little here and there.

The fact is very clear and simple. You cannot have the treaty and have the missile defense system. You have got to do something with the treaty. The treaty allows you to do it.

We are not breaking the treaty. I have said this three times in my comments this evening. The President is not advocating the breaking of a treaty. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and Condoleezza Rice, they are not saying break the treaty. What they are bringing to our attention, and they are absolutely correct, what they are bringing to our attention is that the treaty contained within its own four corners allows us the rights, we have rights within this treaty, the right to withdraw from this treaty so that we can properly defend our country if extraordinary circumstances occur.

As I said earlier, what more extraordinary circumstances do you need as justification other than the fact that

North Korea, India, Pakistan, China, Iraq, Iran, and several other countries now have nuclear capability and have missile technology?

Mr. Speaker, the old days of only the United States and the Soviet Union having missiles are over. Our generation, my generation, worried about the Soviet Union, but that is all we had to worry about was the Soviet Union as far as a missile attack with nuclear capability. That is what we had to worry about. Unfortunately, for the generation behind us, they have a multitude of concerns that they are going to have to worry about unless we accept our responsibilities in this generation and that is the responsibility of some type of vision to defend this country so that, as this new generation comes of age in our country, they are going to be able to relax knowing that if somebody launches accidentally against the United States or intentionally against the United States we will not have to sustain casualties in the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands. We will not have to do it because we will have the capability to defend against it.

Now, some of my colleagues, interestingly, have said, and some of the press, "Well, let's just have a very limited missile ballistic system. Let's just have a few defensive missiles in Alaska and nowhere else in the country. Let's just have a little bit."

Give me a break. Give me a break. You cannot do it halfway. You cannot afford to be derelict in your responsibility. You cannot afford to say to the United States of America, all right, we will protect this portion of the Nation, but the rest of you, because it happens to be politically correct today, we are not going to put a missile defensive system that will help you.

By the way, the missile attacks may not necessarily come against the cities. A good place for a missile attack may be Hoover Dam, knock out 70 percent of the water in the West, knock out the power generation. Psychologically, think of what you would do to a country. You could hit a nuclear generation facility. There are a lot of different targets out there. You cannot just say we are going to defend a little tiny part of the country. That is what some of my colleagues are saying.

I think some of my colleagues have picked this issue up not because they really believe that the United States should not have a missile defense system. I think some of my colleagues have picked this issue up simply because it is a big issue for our new President, George W. Bush, and so politically they are searching for something to attack the President on and this happens to be what they have gotten.

Let me beg all of you, and I said beg. I do not like begging anybody—neither do you—but let me beg each and every one of you, do not use this as your political issue. This is the wrong issue. From a bipartisan point of view, we all

have an obligation, as fundamental as protecting our children when they were babies. We have a fundamental obligation to the people we represent to provide a defense for them, to make sure that nobody, friendly in case of an accidental launch or unfriendly in case of an intentional launch, we have an obligation to give our people the maximum protection, the maximum protection against that type of an attack.

Let us talk about the system the President has proposed.

Real briefly, before we get into that, let me just show this poster because I think this poster accurately reflects and gives you an idea. Remember, that in 1972 when the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, this map only had two areas of blue color, over here in the Soviet Union and right here in the United States of America. Look at where we are today. Look at where we are today. These colors reflect right here countries possessing ballistic missiles.

Take a look at the number of countries that we have on this poster to my left. Let us start over in the extreme left, the Ukraine, UAE, U.S. obviously, Vietnam, Yemen, Taiwan, Syria, South Africa, Slovakia, Saudi Arabia, Russia, North Korea, South Korea, Libya, Pakistan, Poland, keep going, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Hungary, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, France, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria. Take a look at that.

Let me say, look to my left at this poster. How can any one of my colleagues say that with this kind of threat, and everywhere there is purple there is a threat to the United States of America, with this kind of a threat you are saying to the people of the United States of America that we should not be able to defend against this? How can you look at your constituents when you go back to your district? Or, even more importantly, how can you look at yourself in the mirror and say that under these kind of circumstances with this kind of current existing threat, not even assuming what will be in existence 10 years from now, but even under the current conditions of the threat, how can you look yourself in the mirror and say, I am not going to allow the country that I represent to build a missile defensive system?

□ 2200

You cannot do it. You cannot do it. We have that obligation. We owe it to the people of this Nation, and we have an obligation for vision to the people of the next generation and the next generation to make sure that no matter how spread over here on my left, no matter how spread this purple is, no matter how many countries in the world have missiles, we will have a missile defense system that will stop it. We will have a missile defense system that, by the way, we are willing to share with our friends. We can do it. We can do it, and we have an obligation to do it.

Now, let me shift. Earlier, as I said, I wanted to talk for a few moments about the capability of the technology that we have got. What do I envision of a missile defensive system?

Well, what we have got, we are going to have to have several elements of it. I do not have my diagram here this evening to show you, so I am going to explain it the best I can.

You do not want a missile defense system which intercepts the enemy missile or the accidental launch of a missile over the United States. That is the last resort. Why hit a missile over New York City? If it is going to hit New York City and you destroy it a mile above New York City, you may in fact have more casualties. You do not want to have to bring down a nuclear missile over the air space of the United States of America. So that is the last choice you want.

Now, that may be, under some circumstances, the only alternative you have got. But under the technology we are trying to develop, and, let me tell you, if the United States of America can put a man on the moon, if the United States of America can discover penicillin and utilize it in this country, if the United States of America can do some of the amazing accomplishments that we have done, whether it is the invention of the airplane, cars or et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, we can develop the technology to do what I envision, what the President envisions, the type of defensive system we need.

What would it include? It would have to have a space laser intercept. The advantage of being able to utilize a defensive satellite with laser intercept in space is that you can move that satellite to any trouble spot. So if, for example, and again referring to my map on the left, if, for example, we end up with a problem down in this area, and we have got a satellite defense system over here, take a look at this poster to my left, we can move the satellite so it is right over the country that is our threat.

Now, obviously if we have an accidental launch, we want to be able to pick that accidental launch up. But a lot of our threat in the future will begin with or be preceded with tensions between the countries. There will be high tensions. We will know that a conflict is approaching. So, as a defensive move, as a preemptive move, we will move our satellite over that vicinity where we think their missiles are located.

What we want to be able to do, the ideal situation is to destroy a missile that is targeted for the United States of America, to destroy that missile on its launching pad. Let the country that is going to send the missile our way, let them deal with the missile exploding on a pad right there in their own country.

How many countries do you think are going to want to fire a missile against the United States, a nuclear missile, or a biological missile, if they know that

the United States has the capability of destroying that missile while it is still in their own country? There is not a lot of incentive to do that kind of thing.

So we have got a system that, upon its launch, or being able to destroy on its launching pad the missile. If the missile gets off its launching pad and begins to come across, then this is going to really be a three tier system, space, sea and land. So out over here, you are going to have to have intercept missiles based on ships that are going to be able to target and hopefully destroy that missile while it is out over the ocean, where it is going to have the minimal amount of impact.

Now, remember that any time you destroy a missile in air space, you still have air currents, so the fact that we destroy this missile out here somewhere over the Atlantic does not mean we are not going to have an impact over the continental United States. In fact, because of the air currents, we may very well.

But we do know this: We are a lot better off to destroy that missile here before it hits here in New York City or Colorado Springs or Los Angeles.

Finally, the third part of our technology, the land-based system would be our last resort, which means that our laser beam and our space defense system missed it, our ship sea defense system missed it, so we have got a final try, and that is our land-based system, as that missile comes into the final few miles before it hits its target.

My interest on discussing technology tonight is to tell you that the technology will be available; that the United States of America is leading every country in the world in the development of this technology; that this test that we had 2 weeks ago, where a missile was fired and approaching the target, 4½ miles a second, 4½ miles a second, our technology that we have right now, we were able to launch an intercept missile also going 4½ miles a second, and we were able to, in essence, bring two bullets together out there in the air space, and we stopped it. It was a successful test.

Now, we have a long ways to go, but we can accomplish this. I think one way to help us with this technology in this area is for us to give it political support.

My purpose here tonight is not to act like a scientist. I am not a scientist. I can no more tell you about nuclear physics, I am not much better at frying an egg than that. I can tell you about political support.

The President has stepped forward, I think in a very courageous manner, to say, look, somebody has to say what needs to be said, and what needs to be said is that the United States of America needs a defensive system; a defense not only against an intentional launch, but an accidental launch as well. And this President, George W. Bush, has had the courage to step forward.

All the politically correct people, the Europeans, people in our own country,

people on this House floor, jump up as an issue, not because I think they really believe in it, but as an issue, and say, how dare you talk about the United States having a defensive system, a system that would protect them from an intentional or accidental launch? How dare you do that. That is not politically correct.

But our President is determined, and our President has in his heart and has as a principle of his entire philosophy that he has inherent responsibility to the people of the Nation that he serves to protect them from a missile launch. So he said what has to be said.

We need to give that President political support. Do not take cheap shots off this floor. Do not go to your newspaper and talk about technologically it is impossible. Our former President, I heard a former President say this morning, I heard a quote about it is a technological impossibility or something similar to that.

Wake up. What happened 2 weeks ago? We do have the technology available to get us to the point we need to get that will provide a defensive system for this Nation, for this generation and for the following generations, to protect our own children, not just ourselves, but our own children and our grandchildren from a missile attack. So we will have the technology.

But we are not going to get to the technology and we are not going to get to the point where we can protect the citizens of this country if we do not have enough guts to stand up and do what is necessary, and that is give the political support to the President and to the administration with a green light to go ahead, and say, Mr. President, build a system that will protect your and our country. Mr. President, you have an obligation to defend this country. You are on the right track.

Every one of us in these chambers, to the person, ought to be willing to stand strong against political correctness and say to the world, Look, world: No matter how much you criticize, the United States is not going to make itself a target for many multitudes of countries in the future to launch a missile attack against us.

The United States will not allow itself to get into a position where some small country, or some large country, or any country, can intimidate, threaten, or force the United States to take an action they do not want to take, simply because they have the capability to launch a missile into a city in the United States of America. We owe this to the people. We owe it to them.

So let me in my remaining moments, these last 12 minutes, kind of reiterate the importance of the issue that we are talking about tonight.

Obviously Social Security is critical for us. Health care is an important issue for us. Education, I could tell you about that. I would love to talk about education. To me in the West, public lands, water issues. There are a lot of important issues for us. So I am not

meaning to discount any other issue. I am not meaning to dilute your own personal platform as far as what you think is important.

But I can tell you this: I sincerely believe that if we lay out all the issues, we put them on this table, I cannot believe of an issue that is more important nor a threat more impending than missiles, and that issue of missile defense is something important for every one of us on a bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, what I am sensing is that my colleagues, a good number, not all of my colleagues, but some on the liberal side of the Democratic Party, the liberal aspects of the Democratic Party, have decided that a missile defense is not good for this country; that this country should not defend itself from a missile attack.

More than that, I think the real thing that is driving the liberal side of some of these thinkers is that it is President Bush really pushing it. He might get it done. We certainly cannot allow him to accomplish this kind of thing.

So I am asking all of you, and I asked in my previous comments, set the partisanship aside. Set it aside and think about the vision that we owe for future generations. Think about what we need to do to assure that people even 10 years from now will not be intimidated or have the entire future of this country at risk because somebody launches, accidentally, not even intentionally, somebody launches accidentally a missile against the United States of America.

We can all stand together. This is an issue that is not Republican, not Democrat. It is an issue that we can join with the administration, with George W. Bush, to take to the American people, and we can deliver to the American people a security net; a security net that is as important to the American people as a seat belt is to you in a car. We can deliver a security net that will assure the American people, and our allies, and our allies, that no other country in the world can threaten or launch a missile successfully against the United States of America.

Now, earlier in my comments I mentioned about political courage, and it is very interesting to hear all the bashing that has gone on about President George W. Bush's position of missile defense in Europe, that the Europeans, the way you read the media, you would think the Europeans are entirely unified in opposition to this; they are aghast; they are astounded that a Nation like the United States would think of building a system that would defend themselves from a missile attack.

But, do you know what? That wall has cracked. Do you know what? There are countries over there in Europe saying, wait a minute. You know, I think it is nice to bash the United States of America, but, you know, they got a point here. This missile defensive system, you know, it might work. In fact,

after this test 2 weeks ago that they did, this thing is going to work, and the United States is going to have a system that defends their citizens from attack. Maybe we ought to do the same thing.

Who is saying that? Look at the United Kingdom, the Brits. They are saying, hey, we support the United States.

Take a look at Italy this last weekend. Take a look at the comments from Italy. Their leader has said in Italy, we strongly support and strongly advocate the United States of America building a defensive missile system.

Take a look at Spain. They are not far behind.

Do you know what is going to happen? As the rest of the world has in the past, as they are amazed by American technology, they are going to come on board. My prediction is 15 years from now, almost every Nation in the world will have some type of missile defensive system. And what happens when that happens? What happens when that happens? You know what? It takes that very deadly, lethal weapon, the missile; it significantly lowers the risk of impact, negative impact, from that missile. Because what good are missiles, especially in any kind of volume, if a defensive missile system will stop them from being effective, or, even more importantly, if you have a defensive missile system that will destroy the missile on its launching pad in the country that wants to fire it, so it does devastating damage to that country?

You know, there is not a lot of incentive to fire a missile against the United States, if you know the United States can pick it up, fire a laser, and stop that missile on its launching pad. It kind of makes short history of the people around your launching pad.

There are so many things that are essentially common sense in missile defense. Common sense in missile defense. Think about it. Go out and talk to your constituents this weekend. First of all, ask your constituents, find out how many of them today think we have some type of protection. It is surprising. A lot of our constituents think that today we can defend ourselves against a missile defense attack.

□ 2215

We cannot. Once you get by that with your constituents this week, sit down, put your partisanship aside, and for the liberal segment here, for the liberal people, put that aside, just for a few moments and ask the people, person-to-person, all politics aside, person-to-person, do you think it would be a good idea for this Nation to defend itself against an intentional or accidental launch against our citizens?

Guess what? You will get a resounding yes and probably followed by a comment, why have we not done it already? What are you guys doing? I thought we had a defensive system in place.

That is what the American people are saying to us. We are their leaders. We

are not kings. We have been elected by these people in a representative government to come up here. We have fiduciary duties. That is the highest responsibility of duty to our Nation and to its people, to do what will protect the public interest and will protect our country and allow our country to remain strong into the future.

Right now, the number one issue at the very front is a missile defense system.

In conclusion, I ask every one of my colleagues, regardless of what State you are from, whether you are from Massachusetts or Florida or Oregon or Colorado, that you step forward and start giving political support so that we can then advance the technological support to implement, as President George W. Bush has asked, a missile defensive system to protect the citizens and future generations of this country. It is our responsibility. It is not our neighbor's responsibility. It is our responsibility. I hope each and every one of us carries it out to the fullest extent.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-163) on the resolution (H. Res. 290) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUMENAUER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 4 p.m. today and the balance of the week on account of emergency family business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 26, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3053. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment No. 1 [FV-00-706-FR] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3054. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Residues Derived Through Conventional Breeding From Sexually Compatible Plants of Plant Incorporated Protectants (Formerly Plant-Pesticides) [OPP-300368B; FRL-6057-6] (RIN 2070-AC02) received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3055. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Residues of Nucleic Acids that are Part of Plant Incorporated Protectants (Formerly Plant-Pesticides) [OPP-300371B; FRL-6057-5] (RIN 2070-AC02) received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3056. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regulations Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act for Plant Incorporated Protectants (Formerly Plant-Pesticides) [OPP-300369B; FRL-6057-7] (RIN: 2070-AC02) received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3057. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the determination and a memorandum of justification pursuant to Section 2(b)(6) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3058. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting the Office's final rule—Risk-Based

Capital Regulation—received July 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3059. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Commission Policy Statement on the Establishment and Improvement of Standards Related to Auditor Independence [Release Nos. 33-7993; 34-44557; IC-25066; FR-50 A] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3060. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Assuring Access to Health Insurance Coverage in the Large Group Market"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3061. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 130-1130a; FRL-7016-4] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3062. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Control of VOC's from Wood Furniture Manufacturing, Surface Coating Processes and Other Miscellaneous Revisions [PA 168-4109a; FRL-7013-7] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3063. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of VOC Emissions from Organic Chemical Production [MD 118-3073a; FRL-7014-1] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3064. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (West Rutland, Vermont) [MM Docket No. 00-12; RM-9706] received July 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3065. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Caro and Cass City, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 01-33; RM-10060] (Warsaw and Windsor, Missouri) [MM Docket No. 01-34; RM-10061] received July 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3066. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Steubenville, Ohio and Burgettstown, Pennsylvania) [MM Docket No. 01-6; RM-10009] received July 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3067. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Pana, Taylorville and Macon, Illinois) [MM Docket