

AMERICA'S DEFENSES IN THE CURRENT WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). 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, obviously, I hope all of the Members have had the opportunity at 8 o'clock, so about an hour and a half ago, to listen to the President of the United States address the Nation. It was a press conference, but I think the President made several pertinent comments.

Let me begin by saying this: I think the President of the United States and his team, whether it is the Vice President, Dick Cheney, whether it is Condoleezza Rice, whether it is Don Rumsfeld, whether it is John Ashcroft, I think they are doing a heck of a job.

If this kind of horrible tragedy had to occur, I think that it could not have occurred with a better team in place than the team we have today. I think it was indicated and reflected by the President's comments during his press conference this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go through a few of those comments and discuss them at length. I, of course, want to finish what I started yesterday, and that is a discussion, I think a good discussion, of missile defense and why this Nation needs missile defense, and why we as Congressmen have an inherent responsibility for the security of this Nation to provide missile defense. I want to talk about that tonight.

But let me talk, first of all, about a few comments that the President made. I also want to visit briefly about civil liberties. I also want to talk for a few moments about the great fight that we are involved in.

We have heard people use the term "war." That is exactly what this is. As the President very ably said tonight, "This is not a conventional war that we are fighting. This is a war unlike we have ever experienced in the past. First of all and foremost, we have been attacked by the enemy within the borders of the United States. We have suffered horrible losses in civilian casualties. These people, as the President said, they did not agitate this, they did not provoke this kind of thing. It was a blind attack of cold-blooded murder. There is no justification."

By the way, kudos to Mayor Rudolph Giuliani today, who received a \$10 million check, a \$10 million check from an individual. But that individual, in handing that check, issued a statement that said that the United States, as a result of this action, should reexamine its policies in regard to Israel.

Rudolph Giuliani in New York City today said "Look, you may have just given us \$10 million for our recovery fund for New York City, but do not dare try and justify or say that perhaps there is some legitimacy; to take a message across, regardless of the merits of the message; do not try and le-

gitimize this as a vehicle for communicating that message, the act of terrorism. It is not justified." These were the acts of evil men, as the President said this evening.

So Rudolph Giuliani gave the \$10 million back and said, "We do not want the money. Do not come to us, no matter how much money you have, do not come to the United States, do not come to New York City and offer a lot of money, which was appreciated for the recovery effort, but to have a little string attached to it that says, hey, maybe if terrorists commit these kinds of acts against the United States of America, America will adjust its national policies as a response to that terrorist act."

That is the wrong thing to do. We should not let this kind of act that occurred on September 11 gain any kind of credibility whatsoever, zero credibility, because if we begin to give those kinds of attacks credibility; in other words, allow them to legitimize their cause, even a slight legitimization of their cause, we in fact are contributing, in my opinion, to the awful acts that are a result of terrorism. They should not do that. Thank goodness, the Mayor stood up to that tonight.

I thought the President's comments about this war, it was amazing to me. I thought the reporters on a couple of occasions tried to trap the President: "Can you give us an assurance, Mr. President, just how long we are going to be engaged in this?"

Of course the President did not fall for that trick. He said, "We are going to be engaged in it until we get the job done." Congratulations, Mr. President. That is exactly the response that the American people wanted to hear. That is exactly the response that the American people feel in their heart.

This country cannot afford to do this job half-heartedly. We cannot do the job halfway. We have to complete this job. We have to do everything we can to minimize the threat of terrorism anywhere in the world. Terrorism has no legitimate spot. Terrorism has no legitimate spot anywhere in this world with any country.

□ 2145

It must be eradicated, or as close to eradication as we can possibly get. And the President said he is committed; that as long as he is the President, he will stay the course. Did my colleagues hear that? He will stay the course.

And that is exactly the kind of commitment that the United States Congress has to give to the President as well. There will be lots of trials and tribulations that we ourselves as leaders in this country will come across, but we need to stay the course, keep her steady as she goes. Keep her steady as she goes. As the President said, slowly but surely, slowly but surely we are gaining ground; and we are gaining victory in this battle against these evil people.

Now, I say they are evil people. I compared them in comments I made

yesterday and in comments I have made since the September 11 tragedy to a cancer. There is no way to justify a cancer, ever. There is no medical doctor in the history of the world that has come up with some kind of a justification for not the cause, but some kind of a justification to say that the cancer helps the human body. Cancer never helps the human body. It is a foreign agent inside the body, and it has one purpose in mind and that is to destroy the human body. That is what cancer is about, to destroy the human body. It has one mission: destruction, destruction, destruction.

There is no difference between bin Laden, between all of his followers and between other terrorists in this world; there is no distinction between those terrorists and cancer. They all are out for the same thing. They are out there, as the President said tonight very ably, and with a lot of credibility, he said what they have done is hijacked a religion. They are trying to cloak themselves in Islam. Islam does not allow terrorism. Islam does not permit the striking of innocent people. Certainly Islam does not preach striking down other people of the same faith, of those practicing Islam, that same faith.

Keep in mind that these terrorists, these evil people, when they hit that tower, they did not just kill Americans; they killed the citizens of 80 separate countries. They killed fellow Muslims, they killed people who practice the Islamic faith. They killed Irish, they killed black, they killed Canadians, they killed British, they killed Belgian, German. Eighty countries suffered. These terrorists did not discriminate amongst their victims, and now they have the audacity to cloak themselves in religion, one of the great religions, as President Bush said tonight, the religion of Islam.

Come on. We know that is a falsehood. And we have an obligation to continue to look through that falsehood. As the President said tonight again, and well said, I think, that bin Laden is just one part of the puzzle, just one part of the cancer. And there is more than one element to that cancer. Bin Laden is just one of the cells there. We have a number of cells that we have to eliminate to cure ourselves, to cleanse ourselves of this horrible cancer that has found its way to us.

So I thought the President spoke well. He spoke of our determination, our will and our patience. The President has been very methodical in his planning. He and his team have been very focused, and they are determined, and they are strong, and they are patient. And I think the President said it very well this evening.

I was very dismayed in the last week or so when one of our colleagues here criticized the President, saying how could the President launch an attack in 4 weeks; that he does not have enough preparation; he had not done enough planning. Well, that colleague of mine was out of order, in my opinion. Our constituents should know that

we do not sit in the war room and help design the day-to-day combat activities of our military forces. Thank goodness, we do not. That is not our job. We are not military experts. A lot may think they are military experts, but the fact is we are not military experts. So to stand up at this point in time and criticize our President, saying the President did not do enough planning, when this colleague of ours did not spend 2 minutes in the assistance of that planning, how the heck does he know what went on down there?

What you do, as the President said tonight, you measure by performance. And you can go turn on the TV tonight and look at the performance. Slowly but surely, as the President said, we are gaining ground. Obviously, we are gaining ground, and we are going to gain ground every day. Now, some days we may get set back a little. But every time we are set back, the sun will come again and we will gain a little more the next day. The end game is that America will prevail. America and its allies will prevail.

This Nation is too great, its civil liberties are too strong, its freedoms mean too much to the world for the United States of America to fail, and it will not. Failure is not even an option. Failure is not even something to be discussed. The United States will be victorious at whatever the cost, at whatever the sacrifice, at whatever amount of time it takes. Mark my words, the United States of America will prevail over this evil cancer.

Now, I want to mention a good friend, a good colleague of mine, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER); and he and I were talking about missile defense. We were also talking about civil liberties. Now, the gentleman from California and I agreed, and we agree on most things; but we were talking about the fact that I want the American people to know that in our anti-terrorist bill, for example, that we bring up tomorrow on this House floor, that we need to let the people know that we are not out there violating the constitutional rights of privacy or the constitutional civil liberties guaranteed under the Bill of Rights. That is not what is going to happen in this Congress.

What is happening is this: we are saying, look, we all have to pitch in together. So what if they check our baggage a little more closely at the airport? In fact, the previous speakers were talking about how necessary that is. So what if someone decides they want to cross the borders where they have a computer, a television face measuring computer that will tell them whether or not an individual is wanted anywhere in the world? So what if someone is requested to give a fingerprint if they want to cross the borders into America? The fact is America is going to have to tighten its borders.

We cannot afford to have 2½ million students, students who are guests of

the United States of America, we cannot afford to have 2½ million of them stay in our country after their visas expire. Of course, we have a huge gap in regards to our student visa program. And it was amazing to me the other day, even in my own State, that some of the colleges and universities in my own State said that we should not clamp down on student visas. The reason is because they need the money. They want the money. They may charge high fees for these foreign students to be educated in the United States. Well, it is about time the United States thought of the United States.

Our homeland security requires that we have a border policy that makes sense; that we have a border policy that protects America; that we have a border policy that lives within the philosophy of America. That philosophy of America is that America has always opened its arms to citizens of other parts of the world; but we have to do so within a system that is regulated. We just cannot open the borders and allow anybody in here that wants to come in here. As we have seen, unfortunately, on September 11, not everybody has good intentions in mind. Some of those people are cancerous; and they want to lay cancer on every woman, every child, and every man they can, regardless of their religion, regardless of their ethnic background. These people want to destroy.

We have every right, without violating the Constitution, to tighten up our borders. We have every right, and it is not a violation of our civil liberties, if someone wants to fly on an airplane and checks on baggage, they should expect that someone is going to look in their suitcase. They may even be looking through your nighties or your pajamas. The fact is there are certain inconveniences, not civil liberties, but there are certain inconveniences that all of us will now have to suffer to try to keep our country safe from this active cancer and the acts that these terrorists are trying to put upon us.

I think the President handled very well tonight this general threat, this seemingly high level of confidence of a legitimate threat against the United States. Obviously, the President and the law enforcement arms in our country, and by the way, kudos to our law enforcement people that are so dedicated and put themselves out there on the front line, and all of our emergency personnel, whether firemen, ambulance drivers, et cetera; but the President made it very clear he does not have specific information.

Obviously, if they did, if it was a train that was threatened or an airplane that was threatened, they would shut it down. They just have a general threat against the well-being of the United States.

I almost thought I heard criticism of the President not being more specific, when the President did not have more specific information as far as what the

targets would be. The President made it very clear this evening that the targets were not specific. I think the President did an excellent job in his communication to the people that he leads, to the people that he has assumed a major responsibility, the ultimately responsibility for their security.

So the fact is, as the President said this evening, all of us have to be more aware of our surroundings, and that is not just for the next 2 or 3 days; that is kind of something we are going to have to permanently put into our minds. If we see something that looks odd, it probably is out of place; and it probably arouses enough suspicion we should call the authorities. The old saying, if it looks unusual, it probably is. That is the kind of thing that we are facing here.

I used to be a police officer, and we did not develop any sixth sense, as people say, that police officers develop. What we actually did is develop common sense. Common sense that if in the middle of the night you see somebody coming out of a window of a retail store that is locked up, you might think that is a little unusual, and you would then take appropriate action. That is what the President is cautioning the American people to do, to just use common sense. If it does not look like it makes sense, report it to the authorities. That is how we are going to get ahead in this ball game.

Let me move on from the President's comments, although I want to repeat once again that I thought the President did an excellent job. I think the President and his team, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the national security advisers, Condoleezza Rice, this entire team, combined with all those young men and women that are serving in our military forces throughout the world, combined with our people like our volunteers in the Peace Corps, with the Government employees, with all the law enforcement agencies across this land, the firemen, et cetera, et cetera, we are all coming together as a team to provide the security that every citizen out there has a right to expect from their government.

And thank goodness we live in the strongest country in the history of the world. Thank goodness we have a country that has freedom of religion, that has freedom of speech, that allows its borders to be open to the world with reasonable regulations. That is what has made this country such a strong country. And the blow we suffered on September 11, and the blows that we will face in the future, if we stay together as a team, if we bring together as a group but act as one, we will survive this and come out of this stronger than we were before. Sadder than we were before, because of the friends and the family and the good people that were lost in this terrible tragedy, but stronger.

Let me visit about the question that the President was asked this evening,

an area that I spend a lot of time on, and that is missile defense and the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Let me put out the premise right now that I think every one of us in these Chambers, every Congressman, every Senator in Washington, all of us had better not live on a hope that we never get attacked by a missile. The far left in this country, the radical left, wants the American people to hope and believe that a missile will never be launched against the United States, and that a missile probably will not be just based on that hope. It is like hoping away cancer. It is not going to happen.

At some point in the future, the United States of America will face a missile attack. It may be one missile that is accidentally fired against the United States, or it may be a series of missiles that are intentionally fired against the United States.

□ 2200

Today we have time to prepare for it. That is exactly what we need to do. There are several steps that we need to do. First of all, this body has to stay together. We have to give the President the support that he has asked for in building a missile defense system for this country. Keep in mind what the country has today. This country has tremendous capabilities as far as detection of a missile launch is concerned. In fact, within moments after that missile was launched by accident by the Ukrainian military during military exercises and hit a commercial airliner one week ago, the United States of America, it was the United States of America that knew about the launch. We picked it up at NORAD in Colorado Springs.

We were within a couple of seconds able to figure out what kind of missile it was or at least a good guess, the direction, the target, et cetera. But once our NORAD defense system determines that a missile launch has taken place, and after they figure out what size missile it is and where its likely target is, all they can do is call up the victims of the likely target and say, say a prayer, it is over. You have an inbound missile. Its expected time of arrival is 15 minutes. Nothing we can do for you.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation. We are required to protect the American people, the American continent and our allies. How can we stand up in front of our constituents, colleagues, how can we stand in front of them and say that we have chosen not to provide an actual missile defense system. Instead we have chosen the policy of the far left which is let us hope it never happens, and it is crazy to think that someone will attack this country with a missile.

I think a lot of people have thought some crazy things that we never thought would happen, i.e., a terrorist attack would occur that would kill thousands and thousands of American citizens. It occurred on September 11. Who would imagine during a military

exercise that a military, under strict discipline, under careful scrutiny, would accidentally launch a missile that brought down a commercial airliner. The concerns we have in the future are not entirely focused on an intentional launch of a missile against the United States. It could be an accidental launch.

Mr. Speaker, I think the likelihood of an accidental missile launch against the United States is pretty high. I think there is a good likelihood it could be as much accidental as it is intentional. That is why I think it is imperative that the Congress of the United States follow the lead of the President of the United States, and that is to deploy a missile defense policy in this country.

Let us go through the different arguments brought up. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and I talked about, we do not have the technology. That technology is almost there. We have the laser technology. We have the satellite technology. We have the detection technology. Two months ago we were able to intercept an incoming practice target missile. That technology is going to be there. Sure it is going to take some trial and error to get there.

People say what if we fail. One way you can guarantee failure is not to try at all. That guarantees it. So my colleagues in these Chambers who do not want to try at all to provide missile defense for this country, you have guaranteed failure to your constituents. We have the capability to come up with the technology. We have the resources to deploy a missile defensive system to protect the people of this country, and we ought to do it.

Some people will say what about the anti-ballistic missile treaty. That was the question tonight to the President. When you meet with President Putin from Russia, are you backing off, abandonment of the anti-ballistic missile treaty, and the President said that treaty is obsolete. It does no good for Russia or the United States.

Let me tell you a little history about the anti-ballistic missile treaty. A few facts about it. First of all, the anti-ballistic missile treaty is a treaty between two countries. Only two countries are signatories to the treaty, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. This treaty was signed in the 1970s. The treaty is well over 30 years ago. It went on a theory that was abandoned a long time, a theory whose premise was questioned from the very first day.

What is the theory? At the time of the Cold War, at the time the anti-ballistic missile treaty was drafted in the 1970s, there were only two countries capable of delivering such weapons in the world, the United States of America, and the Soviet Union.

Some people, that administration, thought it was logical for the United States and Russia to get together and say look, you are the only two in the

world capable of delivering these types of missiles. Make a treaty that will give you the ultimate resistance to fire a missile in an offensive state against Russia or against the United States.

So the treaty they came up with is called the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, and it works like this: Russia agrees not to build a missile defensive system, and the United States agrees not to defend itself with a missile defensive system. The theory being if you do not have the capability to defend yourself, you would not fire a missile against the Soviet Union because you know the Soviet Union would retaliate, and your fear of retaliation would be enough incentive not to fire your missile in the first place.

Well, the one good thing they did when they drafted this treaty was they put a clause in there. The people that drafted this said, justifiably, Look, we are not smart enough to be able to read the future. We do not know what the future holds for the Soviet Union. We do not know what the future holds for the United States of America. So as we draft this treaty, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, let us make a provision, let us put a right within the treaty for the treaty to be modified for either party, the Soviet Union or the United States, to withdraw from the treaty.

Let me show Members that specific language. This is it right here. Article XVI of the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. That treaty is called the ABM. This treaty shall be of unlimited duration. Each party, and look at this emphasis that I have put on here. This is a guaranteed right. The parties have a right to abrogate this treaty. This is not a breach of the treaty. It is not a breaking of the treaty. It is exercising a right contained within the four corners of the treaty. That is exactly what this language is. Let us go through it.

Each party, remember there are only two parties to the ABM, the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty. See the word "right." It is not iffy. It is a guaranteed right of the treaty. The treaty has it within its provisions. 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 interests.

So we know that the right to abandon the treaty is contained within the four corners of the treaty if in fact extraordinary events have occurred. So the argument here is have extraordinary events occurred to the extent that the supreme interests of the parties have been impacted? Of course they have. I am going to show Members that in just a moment.

It shall give notice of its decision to the other party 6 months prior to withdraw from the treaty. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having jeopardized its supreme

interests. What are extraordinary events.

Take a look at what has happened in the world in the last 30 years. This is ballistic missile proliferation. Remember at the time the treaty was drafted, there were two countries, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, that were capable of ballistic missile delivery against each other. Only two countries. That is why only two countries signed the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Take a look at what has occurred in proliferation in countries throughout the world as indicated by the purple color on this chart. This is the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Ballistic missiles do not have to contain a nuclear warhead. They can, in fact, contain a warhead that has got a biological weapon. So these can be missiles with incoming biological weapons.

The fact is numerous countries throughout the world have acquired the capability to deliver a ballistic missile against the United States or against other countries or against allies of the United States or in fact against Russia. It is in Russia's best interests as well as the best interests of the United States that we acknowledge the fact that the world, that extraordinary events have occurred, and at the very top of that list is the capability to deliver a biological or nuclear weapon in either one of our countries by people who have not signed this treaty. That is the proliferation.

That is an extraordinary event. On that alone, this treaty should be abrogated. Let us look here. Remember again when we signed the treaty in the 1970s there were two countries with nuclear capability. Two of them, the Soviet Union and the United States. Now take a look. These are countries that now possess nuclear weapons: Britain, China, France, Pakistan, Israel, United States. I would add to that list North Korea. Of concern over here, I think North Korea has already accomplished it, Iraq, Iran, Libya.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing, unfortunately, extraordinary events take place with the proliferation of countries, rogue countries, Third World countries, that are doing everything they can to acquire nuclear weapons. We stand back and say we should not build a missile defense. We are doing an injustice to future generations of this Nation. We see the disaster coming. We see the disaster coming. We have the opportunity today, the American people, the leaders of the American people, the government of the American people, we have the opportunity today to build a system that will stop missile delivery of nuclear weapons. That will stop missile delivery of biological weapons. That is our obligation. We can do it.

So any kind of argument that we see in these Chambers about the fact that the United States does not need missile defense are ill-founded on their face. Of course this Nation needs it. Thank goodness the President of the United

States recognizes the fact that the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, which is the only thing standing in the way of an effective missile defense for this country, thank goodness that the President recognizes that extraordinary events which trigger the ability to leave the treaty have occurred.

The President's response tonight, which I thought was very eloquent, he talked about it is to Russia's benefit as well. The United States is not developing a missile defensive system to the exclusion of every other country in the world. It is our intent to develop a system that we can share with our close friends like the British, like Canada, and Mexico and frankly be willing to share with other countries. If we build the right kind of system, satellite laser system, we actually could assist any country in the world, friend or foe, from a missile attack against that country.

Just imagine for a moment if Russia, for example, by accident launched a missile on this country. A nuclear missile. Let us say that it hit Philadelphia or some city and wipes out a city. You know, the retaliation or the repercussions of the actual hit, the result of that missile, would be so significant none of us can even imagine. It is as hard to imagine those kinds of results as what we saw occur in New York City on September 11.

□ 2215

What would it mean? Would it mean a new world war? Would it mean such massive retaliation by the United States that Russia then would fire whatever they had left at the United States? We have an opportunity to avoid that disaster by providing this country with the capability to stop incoming missiles whether they are accidentally fired at the United States or whether they are intentionally fired against the United States.

Now, some people will say to you, "Well, now look, you know, Scott, this kind of missile thing is not going to happen. Let's hope it away."

And I just tell you 10 days ago, although the press has been very heavy on Afghanistan and our military theater of operations over there, consider the fact that about 10 days ago, a missile was fired by accident, and a missile did hit a target that no one intended for it to hit and it did in fact bring down a commercial airliner and killed everybody on board. That ought to tell you that accidents can happen. We are naive, and we are almost shameful if we do not think that in the future at some point this country is going to be challenged by a missile that is inbound, and we have the opportunity today to stop it. We have not only the opportunity today to stop it, we have the obligation to stop it. And we can do it.

So missile defense, I was so pleased that that question was asked of the President tonight. This President intends to lead this Nation not only to

victory over the cancer of terrorism but he also intends to lead this country to victory in its defense of its homeland security. And a part of that is to build a missile defensive system that will give us the kind of security that a lot of us think we have right now. There are a lot of people out there that think we have the capability to stop these kind of things. So this President, as he is doing with other causes, is taking the leadership role. I for one am more than happy to stand tall behind him. As all of us are standing, most of us, tall behind his leadership against the cancer of terrorism, let us too be counted standing behind him for the missile defense system of this country.

Let me go back, leave this subject for a moment, and talk very briefly about the economy, because the President also covered the economy this evening, and I think his remarks were very important. This economy will recover. This economy has some very fundamental strengths to it. This economy has been bruised by the September 11 attacks. The economy was limping along prior to September 11. It happens. Our economy runs in cycles. It has run in cycles throughout the history of mankind. The economies of every country in the world run in cycles. We are in a cyclical state. The worst thing that can keep us in a downward cycle, the worst thing that can continue to propel us into the ground is loss of confidence. It is just like the worst thing that could work against us is the fear of fear. Our greatest fear is but fear itself. And it is the same thing, too, we should apply to our economy. We as Americans need to continue to go out and do what we can to bolster our economy, increase our job performance. Employers, you need to pay your employees what is necessary to keep them so that they can support their families. Our inventors, our capital investment, our inventors need to continue to invent the great products that this country is known for. We need to keep incentive in the system out there. I am very confident that the economy will continue through its cyclical correction but that the country will again see an uplift in our economy. So I urge people not to panic. I urge people that as the Christmas season approaches, go out and buy and spend as you would in a normal Christmas. I am not saying to do it unwisely. I am not saying to waste money. But I am saying that your consumer confidence, our constituents' confidence is the big engine that is driving this economy. And if we can, whatever we can do to sit down with our constituents and tell them just what the basic fundamentals of our economy are and how strong they are, we are not going to have a recovery tomorrow. We are not going to see the boom times with the stock market. People were actually writing and selling books about what happens when the Dow hits 30,000. We are not going to see that. But what we are going to see

is a cyclical correction that also leads to the recovery of an economy. We here in the United States Congress will be acting on a stimulus package. In fact our fine chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), will be chairing the Committee on Ways and Means upon which I sit tomorrow to consider debate and to report out a bill for some type of stimulus package. The government cannot do it all. I think our constituents understand that. We do not need to lecture our constituents. They understand the government cannot do it all, but the government can help. Alan Greenspan has helped by putting more money in, by lowering interest rates. Any of our constituents that are out there that are paying credit card interest that is at all above 10 percent in my opinion, I would consider it excessive. I mean, Greenspan has lowered those rates so dramatically that every American, every American that uses credit, whether it is on your credit card or whether it is for your house ought to be seeing the benefit. And if you are not seeing the benefit, if your constituents are not seeing the benefit of lower interest rates from their credit card companies, tell them to dump that company and go with a company that is going to be fair with them, that is going to give them a rate that fairly evaluates the risk that is involved in doing business with them.

There are a lot of things out there that are going to work in our favor. One of the things that I think that can come out of that stimulus package tomorrow is broad based tax cuts, not tax

cuts for one specific individual or one specific industry but broad based. We need to get consumer confidence back in an upward mode. A stimulus package cannot do it all, as I said, but we can go a long ways, in putting incentive out there in the system so that once again our economic engine warms up and begins that climb up the hill. I know I can; I know I can. We know that that is going to happen. So I feel confident about our economy.

To wrap it up, I want to first of all thank my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for the discussion, I thought a very thorough discussion we had this evening on missile defense. I think the President did a very commendable job. And I, like many, many hundreds of thousands of Americans, and I like most of my colleagues, if not all of my colleagues on this House floor, stand in gratitude for the leadership that the President has shown to this country, to the leadership that Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice and the other Cabinet members and our national security team and our military leaders and our military personnel, all across this country, thank God we have got these kind of people that are dedicated, in many cases with their lives, are dedicated to the cause of the United States of America. Thank God we have got people who are willing to make it their entire focus, in a patient, strong but dedicated way to make sure that the United States of America continues to prevail for the next generation in the good way that it has prevailed for our generation. Thank good-

ness we have got a country that recognizes all types of different religions, that allows people of different ethnic backgrounds to thrive in this country. We are equal under our laws around here. There are some countries in this world that will not allow foreign people to come in and be citizens. Many countries do not have open borders at all. They have closed borders. There are a lot of countries in this world who discriminate very clearly against other religions. But in the United States of America, whether you practice Islam, whether you are a Catholic, whether you are a Methodist, Episcopalian, a Mormon, even being an atheist in this country is protected by our Constitution. It is the strength of that Constitution that will increase the strength of this country. It is being respected by this President and his team.

My final remark is that I stand tall with all my colleagues in backing the President and his team. Let us go out there and let us eradicate the cancer that has fallen upon us. We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to future generations. It is an obligation and a responsibility of our job. And, frankly, we can get the job done.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4206. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges and Grapefruit (Texas and States Other Than Florida, California and Arizona); Grade Standards [Docket Number FV-00-304] received September 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4207. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Changes to the Handling Regulation for Producer Field-Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV01-966-1 FR] received September 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4208. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Papayas Grown in

Hawaii; Suspension of Grade, Inspection, and Related Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV01-928-1 FIR] received September 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4209. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301169; FRL-6801-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4210. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyhalofop-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301167; FRL-6800-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4211. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Truth in Savings—received September 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4212. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions—received September 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4213. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—California: Final Authorization of Revisions to State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL-7065-7] received September 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4214. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7068-1] received September 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4215. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and