With our help in rebuilding their country, we can bring a new era of peace to Afghanistan, and instead of being a springboard to destroy the stability of Central Asia and undermine democracy and freedom in Russia and to be a terrorist haven that would murder millions of Americans, or at least thousands of Americans, Afghanistan can become a civilized part of the world community. We have got that opportunity now. We cannot pass it up. Our State Department, I do not know what has gotten into people's heads. I cannot understand the incompetence of people who are still advocating the policy of keeping the Taliban in power.

By the way, we had incompetence as well with our intelligence community who permitted this attack to succeed in the first place. We need to clear out the executive level people in some of these agencies and departments. We need to make sure that we stand firm and that we send a message to the world, if you slaughter Americans, you will pay the price. It is not just rhetoric. We have got to make sure that those words mean something.

It has been my privilege to serve on this delegation with Chairman WELDON. Without Chairman WELDON'S leadership, we could not have, not only had the transportation but we could not have gotten the support we needed to have such a successful mission. Now we are back and we are part of the debate. It is what we are saying here tonight, and what we said out in our press conference today, and what we will say during our briefings to the senior members of this administration, will play a large role in making sure that the President chooses the right path, the path to long-term peace and tranquility which is the path of strength and courage and not dealmaking with tyrants and terrorists.

I am very, very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know all of us learned a lot. I think we have accomplished a lot with this journey to Central Asia, to see our friends in Turkey who are standing with us so solidly and to talk to also those people in Russia who want to be our friends, and in the future, build a better future for both our peoples and for the whole world.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank our friend and colleague for his comments, for his outstanding leadership, for his involvement on these issues long before September 11.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask our colleagues to read the text of the material that is in this special order, the additions that we have supplied, and get a full sense of understanding of what 11 Members of Congress did over the past 5 days. We will be briefing the administration and our leadership, the Speaker and the minority leader and Members of the other body throughout the next several weeks.

Together, supporting our President, we can win, we can replace Osama bin Laden, we can remove the Taliban and allow the people of Afghanistan to regain control of their homeland.

NATIONAL SECURITY IN WAKE OF EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to pass some comments on to a former employee, a former reporter here, who is facing some trying times as he sits in the hospital, Bob Cochran. Bob's son works here in the House. Bob, while I cannot speak to the TV audience, I know that if he were here today, all my colleagues would go up, pat him on the back and wish him our very best. He set a good record while he was here. Once again, he faces another challenge. I am sure that he will be successful.

This evening, Mr. Speaker, I want to visit with my colleagues at length about the Nation's security. Obviously that is the issue on everyone's mind since September 11 and the tragedy that we all witnessed on TV. There are a number of issues that I want to visit with Members about this evening. One of them is the description of the events and the battle that we face, given by even Tony Blair today or Rudy Giuliani yesterday when he spoke to the United Nations, the first time a mayor of New York City has spoken to the United Nations in I do not know how many years. And our brothers in thought and our brothers in capitalism and our brothers in democracy, the United Kingdom and Tony Blair and his speech and his remarks this evening, I want to go over a few of those remarks because I think they are very pertinent.

My analogy of the situation, of the challenge that we face, that our President is so ably leading us through at this time, is a battle that you can figure like it is against a cancer. You know that that cancer is there. We know the viciousness of cancer. I can tell you that some people, as time goes on, some people in our country are saying that, well, this is a perfect example, a perfect time for us to turn the other cheek, for us to kiss and make up, and to pretend that that cancer, that you do not have to eradicate it off your arm or eradicate it from your body, that you can love it off your body, that you can pray it off your body.

I have no doubt, I am a Christian, I strongly believe in a supreme being, but I believe that our supreme being expects us to have some self-help, that our supreme being does not think that we think that we can discover a horrible cancer on our body and pray it off, or wish that it was not there and somehow it is going to disappear on its own. Or pat it with your hand and think that that cancer is going to turn friendly. Do not be mistaken. I do not think anybody on this floor is. I hope you are not. But do not be mistaken.

This bin Laden is the most vicious cancer that you have ever encountered. It is not a cancer that you can negotiate. The President of this country has made it very clear we will not negotiate with this cancer. It is a cancer that you have no choice but to eradicate, because if you do not, it will be a battle you wish you would not have lost. We cannot, as an American Nation, we cannot as a free world, any country in this free world, afford to lose this battle.

Do not be taken in by some of the peace protesters across the country who interestingly enough in this country have the right to protest and they are protesting against the action that we should take against bin Laden because of the viciousness that it may involve.

□ 2130

This is against bin Laden, whose very strike at the center of America was not to take American lives. That is not the intent of this cancer that is trying striking us. The intent of that cancer that is striking us, the intent of bin Laden and his followers out there, is to destroy a nation, to see the United States and all countries of democracy buckle at the knees, to take them down, as communism was taken down in Russia. That is what their goal is.

These protestors, who are so strong in their thought, ought to take just a moment to see how bin Laden and his followers treat women, for example, what they think about human rights, what they think about homosexuality, what they think about the ethnic issues and the all-men-are-created-equal type of philosophy. Take a look at the prevalence of class structure, of which bin Laden came from, and which bin Laden rules. It defies everything that these peace protestors believe in.

What he is seeking to do is to destroy the constitutional right that our country allows for people to have the freedom of speech, for people to go out and protest. But yet their vision seems to be shortsighted.

Then there are those who I have seen in the last few days who say, well, somehow we can love this thing off, or we can pray this thing away. Look, we need all the prayers we can get and it will be a strong element of our success, and we need all the love we can gather throughout the world. There is no question about that. In fact, our country has given more foreign aid to Afghanistan than any country in the history of Afghanistan. Our country, of any country in the world, believes in the warmth and the prayer and the need to help other people not so privileged.

But that is not what this is about. This is about a horrible cancer that has attacked everybody in the free world; and, if we are not successful, then logically it will be successful.

Think about the last time you ever saw anybody say that they wanted cancer to be successful. Think about the

last time you ever saw anybody that did not want us to have a battle against cancer be successful. We support cancer research through this country strongly; and, I am telling you, the battle we face now is as threatening to our society as cancer is to the human body.

I want to read a little from Tony Blair, some of the comments he made in his speech today. I think it is very appropriate. Let me just read just a couple of quotes. Again, I am quoting from Tony Blair. ''There is no compromise possible with such people, no meeting of the minds, no point of understanding with such terror.''

Think of the words that Tony Blair said today. Let me repeat them. ''There is no compromise possible with such people, no meeting of the minds, no point of understanding with such terror. There is just one choice.'' And if there were any words I have heard, with the exception of the President's speech given right here on this House floor, these words would come in right behind it. ''Defeat it, or be defeated by it.'' ''Defeat it, or be defeated by it.'' And defeat it we must. That is exactly what Tony Blair said today.

If we do not beat it, it is going to beat us, and the results of it defeating us will be the end of the free world as we know it; the end of democracy, the end of the dreams of the multiple generations, the multiple generations in this country that built this country to the physical strength and to the moral strength that it has, and to the success that this country has. All of that, all of that success, all of that compassion, all of that love, all of that that our predecessors by the hundreds of thousands have laid their lives down for, all of that will be nil if we lose this battle. And that is what Tony Blair says.

He says there is no negotiation. He said, my analysis, you cannot negotiate with cancer. You cannot look at the cancer on your body and say I want to negotiate with it. It has no love, it has no compassion. It only has one goal. Cancer's goal is to destroy your body. That is all it is there for. It is not there to assist your body, it is not there to make your body better, it is not to make your body healthier in some manner. Cancer is in your body for one purpose, and that is to destroy your body, and its ultimate goal is death of the human body.

That is exactly what bin Laden and his radical followers are. I think our President was very careful, as are the national leaders, and thank goodness we have George W. Bush, and we have people like Colin Powell, or Condoleezza Rice, or Donald Rumsfeld, and I could go right on down the list, that are leading our country.

They have been very careful to distinguish, as have many of my colleagues here on the floor, they have been very careful to distinguish that this is not the religion of Islam, that this is not the belief of Islam. Islam does not have in the Koran or anywhere else the destruction of democracy. It is not the belief of the majority of the Muslim population. It certainly is not the belief of the Muslim population that resides as American citizens who are American citizens who have a Muslim background.

One of my close friends is Muslim, he and his family, Dr. Malik and Seme Hassen, Pueblo, Colorado. The other day, I saw, and if Members have an opportunity, the Discovery Channel gave us a tape last week for our personal viewing, and the tape is titled ''Behind the Terror, Understanding the Enemy.'' ''Behind the Terror, Understanding the Enemy.'' If Members have not seen that, they ought to get their constituents together and ought to watch that jointly. It is a 2-hour tape. It is a wonderful production by Discovery. ''Behind the Terror, Understanding the Enemy.''

You will understand the background of what we are talking about. That 2-hour film will give one the equivalent of 1 year of education in a university, in my opinion. It is outstanding.

To go back to my friend, Dr. Hassen and his wife, Seme, I invited them last week to come and sit down with other citizens in Pueblo, their fellow citizens, fellow Americans, and watch this film. Then, after the film, I asked Dr. Hassen and his wife Seme to stand up and give their point of view. I will tell you, I was so proud to listen to these people. The patriotism, the sense of belief in this country and what this country offers, is intense.

So our President's thoughts and our President's words, as well as the words of others, whether it is Condoleezza Rice or Tony Blair or any of the world's leaders, is the very careful distinction between the Muslim population, the majority of the Muslim population, and these radical cancers that we are now dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on and talk just for a moment about Mayor Giuliani's comments, which I thought were just wonderful. He gave them yesterday at the United Nations. Many of the people, I think, across the country did not get an opportunity to hear the Mayor speak to the United Nations. I am not sure all Members were able to watch it. I thought it was fabulous, and I want to repeat just a few things that the Mayor said.

No Mayor in the history of this country has faced the challenges that Mayor Giuliani has faced and the people of New York City have faced, and they have risen to the challenge. ''They have suffered a horrible, horrible blow; a horrible blow to the persons of New York, a horrible blow to the infrastructure of New York, a horrible blow to the moral senses of every citizen, to the citizens of New York City.'' This is what the Mayor said. These are excerpts from Giuliani's speech to the United Nations.

''Indeed, this vicious attack places in jeopardy the whole purpose of the United Nations.'' So the Mayor talks about the United Nations. What is the purpose of the United Nations? Many of us in these Chambers have questioned the United Nations, when really put to a test, can the United Nations stand up to it? Is the United Nations really a body that really truly will bring together a united solution? Or will they back down at the moment of the test?

Mayor Giuliani's remarks, ''Indeed, this vicious attack places in jeopardy the whole purpose of the United Nations.'' And he goes on. ''The United Nations must hold accountable any country that supports or condones terrorism. Otherwise, you will fail in your primary mission as a peacekeeper.''

Let me repeat that. ''The United Nations must hold accountable.'' It is not should hold accountable. It is not a negotiable process. The Mayor says that the United Nations must, no choice, must hold accountable any country that supports or condones terrorism. Any country, any individual. ''Otherwise, you will fail in your primary mission as a peacekeeper, which is exactly what the primary mission of the United Nations is.''

He says, ''It must ostracize any nation that supports terrorism. Now, that is a test for the United Nations. It must isolate any nation that remains neutral in the fight against terrorism. Now is the time, in the words of your charter, the United Nations charter, to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security.''

So the Mayor has said to the United Nations, now is your time, now is the time; the challenge is here today. This is not a time for further study or vague directives.

Many of us on this floor have debated extensively about how many more directives or how many more studies does the United Nations need before the United Nations does something. It is a collective body of nations throughout the world, but at some point the United Nations needs to make decisions, and now could be the finest hour of the United Nations, or the worst failure of the United Nations, to see how exactly they address September 11, 2001.

Let me go on with Mayor Giuliani's remarks. ''The evidence of terrorism's brutality and inhumanity, of its contempt for life and the concept of peace, of its contempt for life and of the concept of peace, is lying beneath the rubble of the World Trade Center, less than 2 miles from where we meet today.''

He could not have said it any better. For those people who are protesting our fight against this cancer, keep in mind, you ought to go visit that site of rubble. You ought to keep in mind what evidence is still, as we speak this hour, what evidence is still trying to be recovered, to return to the thousands, not the few families, but the thousands of fellow Americans, which include not just fellow Americans, but 80 separate countries throughout this world and every type of ethnic background you

can imagine, including Muslims, that were destroyed and now lay in a pile of rubbish called evidence.

Mayor Giuliani goes on. ''Look at that destruction; that massive, senseless, cruel loss of human life. And then I ask you to look in your hearts and recognize that there is no room for neutrality on the issue of terrorism. There is no room for the issue of neutrality on the issue of terrorism. You are either with civilization or with terrorists. On one side is democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human life,'' Giuliani says. ''On the other side is tyranny, arbitrary executions and mass murder. Mass murder.''

We are right, and they are wrong. That is exactly what Giuliani says. We are right, and they are wrong. No shoulds, no question of deliberation by a jury. It is clear who is right and who is wrong.

Mayor Giuliani says it very well. Let me repeat what Mayor Giuliani says. ''We are right, and they are wrong. It is as simple as that. And by that I mean that America and its allies are right about democracy, about religious, political and economic freedom, and the terrorists are wrong, in fact, evil, in their mass destruction of human life in the name of addressing alleged injustices.''

That paragraph says just about all of it that needs to be said.

Let me continue. ''Let those who say that we must understand the reasons of terrorism, come with me.'' Listen to this. All of you out there willing so quickly to carry up a sign and call America a bully, that say in some way America probably had this coming, that America does not understand these so-called freedom fighters. They are not freedom fighters. They are cancer. That is exactly what they are.

Listen to this paragraph by the Mayor of New York City. ''Let those who say that we must understand, let those who say that we must understand the reasons for terrorism come with me to the thousands of funerals, the thousands of funerals we are having in New York City, thousands, and explain those insane maniacal reasons to the children who will grow up without fathers and mothers, and to the parents who have had their children ripped from them for no reason at all.''

□ 2145

So we can see that Giuliani, the Mayor of New York City, in his address to the United Nations yesterday, and to Tony Blair in his remarks today, we have people who stand strong; and we have people who are willing to say, it is as clear as night and day. There is no question who is right, and there is no question who is wrong. That is what Mayor Giuliani said. The evidence lays 2 miles, less than 2 miles from the United Nations building, from where he gave that speech. I commend the Mayor, all of us commend the Mayor for his actions in New York City; but I commend the Mayor for having the guts and the gumption to show up in front of the United Nations and lay it on the line.

This is not something that we negotiate, as the President has very ably said. It is nonnegotiable. It is a cancer. We do not negotiate with cancer. We need to eradicate cancer. To my left, we could put the word ''cancer'' right across the top of this. Our Nation's security is an imperative requirement for those of us who have responsibilities of leadership, not only to our generation, but for the future generations of this country. The test of our leadership is here today. The test of our will and the strength of our beliefs are being challenged today by a horrible cancer. Can we and will we rise against this, even though it requires patience?

It is not an easy battle, and nobody out there believes it is an easy battle. We were not able to destroy a country. This, we do not believe, was sanctioned by a country, although it appears that Afghanistan is going to continue to shelter the terrorists; and as the President, and I think the belief of the American people have said to that Taliban regime over there, look, you cannot cooperate with this cancer. You have to get out of the way. Our focus is to get the cancer, and if we find you are a contributing cause to the cancer, you need to be eliminated. There is no question about it. If you are not a contributing cause to the cancer, get out of the way so that we can take on the cancer. If you are a contributing cause to the cancer, it must be eliminated; and that is exactly the message.

In our time today, I say to my colleagues, it is perhaps in our career the one deciding point of how well we can exert leadership and our responsibilities as Congressmen of the United States of America.

There are several different issues that we need to be concerned about for the security of this country. One of them that I found very interesting in the last couple of days, just some recommendations I think we should take a look at. The Feinstein proposal, Senator FEINSTEIN. Let me just give the background. She has mentioned, she said, there is no question we have to look at our immigration laws. Our borders are too loose. There has been a lot of focus on our borders. Take a look at what is happening at the borders. What can we do to improve the borders?

Well, we also have to take a look, because we have a big problem once people get inside our borders. What kind of enforcement do we have across this country? My understanding is that the INS has about 2,500 agents for the interior of the United States, for our homeland; and that is what we are talking about. How do we defend the homeland? We have to assume that people will get by those borders, on legitimate reasons perhaps and then turn to illegitimate purposes, or get by those borders through illegitimate means and then they get into the center of the homeland. We have to provide the INS with the type of resources to have a homeland defense against those who violate some of the most liberal immigration laws in the world. Our country stands proud on its open arms to immigrants. Most of us were beneficiaries of that policy. But it does not mean that we should shirk our responsibility or look the other way at the problems that we have with the immigration policies that are in place.

Senator FEINSTEIN, through her proposal, the Feinstein proposal, urges major changes in the United States visa program. This proposal has found its time. These student visas, let me give a little background. This is from the proposal. One of the suicide pilots of American Airlines Flight 77, which crashed into the Pentagon, had enrolled in an Oakland, California, college in November 2000 for an English language course, but never showed up. Mr. Speaker, when a foreigner gets a student visa, they are required, once they get the visa, to go to school; or obviously, they are not using the student visa to go to school, they are using it just to gain access to the country. That is what appeared to happen here. Investigators are also examining whether or not three others, also believed to be involved in the hijacking of Flight 77, attended a community college in San Diego.

Officials estimate that 245,000, 245,000 foreign students have entered the United States this year to pursue a course of study. Between 1999 and 2000, in other words, in a 1-year period of time, the State Department issued 3,370 visas to students from nations on the United States Terrorism Watch List. In other words, the United States keeps a watch list of countries we consider that harbor or otherwise condone terrorism; and from those States, we allow almost 4,000 students to come to college in the finest universities in the world here in the United States.

What are we? Did we just hit our head falling out of a swing? I mean not even the civil libertarians can defend that kind of policy. We have a right to accept students, and we have a right to say no to students; and if we have students who are coming from a regime who have harbored terrorism, in my opinion, that should stop immediately. There should not be one more student, not one more student visa issued to a country on this Nation's terrorism list, not one. And that statement goes further than the Feinstein proposal.

The Feinstein proposal, as I have read it, does not say that. I have said that. I do not think that the United States of America has to give one inch, has to give one inch to any country or any regime in the world that harbors or condones terrorism and allows their young people to come to our Nation for their education. We should not do it. We do not have to do it. It is not a question of being politically correct or not. In fact, being politically correct would say that our primary concern ought to be the national security, the

security for our homeland. It is not being racial or racist by any definition of the word. It simply is saying, look, it is logical, it is common sense. Do not educate the young people in our own country or countries that condone terrorism against our country. Do not take in the enemy's children to educate them and turn them against ourselves. It does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue on with the Feinstein proposal. In 1996, Congress approved a Federal law to require the INS to electronically collect data on all international students by 2003; but to date, the system has not yet been set up. They have no funding. It is section 110; it is under the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. Zero funding for it. It is not and should not be considered ''politically incorrect'' to talk about the immigration policies of this Nation. What more of a wake-up sound do we need? What kind of an alarm do we need to sound before we start to look at these issues; and the student visas are an excellent place to start, a good place to start. So I think that the Feinstein proposal is something that this Congress ought to look at immediately.

I want to move on to something else that I think is absolutely critical. I want to talk to my colleagues about missile defense. I am appalled that since the September 11 tragedy, that some people have addressed missile defense as something that is not necessary. If ever there was an example of a need to defend the homeland, that September 11 displayed to us that this time it was an airplane, next time it could be a biological weapon or it could be a missile.

I will tell my colleagues something else that people are not thinking about. We not only in this country have zero defense against incoming missiles to this country; but we do not have any defense, not just a missile that is intentionally launched against this country. We frankly do not have a defense against a missile launched against this country by accident. Think about it. Everybody that talks about missile defense puts it in the context of an intentionally launched attack against the United States. I think that that is a high possibility at some point in the future, and I think we have an inherent obligation as Congressmen to defend this country, to defend the homeland, to give us homeland security against a missile defense.

But we also need to broaden our thoughts and think about what would happen if Russia, for example, by accident, not intentionally, but through carelessness or through negligence or by accident, launched a missile against the United States and we do not have a missile defense system to stop it. Would that, because a country, which we could establish was a country, not a terrorist, but a country, fires a missile accidentally, and it hits a major city, and we know what kind of damage a nuclear weapon would do, it would make September 11 look kind of small compared to the damage that a nuclear weapon would do. What do we do, start a war? Every peace advocate in America ought to be some of the strongest proponents in America for missile defense. Why? Because missile defense could help us avoid a future war. Think about that accidental launch as I go through my remarks.

Obviously, what we have to think about is preemptive defense. How do we preempt the challenge that faces us out there? Now, we know, for example, NORAD located in Colorado Springs, we have thought well enough into the future, and our forefathers had the foresight to say we need to have a detection system. We need to detect where the enemy moves around. We need to detect when people who do not have the best interests of this Nation in mind, we need to be able to detect what they are up to. And if they launch aircraft against us, if they launch a balloon against us, a hot air balloon, if they launch a missile against us, we need to track it. We need to have the capability to pick it up very early.

Mr. Speaker, we did that, and NORAD, which is a joint operation with our good neighbors to the north, Canada, put together a system that has incredible detection. We have through this system that we have, that is in place today, we have the capabilities to pick up a missile launch anywhere in the world. We can, within seconds, tell where its target is, we can tell the speed of the missile, we can tell with pretty high probability what the speed of the missile is, whether it has multiple warheads on it; but much beyond that, we cannot do anything else. A lot of citizens out there today are asking questions: How do we defend ourselves? What do we actually have in our arsenal for homeland defense, for national security? Mr. Speaker, we do not have anything for missile defense.

Our President, before September 11, one of the issues that he campaigned on and one of the issues that he has followed through on and has been very aggressive about is that we as a Congress, he as a President, and this Nation as a Nation has the responsibility for future generations to preempt missile attacks against the United States of America.

Probability of events. I have two things listed on this poster. One of them, of course, as we look to my left is the intentional launch. Obviously, at some point in the future, now, people, it could be realistic that a nuclear missile would be launched against this country. Do we think that bin Laden or those terrorists who committed this terrible act, do we think that if they would have had a nuclear weapon in their hands that they would have thought twice about using it?

□ 2200

If they would have had the capability to deliver a missile into this country, that would not have been an airline that hit those towers, that would have been a missile that hit those towers, in my opinion.

The only thing that stopped those people from using a nuclear missile or a nuclear weapon is they did not have it. It was not because, by the way, we would stop it, because it is pretty well known we have no capabilities to stop it. We have the technology that has very rapidly progressed to the point where we think we can develop within this country, in a few short years, a very effective missile defense system. We need to do that. We need to do it today. The time is here, it is now, for a missile defense system.

As I said earlier, again to my left, not necessarily an intentional launch, but take a look about an accidental launch. What if somebody accidentally launched against this country? If we had the capability to stop an accidentally-launched missile as it began to head for this country, if we had the capability to stop it, we may very well have averted a major, major conflict, the likes of which history has never seen.

But if we do not have the capability to stop that missile, what do we do? What do we do if a country accidentally launched a nuclear missile into a major city in the United States, and we lost hundreds of thousands of people? We would feel pretty horrible that we did not take the opportunity we have today to put a missile defense system into place. We would feel pretty horrible that we did not take the time and the money that we have to continue to develop the technology to perfect defense for the United States of America for security for our homeland.

I wanted to point out a few things here, that the terrorist attack of September 11, the terrorist attack of September 11, confirms the growing need for a missile defense. Homeland defense is insufficient without missile defense.

I have heard people say in the last few days, we need to be biologically prepared to fight a biological attack. We need to be prepared to tighten up our airport security so we do not ever see a repeat of what happened on September 11. We have to be prepared for other types of attacks.

Let me tell the Members, one of them that to me is the most dangerous threat for future generations, and frankly, for our generation, but as more countries develop and acquire nuclear weapons, our threat, one of our major threats, not the only threat, and I am not taking anything away from airport security, obviously, I am not taking anything away from biological defense for homeland security, but I am saying, put into that formula a missile defense system, or we will live, I think, I truly believe that my generation will live to see the day that we regretted back in the early part of the 2000's not putting a missile defense system in order.

While systems are in place to thwart terrorism, the Nation still has no defense, and I stress the word ''no,'' the

Nation has no defense against missile attack. Missile attacks will be far more destructive than the September 11 assaults. I do not think anybody questions that.

Terrorist groups, not just states but terrorist groups, have the means to buy ballistic missiles. Missile defenses are needed to shield the United States from retaliation, should it take action against terrorist-harboring states.

Look at that last point. Missile defenses are necessary. If the United States decides to take action against a country that is harboring or condoning terrorism, or actively engaged in terrorism against the United States, one of the critical elements of our offense against terrorism is the ability to defend our Nation from missile attacks that might come back as retaliation. Those are very, very key elements.

The red is nuclear proliferation, nuclear proliferation. That is the red right now. Right now that is what we have. Countries of nuclear proliferation concern, that is the green.

I say to my colleagues, take a look at this map today in 2001, a month after the worst disaster this country has ever suffered. Take a look at this map. If we do not do something about it, if we do not defend against it, take a look at how threatening this map will be just in 10 years. See what happens to these colors, and see how widely they spread throughout the world if we do not take decisive action in the period of time that we now have the opportunity to take decisive action.

We have a little gap in there. We have a window of opportunity to develop this missile defensive system. Right now the countries that would intentionally launch against the United States I do not believe would engage in that kind of conduct within the near future. I do, however, believe, and I think every one of my colleagues would agree with me, that today every country in the world that has nuclear missile capability also has the capability, frankly, to screw up, to fire a missile by mistake.

If that missile comes to the United States, we have an obligation, we have a need for the American people to defend against it. We have this short window of opportunity, a few short years here before this red spreads throughout the world to provide us, to provide Canada, to provide any of our allies or any of our friends defense against missile attack.

Watch this map. Mark this map. A few years from now, a few years from now, take a look at it. By God, if we as a collective body have not, 10 years from now, provided this Nation with a missile defense system, we will have been grossly derelict in our duties. We will have been grossly derelict in our responsibilities for the future survivability of this Nation. That is how much weight I put on this decision to defend against accidental or intentional launches against the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, ballistic missile proliferation. I just showed Members what was happening with the nuclear spread throughout the world. Now take a look at what has happened with regard to proliferation with regard to ballistic missile capabilities. This is a very, very important chart. This indicates very clearly that when the antiballistic missile treaty was signed, for example, there were two countries in this world capable of attacking each other with nuclear missiles. It was Russia and the United States.

But today, look how this has changed, ballistic missile proliferation. Look at the purple throughout this map. Countries possessing ballistic missiles.

Let me just give some examples. There are Iran. Heard that name lately? There is Iraq, India, Hungary, Libya, Pakistan, Poland, Rumania, Syria, Taiwan, South Africa, Slovakia, Saudi Arabia, Russia, United Kingdom, Vietnam, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Afghanistan, Afghanistan, Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, the capability of nations in this world to develop and to deliver a ballistic missile threat to the United States is no longer a threat in somebody's imagination, it is reality. It is there that we have a demand upon our authority and our power to protect this country to stand up and protect against ballistic missiles, either accidental or intentional, against this country.

When we talk about ballistic missiles, when we talk about missile defense in this country, we obviously have to discuss the treaties that have some type of oversight on missile defense of a particular country. There is only one big treaty out there. It is called the ABM treaty, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Now, some people have said that we cannot break or we cannot abandon the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, that we are walking away, that we are breaching a treaty, that we have broken a treaty, in one of the few times, outside of the Native Americans, one of the few times in international relations the United States has broken a treaty.

That is not the case we face. That is not what the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty says. I will go into some detail here in just a minute. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty obviously has a historical story to it. Let us look at that story.

Back 30, 40 years ago, Russia and the United States were worried about Russia and the United States. They were not worried about Pakistan or India or Romania or Slovakia. They were not worried about any of these countries, they were worried about the nuclear capabilities of each other.

So the United States and Russia sat down at a table and said, ''Let us negotiate some type of agreement to minimize the risk of us attacking each other.'' Remember, at that point in time, there was no other Nation in the world, no other Nation in the world that had the capability to deliver a ballistic missile onto the U.S. mainland or onto Russia with a nuclear warhead. Only two countries had it.

So they sat down at that time and they came up with a theory. ''Look,'' the United States says to Russia, and vice versa, Russia says to the United States, ''Let us sign an agreement that will not allow either one of us to defend against the other's missiles.''

Now, that sounds perfectly illogical. I think today it is absolutely crazy. But back then, there were some who thought, hey, that is logical. We will not attack because we are afraid of the retaliation. Since we cannot protect ourselves from the retaliation, the incentive to attack is taken away. That is the fundamental theory upon which this treaty was drafted.

But when they drafted this treaty, both the Russian negotiators and the American negotiators had enough foresight to say, ''Look, treaties protect what is in effect today, as far as we can see into the future, but both countries must have the allowance or the flexibility under this treaty and under the terms of this treaty that if things change in our society, that there is a way to modify or to terminate the agreement.''

So when people tell us the only way we can provide a missile defense is to breach a treaty, they are patently false. It is false on its face, that type of statement. In fact, the treaty itself allows for withdrawal from the treaty.

Let us go over the critical language here that would allow us to withdraw from this treaty. Article 15 of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, again, the ABM, ''This treaty shall be of unlimited duration. However, each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw.''

So this is a right contained within the treaty. It is a right, a treaty right. We are not breaching it, we are exercising a right. ''Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, 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. It shall give notice of its decision to the other party 6 months prior to the withdrawal from the treaty. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.''

September 11 was a horrible, extraordinary event. That, true, was not caused by a missile, or a missile as we define it. It actually turned an airline into a missile. But the fact is, we have now discovered, unfortunately, we have been rudely awakened to the fact that attacks like this are no longer happening in other countries. It is not terrorist acts that we read in the morning papers or see on the morning TV being committed in the Middle East, it is in the center of our homeland. It is in New York City. It is through the expense of 6,000 or 7,000 lives that we have

now learned that extraordinary and terrible and horrible events can occur within the borders of our country.

It should enhance the determination of every one of my colleagues, every one of us on this floor, that we need to defend against every possible tool of murder that we see existing out there, whether it is by another country or by terrorists. This treaty prevents us from having a missile defense system unless we can show that an extraordinary event has occurred.

Let me give an example of the extraordinary events. Obviously, September 11, 2001, was a horrible, horrible tragedy and an extraordinary event. But let us look at other extraordinary events. Remember the graph I just showed a few minutes ago of the proliferation of ballistic missiles throughout this world? That is an extraordinary event. It is a high-risk event. When this treaty was drafted, nobody ever imagined that the ballistic missile would be found in all of those countries.

Remember the chart I showed before that chart about the proliferation of countries that now possess nuclear capabilities? No one ever imagined when this treaty was drafted that anyone other than Russia and the United States would have nuclear capabilities. Those are extraordinary events.

□ 2215

Those are the kind of events that the negotiators for both Russia and the United States realized there had to be a right contained within the four corners of the treaty that would provide for a country, for its national sovereignty, would provide for that country to provide homeland or national security.

So the treaty itself allows us, contains a right for us to walk away from it if, in fact, extraordinary events have taken place, and I have shown to you that these kind of events have taken place, that our Nation now needs to focus and refocus lots of energy, lots of resources at homeland security. On that list, towards the very top of that list, ought to be a missile defense system.

Let me summarize, go back to some of the comments that I think are so critical this evening for us to talk about.

First of all, I think it was a very meaningful speech that Mayor Giuliani gave to the United Nations yesterday. Mayor Giuliani laid it on the line. He in essence said to the United Nations: today is your test. Today, your ultimate and your whole reason for being peacekeepers is being tested. You cannot remain neutral, United Nations, on this issue. You need to come forward. This is not a negotiable type of event. This is a horrible, tragic event, as the Mayor said, with the evidence buried less than two miles from the United Nations.

As Tony Blair said today in his remarks which were probably next to President Bush's remarks and Giuliani, those three speeches I think will probably go down as three of the finest speeches given in a warlike situation like we have faced and like we face today, and what Tony Blair said is you must defeat it or it will defeat you. Think about it. You must defeat it or it will defeat you.

Think of it like a cancer, and that is exactly what terrorism is. Terrorism is a horrible, horrible cancer. You do not negotiate with cancer. You have to kill cancer. You have to eradicate cancer. It is not negotiable. Cancer does not listen to you. Cancer does not care about your children. Cancer does not care about your future life. Cancer does not care about your youth.

Cancer only cares about one thing, and that is, the destruction of the human body. And terrorism is exactly the same thing. It does not care.

Do you think those terrorists cared about the widows or cared about the children whose parents are gone forever, who cared about the parents whose children are gone forever? You think they cared at all about those people that Time magazine or some of these others have pictures of them intentionally jumping off the World Trade Centers, including one couple that is holding hands as they fall? You think those terrorists cared about that? You think those terrorists cared one iota about the passengers on those airplanes?

You differentiate for me between a terrorist and evilness of cancer. There is no difference, and nations throughout the world today must make that choice. As said by President Bush, as said by Tony Blair, as said by Mayor Giuliani of New York City, the choice must be made. There is no neutral territory here. No, none, zero, zip. It is nonnegotiable. You either defeat it or it defeats you.

I say with due respect to those people who are saying, including some college professors around this country, who are saying that, gosh, the United States has got it coming, because of our bullying, our foreign affairs. Keep in mind, no country in the world, no country in the history of the world has done for its neighbors or for people with less good fortune what the United States of America has done. No country in the world has educated as many students from all countries as America has done. No country in the world has guaranteed in its Constitution, and judiciously followed its Constitution, the rights and civil liberties that America has for its citizens.

No country in the world has seen the economic power that the United States has developed through capitalism. No country in the world has taken its military might to help its allies as often as the United States of America has done. No country in the history of the world has allowed the thousands and thousands of its citizens to give their lives for the defense of a country clear across an ocean like America has done.

No country in the world has done for medical research what America has done. No country in the world has helped Afghanistan as America has done. No country in the world allows immigrants from all parts of the world to come in in an orderly fashion and be able to become Americans and be able to live the American dream.

We have a lot of good things about this country, and of interest, Dr. Hassan said the other day, after we had this town meeting in Pueblo Colorado, Dr. Hassan said, we need to continue to put the message out there. We need to tell people what America is about and how good America is and what fine people America has, and he used an example.

He says, you hear people talked about these terrorists and how dare they say something like freedom fighters. Remember what those terrorists did. In some of the writings that you have seen since that horrible day 3 weeks ago, you have seen people say, well, these people were so devoted to their cause that they gave their lives; these terrorists were on a suicidal mission because they were so devoted to their cause.

What was their cause? Their cause was to bring down the free world. Their cause was to destroy democracy. Their cause was to destroy human rights. Their cause was to destroy the rights of women or the rights of any ethnic race. Their cause was to destroy a society that recognizes the value of its population. As my friend Dr. Hassan said, remember, they were in an airplane and they gave their lives for one reason, to take other lives, to destroy a nation.

Not long after, those terrorists committed suicide in these terrible things they did. But add 300 some New York City firemen and 200 or 300 some New York City police officers who ran into those towers, ran up those towers on what they had to know was a certain death. They knew when they went up those towers they would probably never see their children again, they would probably die a horrible death. And, unfortunately, they did. But when they were running up those towers, giving their lives, they went up those towers to save lives, to save a Nation. And that ought to distinguish pretty clearly the kind of cancer that our President is so capably leading our country towards eliminating.

Now, we have to be patient in our upcoming battle. It will be kind of like a cat on the hunt for a mouse. A cat will sit there patiently and the mouse may go by and the mouse may come back by, but until that mouse is in exactly the right spot, the cat will not strike. And that is what we have to do.

We have no gripe with the Muslim population. We have only a gripe with the cancer that has penetrated that population and penetrated our population. It is like delicate brain surgery. We do not want to blast the entire brain out of the human head. We do not

want to go off half-cocked, and our President is showing us he is not doing it this way. We need to go in very methodically and focused and take that cancer out of that human body. And that is the mission of every one of us on this House floor. And that is what the American people expect of us, what all the world's democracies expect. In fact, it is what the entire world expects of us, nothing less.

IMMIGRATION AND PROTECTION OF OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that as I sat here and observed and listened to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), I am taken with the profound nature and the fact that he has for quite some time been a consistent and articulate spokesman for the concept of a missile defense system, which I certainly agree with him now increases in terms of its importance in the context of the defense of the Nation.

I hope he continues to speak on this issue. I hope he continues to be the sort of advance guard for this concept, because, of course, it is one that is being criticized by our opponents. And it needs people like my colleague to defend it.

It is striking because, from my own point of view, it is in a way a metaphor for what I want to talk about tonight. The gentleman talks about the danger we face, among other things, and this was just a part of his presentation, but he was talking about the danger this Nation faces from an outside source, from something coming in, crossing our borders, and attacking our cities. And he talks about the need of the United States to prepare some sort of defense against it. I certainly agree with him that that need is great. But it is a metaphor, as I say, for what I wanted to discuss tonight because I believe the issue of something outside of the United States, or somebody, in my case, outside the United States becoming a dangerous missile directed in our direction.

Whether in the form of a huge massive piece of steel or in the form of an individual who is willing to give his or her life turning an airplane into a missile, the fact is we must protect our borders. We must defend the Nation against these outside incursions. And although I totally and completely support the idea of a missile defense shield, I must add that there is another thing that we are responsible for here in this Congress, something that we are uniquely responsible for in the Congress of the United States, something no State can individually take on for itself, just as they cannot take on the defense of the country individually State by State, but that they rely upon the Federal Government for that purpose, and that is the Federal Government is solely responsible for the control of our borders, for the control of immigration across those borders.

States cannot in any way, shape, or form manage that problem. It is not delegated to them in the Constitution as a responsibility. And, of course, it is not realistic to think that they could take that responsibility on. It is uniquely this body, the Congress of the United States, and the President that have the ability to control that process, entrance into the United States of America.

And what more do we need to know? How much more do we have to see before we come to the conclusion that what we have been doing for the last 20 or 25 years in terms of protecting our borders has simply failed us? The people that took over the planes, the people that did all the preparation, the people that did all the planning, all the cells that are operating inside the United States, or those of which we know anyway and those that have been made public, all of them had as members people who were foreigners to the United States, people who were here on various types of visas or, in some way or other, had come into the United States; but they were not citizens of the United States. They had come across our borders for the purpose of doing us harm. And we allowed them to come across the borders. And we allowed them to stay here, even though, by the way, some of them had given us cause to be concerned.

□ 2230

In a recent article appearing in the New York Times, of all publications, September 27, the headline is ''Suspects in Hijackings Exploited Loopholes in Immigration Policy.''

The article goes on to describe, it says,

> For Hani Hanjour, identified as the pilot who flew the jet that rammed into the Pentagon, blending into the American landscape began in Saudi Arabia with a $110 application for a four week English course in California. He had only to prove that he had $2,285 to pay for the lessons along with room and board. He never turned up for class. Two other men the authorities said plowed jetliners into the World Trade Center, Mohamed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi, entered the United States on tourist visas. Even without the required student visa, the men studied at the flight school in Florida.
>
> Counselor officers deluged with visa applications say they generally do not have much time to investigate the applicants. Once foreign visitors enter the United States, immigration officers and law enforcement agencies usually have no idea if they are complying with the terms of their visas. United States Immigration officials said the hijackers exploited an immigration system that critics contend is riddled with loopholes.

I am certainly one of those critics and have made my concerns with regard to this particular problem known for many months here on the floor of the House.

Until September 11, that system was geared to ease the way for commerce, whether in the form of tourism, business or study. Experts on tourism said that security precautions often took a back seat to pressures from industry, the concerns of neighboring governments, and even bureaucratic rivalries in the United States Government.

According to the State Department manual for counselor affairs, participating in the planning or execution of terrorist acts would bar a foreigner from getting a visa, but ''mere membership in a recognized terrorist group would not automatically disqualify a person from entering the United States, nor would the advocacy of terrorism disqualify a person from coming into the United States.''

I could go to an embassy in Saudi Arabia, in Syria, in Iran; and I could apply for a visa to the United States, and I could list my membership in a wide variety of terrorist organizations, terrorist organizations that had called for the kind of thing that happened on September 11. But the visa officer in those embassies would not be able to exclude me, would not be able to stop me under the present system of immigration laws we have in the United States from coming here.

If this is not unbelievable to you, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine what we can say that could more clearly define the problem than this.

The manual, apparently unchanged since September 11, says that the United States will exclude immigrants who incite for direct terrorist activity but that statements of a general nature that do not directly advance specific acts of terrorism are not automatically a basis for exclusion. Some American investigators have said they believed Mr. Atta, the apparent mastermind of the group, belonged to the Egyptian Islamic jihad, and that he met with Iraqi intelligence officers this year. He apparently entered on valid visas and may have even reentered the country after overstaying his visa on his last trip to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 30 million people obtain visas to visit the United States every year. Thirty million people come into this country via visas every year. Most of them of course are on tourist visas. Some are on business and education-related visas, but 30 million come in. We have some approximation; we think we have a handle on how many overstay or violate their visas, and it runs at about 40 to 45 percent. So that means that 12, 13, 14 million people a year come into the United States, ignore the visa requirements, and simply stay.

Do you know what happens to them, Mr. Speaker? You know one of the reasons why such a high percentage of these people can and do violate their visa regulations? It is because nobody cares. It is because no one will take any action against them.

The INS will say that it is an overwhelming job for which they are not