

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

DECLARATION OF POLICY OF UNITED STATES CONCERNING NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4, Declaration of Policy of the United States Concerning National Missile Defense Deployment with a Senate amendment.

The rule is twofold. First, it makes in order a motion to concur in the Senate amendment in the House. Second, the rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is a straightforward bill, declaring that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as it is technologically possible and to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, during a speech here in Washington, D.C., General Omar Bradley warned that we are now speeding inexorably towards a day when even the ingenuity of our scientists may be unable to save us from the consequences of a single rash act or a lone reckless hand upon the switch of an uninterceptible missile.

Forty-two years later, General Bradley is still right, not because we may be unable to stop an incoming missile, but because we cannot.

Not long ago, this House approved the national missile defense program by a margin of 317 to 105, a ratio of better than three to one. I am urging my colleagues to demonstrate their overwhelming support for this rule and its underlying bill once again.

Besides thousands of nuclear warheads on ballistic missiles maintained by Russia, China has more than a dozen long-range ballistic missiles targeted at the United States, and countries like North Korea and Iran are developing ballistic missile technology and capability much more rapidly than once believed.

The argument that rogue nations need more than a decade to obtain ballistic missile capability is both technically irresponsible and politically naive. The threat is real. The threat is here. The threat is now.

Even worse, most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security.

In fact, just last year, Iran launched a medium-range ballistic missile with the help of North Korea and Russia.

We can protect ourselves from missiles of these potentially hostile nations. Deployment of a national mission defense system would cost less than our last six military peacekeeping missions.

Let us pass this rule and pass this declaration of policy and protect our Nation and its people from the threat of a missile attack.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, while I support the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, I rise in opposition to the rule. I oppose the rule because of the process or the lack thereof.

The Democratic members of the House Committee on Armed Services were totally bypassed on this bill; and that, Mr. Speaker, is reason enough to oppose the rule. The process is really incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker, since the Senate amendment to the House-passed version of the bill states very simply that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective national defense missile system that

will protect the territory of the United States from missile attack.

That simple statement of policy is the distillation of what has been acrimonious public debate for over 15 years. What has changed, Mr. Speaker? I think most of the Members of this body can agree that what this bill calls for is not the Reagan Star Wars of the 1980s. Indeed, the Senate amendment wisely adds language that subjects any missile defense system to the annual appropriations process which, in this era of fiscal restraint, places real constraints on any proposed missile defense system.

In addition, H.R. 4 does not mandate one system over another, nor does it mandate a date for deployment. In its simplicity, this bill acknowledges that the United States might well find itself subject to an attack that we should be prepared to defend against, but that we should do so within the context of the technological and financial realities of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, few of us in this body can deny that the world has become, since the end of the Cold War, an even more dangerous place than we might have imagined. There are rogue nations and factions that seek to harm, if not destroy, the United States.

This bill is an attempt to move forward the debate on the issue of the national missile defense without the acrimony that has accompanied the discussions on this subject in the past. H.R. 4 provides us with a good start, and I am hopeful that it will help us move to a resolution to a thorny, but incredibly important, issue.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow 1 hour of debate on the Senate amendments, a time limit that might have, given the importance of this matter, been extended to allow all Members who are interested in this matter an opportunity to speak.

In spite of the fact that the House has conducted very little business in the past few weeks, the Republican majority continually fails to give matters of great importance adequate time to be fully aired on the floor. I would hope that when we return from the Memorial Day recess, one that has now been extended through an entire week, the Republican leadership will consider a schedule that gives important legislation more time to be debated by the elected Members of this body.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who is the House leading expert on missile defense.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying Senate amendments, but I am not happy with the legislation.

I am not happy because, when we brought this bill up in the House, we

had a clear and distinct debate. As the original author of H.R. 4, I made the point known to every Member of this body that this would be a vote for the President's policy or against the President's policy.

If my colleagues are supportive of holding this decision off for a year so it could be made during the middle of a Presidential election, then they should have opposed the House bill. And 102 brave Democrats and two brave Republicans did that. They opposed the bill.

But I said, if in spite of the President's letter of opposition on the morning of the vote, if my colleagues were for moving forward now to make that decision, then they should vote for the bill. And 214 Republicans did, joined by 103 Democrats, for a veto-proof margin. It was a clear and distinct point of opposition against this administration's policy. No mistake about it.

Then we saw the White House and Bob Bell try to suspend what we had just done, try to tell us that it really did not mean what we said it was. In fact, the Senate on the floor of debates agreed to two amendments. These amendments mean nothing. They mean nothing. They are simply cover for liberal Democrats who do not support missile defense to have a way to cover their you know whats.

One of them says that any missile defense program should be subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Well, duh. Everything we do in this Congress is subject to the authorization and appropriation process. Are we so naive as to think that somehow we pull manna from heaven and we bring dollars to the table and that is what funds programs? That amendment means nothing. It has no bearing on this bill or what we are doing here.

The second amendment says that we should continue to negotiate reductions in arms. Who disagrees with that? The irony is that the Senate put an amendment on that only refers to reductions in Russian arms. What happens, Mr. Speaker, if the Russians regard this as only being an attempt to get them to reduce their arms while the U.S. is not paralleling that process? The amendments unfortunately passed, and we could do nothing about that.

The Senate having the rules, they had forced us to take a bill that I am not happy with. But it does move the process forward, and I would say to my colleagues, in the full debate, we will have a colloquy that will be joined by the chairman of the full committee that will be joined by the majority leader and the Speaker who will clarify on the RECORD what this bill means by this body.

□ 1415

If the White House chooses to run for Congress, than they can interpret our bills. If Bob Bell chooses to step down and run for a House seat, he can change or he can then interpret our bills. But, short of that, nobody can interpret our

legislation except for us. We are the ones who drafted the bill. We are the ones who passed the bill. We are the ones who passed the clean bill of this House, only to be amended by extraneous and irrelevant amendments on the Senate side.

I will be asking my colleagues today to vote "yes." But clearly, during our debate and discussion we will clarify the record time and again to show that there is a clear and distinct difference between the position of this administration and the position that 317 Members of Congress supported.

I am outraged that right after we passed this bill President Clinton would send me a letter that says this: "Next year we will determine whether or not to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats." That is the letter.

That is not what this bill says. It does not say, Mr. President, next year. It says today we will pass this conference report, we will move forward, and we will do it in direct contradiction to what this administration is trying to spin.

And when the White House has its signing ceremony, I do not know whether I will be invited or not, but if I am, I will clearly make the case that it is a clear policy difference between this White House and their attempt to spin what we did that they could not defeat in this body. We could have overridden the veto because we had 103 Democrats agree with this, along with 214 Republicans, and this was at a time when the White House issued a statement in opposition to our bill.

These amendments mean nothing. All of us agree that an authorization and appropriation processes must be followed. All of us want to see reductions in arms by both Russia and America. Unfortunately, the Senate amendment only says Russia, which could be read as destabilizing.

The point is, the crux and the actual content of this bill is simple. Today we are saying in the Congress of the United States that it is time to deploy a national missile defense capability.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania to know that I was one of the Democrats who voted for his resolution. But I must say, we held a hearing in the defense appropriations subcommittee, now called the Subcommittee on National Security Appropriations, this year. Lieutenant General Lester Lyles came over and briefed our committee. And, frankly, we are not doing very well in developing this technology. We have got serious problems.

I personally believe that if we look at missile defense, that the number one priority when we deploy our troops is to have a capable theater missile defense system. We need to focus on that

first. And of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, we have had five failures of the THAAD system, which is fundamental to having a credible theater missile defense system. We have the Patriot 3, the PAC-3 program, which is doing quite well.

Now, if we cannot do theater missile defense, no matter how loudly we yell, we are not going to command a national missile defense system into being. Now, General Lyles has testified before our subcommittee that it is going to be at least 2005 before we have done the testing that is necessary to have any confidence that we would have a credible limited system.

So I think the language in this resolution that says let us be honest with ourselves, we cannot be in denial here, that we are going to do this, I voted to do it when it is technologically feasible. If the science is not there, if the engineering is not there, if the technology is not there, we cannot just wish it into existence.

And so I hope that my colleagues will think about this issue. This is one of the most important national security issues that we face. None of us likes the idea of being vulnerable to any country's potential for using a ballistic missile. But think about it. We had the whole era of the Cold War when the Russians had thousands of warheads aimed at the United States and we had thousands of warheads aimed at them. What did that produce? That produced deterrence. We knew that if either one of us struck the other that we would open up the possibility for a catastrophic war that would destroy both countries, and so we were deterred.

And today the United States has more offensive capability than any other country in the world and more credible and more capable offensive capability. And I believe that any country that thought about launching an attack against the United States would have to be out of their mind, because they would know that we would know where the missile launched from and we could have the potential to respond with overwhelming force. I think deterrence still is a valid doctrine that we should not forget about as we work towards getting a national missile defense system in place.

So I think the language of the Senate improves and makes more credible this resolution that we previously voted on. And I think my view is that I want this technology to work.

One of the companies from my State is in charge of trying to integrate this and make it work. But we cannot tell the American people that there is something out there that will work until we can demonstrate it, and we have not been able to demonstrate THAAD. We have not been able to demonstrate a comprehensive theater missile defense system.

And so I think we ought to be very sober about any of these exhortations that we are hearing about from people

here who want to wish this into existence.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let us focus the debate on the facts.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague just spoke and made some points. First of all, he said the THAAD program has had five failures. What he did not properly explain is that of the five failures that occurred, none of them, none of them involved hit-to-kill. The five failures that occurred were caused by quality control problems of the Lockheed Martin contractor, and we in the Congress took the lead to force them to begin to pay for those failures.

We have never had a test yet to actually get to hit-to-kill, but in fact the THAAD program has accomplished 28 of 30 milestones. That is a tremendous success. So to characterize the THAAD program as a failure does a terrible disservice to those people who are working on that program because the facts do not bear that.

Second, the gentleman made the point that this is a terrible technology challenge. Well, it is. And he pointed out that a company in his area, Boeing, is a lead system integrator. What the gentleman did not mention is that the head of this program, Dr. Peller, in congressional testimony said the challenge to build the Space Station was more difficult than to build a national missile defense. Now, that is the top official of the company that comes from the district of the gentleman.

The third is deterrence, that we somehow can rely on the deterrence of the 1980s. That may have been true. I do not want to trust North Korea not to fire that Taepo-Dong 1 at one of our cities. And I would say to my good friend and colleague, 28 young Americans, half of them from my State, came back from Desert Storm in body bags because we could not defend against a low-complexity missile that wiped them out.

I agree with the gentleman, theater missile defense is our top priority; and I use my votes and my voice to help accomplish that. But we cannot ignore the threat to our country by saying North Korea will avoid attacking us because of deterrence.

And finally, this is what offends me. I will make a prediction on the floor today. The reason why the White House is spinning this the way they are is because next year, in the middle of the presidential campaign, Vice President Gore will announce that we are going to deploy NMD. That is an absolute travesty and an outrage for this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to say to my colleagues, we want a national missile defense system

against a limited attack. I think that is a wise thing to do.

I am just saying to everyone here today, after having General Lyles come before our committee and after going through each of the technologies in place, I have to report to my colleagues that General Lyles says 2005 is the earliest we would have a capability, and that capability has not yet been demonstrated. We have not been able to do what it takes to put it in place. It does not exist. And we cannot just create something out of whole cloth.

Now, let us make it work. Let us be sober. Let us be realistic and honest with the House and the American people. Let us wait and do this when it is technologically feasible. We cannot do it, anyway. I mean, we cannot wish this into existence. So I urge everybody, including my colleague from the State of Washington, to be sober.

I can remember when these people came in from my own State and they told and told me in 1983 that this technology was in hand. Edward Teller came and told us that the technology was in hand. It is now 1999, we have spent billions, and it is not in hand. This is a hard problem.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to speak on the rule. I am compelled to do so because I speak today about the process, about the process that brings us to the floor. Mr. Speaker, I speak not as a Democrat but as a Member of this House and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Just over 2 months ago, the House and the Senate passed H.R. 4 and S. 257, respectively, similar legislation, declaring it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. But since then, Mr. Speaker, the process has been hijacked.

There was no conference committee between the House and the Senate. As a result, differences in the two measures have not been reconciled as normally they are reconciled. Rather, we are being asked to concur in the exclusive work of the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is not right.

Implied in this fact is the notion that the Senate has a patent on all the knowledge and all the insight on this particular matter. And, of course, I reject that because we in this body, in our committee, have been very, very active on this issue.

And, therefore, I am disappointed that the views of the House Members, both Democrats and Republicans, have not been afforded regular order consideration in the matter that is before us today. I think the process that brings us here today is not only unfortunate but it is unnecessary.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate the timing of this debate. As we speak, folks are lined up around the block across America to see the new Star Wars movie. And what better time than right now, with the refrain of that great Star Wars theme music, the opening day of "The Phantom Menace," for us to be taking up this proposal.

Just like the original movie, this bill puts a tractor beam in the Capitol dome and aims it right at the wallets of the American taxpayer to support this defective system. This Star Wars scheme is a technological failure. It has failed one test after another, again and again. An accelerated program to test it has been described as "a rush to failure" by former Air Force Chief of Staff General Larry Welsh.

I am reminded of Han Solo's admonition to Luke Skywalker: "Jumping through hyperspace ain't like dusting crops, boy." Well, hitting a bullet with a bullet, hitting in fact many bullets, with bullets raining down over the entire continental United States at 15,000 miles an hour, and doing it accurately and reliably, is not like dusting crops, either. And yet here we are, year after year, having demands to throw more good money after bad.

I disagree with my colleague from Washington State about this measure, but he is right about one thing. Wishing is not going to make it so. The first law of Disney Wish and make it so, does not apply here; rather it is the laws of physics and thermodynamics that control weather this can be accomplished.

□ 1430

Just 3 days ago, we acted in this Congress on spare parts and training and readiness. As Joint Chiefs Chairman Hugh Skelton said recently, the massive amount of experiments on these kind of Star Wars programs drain resources from personnel and readiness accounts. If there is a readiness problem, it is a problem that this Republican Congress created in preferring pork over readiness. We are diverting these kind of precious resources away from our true military and nonmilitary needs because we have people here who keep coming up year after year asking us to throw an infinite amount of taxpayer money at a problem that has real physical limitations.

I agree fully with my colleague from Texas, Mr. FROST, about the substance of this resolution, about the important meaning of the Senate amendments. But the effect I disagree with him on, because it is clear that the Star Wars advocates are using this measure to boost their cause. The missile defense that is being advocated, even if it worked, would not defend us from the real threats we face from terrorism, with bombings at the World Trade Center, with gas attacks like that that occurred in a Japanese subway.

If we really want to do something to address our security, the Congress

ought simply to read the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science report this week about the threat, the very real threat that we have from the potential or diversion of Russian nuclear materials. Our Energy Department had to spend \$600,000 in emergency funds last year because guards at some of these facilities in Russia had no winter uniforms for outside patrols and left without paychecks searching for food. That is a real security threat that should concern every one of us. We are not doing very much about it.

Implementing the START II nuclear missile reduction treaty would eliminate 3,000 Russian nuclear warheads, in fact, that this fantasy proposes to deal with in outer space. Such implementation would do a great deal more to assure the security and safety of American families than this proposal. We should be giving that our highest national security priority. Instead of diverting attention from this vital objective, this Congress should be encouraging a START III to have further reduction in nuclear armaments around the world and truly protect our freedom.

What so many in this House fail to recognize is that national security is measured in terms other than simply how many bombs, bullets and missiles we possess. It is measured in economic strength, in productivity and in the success of our efforts to reduce threats from abroad. I urge the House to consider defense programs that meet our true security needs and reject this proposal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe in ballistic missile defense if it is feasible, but we have yet to prove that it is feasible. I was the principal cosponsor of H.R. 4 because I thought we needed a focus to our ballistic missile defense program. I thought we needed to make a decision that we would go forward with the objective of fielding a system, a system that worked and would afford us at least limited protection against an accidental strike in this country. But I was honest to acknowledge on the House floor that we are not there yet. We have not proven the capability of this system. However, having spent \$50 billion over the last 15 years, I thought it was time to bring those efforts to fruition, to build a workable system if we can as opposed to putting more viewgraphs on the shelf.

H.R. 4 was an effort to reach some kind of bipartisan consensus on a very basic proposition, that the focus of our efforts in ballistic missile defense would be to deploy a system. We passed that bill here with a hefty margin. We sent it to the other body, they struck everything in it, adopted a completely different bill and now they send it back to us in a process that is a breach of procedure, bypassing the procedures

that are long established and that are intended to achieve a consensus between both Houses. Normally when we pass a bill and send it to the Senate and they pass a different bill, there is a conference to hammer out the differences, a conference to establish a record as to why the compromises in language were made to the extent that these are made. There is no record here. We have had no conference. We are bypassing the traditional procedure. For what reason I do not know. This is no way to legislate. It is also no way to build bipartisan consensus on something that has been sort of a political totem.

As I have said before, we do not debate ballistic missile defense the way we debated the MX or the B-2 or other major systems. This system is so charged with political significance that it is a totally different kind of debate. One of the things we will not have as a result of this procedure is a record, a record to explain the legislative history of what some truly ambiguous and unclear language in this particular bill actually means.

This bill calls for billions of dollars to be spent to deploy a national missile defense system, quote, as soon as it is technologically feasible, or possible. What does this mean? I am concerned that it could mean that as soon as we have got the technology or think we have it in hand, we are supposed to rush to deployment, even though we might end up with a suboptimal or a substandard system. I am concerned that it may mean before we have adequately tested, we will move to deployment. That is not an idle concern.

Yesterday in the defense authorization bill markup, an amendment was added which allowed the director of this program and the Secretary of Defense to begin deployment before this system was fully tested, a dispensation that is granted to very few defense programs. It could mean that we will deploy even though it is extravagantly expensive, far more expensive than the protection it would allow us. It could mean any number of different things. We do not know. There is no legislative history. We have not been able in the House to have the opportunity to give meaning to that particular phrase.

The bill specifies that this national missile system must be capable of affording us a limited defense, or defense against a limited ballistic missile attack. What does "limited" mean? Is it an unauthorized attack, an accidental attack, or an attack by, say, one submarine which could mean easily more than 100 warheads? Very, very critical to have that definition pinned down.

In our bill, we had legislative history. We said it was an accidental attack. We limited the scope of the effectiveness of the system. Here they talk about a limited attack. That could range from 5 warheads to 200 warheads. It is not clear at all. We have no opportunity to make it clear.

Furthermore, the timing of this bill, the timing of the previous bill, dis-

turbed me. I know it disturbed the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), too. Because this bill is misperceived by the Russians. I said that on the floor, I said it in committee. The Russians see this bill as somehow a potential or anticipatory breach of the ABM treaty. I think that is unfounded.

I think what we are trying to move towards is a system where we can rely upon our defenses so that we do not have to rely so much upon the threat of a retaliatory strike. I think that would be an improvement in deterrence and an improvement in the stability in the world. The Russians do not see it that way yet. They see us moving away from the ABM treaty. This language in this bill is not bound to give them comfort and encouragement, because this bill says that in addition to deploying defenses in this country, we should also seek to negotiate reductions in Russian nuclear weapons. I agree that we should be negotiating with the Russians. We should have done START II. We should have pressed them to ratify it long before now. But they perceive START II as being tilted against them.

Now we are saying in this bill, "We're going to build defenses and we want you to build down your missile systems," which suggests that we want complete superiority here. It is not the formulation for a successful bargain. It is not the kind of message we need to send the Russians, particularly at a time when we are leaning on them and Chernomyrdin is today in Belgrade trying to cut a deal with us. It is just ill-timed. I will probably vote for this bill because I believe in ballistic missile defense and I do not want to muddle that message on my part but I am very, very disappointed in the process and procedure it is taking.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It is important that we take a look at reminding ourselves as we debate this rule that the national missile defense program, the vote most recently held in this House, was 317-105, better than a 3 to 1 ratio of the Members of this great body in support of a national missile defense program. Number two, on some of the questions with the rule, I would remind all of my colleagues that at the Committee on Rules yesterday, it was a voice vote on the rule approval that we have before us today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must go back to my opening remarks, that most Americans do not realize that we have absolutely no defense, none at all, against a missile attack. We have been lulled into a false sense of security, unaware that nations across the globe are currently developing ballistic missiles which pose an immediate threat to our security. Mr. Speaker, today is the day to act. I urge passage of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4) to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Spence moves to concur in the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Missile Defense Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense.

SEC. 3. POLICY ON REDUCTION OF RUSSIAN NUCLEAR FORCES.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1995, Norway launched a weather rocket that was mistaken by sensors in Russia for a launch of an ICBM from one of our nuclear submarines. They were in a final countdown in the process of preparing to launch a missile attack against us, and only minutes away when they finally discovered the mistake and called off the launch. We were that close to being faced with nuclear warfare.

Mr. Speaker, most people in this country do not realize we have no defense against that type of an attack nor do we have a defense against even one missile launched accidentally from somewhere else in the world today. There are literally thousands of these missiles abroad in the world today. The threat of ballistic missile attack is real and it is here today.

Last summer, an independent study by the bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission unanimously concluded that the ballistic missile threat to our country is broader, more mature and evolving more rapidly than anticipated, and that the United States may have little

or no warning of a ballistic missile attack. With each passing day, our Nation's vulnerability to missile attack grows. Rogue nations like North Korea, Libya, Iran and Iraq are working aggressively to acquire the capability to strike the American homeland with ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction. Russia and China already possess this capability. I am confident that the more than 200 Members who attended the Rumsfeld Commission extraordinary classified briefing here on this House floor back in March have a much greater appreciation of the need to move forward with missile defenses and of the reason why we need to make the kind of commitment that we are making in this bill.

□ 1445

Let me briefly make a few points:

First, contrary to intelligence estimates that predicted the ballistic missile threat was more than a decade away, the missile threat to our country is real, as I have said before, and it is here today.

Second, technology has matured to the point where moving forward and deploying a national missile defense system is feasible. There will always be test failures, there will always be technological challenges, but Americans have never shied away from a challenge and certainly never in the face of a threat that gets worse every day.

Third, the cost of a national missile defense system, by the administration's own estimates, will comprise less than 1 percent of the overall defense budget and less than 2 percent of our military modernization budget over the next 5 years. Because to deploy an initial national missile defense capability will amount to less than the amount our country has spent on peacekeeping developments, deploying missiles in the past 6 years, this strikes me as a small price and a sound investment.

Mr. Speaker, national missile defense is necessary, feasible and affordable, but in spite of the growing consensus that the threat is real and the technology is maturing, the administration has steadfastly refused to commit to actually deploy a national missile defense. H.R. 4 addresses the administration's unexplainable lack of commitment in this regard and represents the Congress' bipartisan belief that all Americans should be protected against ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this important bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur with the Senate amendments to H.R. 4, an act to declare it the policy of the United States to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Missouri, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on National Security, that I concur with him and that we should pass this, and I am not at all upset about what the Senate did. I think putting in the phrase "when technologically feasible" means that we have to have something to deploy. And I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the committee but I must tell my colleagues, when we brought over the people who were running this program and we went through each of the various possibilities, they have said basically that at this point we do not have something to deploy. Now, we just cannot make it up. Either it is deployable or it is not. Either we have tested it and we know it will work or it will not.

So I urge everyone here that we should stay with our commitment to keep working on this problem, but to start deploying something that we have not tested is an absolute recipe for failure.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I hope that we get a national missile defense, but let us not waste money trying to deploy something that we have not yet demonstrated, and I think theater missile defense should be our first priority. I appreciate the gentleman having yielded to me.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to continue very, very briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

At today's motion I would like to, and I hope we all understand that the technology needed to develop an ICBM capable of delivering a warhead of mass destruction against large portions of these United States is today, in the hands of at least one so-called rogue actor nation. Worse, much of the needed technology has already been demonstrated, and now I believe it is not only possible but probable that significant portions of the United States will be threatened by ICBM-delivered warheads of mass destruction sometime before the year 2005, the time the administration says is needed to deploy a suitable limited national missile defense system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

As some of as my colleagues know, I changed my mind about the way we need to approach ballistic missile defense. I always believed we needed BMD, but over the last year I changed my mind about when we needed it, and that was because of the report of the Commission to Assess Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States. This was a bipartisan commission charged to assess the nature and magnitude of existing and emerging ballistic missile threats to the United States.

The report and testimony of the commission made two things clear. First, the ballistic missile threat to the United States may be coming faster than previously estimated. Second, the threat to our friends, allies and troops overseas already exists.

That is why I cosponsored this bill, and that is why Congress overwhelmingly decided to go on record in support of ballistic missile defense.

Now I think there are legitimate grounds to be unhappy with the procedure we are using today. I think everyone on our side agrees that accepting a Senate amendment without benefit of a conference is not the best way to do this, and those of us in the House would have liked to sit down with Members of the other body to talk about what they mean by phrases like "technologically feasible." And for another thing, it fails to recognize tireless contributions and leadership of Members on our side, such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but it does make the point by putting Congress on record that it is the policy of the United States to deploy an effective missile defense.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think this language sends a message that is vital to national security, and I urge this body to support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member for their support, and let me again clarify some points here.

First of all, none of us are mandating that something be deployed before it is ready, none of us. We are not that naive to put a date certain on requiring that something be done by a certain time, and no one should misinterpret this legislation as requiring that.

What we are saying is that we are making a clear and distinct policy change here as a Nation. For the first time we are saying publicly that it is the policy of this country to deploy a limited national missile defense system against those rogue threats that we see emerging.

We took great efforts in this process to bring the Russians in, to show them that this was not aimed against them. In fact, a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle traveled with us to Moscow the week before the vote with the former CIA Director of the Clinton administration, Jim Woolsey, with the former Secretary of Defense and White House Chief of Staff, Donald Rumsfeld, and with the former Deputy Secretary of State, Bill Schneider, and

we took the time to give the Russian leadership the briefing as to the emerging threats and convinced them that this was not being done to score some type of strategic advantage over Russia. This was being done because in today's world North Korea is not a stable nation that deterrents will work with. In today's world the Chinese now have at least 18 long-range ICBMs. We know that Iran and Iraq both have medium-range missiles and are developing long-range capabilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons we are making a clear and distinct policy change that will occur when the President signs this bill. And the key thing that I want to keep stressing is, one, that when the President signs this bill, that is the change in policy of this government, that we are deploying a national missile defense system as soon as that technology is available, not before it is available, not prematurely, but as soon as it is available. We do not recommend the technology. We do not say land-based over sea-based. We do not say one site over three sites. We say as soon as available and as soon as it is ready, we deploy it.

That is a clear and marked difference over the policy that exists today, and for the White House to try to spin what we are doing is totally wrong. And I want the record to clearly show that this Congress and the other body are on record as interpreting our own bill, and there should be no one in the White House in future years who will try to spin what it is we are trying to accomplish today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with our distinguished chairman for the record. I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

There has been some misconception concerning this national missile defense bill. The purpose of this bill is very simply to establish a U.S. policy, the deployment of a national missile defense, as soon as technologically possible. In the chairman's view, does this bill commit the United States to deploy a national missile defense?

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it does.

The intent of this bill is straightforward and unequivocal. However, I understand that in a May 7 letter the President indicated, and I quote, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made, unquote. Following the Senate passage of S. 257 earlier this year, the Secretary of State even sent a cable to our embassies articulating this same opinion.

I do not understand how anyone could look at this legislation objectively and arrive at the same conclusion as the President and the Secretary of State. This bill makes it clear that the Nation is committed and is committing to the deployment of a national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD both the White House letter as well as the State Department cable so that everyone can see what type of spin the administration is trying to place on this bill.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 7, 1999.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WELDON: Thank you for your letter on National Missile Defense (NMD). We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies.

Next year, we will determine whether to deploy for the first time a limited national missile defense against these threats. This decision will be made when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its NMD legislation two amendments that significantly changed the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill also reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 90 percent from Cold War levels, while maintaining the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be taken into account fully as we pursue our NMD program.

Thank you again for writing on this important matter.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

S. 257—NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Background.—U.S. policy regarding ballistic missile defense most recently was elaborated in refels (n.b., identical text to different addresses). During the March floor debate on S. 257, the Cochran National Missile Defense (NMD) bill, the Senate on a bipartisan basis adopted two very important amendments that modified the original bill that had been reported out of the Armed Services Committee on essentially a party-line vote last month. The first amendment makes clear that any deployment of a limited U.S. NMD system must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, thereby underscoring that no deployment decision has been made. The second amendment confirms that U.S. policy with regard to the possible deployment of a limited NMD system must take account of our objectives with regard to arms control. With these improvements, the administration informed Senate leaders that it would accept S. 257 as amended if it reaches the President's desk in this form. On March 17, the Senate passed S. 257 (as amended) in a rollcall vote, 97-3.

Posts are authorized to draw upon the materials contained herein in addressing this matter. The text of S. 257, as passed by the Senate is at paragraph 3. White House talking points prepared by the National Security Council are at paragraph 4. The text of a statement by the President, released on March 17, is at paragraph 5.

The text of S. 257 as passed by the Senate is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled,

Section 1. Short title.

This act may be cited as the National Missile Defense Act of 1999¹.

Section 2. National Missile Defense Policy.

It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense System capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for national missile defense.

Section 3. Policy on reduction of Russian nuclear forces.

It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian Nuclear Forces.

Begin White House Points:

The administration made clear its strong opposition to the Cochran NMD bill as it emerged from the Armed Services Committee last month. The Presidents senior national security advisors recommended that the bill be vetoed were it to reach the President's desk in that form.

We are pleased that the Senate on two bipartisan votes, adopted two very important amendments to the bill and thereby significantly improved it.

The first amendment makes clear that no decision has been made to deploy a limited NMD system. It does so by specifying that any such decision must necessarily be subject to the annual authorization and appropriations process.

The President has not proposed that any funds be authorized or appropriated in the FY2000 Defense Department budget for NMD deployment. Whether he requests such funds in FY 2000 (the first fiscal year in which the administration intends to address the deployment question) will depend on the administration's assessment of the four factors. Which it believes must be taken into account in deciding whether to field this system:

- (1) Has the threat materialized as quickly as we now expect it will;
- (2) Has the technology been demonstrated to be operationally effective;
- (3) Is the system affordable; and
- (4) What are the implications of going forward with NMD deployment for our objectives with regard to achieving further reductions in strategic nuclear arms under START II and START III?

The second amendment makes clear that in pursuing our policy with regard to the deployment of a limited NMD, we must also take into account our objectives with regard to securing continued negotiated reductions in Russian and U.S. nuclear forces.

Through START II and START III, the United States can realize the removal of up to an additional 8,000 Russian and U.S. strategic nuclear warheads. These treaties are clearly in our national security interests.

At the Helsinki Summit, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin declared that the ABM Treaty is of fundamental significance to the attainment of our objectives for START II and START III.

In this context, it is crucial that the United States negotiate in good faith any

amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be necessary to accommodate any U.S. limited NMD system.

The second Senate amendment affirms the Senate's recognition that the arms control dimension of the NMD deployment question must be taken into account.

As a result of these two amendments, the administration will accept S. 257 if it reaches the President's desk in its current form.

If asked—does this mean that the administration will hold NMD hostage to the ABM Treaty?

The administration has articulated its strong commitment to the ABM Treaty, which it regards as a cornerstone of strategic stability. At the same time, the administration has also made clear that it will not give Russia—or any other state—a veto over any missile defense deployment decision that it believes is vital to our national security interests.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am pleased that the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, included in its National Missile Defense (NMD) legislation two amendments that significantly change the original bill, which I strongly opposed. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation now makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. By putting the Senate on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the bill reaffirms that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control objectives.

We are committed to meeting the growing danger that outlaw nations will develop and deploy long-range missiles that could deliver weapons of mass destruction against us and our allies. Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense against these threats, when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the Arm Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

This week, the Russian Duma took an encouraging step toward obtaining final approval of START II. We want to move ahead on the START III framework, which I negotiated with President Yeltsin in 1997, to cut Russian and U.S. arsenals 80 percent from cold war levels, while maintaining the Arm Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability. The changes made in the NMD bill during Senate debate ensure these crucial objectives will be fully taken into account as we pursue our NMD Program.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina. We cannot have a policy to deploy without a commitment to deploy.

In his letter the President also said, and I quote, next year we will determine whether to deploy a limited national missile defense, unquote. However, when the President signs this bill into law, he will be committing the U.S. to deploy. When the President signs this bill, he is also committing the Nation to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as technologically possible. The law is the law.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if the President is correct in his view that subjecting a national missile defense program to the authorization and ap-

propriation process can somehow be interpreted as meaning the decision on deployment has not yet been made.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, such an interpretation is not correct. The bill's language neither states nor implies anything of the sort. In fact, all Department of Defense programs are subject to authorization and appropriation.

This is a matter of current law in both Titles 10 and 31 of the U.S. Code. It is a constitutional requirement. Every weapon system we have deployed, bombers, missiles, tanks, fighters, ships and so on, goes through the authorization and the appropriation process. Deployment of these systems is simply the manifestation of policies that have been agreed upon to meet national security requirements.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. As the original author of this legislation, I fully agree. The administration has now recognized the threat, as evidenced by the CIA, and when the President signs this bill, he will be committing the Nation to the deployment of a national missile defense to meet that threat.

I would also state that in signing this bill the President is indicating a commitment to use the funds he has budgeted for national missile defense only for the execution of the policy he enacts and endorses by signing this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. The President has budgeted \$10.5 billion through fiscal year 2005 to support national missile defense deployment. When the President signs this bill, I believe it also reflects a commitment that these funds will be used to resolve the programmatic issues, to establish the technological feasibility of a national missile defense and, finally, to deploy a national missile defense system.

□ 1500

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Does the chairman believe that this bill in any way conditions deployment of a national missile defense system on further arms reductions with the Russians?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not. The section of this bill dealing with the arms reduction with the Russians is consistent with the current arms control policy and only reflects Congress' support for continued negotiations. There is no explicit or implicit linkage in H.R. 4 between achieving arms control reductions and the commitment to deploy national missile defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I agree with the chairman. Russia, or any other country, does not now have nor will it ever have a veto over our Nation's deployment of a national missile defense to protect our citizens.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank my friend and colleague for his strong interest in clarifying the record on this important legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying amendments and the underlying bill as well. I thank and congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, and in particular my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for their efforts in this behalf.

At a time of multiplying chaos in the world, this bill gives us a measure of certainty. The sources of chaos are technological as new weapons systems and new instruments of terrorism proliferate every day. The sources of chaos are political as new states are imposed upon ancient religious and ethnic rivalries. The only thing that is certain in our political evaluation is that there will be more chaos in the years to come. The certainty that is behind this bill is that we are making a decision for certain as a Congress that it will be the policy of this country to deploy and defend ourselves in the very best way we can with a national missile defense system.

The arguments against this bill are diplomatic, economic and strategic. I find each of the arguments lacking. The diplomatic argument against this bill is that it will somehow destabilize the world.

I think the greatest source of destabilization is the risks that an accidental or rogue launch could plunge the nuclear powers of the world into an irreversible course of mutual destruction. I think a viable defense system is an instrument of stability, not instability.

For those who raise economic objections to this bill, yes, it is expensive. Yes, every dollar of taxpayers' money that we spend must be spent carefully, but it is important to understand the narrow scope of the expenditure that is before us. In this year's budget, for example, about one nickel out of every \$100 that we spend as a government will be dedicated to this purpose. One nickel out of every \$100 is, in my judgment, a prudent and sound investment for the defense of the country.

For those who raise strategic objections, I would simply say that every strategic instrument that is possible to be at our disposal should be so.

Will this succeed today technologically? Of course not, but we cannot succeed technologically, we cannot reach the goal technologically until we have the goal.

When President Kennedy in the early sixties said we would get to the Moon as the first country in the world that would do so, it was impossible technologically at that time, but because he

set that goal and we followed it as a country we set in means the creative resources of the country and we did achieve it. I believe the same thing will and can happen here.

It is for those reasons that I would urge both Republican and Democratic colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just a few days after Congress first enacted this legislation, or acted on this legislation, the State Department sent an internal cable to our embassies abroad instructing them to explain away the President's support for the bill.

That cable, which Mr. Weldon just placed in the RECORD, told these embassies to say, in effect, even though Congress has passed and the President has endorsed legislation committing America to deploy a national missile defense, do not worry because the President intends to use loopholes to deny that commitment.

In this way, the Clinton State Department sought to comfort foreign governments who feared that we might render their offensive missile programs harmless and obsolete.

Just what are the alleged loopholes the President was to seize upon? Because the bill says that funds for missile defense are subject to annual appropriations and authorization, the President thinks he can sign it without really committing to protect our citizens from missile attack.

This is, of course, ludicrous. The entire Defense Department is subject to annual appropriations. Much of the Federal Government is. Those words merely restate the obvious. They do not add or detract any significant meaning from the bill.

When John F. Kennedy committed to America to land a man on the Moon in his decade, that commitment was no less real because the money for the space program had to be appropriated each year. Neither is this commitment.

The President is seizing on this language to conceal that he and his party have been forced to flip-flop on missile defense. After over a decade spent opposing missile defense, they have been mugged by reality. The reality of a North Korean ICBM test, the Southwest Asia arms race, the Ayotollah's missile program, the theft of our nuclear secrets by Communist China, and the spread of missile technology around the globe.

Once the cable to Moscow and Beijing and elsewhere came to light, we considered trying to rewrite the bill but then we realized, what would be the point. If the President and his aides can so absurdly misconstrue even the most innocuous language, then there are no words that might have fixed meaning for this administration. All we can do

here is make our intentions and the meanings crystal clear.

Let me do so. This bill commits the United States to deploy an effective national missile defense system as soon as is technologically possible. If the President disagrees with this position, if he truly believes that we should leave our citizens vulnerable to missile attack, he should show the character of a true leader and say so, without dissembling, without equivocation, without seizing on nonexistent loopholes. He should veto the bill.

If, on the other hand, he signs the bill, we can, by rights, conclude that he agrees with the plain English meaning of the bill and that is that the United States is committed to deploy a national missile defense as soon as is technologically possible.

I will close with this: The President's endorsement of this language, whatever his private feelings on it, is a tribute to the vast public support that now exists for national missile defense. It shows that the debate that Ronald Reagan started in 1983 has now been decisively won by those who believe that the American people need a defense that defends.

I am very proud that today we are taking this important step to defend the American people from missile attack. I am very proud that in this age of high technology we can use that technology to give our children that which is better than what they have had, the technology of the 1950s of duck and cover.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. There were many reasons to vote against the original House bill, H.R. 4. There are even more reasons to vote against the bill as amended by the Senate.

H.R. 4 provided that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I opposed all 15 words of H.R. 4 because of what it did not say. It failed to acknowledge how much national missile defense would cost, whether it would undermine arms control and whether a national missile defense would actually work. On the other hand, the authors of H.R. 4, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), saw virtue in what it did not say.

As I look at the Senate amendment, I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) have a point.

The Senate's version says that it is the policy of the United States to deploy, as soon as technologically possible, an effective national missile defense system. As soon as technologically possible, what does that mean? One test? Two tests? A really good simulation?

There is a huge difference between technologically possible and technologically viable, or technologically reliable. We should not commit to deploy until a system is fully and successfully demonstrated. Rushing deployment leaves us vulnerable to failure.

This bill may only be a national missile defense policy statement but it sets us on a slippery slope. Hit-to-kill technology has only succeeded in 5 of 19 intercept tests. Now to be sure, some of those failures are in the booster phase and people believe they can be corrected, but if we have another THAAD, which has failed on all six flight tests, we should not deploy NMD.

For other major defense systems, we fly before we buy; but for NMD, however, we are buying before we fly, and that is not right.

The U.S. should decide to deploy a national missile defense not today but only if it is tested rigorously and proven to work; only if it does not undermine overall U.S. national security, by jeopardizing mutual nuclear reductions and the ABM treaty, and only if it is needed as a cost effective defense available against nations with ballistic missiles.

Let me provide some perspective on this Congress' approach to national security. This bill rushes to deploy an unproven national missile defense to defend against an ill-defined future threat. Yet this House recently refused to support the deployment of our men and women in uniform to save lives and bring peace to the Balkans.

Madam Speaker, in the Middle Ages the king would command the alchemist to turn lead into gold but no amount of money or political will could turn lead into gold. Unlike alchemy, national missile defense may work some day but we cannot deny that there is more to national missile defense than wishing it into existence. Please defeat this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 19 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of the original legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services that I serve on.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for their work.

This bill recognizes the reality of the world in which we live today, a world

that is a much more dangerous place, a world in which we face threats from rogue nations like Iran and Iraq and North Korea. The threat of unauthorized, or intentional or unintentional ballistic missile attack is a very real one. This bill addresses that threat that we face.

The people of our country do not realize that we are defenseless against a nuclear missile attack. They do not realize that a missile launched from North Korea would take a mere 23 minutes to reach the continental United States. In fact, it would take only 32 minutes for that missile to reach my home district in Texas. These figures are startling, but it does reinforce the fact that we must take steps today to defend ourselves against this threat.

I join with the many colleagues in this House who are supporting this legislation today, because we believe that our country has no choice but to make this investment in our defense. This bill requires that the system be deployed only after it is determined to be technologically possible to implement such a system. That is the right way to proceed, and I am very confident that our military and the scientists of our country will have the ability to put such a system in place.

We stand here today united in an effort to defend our country against threats that we have to face in today's world. I am confident that this bill will do the job, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 4.

□ 1515

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

It is particularly ironic that we are having the debate this week with the release of the latest Star Wars movie. We might title this "Star Wars, the Phantom Solution," because that is what this is. This is a phantom solution. Hitting a bullet with a bullet in outer space to intercept a North Korean missile.

Now, let us think about it a minute. North Korea has not yet built the missile, it has not been successfully tested, but they might build one or two and put warheads on them. Well, one thing that works in our arsenal of the anti-ballistic missile defense is the radar. We can track the warheads. Guess what? The second they shoot something at us, we will know. Guess what? We have thousands of nuclear warheads with which to retaliate if they have shot at us. Will they do that? No.

This is not a real threat to the United States of America, single missiles launched that could be tracked back to their source. Any nut who is going to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction is going to do it in an undetectable manner, and yet we are doing nothing to deal with bioterrorism, chemical terrorism,

smuggled nuclear weapons, while we spend billions over here to make the defense contractors happy who have yet to conduct a successful defense test after spending nearly \$50 billion.

So what is the solution? Hurry up and deploy it. Deploy what? The phantom system against the phantom menace.

This is real life; it is not a movie. We have to make tough choices. Are we going to defend America against real threats? Are we going to fund pay raises for the young men and women in the military? Or are we going to throw more billions after billions in a failed dream, a dream of Ronald Reagan which was put forward back in the 1980s, an impenetrable shield above the United States?

We all know that even if this thing works, we can bring in a submarine and launch under it, or terrorists certainly can smuggle in a nuclear weapon. This does not defend the United States against real threats.

I say to my colleagues, do not, do not do this. Do not destabilize the ABM Treaty. Do not waste our precious resources, and do not give people a false sense of security while we are letting real threats go unchallenged. Vote "no."

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, it reminds me of the patent chief commenting about the invention of the telephone who said, who is kidding whom about this rip-off? Anybody that believes that two Americans will be able to speak through a wire across town is trying to steal your money.

I say to my colleagues, I support this bill. I support this chairman, the ranking member, and I support the distinguished Members who are responsible for bringing it. We cannot protect America any longer with a Neighborhood Crime Watch, and I am not just concerned about rogue action.

If my colleagues have seen the latest report of a classified Pentagon release, China has developed a super missile that has been labeled by the Pentagon "invincible." Invincible. They have seen nothing like it. Now, what infuriates me is the report further goes on to say it is American tax dollars that built it, with a \$60 billion trade surplus China enjoys now. But what really frosts me, the report goes on to say that the design of the invincible missile is basically the design that was stolen from America.

We have a problem. We have a major problem. And to those naysayers, let me say this. Our number one duty is to secure the national security, to protect your citizens and my citizens, in your towns, in my town, in every town of the United States of America. And with all of the technology we have, I want to compliment the wisdom of the

leaders here, we can intercept their missile. Invincible, my ascot.

Madam Speaker, I want to close out by saying the stealing of our secrets should be investigated, and let the chips fall where they may. I want to know how China got access to these secrets. Second of all, the President and Congress better come together and provide for an umbrella of security for this Nation. It may not be a total, 100 percent fail-safe program, but by God, our military has done quite well on intercepting foreign missiles.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I just want to again clarify for the record that the gentleman who spoke earlier made the point that North Korea has not yet built a missile. Well, if the gentleman would go talk to George Tenet or Bob Walpole at the CIA, he could receive a classified briefing where they are now publicly saying that North Korea on August the 31st fired the Taepo Dong 1 missile. Maybe he does not believe the CIA, and that is something that I cannot comment on.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I was at the so-called classified briefing which was conducted by people who are consultants for defense contractors, and actually, subsequently it has turned out the test was not entirely successful, despite their protestations at that time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would talk to Bob Walpole, who is our CIA expert on strategic threats, the test itself shows that North Korea now, in the minds of our intelligence community, can, in fact fire a three-stage Taepo Dong 1 missile with a light payload that would hit a city in the U.S.

Now, what they say is it will not be accurate. They may aim for St. Louis and hit Dallas, but if one lives in Dallas, does it really matter that it is not accurate? The point is that the gentleman's CIA agents and his own administration have now said publicly that North Korea has the capability today.

Second point, he mentioned that we are not dealing with other threats. Again, I would ask the gentleman, although since he has left the floor I cannot ask him personally, if he would comment on our past five defense authorization bills, because in each of those bills with the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), along with the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and Members on both sides of

the aisle, we have plussed up funding in the area of weapons of mass destruction and cyber terrorism to a higher amount than the administration has ever requested.

We did not do that one year, we did it all five years. We have given this administration money that they did not ask for to deal with the threats of a terrorist device, the threats of coming through our ports. We take that threat very seriously, and we are dealing with it. So when the gentleman says that we do not care or we are not concerned about other threats, he is totally misinformed or just has not gotten the latest brief.

Let me say at this point I want to acknowledge the intellectual honesty of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). He came down to the well and in a very intellectually honest way opposed what we are doing. I respect him for that. I respect the other 105 Members of this body, 104 Members, 102 Democrats and two Republicans, who voted against what we are doing, because intellectually they are being pure.

What I really have a problem with are those Members in the other body who want to have cover; who have consistently opposed missile defense but then came up with nonsensical amendments to now say they are for missile defense. The gentlewoman from California, one of the Senators from California who has consistently opposed missile defense, with these amendments now says she can support this bill. That is outrageously simplistic and it is not being intellectually honest. I would rather have those Members do like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and oppose the bill because they oppose the policy.

We just disagree. Let me say this, Madam Speaker. We passed this bill overwhelmingly in the House. The Senate passed a bill that we are considering today overwhelmingly in the Senate. The President then came out and issued this letter that is now a part of the Record where he said we will make the decision in a year.

Now, what is he saying? In a year we will decide whether or not the threat has changed. Well, Madam Speaker, his own CIA is saying the threat is here today. It is not going to change a year from now. It is already here. He is saying that we will have to evaluate the cost. He has already requested \$10.5 billion in his five-year budget. So why would the President then want to wait a year after we are making a policy decision today?

I hate to say this because this has been a totally bipartisan effort, and I applaud my colleagues on the other side for their leadership, because without that we probably would not be here today. But I can tell my colleagues why I think the President is saying postpone it for a year. He wants to give Vice President GORE a major campaign appearance where, in the middle of the spring of next year, he will hold a press

conference and with all the gravity he can bring as the Vice President, he will say that we now have to deploy a national missile defense system.

Well, I want to let the President know, if the President is listening, and I would say to my colleagues I want to let the President know through them that we see through that facade. We are not going to stand here today and pass this bill and make this change, and have the President or the Vice President plan some kind of a political event a year from now so that they can enhance their standing in the polls. This bill means that when this President signs it, the policy to deploy on behalf of this country is today.

I thank my colleagues and the leadership in both parties for supporting this momentous piece of legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

I rise today in support of this bill, although somewhat reluctantly. As an original cosponsor of H.R. 4 and a long-time proponent of national missile defense, I want to be supportive of this bill. However, I have several concerns that I must express on the floor today.

Like many of my colleagues, I supported this bill as originally drafted, both for what it said and for what it did not say. That bill did not say when a national missile defense system must be deployed, how a national missile defense system must be deployed, nor where a national missile defense system would be deployed. It did not include extra provisions that are not sufficiently defined, like "technologically possible." Our bill also did not include language that could upset our colleagues in the Duma, something that is very important to us as we move towards better relations with Russia.

The Senate version which we are now being forced to take or leave today states that it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. I understand the need to continue negotiating with the Russians, because that is the issue with the reduction in nuclear forces. However, traditionally, negotiations have included both reductions between the Soviet Union and between the United States. The Senate language could be perceived by the Duma as an insult because it includes only a reduction in their forces and it does not address reductions in ours.

Another concern is aimed directly at the other body as a whole. Many of us were under the impression that we would have the opportunity to go to conference with the Senate and work on a compromise between those two bills. Instead, the Senate simply chose to retain only our bill number and return the bill to us with their language.

As I noted, I have been a long time supporter of national missile defense.

Some critics of deploying a national missile defense system argue that the technology is not proven. National missile defense will use hit-to-kill technology. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet.

Recently, another one of DOD's hit-to-kill missile defense programs, the PAC-3, showed that this technology can work. I repeat, this technology can and does work. The PAC-3 interceptor successfully destroyed the target over White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico this past March.

I know that perfecting national missile defense technology will be more difficult than for the PAC-3. However, I just want to make sure that all of my colleagues in this House understand that the Army has proven the hit-to-kill concept.

I also want to reiterate what my good friend CURT WELDON said earlier. THAAD is not a failure. Again, THAAD is not a failure. THAAD has accomplished 28 of its 30 milestones. Every time THAAD has failed to intercept the target missile, it has done so, but has shown that the failure was due to a low-tech problem. These problems with the THAAD have been quality control issues, not design defects.

We need to show our support of national missile defense and move forward with a program as quickly as we can. As such, I will support this bill today and I also urge all of my colleagues to do so. It is vital to the security of this Nation that we move forward on this issue today.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to merely say that much has changed since the Strategic Defense Initiative debate was born some 16 years ago, and a lot has changed since last year. So I ask all of the Members, Madam Speaker, to approach this bill, H.R. 4, as amended, with an open mind, as a good-faith effort to establish a bipartisan consensus on defending America. I intend to vote for it. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We should not have to be here today. People cannot understand the frustrations we have had over a long period of time in having to literally fight our own government to protect our own people.

I will just go back to recent history. In 1996 we provided for national missile defense for our people, to protect our people from missile attack. The President vetoed that legislation. We have been trying time and time again since that time. No one could imagine the hoops we have had to jump through in an effort to force our government to protect our own people.

One example, just for the RECORD, to show the extent to which our own ad-

ministration will go in an effort to re-sist our efforts to defend our people.

Back when the bill was vetoed in 1996, the administration had a politicized intelligence estimate put out by the CIA, the national intelligence estimate. It goes in part like this: Aside from the declared nuclear powers, it will be 10 years before any rogue Nation can develop the capability to threaten this country with missile attacks.

When I saw that, I said, my gosh, what about the declared nuclear powers? Are they not a threat? They were just brushed aside. And what about the fact that a Nation which does not have a capability can simply purchase a capability from someone else? They do not have to develop their own capability themselves from scratch, we say, they can buy it.

So I called up the Director of the CIA at that time in an effort to get him to issue a clarifying estimate that was not misleading to the American people, because the American people had been lulled into a false sense of security.

Well, the result was that the Director refused to change the estimate reflecting those things, so we had to appoint an outside commission, a bipartisan outside commission of intelligence experts, to assess the threat and report back to Congress of what their findings might be.

They reported back and they confirmed what we had said. Instead of 10 years to develop a capability, we would have little or no warning, according to this report.

On the part about taking 10 years to develop a capability, they confirmed what we said by giving an example of how China sold, intact, a mobile intercontinental ballistic missile system to another country. This other country becomes nuclear-capable overnight by simply buying the system.

This is just one example of what we have had to do along this line to get us to this place today. I hope that we are on our way now with the passage of this legislation. I pray that it is, and I pray that it is in time, and that we can develop a defense before we are actually faced with an attack.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4 which states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. I am convinced that this measure should and will pass by a large bipartisan majority. I am also convinced that the President of the United States will sign this important piece of legislation. In doing so the President will make a historic decision, a decision to protect the United States and its people from the grave threat of missile attack.

Today the United States faces these threats defenseless, unable to stop even a single missile launched at the United States. And yet there are dark clouds on the horizon. Countries like North Korea and Iran are moving ahead undaunted with weapons of mass destruction programs, including intercontinental ballistic missiles. The United States and the American people are at risk now, and H.R. 4 states clearly that we must do something to respond to these threats.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tireless work and leadership on this critical issue. It is rare that one individual can make such a difference on behalf of his country. The bipartisan support for this measure is a tribute to his hard work and dedication to protecting the American people from a clear and imminent threat.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this vital measure.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

It is imperative that we move forward to counter the growing ballistic missile threat. Today our nation has absolutely no ability whatsoever to shoot down an incoming ballistic missile—even one fired by accident.

Meanwhile, rogue and terrorist states like North Korea and Iran are committing significant resources towards the development of these weapons. Last August, North Korea—withstanding the severe famine now going on there—launched a three-stage ballistic missile, demonstrating an ability to threaten United States territory for the first time. Likewise, Iran is actively seeking long-range missiles that could threaten our nation.

This bill reflects the Congress's bipartisan concern about this situation, and expresses the belief that all Americans should be protected against this very real threat. It will make it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system to defend against a limited attack as soon as technologically possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to not commit the United States to a flawed policy with a flawed process.

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy that hasn't been proven technologically feasible.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, one of our nation's highest military leaders, said "the simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field a national missile defense."

It is a flawed policy to commit the United States to a missile defense policy with an open-ended price tag.

Since 1962 we have spent \$120 billion to develop missile defense system.

We paid \$67 billion for the failed "Star Wars" initiative.

In the last 10 years we have put some \$40 million into the program.

At \$4.2 billion this year, missile defense is the largest single weapons program in the defense budget.

What about our other defense priorities?

It is a flawed policy to maintain a defense posture at the expense of all other domestic priorities.

We have not yet saved Social Security, we have not reduced class size, we have not provided for health care for all Americans.

In our zeal to protect our democracy we are actually jeopardizing our democracy by failing to protect our domestic tranquility.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 4.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

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

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 71, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Hostettler
Ackerman	Davis (VA)	Houghton
Aderholt	Deal	Hoyer
Andrews	DeLauro	Hulshof
Archer	DeLay	Hunter
Army	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Bachus	Dickey	Hyde
Baker	Dicks	Inslee
Ballenger	Dingell	Isakson
Barcia	Dixon	Istook
Barr	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	(TX)
Bartlett	Doyle	Jefferson
Barton	Dreier	Jenkins
Bass	Duncan	John
Bateman	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Becerra	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	Emerson	Jones (NC)
Berkley	Engel	Kanjorski
Berman	English	Kasich
Berry	Etheridge	Kelly
Biggert	Everett	Kennedy
Bilbray	Ewing	Kildee
Bishop	Fletcher	Kind (WI)
Blagojevich	Forbes	King (NY)
Bliley	Ford	Kingston
Blunt	Fossella	Klecza
Boehrlert	Fowler	Klink
Boehner	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Bonilla	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Bono	Frost	Kuykendall
Borski	Gallegly	LaFalce
Boswell	Ganske	LaHood
Boucher	Gejdenson	Lampson
Boyd	Gekas	Lantos
Brady (TX)	Gephardt	Larson
Brown (FL)	Gibbons	Latham
Bryant	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Burr	Gillmor	Lazio
Burton	Gilman	Leach
Buyer	Gonzalez	Levin
Callahan	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Camp	Goodling	Linder
Campbell	Gordon	Lipinski
Canady	Goss	LoBiondo
Cannon	Graham	Lowe
Capps	Granger	Lucas (KY)
Cardin	Green (TX)	Lucas (OK)
Castle	Green (WI)	Maloney (CT)
Chabot	Greenwood	Maloney (NY)
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Chenoweth	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Clement	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Clyburn	Hansen	Matsui
Coble	Hastert	McCarthy (MO)
Coburn	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Combest	Hayes	McCrery
Condit	Hayworth	McHugh
Cook	Hefley	McInnis
Cooksey	Herger	McIntosh
Costello	Hill (IN)	McIntyre
Cox	Hill (MT)	McKeon
Cramer	Hilleary	Meehan
Crane	Hilliard	Meek (FL)
Crowley	Hinojosa	Menendez
Cubin	Hobson	Metcalfe
Cummings	Hoeffel	Mica
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Millender-
Danner	Holden	McDonald
Davis (FL)	Horn	Miller (FL)

Miller, Gary	Roemer	Stenholm
Mink	Rogan	Stump
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Stupak
Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Sununu
Moran (KS)	Rothman	Sweeney
Moran (VA)	Roukema	Talent
Morella	Roybal-Allard	Tancred
Murtha	Royce	Tanner
Myrick	Rush	Tauscher
Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Tauzin
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Northup	Sanchez	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Sandlin	Terry
Nussle	Sanford	Thompson (CA)
Ortiz	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Ose	Scarborough	Thornberry
Oxley	Schaffer	Thune
Packard	Scott	Thurman
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Pascrell	Serrano	Toomey
Paul	Sessions	Trafcant
Pease	Shadegg	Turner
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Udall (CO)
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Upton
Petri	Sherman	Visclosky
Phelps	Sherwood	Walden
Pickering	Shimkus	Wamp
Pitts	Shows	Watkins
Pombo	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Pomeroy	Simpson	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Siskisky	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Skeen	Weller
Price (NC)	Skelton	Wexler
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Weygand
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wilson
Ramstad	Snyder	Wise
Regula	Souder	Wolf
Reyes	Spence	Wynn
Reynolds	Spratt	Young (AK)
Riley	Stabenow	Young (FL)
Rodriguez	Stearns	

NAYS—71

Allen	Filner	Obey
Baird	Gutierrez	Olver
Baldacci	Hinche	Owens
Baldwin	Holt	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hooley	Payne
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bonior	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Capuano	Kucinich	Sanders
Carson	Lee	Sawyer
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Clayton	Lofgren	Slaughter
Conyers	Luther	Strickland
Coyne	Markey	Tierney
DeFazio	McDermott	Udall (NM)
DeGette	McGovern	Velazquez
Delahunt	McKinney	Vento
Doggett	Meeke (NY)	Waters
Ehlers	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Eshoo	Minge	Weiner
Evans	Nadler	Woolsey
Farr	Neal	Wu
Fattah	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis	Largent	Salmon
Brown (CA)	McNulty	Stark
DeMint	Moakley	Thomas
Deutsch	Napolitano	Towns
Foley	Pickett	Walsh
Frank (MA)	Rogers	Waxman

□ 1555

Mr. BAIRD and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOBSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the vote concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4. The National Missile Defense Act. If I had been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DEUTSCH. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ROGERS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 144, agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4, a bill declaring United States policy of the deployment of a national missile defense system. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

I am a strong supporter of this legislation and voted for the original measure when the House of Representatives earlier considered it this year.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1999, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 21, 1999 to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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