

move forward with missile defense for this country.

It is outrageous to me, and it should be to our colleagues, Madam Speaker, that 10 years after 28 young Americans came home in body bags from Desert Storm, that we still do not have a highly effective theater missile defense system to protect our troops.

□ 1300

We have made some progress. We have pushed the PAC3 system, to the extent now where it is about to be deployed. We have made progress on the THAAD program, having had successful intercepts three times. We have had success in our Navy areawide program.

The Israelis have had success with the Arrow program. We are now moving together with them on the theater high energy laser program, which offers promising potential for us. We are working with the Europeans, particularly the Germans and Italians on the Medium Extended Area Defense System, or MEADs.

We are making progress, but we still have not had the success that we need. I am convinced that part of that is because for the past 8 years we had no consensus and leadership from the White House pushing this country on military defense as John Kennedy challenged America to land on the moon in 1960, and 9 years later we did it.

Madam Speaker, all of that is changing today, as the highest elected official in our country comes out solidly in favor of missile defense as a resource for defending our people.

Now, some would say, well, why do we worry about missiles when a terrorist can take a truck bomb and do the same thing? Well, we are concerned about terrorists activities. In fact, that is why in our committee we have plussed up funding for work-related to chemical and biological terrorism significantly over the past several years; but the fact is the weapon of choice by Saddam Hussein to kill 28 young Americans was not a truck bomb. It was, in fact, a low-complexity SCUD missile that sent those young Americans, half of them from my State, back home in body bags to be buried by their families.

Some say we cannot rush to judgment on national missile defense, and I can tell my colleagues what the President is going to offer is a layers approach, much like we have advocated, where we deploy those quickest possible technologies that are proven and tested to give us some short-term capability.

I say it is about time that we begin deploying technologies that can assist us. Some of our colleagues will say, wait a minute, the Russians will be backed into a corner. I say that is hogwash. Yes, the Russians do not trust us today.

Madam Speaker, I would say if I were a Russian today, I would not trust America either on missile defense, because three times in the last 10 years,

we have publicly rebuked Russia on cooperation of missile defense. The first was after Boris Yeltsin in 1992 accepted George Bush's challenge to work together, and we began the Ross-Mamedov between our State Department and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In 1993, when Bill Clinton came into office, he abruptly canceled those talks. That sent a signal to Russia, we do not want you involved. The second time was in 1996, when the only cooperative missile defense program between this country and Russia, the Ramos project, was canceled by the Clinton administration.

It was only because CARL LEVIN, people like the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) went to war with the White House that we were able to reinvigorate the Ramos program and keep it alive, but the signal was sent to Russia we do not want to work with you.

The third example was in 1997, at a time where almost everyone says the ABM treaty needed to be flexible. The administration sent its negotiators to Geneva to negotiate two outrageous protocols that would actually tighten up the ABM treaty. One would create demarcation between theater and national missile defense artificial differentiation, the other would be multilateralization of the treaty.

The administration knew that neither the House or the Senate, especially the Senate would ratify those protocols, but they convinced the Russians that that was our position. Even though the Constitution requires the administration to submit those kinds of changes to the Senate for their advice and the consent for 3 years, the administration never did that, because they knew the Senate would not ratify them.

The Russians for the third time were tricked in their mind, tricked into believing that America really was serious about cooperating with them.

When the Duma included those two protocols, the part of START II ratification last spring, all of a sudden our Senate said no way are we now going to pass START II, because the Duma did what the administration did not do. They attached the protocols to the ABM treaty, as additions to the START II treaty, something that we would never accept in this country.

It is no wonder the Russians do not trust us. If I were in Russia today, I would not trust America's intentions in missile defense either. It is time to get beyond that. We can, in fact, rebuild a trust that we have lost and let the Russians know that missile defense is not about backing them into a corner.

Missile defense is for Americans, for Europeans, for Russians, and for all peaceloving people on the face of the Earth.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, President Bush will outline today his plan for national missile defense. I reserve judgment until I hear the speech, but I have been following SDI and NMD, National Missile Defense, for years; and I have a few thoughts of mine that I want to share with the House, for whatever they may be worth.

I think National Missile Defense, NMD, is worth pursuing, and if it works, I think it is worth deploying. But we have not proved that it works, not yet. In fact, after spending more than \$60 billion on missile defense, we have learned as much about its limits as about its potential. Every form of defense we have explored at great expense has been found to be an Achilles heel of one sort or another. Boost-phase interceptors can be thwarted by fast-burn boosters or ablative covers. Space-based systems, whether they are lasers or kinetic interceptors move in fixed orbits and can easily be targeted and taken out. Sea-based systems are constrained by an obvious factor, the finite space availability on ships available.

We for now settle on ground-based, mid-course interceptors, which I consider to be our clear first choice, the right way to go, but I will be first to tell you that the problem of discriminating warheads from decoys and chaff is a daunting problem that is a long way from being resolved.

We have spent 18 years and \$60 billion since Mr. Reagan made his speech; and if we have learned anything, it is that missile defense is not likely to render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete. It may enhance deterrence, I believe it will; but it is not likely to replace deterrence.

There is, however, a threat, a threat of an unauthorized or accidental attack, a threat of a rogue attack, existing and emerging, and I think it would be wise to have a missile defense system to meet that threat. But we have to recognize, we have to be realistic and recognize that a rogue or unauthorized attack can well come in an unconventional manner and probably will, rather than by missile with the sender's signature written all over it, and that threat, the threat of nuclear weapons in the hands of parties undeterred by our ability to strike back, is a very real threat best opted at its source.

If we strike ahead to defiantly on our own abrogate the ABM treaty and deploy any defense systems that we want to deploy, we may very well jeopardize the arms control measures that make us secure and make ourself less secure rather than more.

Now, I think that ground-based interceptors are the first right step. We

build the SBIRs-Low system anyway. We are working on a technology here with ground-based interceptors that are complementary to the technology we use for theater missile defense systems. Everybody agrees that is a need we need to develop; and it will be proved to be useful, I think, to have a system on the ground which can be tested continually and improved incrementally.

But having said that, having said that, I want to say, I do not think we should be so zealous to deploy any system that we deploy a substandard system that has not been tested and tested rigorously or else we will find ourselves on a rush to failure.

Finally, I think we need to be realistic. We are soon going to get a defense budget from the Pentagon. We are told it could be to \$200 billion to \$300 billion to \$400 billion more than the \$2 trillion we have already provided in the FYDP for the next 6 years. We need to be realistic about not only the acquisition costs but the life cycle costs of a ballistic missile system.

I do not think NMD deserves a trump card in our budget. It is time, I think, that we in the Congress and elsewhere in the government stopped treating BMD, ballistic missile defense, as a political totem. That is what it has become, a political totem like no other weapon system we have ever seen.

It is time for us to start treating this just as any other weapon system. It does not need cheerleaders. It does not need pallbearers, what BMD, what NMD needs is candor. It needs to be held to the same standards of feasibility, cost effectiveness as every other weapon system we buy and deploy.

If we are going to sell this system to others, our allies, our adversaries, our former adversaries, to Russia, we need to have unity or some cohesion among ourselves, bipartisan unity.

I think if we stay within these bounds, we can build that kind of bipartisan consensus. We should never lose sight of this fundamental fact. We have got a rough, rocky relationship with the Russians right now, but we are making progress.

While we can work with Russia, we should work with Russia to secure their missile systems, to secure their nuclear and fissile materials. And bear this in mind, a critical point, through programs like Nunn-Lugar and the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, we have helped to deactivate so far 5,288 Russian warheads, 419 long-range missiles, and 367 silos. These numbers, what we have accomplished under these cooperative programs, dwarf the number of warheads that even the most robust NMD system could have handled or could have stopped.

We have only begun in that effort. We do not want to diminish that effort and leave ourselves less secure rather than more secure, that is why I plead to the President not just for the statement of policy, but also for balance and also ask him to make a bipartisan ef-

fort founded on consensus and not just on the unilateral position that his administration is pursuing.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Dr. Laudis H. Lanford, The Methodist Home for Children and Youth in Macon, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

The Lord be with you, and for our Jewish friends, Sh'ma Yisrael Adonai Elohanu, Adonai Echad.

Oh Lord, my God, how majestic is Your Name in all the earth. Your handiwork is to be exalted and praised before the people. How awesome You are in everything and everywhere. Your love for us is greater than the east is from the west, yes greater than the number of stars in the sky and grains of sand along our shores.

Humble us this day, O God, that we might pause and recognize who You are within our lives and reflect upon the bountiful blessings that You bestow upon us.

Forgive us when we have failed to be obedient to You, both in word and deed. And forgive us when we have not heard the cry of the needy. Forgive us, O God, when we have not loved our neighbors as ourselves. And free us for joyful obedience to You and service to others.

And like Jabez, we call upon You, the God of Israel, saying, O that Thou wouldest bless us indeed, enlarge our coast, that Thine hand might be with us; that Thou wouldest keep us from evil, and that it may not grieve us. Grant, O God, that which we humbly request. Charge to keep I have, a God to glorify, a never dying soul to save, and fit it for the sky.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST CHAPLAIN, DR. LAUDIS H. LANFORD

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure for me to have Dr. Laudis H. Lanford as the guest chaplain in the House today. My good friend, Rick Lanford, is vice president for development at the Methodist Home for Children and Youth in Macon, Georgia, where he is affectionately known as "Daddy Rick."

Dr. Lanford is a graduate of Emory University in Atlanta and Candler School of Theology, where he received a Master of Divinity, and the McCormick School of Theology, where he received a Doctor of Ministry.

Rick's love of the Lord is exhibited in his everyday life, but no place more than in his work with the 110 orphaned and abused children at the Methodist Home.

Rick has made a strong commitment to his community and his State. He is chaplain for the Macon City Police, the Bibb County, Monroe County, and Jones' County Sheriff's Department. He is also chaplain for the Georgia Sheriff's Association and serves on the Gang Awareness Task Force Committee.

Dr. Lanford changes lives of young people in our part of the State every day. I am proud to have him here today, but I am even more proud to call him my good friend.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, May 2, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

PENSION REFORM

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, retirement is something every American needs to prepare for, but with the prices of everything from college educations to