will be a treasured resource for spiritual guidance.

As former chaplains of distinction Peter Marshall and Richard Halverson continue to impact this historic Chamber, so, too, will Lloyd John Ogilvie.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on September 14, 2001 in Tulsa, OK. A food store employee of Middle-Eastern descent was attacked while leaving his apartment. Three people jumped on him, knocked him down, covered his eyes, and beat him. After addressing him with an expletive, the men threatened, ''We are going to cut you like you cut our people.'' Before his eyes were covered, he saw that one of the attackers had a knife-like object. The victim was hospitalized and treated for multiple lacerations.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, March 23 marks the 20th anniversary of President Reagan's historic address to the Nation in which he launched the program known as the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI, designed to help protect America and our allies from ballistic missile attack.

I would like to commemorate this occasion by placing a copy of President Reagan's remarks into the RECORD at this time.

With each passing year, we see more clearly the wisdom of President Reagan's vision. The spread of technology relating to ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction has grown enormously in 20 years. Since September 11, 2001—and now as we are engaged in military operations to disarm IRAQ—more people have become aware of the growing threats we face from missile attack.

When President Reagan spoke in 1983, he said it might take ''decades'' before reliable missile defense was a reality. And he was right. As he well knew, it was not only the technical and engineering hurdles that stood in the way, but also the formidable political obstacles.

During the Clinton years, the outdated ABM Treaty was enshrined as the ''cornerstone of strategic stability,'' SDI was essentially scrapped, and, in 1996, the Congress's determination to build a missile defense system by 2003 was vetoed.

But George W. Bush dramatically changed the political climate and has taken a different course—a course in keeping with President Reagan's commitment. In 2001, he wisely announced U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, and in 2002, he announced that we would move to deploy the first elements, sea-based and land based for a real missile defense system capable of protecting U.S. cities from long-range missile attacks.

I applaud President Bush for his steadfast commitment to America's national security and to fulfilling President Reagan's vision. The bold actions he is taking are moving us forward to the actual deployment of a missile defense capability that will serve our country for many years to come.

I ask unanimous consent to have President Reagan's speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON NATIONAL SECURITY BY PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN—MARCH 23, 1983

The calls for cutting back the defense budget come in nice, simple arithmetic. They're the same kind of talk that led the democracies to neglect their defenses in the 1930's and invited the tragedy of World War II. We must not let that grim chapter of history repeat itself through apathy or neglect.

This is why I'm speaking to you tonight—to urge you to tell your Senators and Congressmen that you know we must continue to restore our military strength. If we stop in midstream, we will send a signal of decline, of lessened will, to friends and adversaries alike. Free people must voluntarily, through open debate and democratic means, meet the challenge that totalitarians pose by compulsion. It's up to us, in our time, to choose and choose wisely between the hard but necessary task of preserving peace and freedom and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

The solution is well within our grasp. But to reach it, there is simply no alternative but to continue this year, in this budget, to provide the resources we need to preserve the peace and guarantee our freedom.

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisers, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides.

One of the most important contributions we can make is, of course, to lower the level of all arms, and particularly nuclear arms. We're engaged right now in several negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about a mutual reduction of weapons. I will report to you a week from tomorrow my thoughts on that score. But let me just say, I'm totally committed to this course.

If the Soviet Union will join with us in our effort to achieve major arms reduction, we will have succeeded in stabilizing the nuclear balance. Nevertheless, it will still be necessary to rely on the specter of retaliation, on mutual threat. And that's a sad commentary on the human condition. Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed, we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

In the meantime, we will continue to pursue real reductions in nuclear arms, negotiating from a position of strength that can be ensured only by modernizing our strategic forces. At the same time, we must take steps to reduce the risk of a conventional military conflict escalating to nuclear war by improving our nonnuclear capabilities.

America does possess—now—the technologies to attain very significant improvements in the effectiveness of our conventional, nonnuclear forces. Proceeding boldly with these new technologies, we can significantly reduce any incentive that the Soviet Union may have to threaten attack against the United States or its allies.

As we pursue our goal of defensive technologies, we recognize that our allies rely upon our strategic offensive power to deter attacks against them. Their vital interests and ours are inextricably linked. Their safety and ours are one. And on change in technology can or will alter that reality. We must and shall continue to honor our commitments.

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems

and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you.

CHINA AIRLINES PURCHASE FROM BOEING

Ms. CANTRELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to commemorate the purchase of 10 Boeing 747–400's acquired by China Airlines.

The relationship between Boeing and Taiwan's China Airlines has been extensive. Over the last 7 years, China Airlines has purchased a total of 97 American-made aircraft from Boeing. The acquisition of these 10 planes, which value $2 billion, brings the total amount of the airline's Boeing-purchased aircraft to $13 billion.

Sales between Boeing and China Airlines have contributed to increased trade between the United States and Taiwan over the last decade. In these past years, bilateral trade has grown each year by an average of 4.1 percent. Because of this thriving market, the United States has become Taiwan's largest export market. In 2000, the United States accounted for 20 percent of Taiwan's trade worldwide.

In addition, the aircraft have allowed increased domestic flights between Taiwan and the United States. Every week there are over 270 flights—179 passenger and 89 cargo—between our two countries.

I am very pleased to see that Taiwan has become one of our more beneficial trading partners in the world today, and I hope that this market continues to thrive for years to come.

A MICHIGAN MOM

Mr. LEVIN. I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues Ms. Shikha Hamilton, a board member of the Million Mom March from my home State of Michigan. Ms. Hamilton visited my office last month with her fellow board members to report on their successes and to urge us to pass sensible gun safety legislation to stem the tide of gun violence that plagues many of our communities.

Ms. Hamilton currently serves as the president of the MMM Chapter in Detroit. A rash of gun violence in Detroit over the last year has claimed the lives of 26 children; these incidents highlight the challenge gun violence poses for communities in protecting families. Ms. Hamilton is one person who has stepped up and met that challenge. She has helped form a coalition with other Detroit violence prevention groups, organized a huge march on Belle Isle, and helped create public service announcements to air on local radio stations. Ms. Hamilton is a leader in her community and I commend her for her work.

As Detroit chapter president, Ms. Hamilton testified in support of a local ordinance prohibiting weapons in public buildings. It unanimously passed the Detroit City Council on November 13, 2002. Her chapter also persuaded the Detroit Free Press and Detroit News to close the ''newspaper loophole.'' The newspapers agreed to stop the placement of gun sales in the classified ads, one way criminals had been gaining access to guns without background checks. In addition to all of this, Ms. Hamilton is a full-time attorney, wife and the mother of a 4-year-old daughter.

In the meeting with my staff, Ms. Hamilton and her MMM colleagues mentioned several pieces of gun safety legislation that are critical if we are to reduce gun violence. Among the most important is legislation closing the gun show loophole. In 1994, Congress passed the Brady Law, which requires federal firearm licensees to perform criminal background checks on gun buyers. However, a loophole in this law allows unlicensed private gun sellers to sell firearms at gun shows without conducting a background check.

The Gun Show Background Check Act would close this loophole in the law by extending the Brady law background check requirement to all sellers of firearms including those at gun shows. I cosponsored this bill because I believe it is critical that we do all we can to prevent guns from getting into the hands of criminals and terrorists. Study after study has demonstrated that the Brady law has been successful in making it more difficult for criminals to gain access to firearms, and by closing the gun show loophole, Congress would again demonstrate its commitment to public safety. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. Hamilton is doing her best to reduce gun violence in her community. We should do our best to pass sensible laws to make her job easier.

COMMENDING U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last night the President addressed the Nation to announce that coalition forces were in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people, and to defend the world from grave danger.

This action was taken as a last resort against an evil dictator, Saddam Hussein, who for 12 years has continued to defy and evade his commitments and responsibilities set out for him by 17 United Nations Security Council resolutions.

I believe Saddam Hussein must be disarmed, and for this reason I supported the resolution authorizing the President to take military action if diplomatic efforts were unsuccessful.

And, while some Members of this body did not support the authorization for the use of force back in October, I am confident that we here, Republicans and Democrats, stand united in our support for our uniformed personnel now in harm's way.

During the past few weeks and months, I have seen and heard communities all across my State send off, with tearful eyes, their sons and daughters, husbands and wives, and moms and dads who have been called to serve.

These brave men and women, from Decorah to Muscatine, Red Oak, to Mason City, Pocahontas to Davenport, stood proud while high school bands played the ''Star Spangled Banner,'' and local religious leaders prayed for their safe return.

Over 3,700 Reserve and National Guard troops in Iowa have been called up for active duty. They come from all professions and all economic backgrounds.

I commend them, and all those serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, for their courage, bravery and patriotism. I am grateful for the enormous sacrifice made by these men and women and their families. I could not be more honored by their commitment to freedom, and I will continue to pray for their quick and safe return home to their loved ones.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING DR. JAMES R. GAVIN III, M.D., Ph.D.

• Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate a distinguished member of the medical community in Georgia. Dr. James R. Gavin III, M.D., Ph.D. has accepted the offer to serve as president of the Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta.

Dr. Gavin's experience and expertise in the medical field is exemplary and offers a high standard of excellence for the student of Morehouse School of Medicine to model.

In 1966, Dr. Gavin graduated from Livingstone College in Salisbury, NC with a degree in chemistry. He earned his Ph.D. in biochemistry from Emory University in 1970 and his M.D. degree from Duke University School of Medicine in 1975.