

H.R. 2909, the Inter-country Adoption Act;
H.R. 4205, the Floyd D. Spence National
Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year
2001 Conference Report; and

H.R. 3244, the Trafficking Victims Protection
Act Conference Report.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect that appropri-
ators will be working hard to complete con-
ference reports for consideration in the House
next week.

□ 1700

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to clause
8, rule XX, the pending business is the
question of the Speaker's approval of the
Journal of the last day's pro-
ceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Jour-
nal stands approved.

EIGHTH BIENNIAL REPORT OF INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RE- SEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be-
fore the House the following message
from the President of the United
States; which was read and, together
with the accompanying papers, without
objection, referred to the Committee
on Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Pub-
lic Law 98-373 (15 U.S.C. 4107(b)), I
transmit herewith the Eighth Biennial
Report of the Interagency Arctic Re-
search Policy Committee (February 1,
1998, to January 31, 2000).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 14, 2000.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
when the House adjourns today, it ad-
journ to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday,
September 18, 2000, for morning hour
debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
the business in order under the Cal-
endar Wednesday rule be dispensed
with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-
uary 6, 1999, and under a previous order
of the House, the following Members
will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-
uary 6, 1999, the gentleman from Penn-
sylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for
60 minutes as the designee of the ma-
jority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr.
Speaker, I rise today to discuss an
issue that is not getting the attention
I feel it deserves in the current na-
tional debate between the major presi-
dential candidates and Members from
both parties running for Congress, the
House and the Senate, and that is the
issue of America's national security.

I want to start, Mr. Speaker, by fo-
cusing on the speech that President
Clinton gave at Georgetown University
just 2 weeks ago on the issue of na-
tional missile defense. The President
gave the speech because when he signed
my national missile defense bill into
law over 1 year ago, the President said
that he would sign into law, agree to
move forward, on national defense, but
then make a decision to go forward at
some point in time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back and re-
state for our colleagues the facts in
this area, the actions by the President,
and then go through the President's
speech in detail and attempt to give
what I would consider to be our re-
sponse to the President's speech.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago
the CIA produced an intelligence esti-
mate that told the Congress and the
American people we would not expect
to see a threat emerge that could hurt
the U.S. directly from a long-range
missile for at least 15 years.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle
felt that that estimate was incorrect.
In fact when we pressed the CIA, and I
was the one who got the first classified
briefing on that report because I was
one of the requesters of it, the CIA
eventually changed its mind and came
to a conclusion that we all agreed to
with Donald Rumsfeld and the Rums-
feld Commission that in fact the threat
was not 15 years away, but that in fact
the threat was here today and growing
dynamically with every passing day.
That major change caused a bipartisan
group in the Congress to want to prod
this administration to move forward in
defending America, its people, and its
troops.

Some would say, why would you want
to do that? There has never been an at-
tack on America. No country is going
to attack us because we have such tre-
mendous clout, we could wipe them
out, and if they really want to harm us,
they would use a truck bomb or use a
car bomb or an explosive device.

Mr. Speaker, the facts just do not
support that contention. In fact, Mr.
Speaker, in 1991, 28 young Americans
came home in body bags from Saudi
Arabia because our country let those
young men and women down. Twenty-
eight young Americans came home in
body bags because we could not defend
against a low complexity scud missile.
The scud missile was launched into our
military barracks in Saudi Arabia, just
as Saddam had launched missile after
missile into Israel, raining terror on
the Israeli families who were injured
and killed by those attacks.

Mr. Speaker, that attack by Saddam
on our soldiers, and they were both
young women and young men, they
were young wives and young fathers,
because they were largely from reserve
units, half of them from my State,
showed the vulnerability of America to
the emerging threat that missiles pro-
vide.

In 1991, this Congress vowed that that
would never happen again, that we as
Republicans and Democrats would
never allow America's sons and daugh-
ters to be wiped out by a terrorist like
Saddam or a Nation like Iran or North
Korea that would use missiles to kill
our people. So, as a result, Mr. Speak-
er, we began to work the process in the
Congress to change the minds of Bill
Clinton and AL GORE in terms of mis-
sile defense.

Now, let me state for the record, Mr.
Speaker, that President Clinton and
Vice President GORE categorically op-
posed missile defense through the first
7 years of their administration. Now,
the President and the Vice President
can spin this any way they want, but
the facts are that for 7 years they op-
posed missile defense. They opposed
the Congress when we said the threat
was emerging. They opposed the Con-
gress when Democrats and Republicans
put more money into missile defense
systems. They opposed the Congress
when we said that the ABM treaty was
not flexible enough to allow us to de-
fend our homeland and our people. For
7 years, President Clinton and Vice
President GORE said we do not have to
worry about missile defense, we rely on
arms control agreements.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I am
not against arms control agreements.
In fact, I support most of the arms con-
trol agreements that America is a
party to. But there is an interesting
point about arms control, Mr. Speaker,
and that is that if you do not enforce
those agreements, if you do not abide
by the requirements to penalize those
entities that violate those agreements,
they mean nothing, they are worthless
pieces of paper.

That has been the record of this ad-
ministration. Two years ago, Mr.
Speaker, I did a speech on the House
floor. I documented in that speech 37
violations of arms control agreements
by China and Russia. Thirty-seven