

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 proceed-  
ings.

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