

the authors had investigated. Again, it gets back to what the Supreme Court in their decision in Nixon was basically saying, that if there is not reason enough not to prevent corruption from occurring in the political process to justify campaign finance reform, there is certainly enough reason because of the appearance of corruption that other people sitting back in Wisconsin, for instance, the Mr. Doves throughout the country have towards the political process that adds to the cynicism and I think disenchantment and eventually disenfranchisement of their participation in the political process.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from characterizing the Senate action or inaction.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON MARCH 8, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-505) on the resolution (H. Res. 425) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1827, GOVERNMENT WASTE CORRECTIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-506) on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening during the next hour I would like to have a night-side chat with my colleagues in regards to a number of different issues.

The first issue that I would like to start out with is the death tax or the estate tax. Then I would like to move on and cover a few points on the marriage penalty tax, move from there to an issue that I think has become fun-

damentally important to the defense of this country, and that is the missile defense. In fact, tonight I intend to spend a good deal of time discussing the missile defense of the United States of America.

Then if we have an opportunity, I would like to move on to the Social Security earnings limitation repeal. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has stepped forward. And I think tomorrow we will see a very close to a unanimous vote to lift the earnings cap for those people between 65 and 70 years old who are being unfairly penalized by the tax law.

So I do publicly want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON). Both of those gentlemen have worked very hard.

I also want to congratulate the Democrats who have finally come on board with the Republican bill to help us get rid of this unfair taxation. Then if we have a little time after that, I would like to talk about the Internet, a taxation on the Internet. So there are a number of issues tonight on our night-side chat that we can discuss.

But let us first start with the death tax. What is the death tax, number one? Number two, what property does this tax tax that has not already been taxed? In this country, there is a tax called the estate tax. If one's accumulation of property during one's lifetime, property, by the way, of which one already has paid taxes upon at least once, if that property accumulates over a certain amount of money, the Government comes in after one's death and mandates upon one's surviving members, one's family, that an additional tax be levied on this property that has already been taxed.

It is probably in our Tax Code the most unfair, punitive tax that we have got. There is no basis of justification to go and tax somebody upon their death, their estate upon their death, on property that throughout their entire lifetime they have paid taxes after taxes after taxes. It is as if the Government just did not get enough.

Now, one would ask, why is something like that in our Tax Code? Why is it not easy just to take it out? Well, I can tell you. The Clinton administration, and, frankly, most of the Democrats in the House, have opposed taking or getting rid of the estate tax. They say it is a tax for the rich.

Well, what I invite those people to do is come out, for example, to the State of Colorado or go to any State in the Union and take a look at small businesses that are now being impacted by the death tax. Take a look at what happens to families from the personal level when the Government comes into their life after having taxed their property throughout their life and says we have got to take one more hit at the

deceased. We need to go in and assess a tax simply based on the reason that they died.

This tax has devastating impacts. I will give my colleagues an example. I have a good friend of mine who is now deceased. But this friend, we will call him Mr. Joe, Mr. Joe years and years ago started out as a bookkeeper in a local construction company. He worked very, very hard in that construction company. After a while, he got an opportunity through years of hard work to buy some stock in the construction company. He was not a wealthy man. But he and his family, his wife, they scraped together a few pennies here, a few pennies there. They watched their expenses, and they invested in stock.

Well, 5 or 6 years ago, in some of his investments, he sold some of those investments, and he was hit with a tax called capital gains.

Now, most of the citizens of this country will be assessed a capital gains taxation. If one's mutual funds, if one bought property, if one owns stock outside of mutual funds, it is a gain upon property that one has made, and they give a capital tax on it.

So that is what they did when Mr. Joe sold his property. He was hit with a capital gains taxation at that time, which was around the rate of 28 percent.

So take out a pencil, figure out that Mr. Joe, who had worked throughout his entire life, had accumulated property, sold a portion of that property, and on the profit on that property, 28 percent taxation.

Unfortunately, my friend Mr. Joe became terminally ill within a month or so after the sale of this property. Even more unfortunate was that he passed away 2 or 3 months after that. The Government then came in to that family and said we realize that your father in this case has paid on time as a responsible citizen of this country taxes on the property that now belongs to the estate. But we are here for a second dip in the pot. The Government has come back, and we think it is necessary to tax the estate of the deceased person. What did they do to that estate? Exactly what they did to that estate, they hit it with taxes which, when you add it to the capital gains tax, gives it an effective tax rate of about 72 percent. Seventy-two percent on that estate is what was paid in taxation.

Now, let me tell you where the hardship comes in. Number one, 72 percent, imagine, you kind of figure out in your own mind what property you have in your home, what property you and your family has in your home that you own. Then try to determine 72 percent of it that you would like to cut out of it to give to the Government, even though you already paid taxes on it.

What happened to the estate is, of course they did not have the cash to

pay for the 72 percent. They had to sell assets. They had to go out and sell more of the property to pay the 72 percent tax rate that was imposed upon them.

What happens? What happens to the death tax money? Where does it go? I will tell you exactly where it goes. It goes to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. That money is transferred from your communities. In this particular case, it was transferred out of a small community in Colorado in my district, the mountains of Colorado; and it was sent, transferred to Washington D.C. to be distributed amongst the bureaucrats and the agencies in Washington, D.C.

Where would that money have gone had it not been transferred to Washington, D.C. through that death tax? That is a legitimate question. Where would it have gone? Do you know where it would have gone and where it did go? Prior to the tax, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that community, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that estate and taking that money, that money stayed in the community of that small town in the mountains of Colorado.

That was the money that helped fund the local church. That was the money that helped fund the jobs for many, many people in that community. That was the money that bought property and made rental units available in that community.

Now what has happened to that money? It is no longer in that community. It has gone on to Washington, D.C. Because Washington, D.C. is here in the East, they seem to think they know better. They seem to think they need to take one more punch at you, one more punch on the estate tax.

Now we have heard a lot of rhetoric lately. In fact we have even heard some of the rhetoric from the Democrats. Let me make a note here. I compliment the Democrats tomorrow for coming over and assisting us in passing and getting rid of the earnings limitation on Social Security. I wished they would have joined us earlier, but they are joining us, and they should deserve credit for that.

I am not attempting to be partisan here, but I want to make a clear distinction on what is happening on this death tax; and that is, we are not getting help to eliminate this death tax from the Democratic leadership or from the Democratic administration. In fact, let me tell my colleagues exactly what has happened in the last couple of weeks.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means; and on this committee, we do all the taxation. We deal with all the taxation issues. It is probably the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives. In looking at that, we get the President's budget. We just got the President's budget a couple of weeks ago.

Do my colleagues know what the Democrats have done with the death tax? I was in hopes that the Democrats, while I did not really expect them, their leadership to move the party to get rid of the death tax, which is the most unfair tax we have in the system. That was too good to be true to expect them to join us, the Republicans, in our effort to eliminate the tax. I expected them probably to stay neutral.

We hear a little rhetoric about how it is unfair, but they really would not change. I was very surprised. More than surprised, I was extremely disappointed that the President in his budget, the Democrats through the President in that budget, not only did not stay neutral on the death tax, they are actually increasing the death tax. That is right.

For any of you people out there that own a small farm or a ranch or a business or a home in an area where you have seen vast depreciation, hold on to your britches because the Clinton budget increases your taxes by almost \$10 billion, a \$10 billion increase in the death tax in this country.

Come on. How much more can one beat out of a person? Let us be fair to the citizens of this country. I know the bureaucracy in Washington is hungry. I know it is constantly looking for some more money to eat up, some more money to take out of our local communities and transfer out of our States to Washington, D.C. But a \$10 billion increase in the death tax, it is unfair. It is not right.

You are being unfair to the American people. You do not need that additional taxation. You do not need to go out there and seek 10 billion more dollars off the grieving families and off the estates of these families.

Let us be fair. Let us support things like eliminating that death tax. It is unfair. I can give my colleagues example after example after example. In fact, my colleagues here on the House floor can think of it in their own mind, think about their own communities. Ask the question: Is SCOTT McINNIS in his night-side chat correct? Where is that money? Is the money in my community really going to Washington, D.C. because one of our citizens died and happened to leave an estate that the Government decided it should tax? Of course he is right. Of course that is where the money goes.

We need to have the American people be fully aware of the facts. The facts are these: Republicans will continue their fight to eliminate the death tax in this country. But the Democratic administration that we have right now will continue its efforts to increase the death tax.

For some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, if they do not believe me, look it up in the budget. It is right there: \$10 billion. \$10 billion.

Tonight is a good night to talk about some of these taxes. But, Mr. Speaker,

as we go back to our districts, as most of us do every weekend, I certainly do every weekend, there is tax relief out there that I as a Republican am proud that the Republican Party put into place.

□ 2000

Most American citizens do not realize that probably the largest tax break they have gotten in years just happened a couple of years ago thanks to the efforts of the Republicans. And, frankly, we had some conservative Democrats who came across the aisle and supported us on it as well. That is the tax on the sale of a principal residence, on a home.

Under the old law, if a person bought a home for, say, \$10, and then that home was sold for \$15 and there was a \$5 profit, that person had to pay taxes on that \$5 capital gain. That word capital gain comes back. There was an assessed tax on that capital gain unless an individual was, one, over 55 years of age; two, the amount of the gain did not exceed \$150,000; and, three, an individual only got one exemption. Once a lifetime.

Everybody out there who is a homeowner should listen up because it is important. We have seen appreciation of real property values, of homes. We have seen appreciation in this country, and we have great news, thanks to the Republican efforts on this side. And I keep coming back to this because I am proud of it and I like boasting about it. I do not mind saying it is the Republicans that did this because we did. Now, a person owning a home that sells that home for a profit, and that is the principal residence that they have lived in for the last 3 of 5 years, they get to take that amount of money, up to \$250,000 per person, \$500,000 per couple, and it is exempted from any taxes. It is exempt. That person gets to take that money and put it into their pocket.

Now, under the old law, the taxes could be deferred by buying a house of equal or greater value. That is not a requirement under the law we passed here a couple of years ago. We simply said that when an individual makes the profit, up to \$250,000 per person, they can put it in their pocket. And by the way, there is no age limitation. And by the way, we allow that individual to renew this effort. This can be done every couple of years. A person can go and get this tax break.

This is significant. And every homeowner in this country should know about it because at some point or another they will have a big smile on their face because they are going to be able to put a lot of cash, if their property has appreciated, right into their pocket without sending that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

I want to talk about one other tax issue that I think is important and

that is unfair. Marriage couples. I represent the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That is the mountains. Essentially the mountains in the State of Colorado. Out there I have almost 70,000 people, in fact, 69,766 people, who live in the Third Congressional District of Colorado that have an additional penalty on their taxes simply because they are married. Simply because they are married. I could not believe it.

This bill that we passed, that we put together on the Republican side, said, hey, Democrats, Republicans, unaffiliated, whatever, let us stand up and get rid of the marriage tax penalty in our Tax Code. We are a country whose foundation is family. We encourage family. We want our young people to have families. We want them to be married. We want to go back to the cycle of family's right; family's number one. We say that, but on the other hand our Tax Code taxes them, taxes them for being married.

Well, the Republicans in this House, with some Democrats, 40 or so Democrats, passed a bill a couple of weeks ago to eliminate the marriage penalty. Now, I think the President is probably going to veto it. I cannot imagine that he would, but he is probably going to do it. And I was frankly really surprised that some of the Democrats would vote against this. Come on, how do they go back to their districts and look somebody in the eye and say, "You're getting married? Congratulations. Time to take a little more money out of your pocket and transfer it to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C."

It is an unfair tax. We ought to do something about it. We ought to eliminate it. And to the Democrats that voted no, they will probably have another chance this session to vote on that bill again when it comes back out of conference, and I hope they support us. I hope they stand up and vote and I hope they have the courage to say, look, it is an unfair tax.

Politics aside, election year aside, let us be fair to the taxpayers. Let us let married couples not be penalized for being married. Let us let families who have had a death in their family not get an additional death tax. We can do something. We showed that we could do something on the capital gains when a home is sold and it has not brought the government to its knees. That money has not been buried in the ground somewhere. It is recirculated in the communities. We have helped the homeowner, now we can help the married couple and now we can help the families of the deceased by revisiting these tax codes and by eliminating these unfair penalties on these people.

Now, let me cap off, before I get into something that I think is extremely serious, extremely serious, by once again to publicly commend my fine col-

league, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. SHAW), and my fine up-standing colleague, the gentleman from the State of Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), on their efforts today in the Committee on Ways and Means, which passed unanimously, unanimously, the Democrats joined us, in eliminating the earnings cap for those on Social Security between the ages of 65 and 70.

Over 70 that cap was lifted, but between 65 and 70 citizens were actually penalized if they had worked all their lives and decided they wanted to continue to work between the ages of 65 and 70. They were penalized under the Social Security System. Today, that bill passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas. Tomorrow we will have it on the House floor, and I would expect that tomorrow we will have a strong vote.

It is not assured. I was surprised on the marriage penalty and doing away with that. I thought everybody would vote for that, but some of our colleagues on the Democratic side voted against it. But tomorrow I hope my colleagues on the Democratic side will join us and get rid of that earnings cap. I hope they will join us, put aside the election year, put aside the partisanship and join us and let us get rid of it. Let us make the Tax Code fair for everybody.

So a recap real carefully on these tax issues. Number one, we need to eliminate the death tax. It is unfair, it is unjustified, it is punitive, meaning it is a penalty. It is a penalty on the taxpayers of this country to be taxed on property they have already paid taxes on simply because they die.

Number two, we need to recognize that the Congress under the Republican leadership passed successfully for every homeowner in this country an opportunity for them to take the profit from their home and put it right into their pocket.

Number three, we need to eliminate the marriage penalty. It is unfair, fundamentally unfair, for us, as the government of this country, for the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., to penalize a couple because they are married. It should be the policy of this Congress and every other Congress to follow that we encourage marriage in this country; that we tell people to go out and focus on that family and not worry about being penalized by the government.

And, finally, let me wrap this portion of the comments up by saying that I hope tomorrow we have uniform support on this House floor to eliminate the earnings cap on Social Security. And any of my colleagues out there who have constituents out there between the ages of 65 and 70, they know exactly what we are talking about. Tomorrow's debate should be short, it

should be to the point, because the issue is right.

Let us move on. I want to visit this evening in some depth here for the next half-hour or so about missile defense. And I think really the best way to get into this, and I do not like reading a script when I speak on my night-side chats, but I think it is probably an appropriate entry or a lead or a path to follow when we talk about the missile defense of this country.

First, let me precede the reading of these articles with a very strong statement. Every other country in the world, every nation in the world understands this message: The United States of America has the fundamental right, the fiduciary responsibility, and the obligation to defend its citizens. And we will defend our citizens. And as a part of that defense, they should not dare criticize this country for putting together a missile defense system to take down an incoming missile into this country. Not offensive, defensive.

We have an obligation. My colleagues on this floor, each and every one of us, share that responsibility to be sure that our generation, the next generation, and the generations to follow have the weapons and the tools to defend themselves from aggressors of freedom and against freedom. It is our fundamental obligation as Congressmen of the United States of America.

Let me begin. An article in the Dallas Morning News, that is where I pulled it down from, written by William Safire. Think about this, because this article is really pertinent tonight. As my colleagues know, we have several primaries going on across the country as I now speak. We have three of them, Washington, North Dakota, and Virginia. We know that in the next few months we are going to pick the next President of the United States. So this article kind of plays into that.

For a moment I want my colleagues here to imagine that they are going to be the President of the United States. Just try to put in our minds that we are going to be the President of the United States. Let us start the article.

"Imagine that you are the next United States President and this crisis arises: The starving army of North Korea launches an attack on South Korea imperilling other 30,000 troops. You threaten a massive air assault. Pyongyang counter threatens to put a nuclear missile into the State of Hawaii. You say that that would cause you to strike back and destroy North Korea. Its undeterred leaders dare you to make the trade. You decide.

"Or this crisis: Saddam Hussein invades Saudi Arabia. You warn of a Desert Storm II. He says he has a weapon of mass destruction on a ship near the United States and is ready to sacrifice Baghdad if you are ready to lose New York City. You decide.

"Or this: China, not now a rogue State, goes into an internal convulsion

and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan.”

Now, let me leave the article for a minute. Did my colleagues read the paper today? In the last 48 hours, China has threatened the United States of America with a missile attack if in fact we go to the defense of Taiwan. So when this article was written it was just an “imagine yourself in that place.” But, in fact, in the last 48 hours, China has made that threat to the United States. So it is fairly realistic. Let us go back to the article.

“Or this: China goes into the internal convulsion and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan. You threaten to intervene. Within 10 minutes you threaten to intervene. But all of a sudden you discover that China has missiles targeted on several major United States cities. You have a decision to make. Before you make the decision on North Korea, on Saddam Hussein, on China, remember this; that in 1998 the Central Intelligence Agency told your predecessor that it was highly unlikely that any rogue state, except possibly North Korea, would have a nuclear weapon capable of hitting any of the contiguous 48 States within 10 to 12 years.”

□ 2015

That is some exception. Apparently, our strategic assessors are untroubled at the prospect of losing Pearl Harbor again. So we are talking about the 48 States that have no missile defense in place, no missile defense in place.

The CIA assured your predecessor you would have 5 years' warning about the other nations' weapons development before you would have to deploy a missile defense system, but the CIA's record of prediction is poor.

President George Bush was assured that Saddam would have no nuclear capability for the next 10 years. When we went in after we invaded Kuwait, we discovered it to be less than a year away. And India, despite our extensive satellite and surveillance, surprised us with its recent nuclear explosion.

Six months ago, the Congress decided to get a second opinion about how vulnerable the United States is. Donald Rumsfeld, a former Secretary of Defense, was named to lead the bipartisan commission to assess the ballistic threat to the United States. Its nine members are former high government officials, military officers, and scientists of unassailable credibility.

Clearly, forever a national secret, these men with command experience had the advantage denied to CIA analysts. The unclassified summary of this T&B's 300-page report was released recently. This report just came out and it was a shocker. The direct threat to America, it concluded, by a ballistic missile attack is broader, more mature, and evolving more rapidly than has been reported in estimates and reports by the intelligence community.

Not only Iran and other terrorist states capable of producing a nuclear-tipped missile within 5 years of ordering it up, they are capable of skipping the test and fine-tuning what we have depended on as our cushion to get our defenses up.

That means the Commission concluded that the warning time the United States would have to develop and deploy a missile defense is near zero. That means, I will repeat, that the time the United States of America will have to develop and deploy a missile defense system is not 5 years, not 10 years, it is close to 0.

Let us set aside our preoccupation with executive privileges and hospital lawsuits long enough to consider the consequences of the judgment of this report. The United States no longer has the luxury of several years to put up a missile defense. We no longer have the luxury of several years to put a missile defense system up. If we do not decide now to deploy a rudimentary shield, we run the risk of Iran or North Korea or Libya building or buying the weapon that will enable it to get them to drop it upon the United States of America.

The Commission was charged only with assessing the new threat and not about what we should do to meet the danger. Nine serious men concluded unanimously that our intelligence agencies, on which we spend \$27 billion a year, have misled us. Smiling, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency responded that we need to keep challenging our assumptions.

Wrong. We need to defend ourselves from the likely prospect of a surprise nuclear blackmail. A first step is egregious, the naval theater defense, but that requires the President to redefine a 1972 treaty with the Soviets, the anti-ballistic missile treaty that he thinks requires us to remain forever naked to all our potential enemies.

The crisis is not likely to occur as Bill Clinton's sands run out. His successor would be the one to pay, the new President will be the one to pay, in the coin of diplomatic paralysis caused by unconscionable lack of preparedness for this President's failure to heed the warning time in 1998.

Let me move on to another article and just summarize a couple parts of it. This article was written by the Columbus Dispatch. The headline was, “No Shield: The U.S. is Subject to the Threat of Missiles.” A chilling paradox of U.S. defense strategies suggests that a Columbus sailor on a Navy ship in the Pacific would be safer from a North Korean missile attack than his parents who work in downtown. It talks in this article about the Rumsfeld assessment. But I like the conclusion of it.

This is the conclusion of that article: One thing is sure, while the United States debates the cost of an anti-missile defense, rogue nations are sparing

no expense to make the missiles threat a reality.

Finally, let me go to the Wall Street Journal and then I will leave the articles. Tuesday, February 15, just about a couple weeks ago, under the editorial called the November Missile Defense. Let me just read a couple of paragraphs from that article.

“An influential member of the Russian Duma said this month that a compromise on the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty was possible and would probably include steep cuts in the limits on strategic warheads and an end to the ban on MIRVs, missiles that can hit more than one target.

“It's absurd enough that the administration is asking Russia's permission for the United States to build a defense against terrorists or rogue states,” a system for its citizens, asking Russia's permission to do this, but, on top of that, for the United States to build a defense and to pay for it by agreeing with Russia to cut our nuclear arsenal.

What that paragraph said and what it refers to is there is a treaty called the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Back in the 1970s, the thought for nuclear deterrent was that if the two countries, the two superpowers, which were Russia and the United States, and that is all that that treaty involved and it did not imagine a North Korea or Libya or Saddam Hussein with nuclear weapons, this treaty, when it was drafted in 1972 or so, said, hey, the best way to stop a nuclear attack is for the two superpowers, Russia and the United States, to agree not to build a defense against each other, so that Russia would have the incentive not to fire missiles upon the United States because they could not defend themselves and the United States had the incentive not to fire missiles on Russia because the United States could not defend itself.

I think it was absurd. The fact is it was signed. It has been in effect. But times have changed. Times have changed dramatically. Number one, Russia is no longer the superpower that it was. Number two, China now has the capability to deliver nuclear missiles into many of the cities of the contiguous 48 States in the United States.

We now know that several countries, including India and Pakistan, have nuclear weapons. We know that these weapons can fall into the hands of the wrong people. And yet we continue in this country to have some of our leaders who resist our country's efforts and, frankly, the Republican's efforts, to put into place a missile defense system.

How many of you have ever heard of NORAD or Colorado Springs, Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs? I will give you an example of what could happen today. In Colorado Springs, Colorado, we have NORAD, the defense command system, inside our granite mountain called Cheyenne Mountain;

and within that mountain, through our intelligence services, we can detect almost anywhere in the world, well, we can detect anywhere in the world a missile launch.

Within a few seconds, we can advise the military leaders and the President of the United States that, one, a missile has been launched; two, the speed of the missile; three, the direction of the missile; four, the most likely target of the missile; and five, the most likely time of arrival of the missile. We can detect all of that anywhere in the world. The United States knows it.

But then what can they tell the President? When the President says, what do I do, the answer from the military is, there is nothing we can do, Mr. President, because we do not have a missile defense system in this country.

The CIA reported this month, again from the Wall Street Journal article, that the threat of a missile attack is higher than ever as more and more terrorists and rogue states have the ability to build or buy long-range ballistic missiles. We ought to think about that. We ought to think about the threat to this country.

Now, some people would say to you, well, we do not have the technology to defend ourselves. We do have the technology. We have come a long ways. And we had a shot, we did a test about a month ago, and the test failed. But we have discovered where the fallacies are. We have the technology available. Now remember what we are trying to do. We are trying to intercept a missile. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet, and they are going at a combined speed of several thousand miles an hour, and you have got to bring the two of them together. But we will have the technology in a very short period of time. So we need to determine what kind of missile defense system will work for this country.

Now, my opinion is, although Ronald Reagan got lots of criticism and so on, I think the best missile defense system this country can deploy over a period of time is a space-generated defense. Why? Now listen. Just listen. If we have a land-based missile defense system versus a ship-based system, where you can move the system around, if we have a land-based system, you have to destroy that missile, you cannot destroy it on the launching pad.

Let us say, for example, China launches a missile, as they have threatened to do in the last 24 hours. Let us say they launch a missile. We then have to wait for that missile. We track it as it comes across the ocean; and as it gets close to the United States, we have to start taking shots to try to bring that missile down. If we hit the missile down, it explodes over the top of us.

They may have a missile headed for Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs and we detonate it over the

city of Los Angeles. You could have nuclear fallout. There is a danger to that. And if you miss it and you continue to miss it, it is going to hit its target.

Now a space-based system, number one, is mobile. Number two, it could move over the top of China. We could then move it over Iraq. We could move it over North Korea. We have the opportunity to move the defensive system around.

The thing I like the best about it is, with the advancing technology, we could destroy the missile on its launching pad so the missile blows up in China or over China or over the ocean as it arcs over instead of over the lands of the United States.

The facts are very simple in what we face today. Number one, we are subject to a missile attack from our countries. Do not let other people joke to you about it.

I just came back from Europe. I am a member of the parliamentary arm of NATO, and the NATO delegation just came back. I was amazed that our colleagues in NATO who are afraid of Russia who stand there and criticize the United States of America for saying we have an obligation to build a missile defense system.

Well, let me tell you, Europe, you better get off dead center; and you better put in place a missile defense system because you are going to be subject to the same kind of threats that the United States is; and instead of criticizing the United States, you ought to step forward and say we are going to do what the United States is doing; we are going to defend our countries. And frankly, I think your citizens will feel you have an obligation to defend them from a missile attack.

Second of all, at these NATO meetings, I am surprised how many people think we ought to curry the favor of Russia. Russia does not have the best interest of the United States of America at hand. We should not let Russia drive the decision as to whether or not we will in this country deploy a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States. We are not one to pick a fight with Russia. In fact, we ought to tell Russia to step aside. We are not looking for a fight, but what we are saying to Russia is do not attack the United States.

We are also saying to every terrorist organization out there, at least from the ballistic missile point of view, that, if you attack the United States with a ballistic missile, we will have the capability to shoot it down. You want to know what a deterrent is? The deterrent is, if you take a shot at America, it will not work. So why take the shot? If have you got a weapon and you want to shoot your neighbor or take down your neighbor, but you cannot pierce the defense system that your neighbor has, how good is the weapon that you have?

That is what we need to do. We have an obligation to defend this country. So, again, let us come back to it. In this country, we should have no shame for being the strongest military power in the world. We should feel no shame in this country for saying that we might need to build a missile defense system to protect the people of the United States of America.

And, frankly, to our friends in Europe and to the free countries throughout the world, I have no objection whatsoever for the United States to share our technology with you so that you can defend your own countries. Join us in the battle. Join us in the effort.

□ 2030

Nothing is better for this world than peace. But peace does not come free. We have to take steps, preventative steps to preserve the peace. In doing that, the United States should proceed full speed ahead with a missile defense system. Do not buy into the argument that the technology will never be here. The technology is very close. In fact, as many of my colleagues know, two or three of the tests have been successful. The last test about a month ago was not successful but we think we know why. We think in this country that for a relatively inexpensive price, we can defend the citizens of this country from a missile attack. We ought to do it. We have that obligation. When you talk to most citizens in the United States and you say, hey, if Russia fires an incoming missile, what do we do about it, most of our citizens think we already have a missile defense system. We do not. We need to step forward and do something to protect the borders of this country.

Let me move on and talk again, I mentioned that I have just completed a NATO trip over in the European continent. I also had the opportunity on this trip to go down to the Aviano Air Base in Italy and also to visit our intelligence and our naval base in Rota, Spain. I have got to take a minute to the American people and tell them about our armed services. I could not be more proud of the military of the United States of America. We can enjoy the freedoms we have today because we have got a lot of young men and women out there standing in harm's way, and the taxpayers of this country and the citizens of this country really truly have stepped forward and given these young people the apparatus and the kind of backing that they need to go and stand in that harm's way.

When I was at the Aviano Air Base in Italy, I was so proud of our military men and women. Those people that man those aircraft, that maintain those aircraft, that handle our community relations, that do our maintenance work, all of that team down

there is exactly that. It is a team, an Air Force that works with an Army, that works with a Navy, that works with a Marine Corps.

When we went on to Rota, Spain and studied the intelligence, and by the way, the motto of that, "In God we trust, all others we monitor," I am very proud of them. Our Navy sailors out there, our intelligence-gathering operation down there, the soldiers and the sailors, the people we have in these military bases throughout the world, you have got a lot to be proud of.

Without question, the United States of America is by far the most powerful military operation in the history of the world. We are going to have some people who bash us for being strong, who criticize us for having a strong military, who say, you are trying to act like Rambo. Let me give Members an example that I gave to a classroom the other day. I went to a local high school in my district and I was talking about military and the importance of the preservation of freedom, that the best way to maintain peace is to be strong and that you have got to be number one.

I had one of the students question me, so I will use this example. There was a lady in there, I asked the young lady, I said, if you were a black belt in karate and everybody in your class knew that you were a black belt in karate and they knew that if they decided to take your lunch or if they decided to fight you, that you would break their neck, how many fights do you think you would be in under those circumstances? The answer is pretty easy. Probably none, because you are in shape, you are strong, and they know that if they dare come after you, there will be severe consequences to pay.

Thanks to the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women, and thanks to the hundreds of millions of American citizens who think the United States should be militarily strong, I think our military, relatively speaking, is in good shape. And I think we have got a lot to be proud of. I know that all of my colleagues in this room have constituents, many of whom may be serving in these bases, these overseas bases, and I know that many of them on both sides of the aisle join me in patting them on the back and saying thanks for what you do for our country. You are out there on the front lines and we are going to support you, and we need to support these people, and one way we can support them is to let them know that despite the efforts of some countries that want to see the demise, see the destruction of the United States of America, we will prevail.

Freedom will always come out on top. But freedom can never survive if you do not have freedom with strength. Freedom with strength. That is what our young men and women who serve

in the military, all men and women who serve in our military throughout the world are doing for this country. You are doing a task of which I could not thank you enough for. I wanted to let you all know how proud I am of you.

Let me talk just for a couple of minutes, move on in my subject here of what I would like to talk to you about in our next night-side chat, and that is, let us talk about the Internet. I want to tell you a little more about my experience with the Internet and what we are seeing in this what I would say the second industrial revolution of the world. It is absolutely incredible, and most all of us on this House floor have experienced it. I want to spend the better part of an hour in the next few nights talking about this new second industrial revolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks this evening by simply doing just a summary of what we discussed. Let us go in reverse order. First of all, the missile defense system. It is imperative that the United States of America prepare itself for a missile defense system. We must deploy, in the near future, a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States of America, and we should be prepared to share that technology with our friends around the world so that they do not face the threat of terrorists or rogue nations firing a missile into the United States. If you do not think this is serious, take a look at the headline in the Washington Times this morning which discusses in detail the threat from China to launch a missile attack against the United States, a threat made in the last 48 hours.

We talked before the missile defense about taxes. I have urged my Democrat colleagues to come across the aisle in a nonpartisan fashion tomorrow and support the Republican bill to do away with the cap on Social Security earnings. I urge those Democrat colleagues of mine who voted against the marriage tax penalty, in other words, to go ahead and keep the marriage tax penalty, to drop your opposition, come across the aisle and join us in support of that bill, the Republican bill to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is unfair. It is not right for us under our tax code from the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., to tax people simply because they are married. Help us get rid of that. We can do it this year. Let us do it this year.

We talked about the death tax. It is the most punitive, unfair tax in our system. There is no justification for the government to go to the estate of the deceased and take property over which the taxes have already been paid in several instances over and over again and taxing that property simply because there has been a death. It is ruining family farms, it is ruining ranches and small business in this

country. It is transferring money from our small communities in all of our respective States, it is transferring that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

Let us be a bureaucrat's worst nightmare. Let us cut out some of these taxes, the death tax. Let us get rid of the marriage penalty tax. It is not right. Let us get rid of that cap on Social Security earnings. It is time for us to reform some of these unfair elements of the tax code of this country. We can afford to do it. We have a surplus. Let us be fair to the taxpayers of this country. Let us be fair to every citizen in this country. Do not penalize them for being married. Do not penalize their estate because they died. Be fair to them on the Social Security earnings cap.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the evening with my colleagues and I look forward to further discussions.

ON BOB JONES UNIVERSITY AND HOUSE CHAPLAIN CONTROVERSIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, as an Iowa Republican Congressman who is Catholic and has been supported by Christian conservatives as well as moderates, I feel compelled to comment on the Bob Jones University and the House Chaplain controversies.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Catholic grade school in the 1950s and early 1960s. I remember what a big deal it was when JFK was elected President. In those days, there were still discriminations against Catholics and terrible stories told about my faith. To be fair, Mr. Speaker, Catholics were not always tolerant, either.

My mother came from an Irish-Catholic Democrat family. Older Catholics today still have vivid memories of anti-Catholicism. Our country's anti-Catholicism history goes way back before the virulent "Know-Nothings" just before the Civil War. In the early days of my party, the GOP did not do much to reassure Catholics that the Republican Party was a place where they could be comfortable.

But times change. Along came the Ecumenical Council, Christians of all creeds became more tolerant, and now even Garrison Keillor can make jokes about the foibles of Catholics and Lutherans in Lake Wobegone.

I certainly believe that my Lutheran mother-in-law and father-in-law have every bit as good a chance to go to heaven as my Catholic relatives do, maybe better in light of all their good works, but do not let us get into good works versus faith.

So when Governor Bush spoke at Bob Jones University and its anti-Catholicism was publicized, Catholics were reminded of past discrimination and were