Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, I was with a group of 15 Members of Congress who were visiting the American cemetery at Normandy, France. There we saw the graves of more than 9,000 men and women who gave their lives not just for the liberation of Europe but in defense of an idea: democracy, and all that it stands for. What democracy stands for is forever enshrined in our Constitution. These men and women who died for an idea, and the patriots who came before and after them, understand that idea.

I brought back these two flags, this one especially, the American flag. The other is the flag of France. I hold it here to remind myself of what others gave so that I may be here today in this country which protects individual rights and liberties more than any other country in the world. Understand, though, this flag itself has little inherent value. It is cloth attached to a piece of wood. The value of this cloth is in the messages that it conveys and the country that it stands for and the people who have fought and died to keep this flag and others like it flying high and free. Those men who died storming Omaha and Utah Beaches did not fight for a flag; they fought for the idea that our flag represents. This amendment, in my view, would diminish what those brave men and women fought and died for.

The last time Congress debated a similar bill, retired four-star general and current Secretary of State Colin Powell said that he would not support amending the Constitution to protect the flag. In fact, General Powell said, “I would not amend that great shield of democracy to hammer a few miscreants. The flag will be flying proudly long after they have slunk away.”

We are a Nation to risk our commitment to freedom by endeavoring to legislate patriotism. If we tamper with our Constitution because of the antics of a handful of thoughtless and obnoxious people, we will have reduced the flag as a symbol of freedom, not enhanced it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule. The American flag serves a unique role as the symbol of the ideals upon which America was founded. It is a national asset that helps to preserve our unity, our freedom, and our liberty as Americans. This symbol represents our country’s many hard-won freedoms paid for with the lives of thousands and thousands of patriots and soldiers who gave their lives in this Nation’s history. For years, 48 States and the District of Columbia enforced laws prohibiting the physical desecration of the American flag. In 1989, the Texas v. Johnson ruling, the United States Supreme Court in a 5–4 vote overturned what until then had been settled law and ruled that flag desecration as a means of public protest is an act of free expression protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. A year later, essentially reiterating its Johnson ruling, the Court in U.S. v. Eichman, another 5–4 ruling, by the way, struck down a Federal statute prohibiting the physical desecration of the flag despite the court’s own conclusion that the statute was content-neutral.

In the years since these two rulings were handed down, 49 States have passed resolutions calling upon this Congress to pass a flag protection amendment and send it back to the States for ratification. Although a constitutional amendment is the only alternative but to amend the U.S. Constitution’s conclusions in the Johnson and the Eichman cases have left the American people with no other alternative but to amend the Constitution to protect Congress the authority to prohibit the physical desecration of the American flag. The amendment enjoys strong support throughout the Nation, indicating that it will likely be adopted by the States should this Congress approve the language.

I urge my colleagues to approve this rule and move to full debate and pass H.J. Res. 36.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the rule. Mr. Speaker, this rule allows the well-settled law of this nation to be called into question at the whim of special interest groups who disagree with the value we Americans place on freedom of speech. By allowing this debate to occur, the leadership has signaled its intention to favor its ideological companions without regard for legal precedent or constitutional muster.

In 1989 the Supreme Court was faced with a difficult balancing test. Texas v. Johnson, 491 U.S. 397, forced the court to examine whether the interests of this nation in protecting the symbol of its freedom are outweighed by the individual freedoms of its citizens. The Court did not shy away from this dilemma, holding that the government cannot prohibit the expression of an idea society finds offensive, and that national laws must be approached only after much reflection, the U.S. Supreme Court’s conclusions in the Johnson and the Eichman cases have left the American people with no other alternative but to amend the Constitution to protect Congress the authority to prohibit the physical desecration of the American flag. The amendment enjoys strong support throughout the Nation, indicating that it will likely be adopted by the States should this Congress approve the language.

I urge my colleagues to approve this rule and move to full debate and pass H.J. Res. 36.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the rule. Mr. Speaker, the rule allows the well-settled law of this nation to be called into question at the whim of special interest groups who disagree with the value we Americans place on freedom of speech. By allowing this debate to occur, the leadership has signaled its intention to favor its ideological companions without regard for legal precedent or constitutional muster. However, in this circumstance, that is exactly my point. The Supreme Court has spoken in an unambiguous way about the balancing of interests between the flag and the rights of individuals. On two separate occasions the right of individuals to speak has won. Instead of honoring the decisions of the Court, and thereby respecting the separation of powers within the federal government, the House leadership instead chose to play politics with the law. On this day we begin subjecting legal opinions to the whims of the legislative branch in a new and chilling way. Any coalition with close enough ties to the majority might hope to see their pet project ratified as an amendment to our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, not only this resolution, but also this very debate can cast a long shadow over our long history of separation of powers. I contend it is our rights as citizens and our legal system that suffer. I oppose this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING MILITARY AND DEFENSE CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SUCCESSFUL BALLISTIC MISSILE TEST

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 195), commending the United States military and defense contractor personnel responsible for a successful in-flight ballistic missile defense interceptor test on July 14, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas more than 35,000 Americans contributed to the successful test, including the Air Force team which launched the target.
from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The road to Saturday’s successful intercept has been long and arduous; and we have miles to go before we can say we have gotten there, even gotten to the point where we have what we call a limited defense system capable of defending us against rogue missile attacks, simple rogue missile attacks, or perhaps unauthorized or accidental strike. We have a long way to go, and we should not let the euphoria of this moment obscure that fundamental fact.

Indeed, if we have learned anything since March 23, 1983, when Mr. Reagan made his speech and proposed what became the Strategic Defense Initiative, it is that missile defense is not likely, unfortunately, to make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete. It is enhancement deterrence, but it is unlikely to replace deterrence. That is a fundamental point.

Nevertheless, I think enhancing deterrence is a worthy goal. I think that if we can prove through testing, like the tests that we held Saturday night, rigorous testing, that gets more and more demanding and challenging with each test, that eventually takes on countermeasures as well, we can prove after this kind of rigorous testing that we have a system worthy of deploying, that will give us limited protection against the kind of threat I just described, it is worth deploying; and I think it is worth observing what was accomplished Saturday night, because it moves us in that direction.

Let me emphasize that testing is critical. I have been a long-time supporter of that. We do not want to fool ourselves into thinking that we have got a system that can take on this daunting challenge, we can, in fact, it can easily be overcome or is not capable of what it is touted to be. We do not want to fool ourselves by deploying some kind of scarecrow system.

We associate ballistic missile defense with Mr. Reagan’s speech on March 23, 1983; but in truth both administrations, the Clinton administration, the Reagan administration, the Bush administration, going all the way back to Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1967, have supported missile defense in one form or another.

Indeed, the safeguard system originated in 1967 with President Johnson’s administration. It was taken to the point that it was deployed. The Spartan system failed a number of times; but it is now impotent and obsolete. It is truly extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.
We kept spending money on ballistic missile defense in Democratic and Republican administrations. There were systems that had been forgotten, like the BAMBI, which was a boost-phase intercepter, which was abandoned because it could not be proven to be invulnerable to counterattacks in fixed orbits in space.

Indeed, that past to Saturday night is littered with systems that simply could not meet the mettle. We have spent a lot of money, $60 billion since 1983, to get where we have gotten; but we have had some successes, and if I think it is right to take some time aside to savor those success.

I think the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) would agree we should not forget that this was not the first intercept with this system. Indeed, making the F-22 meet its test years ago under the Clinton administration. This was a Clinton administration system. They in effect brought the technology to the point where it could be tested Saturday night and proven to work. The story of those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, when the test was concluded, General Kadish, who is doing a commendable job as the manager of this program, a very practical, pragmatic man, told everybody there, all the press there, when they asked him what should we deduce from the success we just had, he said if you just lower the level a little bit and let us proceed in a rigorous disinterested way, let us not get too excited about this thing, let us do our work, we think we can prove to you that we have got something worthy of deploying.

I think it is very, very fitting and very, very appropriate for us to rise today to commend the thousands of people who have made this a success.

Mr. Speaker, I think we might commend a lot of other people in the so-called military-industrial complex, which is what we call them when we are usually disappointed, when we are usually confounded by the bills they present us; when we are usually suspicious of what they are up to.

When they succeed like Saturday night, we call them the arsenal of America. There are a lot of people out there working in the arsenal of America, whether by profession or by choice, who go to work everyday in various aspects of this job. They went three times as fast as an ordinary high-powered rifle, and having those little bullets collide in midair.

So there are successes, and we should commend them for their enormous technological capability, their perseverance and ability that brought us to this point to Saturday night. However, the PAC-3.

To put this system up, we have to know at bat what the pitcher is going to throw. But here we have this system, right here and right here, and twice we missed it; and we are out here congratulating.

I do not say anything about the employees. Boeing has worked on all kinds of these programs, but we never came out and congratulated them the first time they succeeded. This is simply to build up a momentum in this society for a system which, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) says, is driving the Chinese and the Russians together.

To put this system up, we have to tear up the ABM Treaty. The Russians say do not do it; it has kept peace for 50 years. The Chinese have said do not do it.

Why are we out here whipping up the public to believe this is a good idea? I am going to vote against the resolution; not against the people, but against the purpose of it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think one aspect of this resolution that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I have coauthored is that it does not speak to the politics of missile defense or the ABM Treaty or the relationship of the Soviet Union and the United States. What it does speak to is a technological challenge that we gave lots of people, many of whom make great sacrifices to work in the uniform of the United States or who go to work everyday in various places around this country, working either for the government or for private business, whether they are physicists or engineers or blue collar workers, working on a program that I would state again is monumental in its success.

Once again, both of these systems were going three times faster than a high-powered rifle bullet, and they collided 148 miles above the earth, some 4,800 miles off into the Pacific, an extraordinary thing. It is like having somebody stand in San Diego with a high-powered rifle shooting to the center of the country and somebody standing in New York doing the same thing, except the high-powered rifles really went three times as fast as an ordinary high-powered rifle, and having those little bullets collide in midair.

Now, I think that is an extraordinary thing. Indeed, it is something that a
knowing that there are going to be impossible: hitting a bullet with a bullet. But, I think if we look at the resolution, Mr. Speaker, which is sponsored from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I have cosponsored, it does not say that this is the end of the line and that somehow we have now achieved absolute defense against incoming ballistic missiles.

What it does say and I quote: "The House of Representatives understands that testing of ballistic missile defenses will involve many failures as well as successes in the future. The House of Representatives, nonetheless, commends the effort and ingenuity of those who worked so hard to make the test a success."

Mr. Speaker, when Billy Mitchell came back to the Coolidge administration in the 1920s, one of his messages was that we were a land power, whether Americans liked it or not. He recommended to a then Republican administration that they spend a lot of money developing air power. Well, we had a number of budget hawks who did not want to do that, and we did not do as much as we should have. As a result of that, we were not as ready as we should have been for World War II.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, and particularly since the Gulf War when Americans were killed for the first time with ballistic missiles fired by Saddam Hussein, we realize that we live now not in the age of air power but in the age of missiles. When we look at the array of military systems across the board that we have, and the gentleman from South Carolina and I work on a daily basis with lots of other great Democrat and Republican members of the Committee on Armed Services, we know that we build systems to stop ships, we build systems to stop submarines. We build systems to handle tactical aircraft, fighter aircraft. We build systems to take down bombers. We build systems to handle and that can handle capably just about every type of offensive weapon that an enemy could throw at us, except one.

So the one question I have always asked the Secretary of Defense when he appears before me and the other members of the Committee on Armed Services: Could you today, could you today stop a single incoming ICBM, Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, coming into an American city? And the answer always is, whether it is a Democrat or Republican administration: No; today we cannot do that.

Well, that is what we are working toward, Democrats and Republicans, people in uniform and people out of uniform, is to achieve that capability.

I think that it is very important for us to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I put this language in, acknowledging that there are going to be failures in this testing program as well as successes and the difficulty of this program. We are going to have decoys. That is, when the offensive missile puts its warhead off of the booster system, it is going to have perhaps decoys that would attract the interceptor missile; and the interceptor missile would end up hitting decoys, not being able to discriminate between a decoy and a real warhead. We have to work that problem. We have to be able to handle that problem.

We are going to have, in some cases, perhaps evasive maneuvers. We are going to have lots of problems. We are going to have in some cases multiple shots; that is, a number of warheads coming in that we have to handle at one time. We may have to handle the effects of a nuclear burst at some point.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the alternative is for us to do nothing. The old saying is, "You don't do anything until you can do everything, so you do nothing;" and I think that is an inappropriate position for the United States to take. We should build a defense and not try to develop this interception capability, this will be the first time in this century that the United States has looked at a weapon, at an offensive weapon, and decided that they are not going to try to learn how to defend against it. I think that would be a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just take a minute to comment on the legislative history of this resolution.

I first learned of this resolution when I got a call yesterday afternoon from the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on the golf course. He had his staff busy at work on this, and he wanted to send me a copy of it. Over the evening, we proposed a number of changes to the preamble and to the resolving clause. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), to his credit, acknowledged our purpose, which was to confine this resolution to the purpose at hand; that is, commending those who have accomplished what is a daunting feat. It is done every day, but this is a particularly daunting feat. It was a big challenge. So we want to send them a message of commendation.

We took out references as to how much we should infer or read from this particular success as to whether or not we would one day have a big missile field over the country so that those who disagree could at least send a word of commendation to the people who have so ably pulled off this test.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for working with me, but I want to say to my side that this is a much pared-back resolution which we resolved through genuine compromise and I agreed to cosponsor about 1 minute before this debate began.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was a good decision, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Although I am proud of the men and women in our military service and those working for defense contractors who were part of this success, I have to rise in opposition to the resolution for several reasons, first, in terms of process.

As the gentleman from South Carolina said, this resolution was never considered by the Committee on Armed Services. It was just brought to the attention of the minority yesterday at 5 o'clock. There was no consultation with the minority until then. I think many Members really do not have a grip on the implications of what it is we are voting on.

Second, precedent. This resolution commends the U.S. military personnel and contractors for the apparently successful national missile defense tests of last Saturday. BMDO says it will conduct 10 more tests in the next year. So do we pass a resolution each time it hits? Should we pass a resolution each time it misses? Because there are some Members, who would do that. And although I am not one of them. Would the majority support their right to offer such a resolution? What kind of precedent are we setting? Will we feel compelled to vote every time a major weapons system passes a milestone? The F-22, for example. Why not pass a resolution every time a community gets a COPS grant or a housing grant?

My third objection is substance. General Kadish, in the post-test briefing, cautioned that scientists could need months to finish analyzing the test results: "We do not know for certain that every objective was met," he said. "In all probability, some of them were not." I believe it is irresponsible to put the House on record before there has been a full analysis.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) on the Republican side, who has worked on this issue for years, and I do not see eye to eye on missile defense very much, but together we sent a "Dear Colleague" last week urging Members not to rush to judgment on the test results, positive or negative. We quoted General Kadish: "It is not my belief it is helpful to overplay our successes or failures." This resolution runs counter to the spirit of his plea. It is not productive. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I can actually agree on something related to missile defense, we hope a few other Members will listen.

Finally, politics. This resolution will not help solve NMD's technological
Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to Secretary Rumsfeld today which cites reports that certain modifications were made to the test vehicle and warhead to greatly increase the likelihood of success.

In the letter, I state that Congress must know which modifications were made, how they contributed to the success, and the likelihood that such modifications could be used in a real engagement of the missile defense system.

I asked if the kill vehicle or dummy warhead employed a GPS, global positioning system, and if so, at what stages was the GPS system used.

I asked, did the kill vehicle or dummy warhead employ a C-band radar system, and if so, at what stages was the C-band radar system used.

I asked, did either the GPS system or the kill vehicle or dummy warhead employ any tracking system, such as an infrared tracking system, and if so, at what stages was the GPS system used.

I asked, did the software modifications to the tracking computer or infrared tracking system provide information to the kill vehicle not normally available in a real-life scenario.

I think before Congress acts on such a resolution, it would be nice to get an answer to some of these questions. Otherwise, what we have is a situation where we are into a dark fantasyland, where the threat of a nuclear strike against the United States is being exaggerated or it is nonexistent.

Our task as Nation and as a world should be to get rid of existing nuclear arms, to stop nuclear proliferation to new countries, to deal with arms control and arms elimination.

We have people who are actually predicting nuclear war in the future. We are back to the days of the Cold War. We have a responsibility to work for peace, not through nuclear proliferation, not through nuclear rearmament, not through building bigger and better ballistic missile systems. We should defeat the ABM treaty or the nonproliferation treaty, but through the painstaking work, the daily work of diplomacy, of human relations, of seeking cooperation between nations.

It is fascinating that we have technology to restart the arms race, that we have technology which violates the nonproliferation treaty, that we have technology which violates the ABM treaty. But it would be even more fascinating if we used this opportunity to start a new dawn of peace where we get rid of nuclear weapons once and for all.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a resolution commending defense contractors and the military for the ballistic missile defense test of July 14, 2001. This test, not the personnel, mind you, but this test, is really something to condemn, not to commend.

The defense industry and the Pentagon have now passed their half-scaled-down, simplified test. This is really nothing to celebrate. When our schools have that failure rate, the President wants to close them down. The military-industrial complex is apparently held to a much lower standard.

More fundamentally, this test moves us ever closer to violating the anti-ballistic missile treaty which we signed and ratified the ABM because we recognize that missile defense systems could destabilize more than they could protect.

We cannot go back on our word and abandon this treaty. Peace is really our national security. We cannot be a nation that approaches nonproliferation while really practicing escalation, and that is what this test has taken us down the road to. Instead of leading the way towards responsible disarmament, we are unraveling arms control agreements.

We must be a nation that decides where we really want to go. Do we want to go down a path to a new arms...
race, or forward to a real post-Cold War peace?

Attempts to build a national missile defense system are really not enhancing our national security, they are destabilizing the world, which I heard over and over again just 2 weeks ago from our European allies. Violating treaties does not make the world a safer place.

Congress should not be celebrating spending billions and billions of dollars on national missile defense. We should be standing by our treaty agreements, we should be working to end nuclear proliferation, and we should be spending that money on vital national needs, such as health care, education, and housing.

Yes, there are dangers in the world, but missile defense systems will spark new and old rivalries. They will also entangle us in international politics and violate treaties.

We have troops around the world, and we shipped most of those Scud missiles were not killed by tanks, they were not killed by machine gun fire, they were not killed by fighter attack aircraft, they were killed by ballistic missiles.

Those Scud missiles were going faster than a bullet, and we blew up some Patriot missiles, defending against those incoming Scuds. We got some, we missed some. There is a discrepancy as to how many we got and how many we missed. But at the end, when the smoke cleared, 28 Americans were dead and 100 were wounded.

We have troops around the world, and at some point, and I think we have reached that point, we have to acknowledge that we are squarely in the age of missiles. Missiles will kill Americans in the future, I think we can predict that, unless we build defenses.

The idea that unless we build a perfect defense, we do not have any defense, does not make any sense. Certainly some of those young people who were in North Africa who were killed, some of those weapons, some of those Scuds were knocked out of the sky before they could kill Americans.

We have slow missiles, the Scuds; we have medium-speed missiles, the missiles like the SS–20s; and we have very high-speed missiles, like the Minute man missiles. They are the target we shot at over the Pacific.

It is very clear these tests are going to get tougher. They have to get tougher to replicate what we think will be operational conditions. We are going to have lots of misses in the future. But for us to not pursue this capability to defend our troops and the people in American cities would be disregarding our obligation as a Congress of the United States to preserve national security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, in the euphoria after the test, General Kadish warned against reading too much into this single test. He warned specifically that we have a long way to go before we have a system we can deploy.

I think, at this moment and in days ahead, we should bear his caution in mind. We are still a long way from the beginning of the end. If this test shows that the technology for an operational system is within our reach, and that is good news. This was a daunting feat. That is why I support this commendation. But it is not yet within our grasp.

We should continue with this ground-based system, we should commend the people who were developing it, testing it. They are working hard, and they deserve our gratitude. But we should not fool ourselves. Challenges remain. This system should be held to the same standards as any other weapons system before we make the decision to deploy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would probably be appropriate to quote Churchill after North Africa at this point, who was asked, “What does this signify?” He said “It is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. It is, perhaps, the beginning of the beginning.”

Maybe we are a bit farther ahead than that, but that is where we stand. We should not get too carried away or euphoric about one single test. There are many more to come.

This resolution itself says we had better be prepared for failures, because they are likely to happen, particularly if the program does what we have asked it to do, and that is begin with the simple and move to the complex: add with each test more rigor, more difficulty, countermeasures, and other things.

We are going to see failures before we have a system that we can judge.

One further point, and it is a critical point. This system, the ballistic missile system and all its components, is different from other weapons systems in the sense that it is affected and controlled by a treaty called the ABM treaty of 1972.

This treaty, some support it, some do not, but in any event, it is an integral part of our arms control initiatives with the Soviet Union and today with Russia. It underlies START II, it makes possible START III, and we must be careful not to create a rupture with Russia over the provisions of the treaty. In anything we do, we should try to make it treaty compliant, or at least bring it into compliance by a mutual amendment to the treaty.

If we deploy this system and create a rupture in our relationship with Russia, if we abrogate the ABM treaty and simply walk away from it defiantly, we can see the Russians, as they have threatened, pull out of START II, forego START III, and call an end to cooperative threat reduction, which has removed hundreds of warheads that were a menacing threat to us.

If we did that, if that was the end result, then the net result for our national security would be a greater threat and not a lesser threat as a result of deploying ballistic missile defense. Those sober words need to be borne in mind as we pass this celebratory resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kucinich).

Mr. KUCINICH. I think we can all appreciate the work of all Federal employees who work in defense-related matters, but that is not really what this resolution’s subtext is about. This is an attempt to approve a process which violates the ABM treaty and which, in its essence, will restart the arms race.

There is no reason for the United States and Russia and China to be engaged in a showdown over nuclear arms. We need to get rid of nuclear weapons, we need to enforce our arms treaties, and we need not to move forward with this war, which wastes taxpayer dollars and which diverts us from the necessary work of building a new peace in our world.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I think it is interesting, the debate over this system, as to whether the science is there or not, because I recall a time 30 years ago when President Kennedy, with great courage, said, “We will put a man on the moon by the end of this decade,” and we did not have any of that science, but we achieved it.

When this Nation can put itself behind a project, it will succeed.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude this debate, we are saying to the men and women of the Armed Services, to the men and women of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, and all those folks in big and small businesses, the 35,000 people that made this test a success, good work. It was a job well done. It was a joy to see us roll up our sleeves and go on to the next challenge.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members
The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today. Votes will be taken in following order: S. 360, by the yeas and nays; H. Res. 195, by the yeas and nays. The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the House will proceed to the consideration of Senate Bill S. 360, National Emergency with respect to Sierra Leone. The motion to suspend the rules, offered by Mr. Hunter, to proceed to the consideration of the Senate Bill S. 360, is in order.

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President:

_MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT_