look at highways. We put speed bumps to slow you down. Why? Because we do not want an incoming car. We want to slow the speed zone that school of my colleagues could think of example after example after example where we deploy a defensive mechanism to protect our health and well-being or the health and well-being of our children. That is why we have crossing guards. That is why we have tough law enforcement, so that we can preserve those things that are special to us. Now, for us not to put out a defense that protects a country that is special to us is foolish.

Now, because I cannot go into the details, but I will in the next week, I hope, I am going to have some diagrams and some charts and show you why this system will work. Now, remember that the critics of this system will tell you, first of all, we have offended China and Russia. Do not offend China and Russia. And our European colleagues, they are upset about this because of the fact we might offend Russia and China.

Who do you think is likely to use a missile against the United States? Not only those rogue countries, but do not discount China and do not discount Russia. I hope it never happens. I hope we become allies with these people. And if we do become allies, then we do not need to use a defensive missile system. You just have it in place. You never have to engage it. But the reality is somewhere in the future there is going to be a difference of opinion, a professional difference with these two countries. A rogue nation, a rogue Third World nation may not need a reason to fire a missile against us. People have been willing to blow our airplanes, they have been willing to shoot the Olympics. The Olympics have been able to set off a bomb at the Olympics. Do you not think that someday somebody may want to launch a missile against the United States?

Now, the critics, as I was saying earlier, well, the system has had too many failures. How many failures did we have before we came up with penicillin? How many failures did we have before we mastered the car? Of course you are going to have failures. The technological requirement, the explosion of knowledge and expertise to have two objects that are traveling 41⁄2 miles a second, to be able to bring them together and to be able to intercept right on the spot, you cannot afford to miss. You do not get two shots; you get only one shot on that intercept over the weekend. It worked. I can assure you that our European colleagues and that the people, the leadership in Russia and China are saying, wow, American technology.

By gosh, America, think about Russia and China simply by coming up with a defensive mechanism. Why put all your money in an offensive missile system if the country that you are concerned about, the United States, has the ability to stop them? You want to know what is geophysical growth in this world? It is the ability to make them an ineffective weapon. But how do you make them an ineffective weapon if you do not have some type of shield against them? What we are talking about with our missile defense system is a shield, a shield that not only protects the United States but a shield that we would share with our allies. Frankly, a shield that the more it is shared, the less likely that there will ever be a nuclear attack because the missiles, which are very expensive and the technology that is required is substantial, these missiles become pretty darn ineffective. How could somebody legitimately argue that we should not deploy a system that will make missiles less effective?

Mr. Speaker, we have a heavy burden on our shoulders. That heavy burden requires that we protect. We have an inherent responsibility to protect the citizens of this country from somebody who decides they want to launch a missile against us. This is not starting a war. It is not starting an arms race. That is rhetoric. And even if it was not rhetoric, are we going to let them bully us into not defending our citizens? Members, we are elected to the United States Congress in part to not only protect the Constitution but to protect the people of this country.

We have defined our obligations to the people and the safety and the welfare of this country. It is in every bill we pass. A part of doing that requires us to deploy, in my opinion, a missile defense system so that the United States and its allies. 20 years from now, I want them to look back and say, gosh, those missiles, that is what used to scare them back then. Today, nobody could fire a missile anywhere because you could stop it in flight or better yet you could stop it on the launching pad.

So there is a lot to think about with the missile defensive system. But the basic philosophy, the basic thought ought to receive a "yes" vote from everybody in these Chambers. Everybody in the Chambers, every one of my colleagues ought to be in support of a missile defense system. I think you owe it to the constituents that you represent.

In summary, we need a missile defensive system for this country. Technologically we are going to be able to do it. Sure it is going to be expensive. The airplane was expensive when we deployed it. Landing a man on the Moon was expensive. Sending a ship to Mars was expensive. There are lots of things the technology requires is expensive. Conservation is going to be expensive for us but it works. And this missile technology worked this weekend, and we have years of testing left; but it will work and it will be a lifesaver for hundreds of millions of people in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues had an opportunity to listen to my comments on the American West. I am proud to be an American citizen, but I am deeply proud of being able to have been born and raised in the American West. I hope all of my colleagues have that opportunity to experience what I have been able to spend an entire lifetime experiencing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. KERN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material;

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORA of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGER, for 5 minutes, today and July 18 and 19.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Mica, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 360. An act to honor Paul D. Coverdell.
S. 360. An act for the relief of Rita Mirembe Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembe).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 18, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: