

defend themselves from a missile attack.

But, do you know what? That wall has cracked. Do you know what? There are countries over there in Europe saying, wait a minute. You know, I think it is nice to bash the United States of America, but, you know, they got a point here. This missile defensive system, you know, it might work. In fact, after this test 2 weeks ago that they did, this thing is going to work, and the United States is going to have a system that defends their citizens from attack. Maybe we ought to do the same thing.

Who is saying that? Look at the United Kingdom, the Brits. They are saying, hey, we support the United States.

Take a look at Italy this last weekend. Take a look at the comments from Italy. Their leader has said in Italy, we strongly support and strongly advocate the United States of America building a defensive missile system.

Take a look at Spain. They are not far behind.

Do you know what is going to happen? As the rest of the world has in the past, as they are amazed by American technology, they are going to come on board. My prediction is 15 years from now, almost every Nation in the world will have some type of missile defensive system. And what happens when that happens? What happens when that happens? You know what? It takes that very deadly, lethal weapon, the missile; it significantly lowers the risk of impact, negative impact, from that missile. Because what good are missiles, especially in any kind of volume, if a defensive missile system will stop them from being effective, or, even more importantly, if you have a defensive missile system that will destroy the missile on its launching pad in the country that wants to fire it, so it does devastating damage to that country?

You know, there is not a lot of incentive to fire a missile against the United States, if you know the United States can pick it up, fire a laser, and stop that missile on its launching pad. It kind of makes short history of the people around your launching pad.

There are so many things that are essentially common sense in missile defense. Common sense in missile defense. Think about it. Go out and talk to your constituents this weekend. First of all, ask your constituents, find out how many of them today think we have some type of protection. It is surprising. A lot of our constituents think that today we can defend ourselves against a missile defense attack.

□ 2215

We cannot. Once you get by that with your constituents this week, sit down, put your partisanship aside, and for the liberal segment here, for the liberal people, put that aside, just for a few

moments and ask the people, person-to-person, all politics aside, person-to-person, do you think it would be a good idea for this Nation to defend itself against an intentional or accidental launch against our citizens?

Guess what? You will get a resounding yes and probably followed by a comment, why have we not done it already? What are you guys doing? I thought we had a defensive system in place.

That is what the American people are saying to us. We are their leaders. We are not kings. We have been elected by these people in a representative government to come up here. We have fiduciary duties. That is the highest responsibility of duty to our Nation and to its people, to do what will protect the public interest and will protect our country and allow our country to remain strong into the future.

Right now, the number one issue at the very front is a missile defense system.

In conclusion, I ask every one of my colleagues, regardless of what State you are from, whether you are from Massachusetts or Florida or Oregon or Colorado, that you step forward and start giving political support so that we can then advance the technological support to implement, as President George W. Bush has asked, a missile defensive system to protect the citizens and future generations of this country. It is our responsibility. It is not our neighbor's responsibility. It is our responsibility. I hope each and every one of us carries it out to the fullest extent.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-163) on the resolution (H. Res. 209) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUMENAUER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 4 p.m. today and the balance of the week on account of emergency family business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 26, 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:

3053. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment No. 1 [FV-00-706-FR] received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3054. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Residues Derived Through Conventional Breeding From Sexually Compatible Plants of Plant Incorporated Protectants (Formerly Plant-Pesticides) [OPP-300368B; FRL-6057-6] (RIN 2070-AC02) received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3055. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for Residues of Nucleic Acids that are Part of Plant Incorporated Protectants (Formerly Plant-Pesticides) [OPP-300371B; FRL-6057-5] (RIN 2070-AC02) received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.