church pastored by Reverend Willy Jones. That church is still riveted by the friendship shown by Chaplain Ford, the good humor, and the ability to interact with different faiths.

We know that he is among the angels, and we offer to him and his family our deepest sympathy and our deepest love.

Madam Speaker I wanted to address tonight several issues. First of all, let me do one that is particularly joyous for me in this time of technology and web pages and communications by e-mail.

Let me congratulate First Lady Laura Bush for an exciting weekend, which I am sorry that I missed; but I hope it will be captured around the Nation. That is the National Book Festival; 25,000 persons enjoyed literary art, enjoyed the reading of famous authors actually reading from books. I hope this will take off around the Nation so that this Nation never lacks its appreciation for the written word, for wonderful books written by our national authors. Let us do this around our Nation. I thank Laura Bush, the first lady, for an outstanding job.

Now, I hope that this viewpoint is one that will be based upon the concern for saving lives. In February of this year, 2001, I came to the floor of the House and acknowledged that I believe that the policy toward the Middle East by this administration is wrongheaded and misdirected. I said that because many times engagement in diplomacy is painful. Many times it results in failure. But it is often utilized as the only vehicle and only tool to save lives.

Much laughter and criticism was given to President Clinton in the last days of his administration as he engaged in shuttle diplomacy between Camp David and Washington, D.C. and the country of Israel. I did not find it humorous because it was an attempt to save lives.

Since we have disengaged with the Mideast, all that has resulted is the loss of lives, bloodshed for women, children, and men, both in the Palestinian people and in the Israeli people.

Can anyone believe that our disengagement has been victorious? Does anyone believe in reality that one can stand off to the corner and point fingers and tell ''those guys'' to get to the table of empowerment and peace? No. It is well known that the United States carries a heavy stick with respect to these particular countries, and it also is well known that the United States' good will is very important in bringing these two disparate worlds together.

Day after day after day, Arab militants and then Israelis on the other side are engaging in a bloody battle. This is a war. This has accelerated to more than a conflict. I believe our foreign policy on this issue is wrong.

It pains me, as we move to some of the humblest and most sacred times in the Jewish community here in the United States and across the world, two of their most important holidays over the next 2 to 3 weeks in the United States will be honored, and of course in Israel and around the world. Would it not be a wonderful tribute then to say that we are reengaged, that we want to save lives, that we want them to come to the peace table, and we say, ''Stop the accusations, Arafat come to the table, Sharon come to the table, release yourselves from the strictures of hatred, and begin to talk about real issues of saving lives and living harmoniously together''?

I believe this is an enormously important issue and would ask the President and the administration and his advisers to wake up and understand the importance of U.S. involvement.

Let me conclude by answering my colleague's comments on 245(i). As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, it is wrong headed to interpret this particular legislative initiative as a general amnesty. All it is is because the Immigration and Naturalization Service made a mistake. They made a mistake with a date, they made a mistake administratively.

This is simply to allow those who are in the process of filing for legalization 10, 15 years ago, to reactivate their applications.

□ 1900

Many of these people are family members who need to be reunited. Many of these people come from many parts of the world. It is not isolated to people from Mexico. It is not isolated to people from South America. It includes people from Poland, from France, from India, from all continents around the world. It is simply an administrative snafu which is allowing people who legally apply to reapply and to follow the legal process. It is not an affirmation. It means the INS has to make a decision one way or the other.

THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY; MISSILE DEFENSE, AND SEX AND INTERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, this evening I want to talk about a number of different issues with my colleagues.

As my colleagues know, we have just come back from our August recess and there are some issues that have come up. First of all, I hope later in the week to talk a little more about natural resources and talk about our public lands. I was up in Alaska and had the privilege to enjoy Mt. McKinley and Denali National Park. Beautiful. Alaska, as we all know, is a great, great State and I learned a lot on my trip up there.

I also spent a good deal of time back in my district, the Third Congressional District of Colorado, which many of my colleagues know includes almost all of the mountains of Colorado. In fact, the Third Congressional District of Colorado geographically is larger than the State of Florida. And of the 67 or so mountains above 14,000 feet in the United States, 53 of them are located in my district. It is the highest district in the Nation. As a result, there are a lot of things that are particular to the Third Congressional District not found in many other districts in the country.

Seventy-five percent of the land in this Nation, including Alaska, 75 percent of the land above 10,000 feet is in the Third Congressional District of Colorado. The Third Congressional District contains the majority or the largest amount of ski resorts of any congressional district in the United States, world-renowned resorts in Aspen, Colorado; Vail, Telluride, Durango, Steamboat, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So I hope later this week to get an opportunity to address my colleagues on some of the issues like public lands, like water, like wilderness areas, national parks, and national monuments because these issues are very important.

But tonight I want to talk about a couple of other subjects. I would like to visit for a few minutes about the President and the budget and the economic situation that we are in. As many of my colleagues know, I serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, and that committee is working very hard on both sides of the aisle to try to figure out some answers to what would be the appropriate government interaction in regards to the economy.

I would also like to talk about missile defense and the importance of missile defense. And the third thing I would like to talk about, and which I will start out at the very beginning with, is sex and interns.

I have come under a great deal of criticism in the last month when I have addressed the issues of inappropriate relationships between a United States Congressman, and I am speaking generically here, no specific Congressman, but speaking generically of the United States Congress and exactly what its ethics rules are in regards to inappropriate relationships with interns. That, I have received criticism for.

I have had people across the Nation, editorials across the Nation asking why would I think we need an ethical rule in the United States Congress to say that a sexual relationship with an intern is inappropriate? Well, we need that rule in the United States Congress for the same reason that we find that very rule, that very specific content in

rules in every educational institution in the United States.

I defy any of my colleagues and I defy any of those editorial boards to pinpoint for me one high school in this Nation, to show me one college in this Nation that allows a teacher or a professor to have a sexual relationship or an inappropriate relationship with a student. They do not allow it. A teacher, a professor who engages in a sexual relationship with a student, they are gone. They are fired.

It was this body not very many years ago, as a result of Tailhook in the United States Navy, that addressed this with the Department of Defense and the executive agencies. They have very specific rules in our military. A commanding officer engaging in a sexual relationship with a consenting adult, an adult who is consenting but falls below them in the hierarchy of command, is gone. That fast. It does not matter. Why? Because they have a position of authority over the person they are having that sexual relationship with.

That is exactly what we have in the United States Congress. We have a position of authority over these interns. But in a lot of these cases these interns, in almost all these cases these interns are students. Now, sure, by the technical definition, these students are adults. I do not know what it is in D.C., maybe 15 or 16. So, theoretically, if they are above statutory rape age, 15 or 16 years old, they are an adult.

So some of these editorials and even some of my colleagues have said to me, hey, they are grown up. Give me a break. Why does the field of medicine, doctors, prohibit themselves from having sex with patients? It is considered an inappropriate relationship and it is in their ethics. They can lose their medical license for an inappropriate relationship. Why does the clergy prohibit it? Because a clergy person, a priest or a minister, is not supposed to have an inappropriate relationship with a parishioner. It is against their ethical rules, their in-house rules. Why does the legal profession, lawyers, prohibit by the ethics of their bars their members from having an inappropriate relationship with their clients? It is because they exercise a great deal of influence over people.

Now, what I have proposed, contrary to some of the news reports across the Nation, is not precedent setting. It is not some novel idea that I came up with. It is simply taking the language that applies in the military, that applies in the clergy, that applies in the teaching profession, that applies in the medical profession, that applies in the legal profession and apply it to the one institution in this country that has no ethical rule about it, to the best of my knowledge, and that is the United States Congress.

I am not saying going out there and trying to legislate morality. My proposal is not a piece of legislation. I have not introduced a bill. What I have asked is the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to give me an opinion as to whether or not under current ethics regulations, and it is clearly not clear, but under current ethics regulations if this type of relationship is prohibited. And if it is not prohibited, I have asked for an in-house rule, not legislation. We are not trying to draft a bill. I am not trying to legislate morality, I am just trying to say the same rules that prohibit us from misuse of government credit cards, for example, or things like that, that we put this in there as well. Just like every other major institution.

Now, remember, these interns are in the United States Congress. First of all, the internship program is what I care the most about, and I want to see that program preserved. It makes me sick that the late night talk shows spend a good deal of their jokes about interns in Washington, D.C. I have seen editorial cartoons across the Nation, and one in particular where they show an intern in a life raft, and I saw this the other day, an intern in a life raft, and her legs are hanging over the side. Underneath the life raft are a bunch of sharks and they have Congressmen as the names for the sharks.

I can say to the parents who have interns back here, that this is an exception, this type of inappropriate conduct with an intern. This is a program that has made many changes in young people's lives, and these are young people. These students and interns are not hard to determine who they are. Back here in the United States Congress, interns have separate IDs. Interns have a separate pay classification. They are back here as students of government. The interns are students of government and we are the teachers. We as the Congressmen exercise a disproportionate amount of influence, a disproportionate amount of authority over these young students, and we ought to have certain responses that we follow.

I saw last week where somebody asked, why do we need a rule; our own moral beliefs ought to tell us we should not have an inappropriate relationship. Well, why do schools need rules; why do high schools or colleges need them? Why does the clergy, the medical or legal profession need them? Because of the fact there are some people who pay attention to those rules. In my opinion, every Congressman that is now serving today, all 435 of us, reads the rules. And I would venture to say that all of us, or almost all of us, when we read the rules, we will modify our behavior so that we fall in compliance with those rules. If the rules say that we cannot send out constituent mail, say, with political advertising in it, I would venture to say that most Congressmen do not send out congressional mail with political advertising because the rules prohibit it. They follow the rules.

So what I have suggested here is not something that should be deserving of ridicule in editorials or under-the-breath talk by some of my colleagues, because what we are trying to do is preserve the internship program. A poll was just recently conducted, and parents were asked if they would trust the Congressmen to send their children back to, their students, their young people, back to be interns. Of course, as you might guess, the answer was overwhelmingly no.

This is a program that a lot of my colleagues came through themselves. This is a program that has exposed the young people to the American government and its workings. Every intern in my office, I believe, will remember their internship in Washington, D.C. in a very positive fashion, and it has made a significant change in their life. So I think it is important to preserve this program.

Now, I have three children, two daughters that are internship age. One is 22 and the other one is 19. Both of them have been back here in Washington, D.C. And as a parent I want to know, as every parent wants to know with their young son or daughter, that when they are back there they are in a professional relationship. They are back there in a relationship that has a fiduciary responsibility so that they do not have to worry about the Congressman exerting influence over their child. And they are still students. I do not care whether they are technically adults. The fact is they are students of government.

Do not forget, in college, or in the military, if a professor in his or her class has a student that, say, is 25 years old, the age does not matter. It is the fact they are a student and it is the fact that there is a position of authority over the student and that is why these educational institutions across the Nation prohibit inappropriate relationships.

Now, some people have suggested I not take the floor to discuss this. I feel it is important, because I think it is getting a little out of hand. Not the inappropriate relationships, because contrary to popular belief, in my opinion, most of the Congressmen in these chambers, if not all, and I am not aware of others, all of the Congressmen I know maintain themselves in a professional mode. They are highly ethical when it comes to the treatment of interns and there is not widespread abuse in the internship program. But the perception that has gone out there is in part caused by the fact that our own ethics do not prohibit it, or apparently there is some confusion as to whether our ethics prohibit those types of relationships.

So we owe it to the internship program, we owe it to the program to put

forth a proper in-house rule. Not legislation. We are not legislating morality, we are putting in our own in-house rule, the kind of prohibition that, as I have said three or four times in these comments, the same kind of prohibition that exists in our churches, exists in our schools, exists in our hospitals, and exists in our courts.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say I would be interested to look at some of the major news networks who waste editorial space on me, I would venture to say most of them probably have prohibitions against inappropriate relationships with their student interns that are in there to learn how to be journalists. I would ask my colleagues to support me and publicly acknowledge that it is appropriate for us to have in our House rules a rule which prohibits inappropriate relationships with interns.

I will wrap it up with this: Let me say that we are talking specifically about interns. I am not talking about a congressman who may choose to go outside of his or her marriage and have a relationship with someone who does not work as a student intern or one staff member dating another staff member. I am not talking about those kinds of relationships.

What I am talking about, very, very specifically what I am talking about is a congressman and a student intern. I cannot stress enough that these interns are students. They are students of the government. We do not have to use interns, by the way. As a congressman, we are not required to hire interns. But if we do, we ought to assume some professional responsibility. As I have mentioned several times before, all of my colleagues that I know do assume that professional responsibility, contrary to popular perception. Whether Democrat or Republican, they handle their interns on a professional basis when I have seen them. But I think the internship program, and certainly the reputation, is in danger because of the fact of some of the things that have gone on.

Mr. Speaker, I think one way to help rebuild the reputation is to at least put in place a rule; and then if somebody breaks that rule, let them suffer the consequences. We have a process for that. We have checks and balances in that process. There is absolutely no reason that the United States Congress should not have a House rule prohibiting inappropriate relationships between a congressman and a student intern.

Let me move on briefly to cover a couple of points. During the break, the liberal side of the Democratic Party has been lambasting President Bush on this tax cut. What the liberal side of the Democratic Party seems to be forgetting is that my good colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), introduced an amendment on this House floor, and that amendment was a tax cut. That amendment called for a tax rebate. It was very similar, not exact, but very similar. Certainly pretty close to exact in concept, but it was very similar to what the President put into place.

The debate here on the floor was not the amount of money of the tax cut, the debate was between the Democrats and the Republicans, and really between the liberal side of the Democratic Party because several of the conservative Democrats supported President Bush's program for tax cuts, so it was not a clear Democratic/Republican bill, but the Democrats that opposed it, their primary argument after listening to hours and hours of debate, was not about the amount of money, but it was focused on who should get the rebate.

Those Democrats said that the tax rebate should go to people who paid payroll taxes but paid no income taxes. The Republicans and the Democrats who supported the Bush program countered that argument by saying the people who ought to get the tax rebate back are people who paid taxes in. You should not give a tax rebate to people who had no tax liability. That is where the intensity of the debate focused.

Now because our economy continues to go south, which everyone acknowledges, it really started to do that about 6 months before President Clinton left office, but now that the economy continues to go south, instead of joining together as a team, which is what the American people are demanding, we are seeing the Democrats starting to pile on President Bush, and I heard over the weekend one of the leaders said Bush is the architect of this bad economy.

What does he mean? Does my colleague think Bush went out and designed a bad economy? Does my colleague think any of us are comfortable that our economy is going back and continues to worsen? No. But there are some people who are going to use this bad economy, and some people in leadership positions throughout this country, that want to use this bad economy for their own political advantage. They are not worrying about what do we do for the American people to improve this economy, but instead trying to figure out how can we win the elections next year by monopolizing on how terrible this economy is and doing the blame game.

The time has come. We cannot allow this economy to continue to go in its downward direction and perhaps get into an uncontrollable spiral just because you want political advantage next year in the elections. Every one of us, the Democrats, the Republicans, have an obligation to come together as a team. Sure we will have some debates, but our primary focus ought to be what can we do in working with the President of the United States to try and get this economy to at least level out or hopefully begin a recovery. There are a lot of unique situations about the economy that we face today. One of those is that the entire world is in an economic recession. Many of the countries, a lot of the countries in the world are in an economic recession. The world is in an economic slowdown. The United States is swaying back and forth as to whether or not we go into that economic recession.

Mr. Speaker, so in a time like this, there is a demand for us to work together as a team for the benefit of the American people so that they have a healthy economy. I would advise my colleagues, take a look at the Sunday talk shows, and take a look at which one of our colleagues really want to work as a team to improve this economy or really want to take advantage of the sour economy for political purposes for next year's elections. If you know some of them, obviously you know who the ones are that want to take political advantage, you ought to say, I understand that we want political advantage, but maybe we better pay attention to what is happening. While we are preparing for next year's elections, the ship has a big hole in its side. We are taking on a lot of water. We may be so worried about next year's elections, by the time we get that secured and take a look at the boat, we may have too much water to save the boat. I expect now that we are back in session that we are going to see people popping up here and there trying to take political advantage of this economy.

On the other hand, if my colleagues want to see examples of leadership, take a look at which Members of those parties stand up and are willing to walk back and forth across this aisle and say, Hey, as team, what are we going to do on this economy? How are we going to control spending? Are we going to need further tax cuts?

The Democrats over the weekend on national television on the Sunday shows acknowledged that additional tax cuts may be necessary. Why are they necessary? We need to get more money into the economy. That is why the interest rates have been lowered. That is why Greenspan lowered the interest rate. That is why President Bush put into effect his tax cut. That is why we are talking about additional tax cuts, and we need to figure out in what areas of the country government spending makes some sense, and what do we need to do about deficit spending. Will deficit spending become a necessity to prevent the country from going into a recession?

Mr. Speaker, I have some ideas to those questions, and I take it upon myself to have the responsibility, and I think most of my colleagues do, and I

hope all of them do, to assume that responsibility to come across that aisle and talk.

I invite the liberal Democrats, put down your arms and come across and help us come up with a solution because in the end, maybe next year's elections you will have an advantage, but in the meantime, you may very well be a participant in driving this ship to the bottom of sea, and now is our time to avoid it.

I hope to see some effort of cooperation from the Democratic side and from the Republican side in an effort to improve our economy, or at least get this country going in a positive recovery from where we are right now.

Mr. Speaker, for the balance of my time I would like to talk about missile defense. I think missile defense has been mischaracterized in the last month. There are a number of issues of missile defense that I want to discuss.

First of all, we will talk about the anti-ballistic missile treaty. I want to talk about the capabilities that this country is going to need for the future, about the weaknesses that we have, about the responsibilities and the obligations we have to the next generation in regards to the defense of this country.

This country is not the most popular country in the world. It certainly is the strongest country in the world, the strongest country in the history of the world. This country has done more than any other country in the history of the world. This country has some of the best of everything. But it is all at risk if we do not continue to defend ourselves. We have to be on constant alert that somebody else wants something we have or somebody else wants to do harm to us.

I had a group of high school students in my office, and we began to talk and we talked about defense. I can tell Members, the students today are smart young men and women. They are very thoughtful, and they look into the future. We talked about defense.

I asked them, I said what student do you think in your school gets in the least amount of fights. One said the person who is in the best shape, the person that is the strongest, the toughest. Not the person that picks the fights, but the person that avoids people picking a fight with them. That is right.

If you have in your class or group of friends, if you have somebody who is a black belt in karate, and everybody knows that and everybody knows if they decide to take them on they are probably going to get their nose busted, how many people are going to fight with the person that is a black belt in karate? But the moment they notice the person with the black belt in karate is no longer staying in shape, when they notice that person is not practicing, getting overweight, his or her moves are not what they used to be and really kind of just becoming lazy, what happens? Somebody then begins to take a look, and then the temptation starts.

Maybe now when they are not properly defending themselves and not staying in shape, maybe now is the time to take that person on; and it is the same thing with the United States of America. We are in pretty good shape right now, but we cannot bank on the good shape we have been in in the past. We have to bank on how well we keep ourselves in shape for the future. What do we have in regards to military apparatus and defense.

I know there are a number of people out there that say and kind of go on the theory we should stop military spending and we should limit defense spending, and do it in peaceful discussion. We should settle things in peaceful ways. And I have interest, in the last year there seem to be a lot more people saying violence has no place in our society.

Well, I am here to tell Members violence does have a place in society. That is exactly how we took care of Hitler, and that is exactly what our police officers do. But these people are correct that while violence is sometimes necessary, it ought to be the last remedy that we use.

Obviously we need to have the ability to communicate, and communication is a very important part of a Nation's defense. That is why our Secretary of State, and fortunately we have an excellent Secretary of State in Colin Powell, that is why the position is so critical. That is why we have ambassadorships.

One of the best elements of our defense is communication with other countries. Talk to people. Have the ability to negotiate. Have the ability to try and understand where they are coming from; but sometimes that fails. We saw it in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1930

Despite repeated warnings by the President, that country failed to communicate; and we gave them every chance, and finally we had to resort to violence; but as I said, it should be the last remedy.

When we talk about our country, we need to talk about something. Let us look back, for example, in history, in the sixties and the seventies, about 30 years ago. At that time, as you know, the Russian empire was in existence, U.S.S.R., Soviet Union, Communist, threatening to take over the world, Krushchev and people like that had been their previous leaders, talked very strongly about the United States was the number one enemy.

The United States knew that it had to build up and they did so, and even in the Kennedy years and so on; and we had the Cuban missile crisis and so on, we began to build up.

Somebody came up with an idea that said, you know, Russia has got a lot of nuclear missiles and the United States has a lot of nuclear missiles; maybe what we ought to do is sign a treaty between the two, communicate between the two and a treaty should be what we call the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, and this is very, very important.

The Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty as its concept, as its original thought of the basis of this treaty says that one country cannot defend itself against the other countries.

Now, remember, that the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, often called obviously ABM, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. The Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty which was executed, signed, only had two parties to it. There are only two parties that are subject to the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty.

Why only two parties in the 1970s? Because there were only two parties that were capable of delivering a nuclear missile upon the land of another country, and they were the United States and the U.S.S.R. That is why you had two parties.

Well now, today, how many parties to the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty? Well, theoretically only one because the U.S.S.R. does not exist anymore. The Communist regime fell. But realistically let us say two, still two. Now remember, back in 1970 there were only two countries capable of delivering one missile into another country, only two. That was in the 1970s.

What is it today? I do not know: 12, 14. There are lots of countries today. You can start off with China. You can move to India. You can move to Pakistan. You can talk about Israel. You can talk about Iran. You can talk about North Korea. You can talk about South Korea. There are a lot of countries today who are not subject to this Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. So based on that alone, the treaty needs to be modified or eliminated.

Let me tell you that when this treaty was drafted, the thought of it was one country would not build a defense. They would agree not to defend themselves against missiles. So the United States agreed not to build a missile defense system. Russia, at the same time, the U.S.S.R., the Communist regime, agreed they would not build a missile defensive system. The theory being that the United States would not fire upon Russia because they knew Russia would retaliate and we would have no defense because we do not have a missile defensive system; and obviously it works the same thing with Russia.

Well, the people that drafted this, while I disagree with that concept, that is clearly the basis upon which the treaty was drafted; and while I do disagree with that, I can tell you that the drafters of that document had a lot of foresight in that they knew that as

time moved on there may be other circumstances that were unforeseen that entered the picture.

Therefore, they put within the four corners of this agreement a clause. They put a clause in there that said that this agreement, they could end the treaty, that the treaty could be abrogated and they called for that. That is a right of the treaty. It is a basic right in the treaty.

Now, President Bush has said and the administration has said that the United States could very well terminate that treaty because of our best interests and the risks we have against the best interests of the American people. I have noticed that, frankly, some of the more liberal journalists in the country have said what do you mean you are going to abrogate that treaty? What do you mean you are going to walk away from the ABM treaty? You cannot do that.

Read the treaty. Read the treaty. Of course you can do that. It is a fundamental right. It is in the language of the treaty. Of course you can do that, because the people who drafted that 32 years ago knew that in 32 years things might change; and boy, have they changed.

Who would have ever imagined 32 years ago that North Korea could deliver a nuclear missile? Who could have ever imagined the fire power of China or India or Pakistan or Israel or other countries in the Middle East or Iran? And not just with nuclear warheads, but with biological warheads as well.

Look, we are kidding ourselves, and I can tell you that as Congressmen we have an absolutely inherent obligation, a fiduciary obligation to the American people to provide the American people a defense, a military defense against the aggressiveness of another country. We are fools, we are kidding ourselves, if we continue to think that we should not build a missile defense for this country.

In Colorado Springs, Colorado, there is a mountain. It is called Cheyenne Mountain. Cheyenne Mountain is a granite monument, a beautiful mountain. Years ago on the inside of that mountain, they went out and they bored out the center of that mountain. They took the granite out of the center of the mountain, or a portion of it out of the mountain, and they put in there the NORAD defense detection. Inside that mountain, we have the capabilities of detecting within seconds, anywhere in the world, a missile launch. We can within seconds tell you where that launch took place, where the trajectory is of that particular missile, what type of missile we think it is, what kind of warheads we think it has on it. We can tell you where its target is. We can give you the estimated time of arrival.

So let us say that North Korea launches a missile, or let us say China launches a missile. Let us say that the target is Oklahoma City, the military base in Oklahoma City. We have the capability, we have it today, we have the most advanced technology in the history of the world. We can immediately know within a couple of seconds we have got a missile launch, it is coming out of China, it is headed for Oklahoma and it is going to hit in 15 minutes. Then what can we do?

All we can do is call Oklahoma. Governor, you have got an incoming missile. Sorry, Governor, we decided not to provide a missile defense for this country. Sorry, Governor. We had a lot of people that said we should live by the laws of 30 years ago. Sorry, Governor, we pretended that that threat out there did not exist, even though in fact, Governor, we knew it existed. And sorry, Governor, there is nothing we can do. You are going to have a missile hit in about 13 minutes. God bless you. We will think of you in the future.

That is all we can do today. President Bush has had enough guts to stand up and several Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, have had enough guts to stand up and say, uh-oh, we better stop, enough time has gone by, we better pay attention to our responsibilities to the American people. We need to put in place a missile defense system.

Missile defense is very complicated. Obviously, we are going to have to research it. Take a look at how much research it took to fly an airplane. Take a look at the money we spent on the space program. Take a look at how much research there was to figure out a TV. You do not just go out there and wave the magic wand and have a perfect missile defense system.

Some of my colleagues are saying, Oh, my gosh, we don't have one ready today to go, so we shouldn't build one. Is that ludicrous? Is that crazy? We do not have the technology today, although we do have the technology today, but we do not have one in place, so let us not build one because we have to spend too much time on research.

Give me a break. Of course we have got to spend time on research. We need to get a system that is perfected. And it is going to take some time. But we have no time to spare. If we start today, if we give the President the money that the President has requested to put a missile defense system in place, it will still be several years down the road before we can deploy that missile defense system. In the meantime, China has built up more, Iran has built up more, Iraq has built up more, North Korea; and I can go right down through the list. Times have changed.

What do we have to do with a missile defense system? You, in effect, have two missiles, two bullets speeding through the sky. You have got to be able to connect your missile defense, it may be a land-based missile, has got to be able to hit this incoming missile. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet. They are both traveling at very, very fast speeds. You have got to be able to connect them. You cannot just do it with a land-based missile.

The best place to stop an enemy missile is where? Where is the best place to stop an enemy missile? On their launching pad. Not while it is over New York City or over the continental United States, but stop that missile when they are getting ready to launch it. How do you do that? You cannot do it with a land-based missile in the United States. You have got to do it with some kind of space technology. You have got to be able to do it with laser.

Every peace-loving person in America who is against war, and I guess we are all against war, but who is anti-military or is against violence, you ought to be the strongest proponents there are for missile defense. Because what happens if that missile leaves the launching pad? Think. For example, a big danger today is not necessarily an intentional launch of a missile. A big danger today is somebody pushes a button by accident.

What if we had an accidental launch of a missile incoming to the United States? I mean, if we had the capability to stop that and we confirmed that it was an accident, we may have just stopped the next war. We may have stopped nuclear oblivion because of the fact we were able to stop it before it did harm and determined that it was an accidental launch.

Today as somebody launches a missile, let us say that Russia, by accident, launches a nuclear missile or launches a nuclear missile with multiple warheads on it so that the missile comes into the United States and fires multiple warheads and hits several different targets. How convinced do you think the United States is going to be that that was an accident? What do you think our response would be? We could very easily end up with a nuclear war on our hands. So even those of you who are big proponents of no violence, and I hope you are successful in your efforts, by the way, but realistically I do not think you will be, but let us say those of you who are absolutely opposed to violence, you ought to be the strongest proponents there are of a missile defense system, because the best way to avoid that violence is to take away the tool of violence that they have, and that is a missile that they could deliver to the United States.

So you have several different stages that you want to develop so that you can take out an incoming enemy missile or a missile launched by mistake. One, you want to be able to get it on the launching pad. Ideally, that is the

best place to do it. If it gets off the launching pad, you want to be able to, at any different time, have satellite laser beam technology that hopefully can destroy that over the ocean. Then, finally, if it gets into the United States, over into our airspace, you want to have the capability of not only satellite laser beam but you also want to have the capability of ground-based or some other ship-based type of missile that could go up and collide with that missile and take that missile out.

About 2 months ago, we had a successful test. They fired a missile and they fired an intercept missile and we hit them. That is pretty good. Think about it. You cannot miss by this far. You have got to hit. That missile is not that big around. When you take a look at the warhead on top of a missile, it is maybe the width of a car, so you have got to bring those two cars together out there going at the kinds of speeds that they are going at, and they have got to be able to hit. The test the other day was a successful test. We were able to calculate it. So it is a good step.

But I am amazed at the people who, number one, criticize the President. He, by the way, is the one whom we charge with the leadership of this country. We say to President Bush, President Bush, you better take a look at this treaty. Are you protecting this country? You are in charge of it. You are the President. You are the guy that we are holding responsible to make sure that we can go to work every day without being concerned about being dragged into some kind of war or having a missile attack against us.

□ 1945

Yet we tell them on this end, on this hand we say you are spending too much money, you are dreaming about missile technology that may or may not exist.

The fact is, Mr. President, I am proud of you. We need a missile defense system in this country, and we need it, and we have needed it for some period of time; a leader of this country, to finally stand up and say to Russia, look, Russia, we will even share with you our capability to defend ourselves, but you better acknowledge, Russia, that there are no longer two countries in this world capable of firing missiles at each other. That number is in the tens and twenties, maybe even the high twenties, of countries capable; and every month, every year that goes by, some other nation out there is developing the capability to deliver a missile into another country.

We have got finally a President who has got enough guts to stand up and say, all right, it is time to get back in shape. It is time to build a military missile defense system for the protection of this country and its allies.

Of interesting note, the Europeans, as you know, probably the Brits, some of the strongest allies we have ever had, good allies out there, they are standing up for us. They want a missile defense system. Take a look at the Italians. The Italians, their Prime Minister, they support this.

So do not be misled by the national media that may say the Europeans say that this could throw off the balance of power, and that the United States is a warmonger because they are trying to deploy a missile defense system. You watch what happens in Europe. You watch what the French do and some of the other people do over in those European countries once we perfect that technology. They are going to be at our front door. They are going to be at our front door with their Xerox machines, saying, look, can we get a copy of what you have got, because we too have an obligation to defend the people of our country.

As far as I am concerned, I would like to see every nation in the world have a defense apparatus so that they could stop incoming missiles, because I really, really am concerned, really concerned, about an accidental missile launch.

Now, some people who are, I guess, theoretical in the concept of peace, say, well, everybody should agree not to fire a missile. Everybody should lay down their arms. All we have to do is look at the Middle East. I mean, look, there are inherent things of human nature, and we better accept them, and most of us have accepted the fact that there will always be somebody who is not willing to lay down their arms, and as long as one people has their arms, you better be willing to defend against it. The United States, because of our prominence in the world, because we are such a strong power, will always have somebody who wants to take us on, who wants to launch a missile against the best interests of the citizens of the United States.

Now, we have some appropriation battles coming up here pretty soon. We know the basis of our economy. It is requiring that we tighten our belt, like every other American citizen, that we manage the Federal budget just like the American families have to manage their own home budget, and we have to take a look at what programs are priority programs.

The President has made it very clear that there are a couple of priorities for him, and when he says ''for him,'' he speaks of his concept for the country. In other words, there are a couple of programs that are of priority for the Nation.

The first one, education. The President has asked for a considerable increase in appropriations and in reform, regulation, regarding education; testing, accountability, and more money for education.

That is pretty hard to argue, although, as you might guess, on our floor we manage to find argument about it. But education is one of the priorities of this President.

The other appropriation he is talking about is the military. Now, remember, when we talk about military, in excess of 70 percent of our military budget goes for salaries and wages. We have got to pay these men and women that are serving this country something above the poverty level. We have to be able to provide for them. So we have to be able to take that into consideration.

But one of his priorities contained within that military priority is military defense. I am suggesting to my colleagues, no, I am not suggesting to my colleagues, I am telling you, the time has come. We have got to work with the President on a military missile defense system. We cannot continue to waste any more time. We have an obligation to the next generation, to my kids, to your kids, to your grandkids, to my grandkids, we have an obligation to provide a defense apparatus in this Nation so that they do not live under the threat of an accidental missile launch or an intentional missile launch against the United States of America.

We are the ones today that make those decisions for tomorrow. That is why we were elected. We were not elected to sit here and not think about tomorrow. The President has said to the United States Congress, think about education tomorrow. What are the results tomorrow? And it is the same thing with our military defense. Think about tomorrow, because, before you know it, tomorrow is here, and we have added many, many more countries in the world that have that capability to launch missiles.

Mr. Speaker, let me show this poster. Take a look at today. I am talking about nuclear warheads. But do not forget that on a missile you can also deliver biological or chemical warheads. Take a look. Every spot on this map is a country that is capable of delivering known or probable biological and chemical programs, and they can deliver those chemicals with a missile.

Now, remember, in 1970 when that treaty, the antiballistic missile treaty was drafted, there were two countries, the United States and the USSR, there were only two countries in the world that had to be concerned about that. But, because of this expansion, things have changed.

I want to stress to my colleagues, because this argument continues to come up again and again and again, and in my opinion it has no validity, and that argument is the proposition that we cannot build a missile defense system without violation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, which we have no right to exit from.

What I am saying here tonight is that Antiballistic Missile Treaty, fortunately, the people who drafted it, as I mentioned earlier, I disagree with the

concept that the treaty was drafted 30 years ago, but fortunately the people who drafted that treaty had the foresight to say, gosh, over a period of time the consequences may change to the extent that the United States and the USSR ought to be able to walk away from this treaty; that the consequences are of such importance that it justifies withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

I think the President is justified in taking the position that with all of the countries today that can accidentally or intentionally launch a missile into the United States, that the circumstances have changed dramatically enough that the United States has to take a new approach; that the United States can no longer afford, can no longer afford to sit by and pretend that in our future there will be no missile attack against the United States.

In fact, it is just the opposite. The United States must prepare today for tomorrow and for the future generations, prepare for the expectation that in fact a missile at some point or another will be launched against the United States of America, either intentionally or accidentally.

But once that missile is airborne, it does not much matter as far as the consequences of the missile hit. But it does matter if we are able to stop that missile, let us say, on its launching pad; and let us say we are able to determine it was an accidental launch, that somebody made a mistake, that some mechanism, a malfunction, and we were able to stop a war or we were able to stop American retribution, which you know because of our capabilities would be severe, harsh, and instantaneous; that we were able to avoid that because we had in place a system that was capable of stopping an attack against the United States.

So I urge every one of my colleagues, instead of playing the political rhetoric game, which I am beginning to see emerge up here, against the missile defense system, put that political rhetoric aside for the benefit of the future generations of the United States of America. Try and put in place a vision for the future, a future that allows the people and the population of the United States, and the friends of the United States of America, the capability of making a missile attack a nonissue, because we have the capability to stop it.

For those of you who want to end violence or at least do what you can to minimize violence, you, as I said earlier, should be the strongest proponents we have for a missile defense system. So I congratulate the President, I congratulate the administration, and, frankly, I commend both Democrats and Republicans on the House floor that are coming across this aisle to stand in unison in favor of a missile defense system for this country.

Let me just reiterate a couple points I made earlier. It is appropriate and it is timely for the United States Congress to put in our rules a rule which prohibits inappropriate conduct between a Congressman and an intern.

I spent a good deal of time at the beginning of my remarks explaining why I have pursued this issue. I spent a good deal of time pointing out that we are the only major institution, the U.S. Congress is the only major institution in United States that does not have a prohibition against inappropriate relationships between a Congressman and an intern. For example, the teaching profession, every school in the Nation prohibits it; the medical profession prohibits it; the military prohibits it; the clergy prohibits it; the legal profession prohibits it; most major corporations prohibit it. The United States Congress ought to follow good example. It is not precedent breaking. We should set a good example, follow a good example, and put in place a rule that prohibits that type of inappropriate conduct.

Finally, as my final remarks, I urge all of us to stand as a team to address this economy. This is not a laughing matter. This is a very serious situation. We are in a tunnel, we are not out the other side of it, and there is a train coming in. We need to stand in unison to figure out how to get out of that tunnel. And there is light. We can get out of the tunnel, but the more bickering and partisanship that we see on this House floor, the less likely that we can fulfill our leadership responsibilities and obligations and lead our country into some type of economic recovery.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AKIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond, if I can, briefly, to some of the comments that my colleague from Colorado made with regard to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do realize that we in Congress all have an obligation, certainly, to work for economic recovery, and there is, of course, a great deal of concern about the economy right now because of some of the indications we have had over the last week with regard to the stock market, with regard to some of the unemployment figures that have come through.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not point out, and this is really the gist of my comments this evening, I do not intend to use the full hour, but I need to spend a little time reiterating once again the negative impact of President Bush's tax cut, the tax cut that was supported by the majority of the Republicans, who are the majority here in the House of Representatives, and which I think has had a very negative impact and certainly over the long term will have a very negative impact on the economy. And my fear that it is going to lead to President Bush suggesting and the Republican majority suggesting at some point, if it has not happened already, that we dip into the Medicare and the Social Security Trust Funds in order to pay for ongoing expenses with the Congressional budget, with the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, before we had the 4 weeks when we as Members of Congress were back in our districts during August, during the summer, we had been told over and over again by the President and the Republican leadership that there was no need to worry about this tax cut, this huge massive tax cut that primarily benefited wealthy Americans, because we could have the tax cut and we would also be able to make sure that, even with the tax cut, that we would have enough money left over to pay for the national priorities that President Bush outlined, an education bill, a new defense initiative to make sure that the military was ready in the event of war, and also a Medicare prescription drug benefit. We could have the tax cut and we would also be able to have money left over for those national priorities.

We were also assured by the President and the Republican leadership that even with this massive tax cut that primarily favored the well-to-do, that we would have enough money for Social Security, that we would not dip into the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

□ 2000

Well, Democrats have been saying for over a year that none of those things were true; that the nature of the tax cut, the fact that it was so big, that what the President and the Republicans were proposing was so big, that it would basically make it impossible to not dip into the Medicare and Social Security trust funds and that there would not be any money left for any of those other priorities.

Well, we are there today. We went home at the end of July, early August, we came back, and lo and behold, the numbers have come back about the budget and what money is available; and the Congressional Budget Office, among other agencies, have told us that none of those things are true, that we probably have already dipped into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds because of this massive tax cut that the President insisted on as the sort of milestone and the main thing that we wanted to accomplish in the first year of his Presidency.

Just as some information, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office, this is from about a week or so ago,