

my colleagues to join in support of H.R. 3113 by co-sponsoring this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ECO-TERRORISM, THE CHARACTER COUNTS PROGRAM, MISSILE DEFENSE, AND MILITARY TRIBUNALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to take a few minutes to talk about a number of subjects which I think are very important, especially considering the times that we are in.

The first subject that I want to talk about is domestic terrorism. Specifically, I want to focus in on ecoterrorism and talk a few minutes about that.

Second, an exciting program which has been implemented in many schools across the country, the program Character Counts. This evening I am just going to do kind of a teaser on it and discuss some of the elements of the program, but I intend later to go into much more depth about the program and why it would be important for my colleagues to try to encourage their local schools to adopt the program Character Counts.

Then I would like to move on to a subject which I have addressed many times, and that is missile defense and the importance of missile defense.

I would also like to touch on the military tribunals that the President has proposed for war criminals, not for American citizens but for those individuals who have committed acts of war against the United States.

Keep in mind that military tribunals were first used by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and President Roosevelt. The United States Supreme Court on a number of occasions has found that military tribunals are constitutional, so our discussion this evening about military tribunals will not be on constitutionality because that issue has been determined. Our discussion this evening should center more instead on why they are necessary, why they are important and of what benefit are military tribunals to the United States of America in its continued and long-lasting fight against terrorism worldwide.

Let me begin with terrorism on a domestic picture. For some reason, over the last few years there seems to be kind of a Robin Hood image given to

those people who are so dedicated to the environment that they think that their dedication to the environment justifies acts of terrorism against the property of others and at some point in time against humans and other citizens in the United States.

This Robin Hood picture is kind of being played on by the media. It is not a noble act. Environmental terrorism is not the way to accomplish their means. There are many active organizations in this country who care very, very deeply about the protection of the environment. Many of us on this floor, including myself, care very deeply about the environment.

Obviously, on many occasions we have a difference of opinion. In fact, on this House floor, the two sides of the aisle are sometimes urban versus rural. We have deeply held differences with the people from the other side of the aisle or with our colleagues from another State. For example, in Colorado we generally find ourselves with strong differences on issues of Colorado water when we discuss that issue with Members from the State of California, which is a large user of water from the Colorado River.

But never on this floor, never on this floor do we engage in conversation or strategy or do we engage in the actual act of terrorism against our colleagues who disagree with us on this floor. We have never even heard of that. It has never been considered. If it were considered, it would be quickly squashed by my colleagues under our own self-policing process. Members just do not do it.

In America we have a process which has been defined more accurately against September 11, a process which allows us a legal venue to carry these disputes. There is no justification for domestic terrorism. I do not care whether we are talking about a bomb on the Greenpeace ship, or a threat on an abortion clinic, or if Members are talking about organizations like ELF, which is an organization completely focused on accomplishing goals for the environment through the tool of terrorism. It has no place in the United States of America.

Recently, I contacted a number of environmental organizations across the country and asked them to join me, to join my coalition, my coalition consisting of several of my colleagues' joint effort with me, our coalition, to come out as a group and speak against, regardless of which side of the spectrum Members are on, come out as a coalition, just like we have done for international terrorism, to come out as a coalition and speak against domestic terrorism under the name of the environment.

I have actually been a little surprised by some of the responses I have received. Over the weekend, there was a nasty article in the Denver Post, a letter to the editor. It is amazing how people squirm to somehow say why do you ask us to join your team against

environmental terrorism? Do you think that we are terrorists? I have never said that. Organizations like the national Sierra Club, other organizations, I do not think that they are terrorists. But there are some organizations that, under the guise of the environment, are terrorists, and they commit acts of terrorism.

It is justified to ask every legitimate organization in this country to join the coalition that we are putting together to speak out as a unified voice, to speak out against acts of terror and against those people who think that it is the lesser evil for protection of the environment.

I had some negative responses to my letter, asking, not accusing anybody of terrorism, asking them to join our team, kind of like the President said, you are either with us or you are not with us. The same context as this letter. Hey, join us, help us. Because, frankly, environmental organizations like the Sierra Club, like some of these other national organizations, a lot of people look to them for guidance on the environment.

In a lot of cases I disagree with the national Sierra Club, not so much with the local but the national policies, especially when it regards the Colorado Rockies in my district. But the fact is I have never considered that organization or the organization of Greenpeace a terrorist organization. They do not advocate it. I have never seen any evidence that they are proponents of terrorism.

On the other hand, these groups are nationally recognized, and perhaps some of the radicals who are committing ecoterrorist acts will listen to what these organizations say and listen to their experienced opinion that terrorism does nothing but hurt the cause. It does not help forward the cause of the environment. Committing acts of ecoterrorism, as they did in my district and throughout this Nation, those acts did not further the cause of the environment.

In fact, what it does is it makes the people who really care about the environment, the organizations like the national Sierra Club and others, it kind of draws them in by association. Even though they are not associated, it draws them in by association and starts to give a black eye to what otherwise might be a legitimate cause.

□ 2015

So why would someone not join our effort, our coalition? I got some positive responses, though, and I think some very mature responses, one might say, very well thought-out responses. I would like to read one of them from the Natural Resources Defense Council:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCINNIS and CHAIRMAN HANSEN:

Thank you for your letter of October 30 in which you and your colleagues invited us to repeat our long-held position concerning violence by some who claim to be part of the environmental movement. Let me state, therefore, that the Natural Resources Defense

Council unequivocally condemns and abhors any act of violence committed in the name of environmental protection. Violence has no place in the struggle to protect the earth and its people from the ravages of pollution and exposure to toxic chemicals. There is no excuse for fire bombings and other acts of violence that you have detailed in your letter. We are blessed to be living in a country where people are free to have differing opinions on matters of public policy. Moreover, it is especially at times such as these when we see the horrible way in which disagreements are handled in other countries that we appreciate our American tradition of honest, forthright and civilized debate. As you know, the Natural Resources Defense Council's more than 500,000 members from all 50 States feel strongly that our children have entrusted the earth to us for safekeeping until they are ready to assume their place as leaders. We will continue to fight what we consider bad public policy with every legal means at our disposal. And as we find ourselves in agreement on at least one issue, that violence has no place in policy debate, I want you to know we would be pleased to discuss environmental policy issues with you, your colleagues and your staff at any time that is convenient.

And that is signed by the executive director.

That violence has no place in policy debate. There are lots of policy debates on environmental issues, but as it was very clearly stated in this letter, as I have very clearly stated on a number of occasions, violence has no place in this public policy debate.

Over the weekend, I had an opportunity to write a response in the *Denver Post*. I would like very briefly to read this and put this as a matter of record. Let me say that in regards to ecoterrorism, this is not something that has happened since September 11. We suffered a horrible loss in our district, not horrible as compared to the horrible loss we have suffered over at the Pentagon and New York City. Those two do not compare, other than the fact that they are both acts of terrorism. Unfortunately, we had horrific loss of life on September 11.

But what is happening with ecoterrorism in this country is gradually and over time throughout and probably riding this kind of concept that they are a Robin Hood or that it is the lesser of two evils, that somehow terrorism is justified in environmental policy arguments, we begin to see groups like ELF, which is the Earth Liberation Organization, and ALF, which deals with the animal rights group, we are beginning to see that these organizations are becoming bolder and bolder in their acts of property terrorism; and soon unfortunately I am afraid that these acts of property terrorism such as burning down the lodge in Vail which was a \$12 million lodge and by the way as a result of them burning down this lodge, the ELF organization, what happened is now we had to use twice as many logs as we would have used before, they have put a lot of people out of work.

There was clearly no justification for this, but they are becoming bolder. One of these days by accident or inten-

tionally they are going to take human life, all in the name of the environment, which as I stated and I would like to repeat this letter because I think it is an outstanding letter from the Natural Resources Defense Council which, by the way, is a very well-respected, very active environmental organization.

Bombing and fire bombings have no place in this argument. Acts of violence have no place in the policy debate of the environment.

Let me read my response:

"Several comments attributed to me by critics are at best taken out of context, a self-serving manner in order to make their case appear stronger. As America begins the long haul back following the monumentally tragic events of September 11, we all have to come to more fully appreciate and understand the cancerous effect of terrorism on free and civilized people. Now more than ever, America knows in its collective heart of hearts that terrorism, no matter its form, and no matter its motivation, is intolerable. Whether it is crashing a plane into the Pentagon, sending a mysterious white powder to an abortion clinic, burning up a Greenpeace ship or burning a Vail lodge into the ground, terrorism has no place. I am chairman of a House subcommittee charged with overseeing our national forests. One form of terrorism is high on the committee's radar screen, ecoterrorism. While not as menacing or destructive as the terrorist attacks of September 11, environmentally motivated violence has nonetheless reached such a level that the FBI now recognizes it as one of America's primary domestic terrorism threats. Let me repeat that. The FBI now recognizes it as one of America's primary domestic terrorism threats. Shockingly, ecoterrorists continue their war against American communities, fire bombing a biomedical research lab and a Federal facility just days after America was rocked by Osama bin Laden and his network of terrorists.

"Ecoterrorism is not an imagined problem. Environmental vigilantism is on the rise and it is for real. Recently the national dialogue about ecoterrorism took a heated turn when a handful of environmental groups objected to a letter written by myself and several of my colleagues urging organizations to openly disavow the action of ecosaboteurs like the Earth Liberation Front and its sister organization, the Animal Liberation Front.

"ELF, as the Earth Liberation Front is known, and ALF, as the Animal Liberation Front is known, have reigned terror on communities in all corners of the United States over the course of the last decade; setting fire to homes, academic research labs, government buildings and many businesses.

"Colorado has not been immune from this type of ecoterrorism threat. In 1998 ELF's henchmen burned a \$12 million ski lodge in Vail to the ground. In

all, these groups have prosecuted a campaign of terror with a price tag well over \$40 million, and it is just a matter of time before human life is taken.

"Alarming, ELF and ALF, and other like-minded radicals, have found refuge in certain circles of the popular press. Instead of being forcefully condemned, too often these groups have received a wink and nod and a rhetorical pat on the head from those who view environmentally motivated violence as a lesser evil in the furtherance of a greater society of good.

"A National Public Radio guest commentator, and I stress guest commentator, when recently reporting on a series of arsons in Arizona, then thought to be the handiwork of ecoterrorists, offered a shocking on-the-air endorsement of environmental push saying she would be happy to buy matches for the ecoarsonists the next time they were prepared to strike."

I should add, taking away from the letter for a moment, that National Public Radio readily acknowledged that this should not have been on the commentary, that it was not professional journalism, and I can tell my colleagues that National Public Radio apologized. I felt they acted in a very professional manner, but let me continue.

"In 1999, a story in the *Portland Oregonian* chronicled a subtle and sometimes not so subtle, claim that certain members of mainstream society offer groups like ELF. It is exactly this kind of thinking and rhetoric that fuels the destructive tendencies of environmental terrorists. If America is going to get the upper hand on ecoterrorists, we have got to strip away the Robin Hood mystique and perceived moral high ground that some gleefully give these radicals which brings me back to the letter of the environmental groups.

"The purpose was not to impugn or otherwise link organizations like the Sierra club to ELF or ALF, and nothing in my letter could reasonably send that impression. The letter has just one purpose, to send a powerful message to the ecocriminals of ELF and ALF and their sympathizers that even those who share a similar environmental ideology deny and reject the use of terror as a tool to promote those thoughts.

"Notwithstanding the self-serving criticism and outrage coming from the lips of certain excitable commentators, this letter is singly targeted at building a cultural coalition against environmental terrorism and provides the opportunity for those who care about the environment to openly express distaste and disapproval of ecoterrorists. Those who commit these shameless acts of terror should find themselves with no support because all of us can unite against it."

My point is this, that environmentally motivated terrorism is not noble. It is not a noble act, and it is not some kind of lesser evil in pursuit

of greater good. It does not work on domestic terrorism in this country. We have policy debate and acts of terror have no place regardless of how deep one feels, regardless of how intense the debate becomes.

We have a system in the United States that allows remedy, that allows claims to be heard. We have the freedom of speech in this country. All of these rights that were written by our Bill of Rights and are protected by our Constitution were put in there for the very purpose of avoiding utilization of the tool of violence as a way to dissolve or resolve domestic dispute. So I intend to be very aggressive in my continued pursuit against the ecoterrorists of this country.

I want my colleagues to know that this pursuit started well before September 11. In fact, we attempted and were eventually successful at subpoenaing the spokesman for the ELF organization, and I would like to read that letter very briefly, the response, so that my colleagues understand what kind of individuals that we sometimes deal with.

This is a letter from a guy named Craig Rosebraugh. Craig is the spokesman of, although I understand he has recently resigned, was the spokesman for the North American ELF press office; and by the way, my colleagues ought to take a look at their Web site. If my colleagues think that I am exaggerating things, take a look at the Web site of the Animal Liberation Front, ALF, put it in a search. Just put ALF in a search and take a look at it or put ELF in a search.

The Earth Liberation Front, now their particular Web site, look it up, take a look at what they talk about is justification within the borders of the United States to further their policy position. They advocate, they encourage and I think they coordinate acts of destruction and acts of terrorism.

When we served this gentleman with a subpoena, first, however, before I served him with a subpoena, I asked him to voluntarily come back. This is the response I got:

"Dear, Mr. McInnis: I received your letter, whether or not I am available to testify at the upcoming hearing regarding the emerging threat of ecoterrorism on the national forest lands. It is unclear to me why my testimony is desired at such a function. Furthermore, the topic of discussion appears, at least to me, to be somewhat vague, with no stated goals in mind.

"By addressing the subject of ecoterrorism threat on national public lands, are you referring to the ongoing destruction caused by the State itself along with industry as both continue to exploit and alienate the natural resource wilderness and ecosystems for this country for the sake of profit or it is a given subject in reference to the State and mainstream media created label which attempts to place a negative stigma on those actions attempting to place life in front of profits?

□ 2030

"In answer to your question am I available, the answer is no. I see no value, unless I am mistaken in your intent, in cooperating with the same state," referring to the United States, "in cooperating with the same state that is directly responsible for the ongoing murder and exploitation of life, both within this country and internationally." And it is signed by this guy.

This is the leading spokesman for this radical organization. They are not environmentalists, they are terrorists. There are a lot of organizations in this country that you can label environmentalists that are legitimate and, in my opinion, on a number of occasions there are issues I actually agree with. But they represent the views of a lot of people in this country. These are organizations that speak for a lot of people, like the Natural Resources Defense Council, but they do it in a legitimate fashion.

This should no more be accepted than bombing an abortion clinic. In my opinion, a bombing of an abortion clinic or burning down the Vail Mountain lodge, burning it down to the ground, and putting a bomb on the Greenpeace ship, those have no place in our society. And we as a society, regardless of where you stand on an issue, whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, whether you consider yourself a Sierra Club member or not a Sierra Club member, whether you like Greenpeace or do not like Greenpeace, we can all come together as a coalition.

We can all speak as one voice, that environmental terrorism has no place in policy debate in this great country that we have, because this great country has become great because there are platforms, such as this platform, that allow us to have policy debates, as we have day in and day out in this great chamber of this House of Representatives.

So I would urge people, my colleagues across the country, representing places across the country, speak up against eco-terrorism. Emphasize that while someone may have deep, deep beliefs about an environmental issue, that at no time is there justification to pull out a pack of matches, as that commentator in Arizona said she would supply, at no time is there justification to go to Vail, Colorado, and burn the lodge down; at no time, if you are pro-life, is there justification to go after somebody who is pro-choice, or vice versa, pro-choice after pro-life. It just does not fit. It is not the policy of this Nation. We should not tolerate it for one moment.

Now, I hope that we can come together, and I hope our law enforcement agencies, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, our State investigative agencies, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, whatever law enforcement arm we need, will be able to crack down on the individuals who believe that terrorism is the correct tool to use to further

their cause, regardless of what that cause is.

Well, enough for that. I think it is important. I want to visit now on some other issues. I intend however to come back when I make comments to my colleagues and talk about environmental terrorism and talk about the importance of eradicating terrorism within our own borders, going after it, stopping it. This is how policy debate ought to be handled.

Now let us move to another subject which I have seen a lot of discussion on lately in the last few days, discussion, as if this were an unconstitutional movement by the President of the United States, and that is military tribunals.

The President of the United States, who has done a very, very able job of leading this country in a time of need, in a time of war, has proposed to do just exactly what previous great presidents have done when this country has been in a time of war, and that is to take war criminals, whether they are Nazi war criminals, or whether it is Osama bin Laden or some of his lieutenants. These people are war criminals.

This is not a traffic violation or a civil violation or a U.S. code criminal violation or state code criminal violation. These are acts of war committed against the United States of America. Throughout the history of this country, for justice for those people, we have had military tribunals. Military tribunals were first utilized by George Washington at the beginning of this country, the birth of this country. Abraham Lincoln used military tribunals. Roosevelt used them in the war.

Two times in the forties, as recently as the forties, the military tribunals in and of themselves were questioned in regards to constitutionality, and on both occasions the United States Supreme Court has ruled that military tribunals are constitutional within this country.

So do not let people divert your attention on these military tribunals by saying it is an unconstitutional act, or somehow we are leaving what America is all about. America is about defending its borders. America is about bringing justice to the people who bring great harm outside the borders of this country to the inside of the borders of this country.

America is a strong Nation and should not bow to the politically correct who are afraid they might offend some of these war criminals. These war criminals are not going to have their rights violated. What rights do they have?

How many rights did those people in New York City have when those towers tumbled, or, not very far from here, when the Pentagon was hit? Oh, sure, they are going to be granted certain rights, as they should be, during their trial. But I will tell you, they are not entitled to what an American citizen should be entitled to on a civil or

criminal dispute, outside of an act of war. This is an entirely different picture. This is an act of war that we are talking about. So you are comparing apples to oranges.

When you talk about a crime committed outside of an act of war in the United States, that is entirely different than talking about an act of war committed against the United States of America.

Now, why are these military tribunals necessary? First of all, understand that any time, and take a look at the spy cases we have in our own Nation, one of the easiest tricks in the book for a defense attorney if they are defending under our current legal system, if they are defending a spy, for example, one of the first things they would do is to issue a subpoena to try and force the government to open up secrets, for example, everything they can open up, whether or not if it has the faintest thing to do with their case, like open up the CIA.

I can just see it. If you were defending one of these people who committed this act of terror against the United States, the defense attorney would want to know all our secrets about the satellites that located the person for their arrest, all of our financial spy network that was able to locate how this person got their money, all of our communication equipment. They would want to know publicly and they would disclose it publicly. Why do they do that? These defense attorneys want to drive a plea bargain. That is exactly what happens in spy cases.

Take a look at the most recent spy cases, any of the last five most recent. That is why plea bargains were driven, in part, because of the information that our intelligence services would have to disclose, that our enemies would love to get their hands on. So military tribunals avoid that.

The military tribunals also do other things. It is a tested method for bringing these individuals to some sort of justifiable trial.

Now, can you imagine, where are you going to locate this trial? It allows us to hold them on military bases. Can you imagine, you do not have to have juries that are disclosed publicly, like a civil jury would be or a criminal jury today in America is.

So what I would say my comments tonight are not extensive, not extensive on these military tribunals, but before you buy into the rhetoric that they are unconstitutional on their face or they are somehow unfair, take a look at the legal history, take a look at the legal history of this country, and you will find out that while they are different than a bank robber might be tried, for example, the type of tribunal or the type of court system that a bank robber would go through, in fact they do allow defense for the defendants. They do allow the defendants certain rights, but it is taken in a different context.

It is viewed by this country and by the United States Supreme Court as an

act of war against the United States, and it is justified to have these types of military tribunals, this type of venue for remedy, not only for the country, but a remedy that provides legitimate protections to the defendant, while not going overboard to the politically correct sometimes theory that we ought to just open the door and let these defendants get the best of everything we have got in this country and force disclosure of some of this Nation's top secrets.

So, give it a chance. Read about these military tribunals. Everyone from the Wall Street Journal to the New York Times, there has been lots printed just in the last 2 weeks. But I think when it all comes down to the bottom line, colleagues will agree with me, or most will agree with me, that military tribunals have a legitimate place in our justice system, and that that legitimate place has found a proper venue under the circumstances that our Nation faces today.

Let me move on. Let me visit about a real positive program called Character Counts. Now, I intend later on this week, I hope, or perhaps early next week, to have much more, many more extensive comments in regards to this program.

This is a program that has a Board of Directors that are nonpartisan. In other words, it is not a politically driven program. It is not sponsored by the Democrats, it is not sponsored by the Republicans. It is a program that was put together by leaders, various national leaders, leaders of the communities, leaders of religion, leaders of community groups, all types of facets of society.

The way the program was put together was people were invited to come together and say, look, what do we need to do for our young people in this country? How can we define the word "character?" What can we do to bring character back as a process of our education of our younger generation? How can we once again deploy character into maturity when we speak of the youth of this country? How do we do this, and how can we do it in a way that is not racially offensive, that is not religiously offensive, that is not political or partisan in any fashion whatsoever?

So this group of people got together, and I will go into this in much more depth in the next week or so, but this group of people, to summarize it, got together and said, hey, let us define the elements of character, in other words, the characteristics of character, and see if we can come to an agreement. And they did come to an agreement.

They wanted to call the program Character Counts. You know, whether you are in the Boy Scouts or whether you are in the Girl Scouts or in some other type of organization, all religious organizations, community, activist organizations, all of these have as a fundamental base character. That is what it is about. The greatness of this coun-

try was developed through the character of its leaders, through the character of its citizens, through the character of the everyday person who believes in honesty, who believes in hard work, who believes in diligence. That is what has made our Nation great.

But that trait is not an inherited trait, those traits. It does not just automatically appear in our young people. It has to be taught and it has to be taught not only in a classroom sense, it has got to be taught by example.

So we, too, have to adopt those characteristics of character and follow those, and we have to deploy the education of those characteristics of character in our schools and in our educational system in hopes that character begins to replace what some people would say is not politically correct, that it is not politically correct to talk about character.

It is politically correct to talk about character. It is a very important thing to the foundation of our Nation.

Let us look at the various elements that I have over here to my left. Character Counts. Trustworthiness. As you will see as we go through these characteristics, there is not one of these on this chart that any of my colleagues could object to, not one, and put together as a unit, it is a very powerful message to educate, not only ourselves, but our young people, and to take into our schools. Character Counts. Trustworthiness.

Responsibility. The ability to trust. The ability to be responsible, responsible for the actions that you take, responsible for the work product that you come out with, responsible for your family, responsible for yourself, responsibility.

Citizenship. You know, one of the horrible things that has occurred to our country in many, many decades, some would argue throughout the history of this country, although I would argue perhaps the Civil War was more of a horrible thing, but you take a look September 11. What has it brought out? There are some good things that have emerged from that horrible, horrible disaster.

□ 2045

One of them is, people now are taking a much more positive view towards citizenship and what it means to be a citizen in the United States of America and what kind of price we have to pay to make this country and to continue this country to be the greatest country in the history of the world. Citizenship is a big part of it.

Recently, there was a book by Tom Brokaw, and that book I think was titled "The Greatest Generation." I do not agree with that title. I do not think there has been a greatest generation. I think every generation has great people within it. I think every generation in the history of this country displays the greatest, not just one generation, although certainly the generation that Tom Brokaw talks about

that my father and mother were involved in, the war effort, et cetera, these were great people. But every generation has great people, and we can continue, and I think we can measure greatness through trustworthiness, through responsibility, through citizenship, and respect. Respect is an important element in our society.

Mr. Speaker, when I grew up, my folks, I never was able to call anyone that was more than 1 or 2 years older than me anything other than Mr. and Mrs. In fact, there are friends of my parents today that I have known for decades and I could not tell my colleagues their first names. I have always known them as Mr. Delaney or Mrs. Delaney or Mr. Jackson or Mrs. Jackson or Dr. Jackson, et cetera, et cetera.

Respect. When I was growing up, we always opened the doors for the elderly, or for women. And I realize that society changes on some of these things, but respect can be demonstrated in many, many different ways, and every generation has a different way of demonstrating that, a different use for respect. But respect must make the transition from generation to generation. It is an important element of character.

Fairness. I think fairness has been demonstrated clearly by President Bush in his response to those acts of terror on September 11. The United States has a reputation for fairness. That is what has made it the greatest country in the history of the world. When we talk to people about the United States who have a nonbiased view of the United States, they will talk about the fairness in the United States. Fairness, it is important. Not only is it important in education, it is important in every aspect of our lives, fairness and caring.

Think about caring. We go over, and I have heard a number of people, and we have held the war in awe about our military machine in Afghanistan. But if people think our military machine has been mighty and something to behold, wait until they see the American feeding machine. We are over there in Afghanistan and we care about the people over there that did not commit an act of wrong against this Nation. We care not to make innocent people the victims if it at all can be avoided.

This country does not go in and take care of its business and then walk out. This country has gone on, it has gone after the war criminals, and it will hunt them down one by one and destroy their empire piece by piece. But the innocent citizens, the citizens who have now seen liberation, liberation of playing music, liberation. This winter, with the tough winter, they will see more food in that country than they have seen in many, many years, because the United States of America cares about those people.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America cares about people other than themselves. There is no country in the

history of the world that has done more charitable acts, contributed more foreign aid, helped more countries in need than the United States of America, and that is because the United States of America cares.

So these are the elements of Character Counts.

Now, when I continue my comments later on in the week or early next week, I am going to really talk about the structure of the Character Counts program and why that program is important for all of my colleagues to encourage their local school districts to deploy within their classrooms, to utilize as one of their core courses, so to speak. Because I think in the end, by relooking, by reemphasizing responsibility, by reemphasizing to our young people through our educational process responsibility, the caring, take a look at this, the citizenship, the fairness, the trustworthiness, the only winners by educating Character Counts are us, our Nation and our future.

Let me wrap up. Let me conclude my remarks with a final subject, a subject which I have talked about on a number of different occasions, and that is missile defense.

Many people in the country today are especially aware of the military might of the Nation, and they are asking a lot of questions that we never thought of asking before. Mr. Speaker, prior to September 11, many people in this Nation thought that wars were fought outside our borders and that what we worried about within our borders were domestic murders, for example, an act of violence like that. No one imagined that we would have the strike against this Nation that took place on September 11. Now people do, and many of my colleagues' constituents are beginning to ask the what ifs: What if we had another act of terrorism? What are the acts of terrorism? What if we had a biological attack?

And one of the questions that needs to be asked is what if a missile were launched against the United States of America? What if the United States of America were the victim of a missile attack? What could the United States of America do to defend itself against a missile attack?

Remember, a missile attack, a missile being launched against the United States of America does not necessarily have to be an intentional launch. We could very easily have a missile launched against the United States of America that was an accidental launch. And if we do not think accidental launches cannot take place, take a look at what happened over the Black Sea about a week after the September 11 event when the Ukrainian navy accidentally fired a missile into an airliner and blew it out of the sky. These accidents happen, and it could happen to the United States of America.

I think it is important today that we all stand up and support the President's determination to put in place for this country a missile defense system.

Now, most people believe that if a foreign country fired a missile against us today, that our NORAD command center, which is located in Colorado Springs, buried deeply within a granite mountain, that NORAD would quickly pick up on its radar and on its devices the fact that a missile has been launched; and that is, in fact, accurate. They would pick it up, in fact, within a few seconds. NORAD could tell us that a missile has been launched. It could tell us the size of the missile, it could tell us the speed of the missile, it could tell us the approximate target of the missile, and it could tell us the estimated time of arrival of the missile. But, after that, there is not much more NORAD can do.

A lot of our citizens, I say to my colleagues, assume that we then would fire a missile to stop it or somehow we could defend ourselves. But all we can do today is quickly advise Oklahoma City or somewhere else, hey, there is a missile, an in-bound missile, and it is going to strike at this point in time. That is all we can do for you.

Today, our responsibility has risen to a higher standard as a result of the events of September 11, and that standard is to follow the President's lead and deploy within the borders of the United States of America a missile defensive system that will protect its citizens, that will provide a defense for the security of this Nation. Failure to deploy a missile defensive system is, in my opinion, gross dereliction, gross dereliction of our constitutional duties to protect the security of this Nation. This is critical that we put this type of system into place.

Now, some will tell us, wait a minute. There is a treaty out there called the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. It is a treaty between the USSR and the United States of America that prohibits either country from building a missile defensive system. That treaty ought to be trashed. That treaty has within its four corners, and it is contained right here, let me show my colleagues. It allows, the legal rights of that treaty called the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, it allows within its four corners each party, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from the treaty. It is a right to withdraw, the right to withdraw. We are not abrogating the treaty. We are not breaking a treaty. We have the right to withdraw from that treaty.

But it is subject to one condition, and that condition is that if it decides extraordinary events relating to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests. Have extraordinary events jeopardized the supreme interests of the United States of America since this treaty was signed between Russia and the United States? The answer is clearly and undebatably yes. It has changed for Russia, and it has changed for the United States.

Take, for example, the proliferation of missiles, the proliferation of missiles that have taken place since that

treaty, countries that possess ballistic missiles. Look at them. Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Belarus, China, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, France, India, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, this list goes on and on. When that treaty, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty was signed, there were only two nations in the world capable of delivering these missiles. It was the United States and Russia. Whether or not we agreed with the merits of the treaty at that point in time, surely today we would agree that the circumstances have changed dramatically, that it is in both Russia's best interests and the best interests of the United States of America that we provide the people of this Nation not further offensive missile capability but defensive missile capability.

Every peace advocate in this country ought to be a stronger advocate of a missile defense system. Why? Because it could possibly avoid a war.

Let us say that some country launches accidentally. Let me tell my colleagues, the consequences of being able to stop a missile over the ocean or stop it before it gets very far off its launching pad, dealing with those consequences are much easier to settle than dealing with the consequences of a missile landing on a major city in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come. The time is here today to follow the lead of our President, and that is to deploy a missile defense system for the defense of this country. Every one of my colleagues, in my opinion, has an inherent, an inherent obligation, an inherent responsibility to provide the constituents, the citizens, and the people of this Nation security on the home front by putting in place and deploying a missile defense system.

At some point in the future, at some point in the future, a missile will be launched against the United States of America. That is my opinion. And if we today, while we have the opportunity, fail to provide a defense against that missile, how could we ever, ever face ourselves again in a mirror and say that we carried out our responsibilities for the protection of this Nation?

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to speak strongly, because I feel deeply committed about our obligation, I say to my colleagues, to provide our citizens, to provide the people of this Nation a security blanket, and that security blanket in a missile defensive system, is one that is technically available, it is economically available, and it is an absolute must.

Again, I repeat, it is an inherent obligation of the leaders of this Nation, and we are leaders in this Chamber, to follow our President's lead and to put that security blanket of a national missile defense system in place and to do it without haste or waste.

□ 2100

We can do it. I expect that we will have to do it much sooner than later.

THE SUPERIORITY OF THE DEMOCRAT STIMULUS PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). 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, during the Thanksgiving recess or break, I had a longer period of time to talk to my constituents about many issues that they are concerned about, and I was particularly concerned about the state of the economy, and about so many people now that continue to lose jobs who have been displaced because of the events on September 11, in particular.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that my district, being so close to New York and to the World Trade Center, we did have many people, maybe almost 200 people in the two counties that I represent, who died in the World Trade Center tragedy. So people are still concerned about terrorism. A lot of attention is focused on the war on terrorism overseas, certainly, as well as security issues here at home.

But I also noticed that although people still focus primarily on those security issues, that many of them are suffering. The economy is not what it used to be. Of course, this past Monday we had the official economic experts who proclaimed that we do in fact officially have a recession; that the recession in fact began last March and was accelerated by the tragic events on September 11.

So I come here tonight urging my colleagues to pass an economic stimulus package. We only have 3 or 4 weeks now before Christmas, and probably only 3 weeks, maybe 4 weeks, that Congress will continue to be in session before the end of the year. I think it is incumbent upon us during this period to pay attention to the economic needs and to the suffering that more and more Americans face, and try to do something about it by passing an economic stimulus bill.

Mr. Speaker, we know that when talk first began on how Congress should address the economic aftershocks of September 11, Members pledged to work together across party lines on a bipartisan basis to create a stimulus package. However, in just a few weeks after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the House Republican leadership broke off talks with Democrats and essentially crafted a stimulus package of their own, which I maintain primarily benefits corporate interests and wealthy Americans and not the displaced workers and not the people who are losing their jobs, not my constituents that I am talking to when I go home.

On October 24, the House actually passed, strictly on party lines, 216 to 214, the Republican stimulus package. I wanted to talk a little bit this evening about why I think this Republican bill is not the way to go, why it cannot be

the basis for any compromise that would ultimately pass the House and Senate and be signed by the President.

I also had the opportunity a week ago during the Thanksgiving break to do a press conference with one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), and also with the president of our New Jersey State AFL-CIO, Charlie Wowkanec, representing some displaced workers, and in particular one displaced worker who was a limousine driver, who basically expressed the concern that he has for himself and his family over the fact that the economy has moved into a recession, and what it means to him in a real sense.

I mention that because when I say that the Republican bill does not address the crisis that we face, the economic recession, it is not out of some ideology, that I am opposed to the Republican bill, but just because I do not think it works. I do not think it will accomplish the goal of ending the recession, getting the economy back on track. Something like the Democratic alternative is more likely to accomplish that goal and also more likely to be the basis for some kind of bipartisan package that we can all support and get signed into law by the President.

The Republican bill, very much like the Bush tax plan that was passed earlier in the year, was loaded with tax breaks to the rich and big business. The legislation made no mention of unemployment benefits for displaced workers and does not adequately address the issues of health benefits for those workers, as well. It just basically does not provide for stimulus and any kind of relief or any kind of benefits for displaced workers.

The reason this Republican bill will not stimulate consumer demand is because it does not focus on low- and middle-income families who are most likely to spend money. It does little to protect those who lost their jobs and may lose their health insurance benefits.

Where it does address the issue of possibly dealing with unemployment compensation or health benefits or other benefits for displaced workers, it basically gives monies to the States and asks them to try to allocate the funds in some way that would help displaced workers. But Mr. Speaker, that could take months; and it could likely be very uneven, and it really was not very much money compared to all the money that was going to the tax breaks, primarily for corporate interests and wealthy individuals.

The Democratic proposal, the Democratic alternative, the Democratic economic stimulus package, included unemployment benefits, health insurance premiums, and rebate checks for low- and moderate-income workers who did not qualify for rebate checks issued under the original Bush tax bill that we passed earlier this year.

It also has additional spending on programs for domestic security that