

Tax reform: Tax reform and simplification should be priorities again. Several proposals are pending in Congress to significantly simplify the tax code. Those proposals include replacing the income tax with a consumption tax or a flat tax; or reducing the rates in the current system in exchange for fewer exemptions and deductions.

Congressional reform: Real government reform means cleaning up our system of campaign finance, restricting special interest PACs, and ending lobbyists' gifts to members of Congress. Voters are deeply suspicious that organized interest groups have become too powerful and that they have multiplied to the point that they now are clogging the arteries of the democratic system.

Health care: Americans are concerned about the rise of health care costs and the risk of losing coverage if they leave their jobs. In almost every public meeting now, a constituent will pull out a hospital bill that has delivered a knock-out blow to family finances. They favor incremental reforms to our health care system, such as barring insurance companies from denying coverage to people with pre-existing medical conditions, or cutting administrative costs in the system. They do not want to see drastic cuts in Medicare services.

National defense: Our military strength should be preeminent. Americans are proud of our military forces, and recognize that in a dangerous world those forces will be called upon to perform difficult missions. They favor improved readiness and strengthening our ability to meet realistic threats to our national security, but not wasteful spending to meet threats long since gone with the end of the Cold War. They know that defense dollars can be more prudently spent, and money can be saved by cutting waste, fraud and abuse.

Foreign policy: Americans are wary of our commitments overseas, but they do not support a compete withdrawal from foreign affairs. They recognize that his country must be engaged in the world—not because it feels good, but because it's in the national interest to do so. They believe that the world is a better, more secure place because of American leadership. They think the overriding consideration in any challenge should be to act to protect the American national interest. They support trade policies that open foreign markets to U.S. businesses and farmers; arms control efforts that make the world a safer place; and use of force, when necessary, to defend key interests.

Values: I am impressed by the number of constituents who talk about the importance of values, religion, and faith. They understand that not all our problems are fiscal, and they are concerned about the coarsening of our culture, the breakup of the family, and a decline in civility. Voters are rightly concerned about where as a society we are headed. They believe federal programs should strengthen families and traditional values and not in any way undermine them. At the same time most Americans say that the federal government should not be excessively entangled in people's religious lives.

Conclusion: This is not meant to be an exhaustive list, but it is a good start. What underlies the public's demand for change is a deep anxiety about the future. Many working families have watched their income stagnate or fall for a decade and are worried about the future. Government must help working people confront the uncertainties caused by a changing global economy. It should try to give them more security and confidence about the future. The demand from ordinary Americans is for greater economic and personal security. They want the good life in a stable community. They want a chance to send their kids to college, to live

in safe communities, and to enjoy a rising standard of living.

Our fundamental task is still to put the nation back on the track—now and in the future—toward broad prosperity for all Americans.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE THROUGH NAVY UPPER TIER

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, a near-term defense against ballistic missile attack can be achieved by upgrading existing Navy AEGIS cruisers, destroyers, and standard missiles.

[From the Wall St. Journal, June 5, 1995]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—DOABLE MISSILE DEFENSE

Opponents of defending America against missile attack have long argued that (1) it can't be done and (2) even if it could, it's too expensive. Meanwhile, proponents of missile defense of late have been squabbling among themselves about the pros and cons of their individual pet projects.

But now, under the auspices of the Heritage Foundation, a group of 16 eminent scientists and former military and civilian Defense officials have put aside their differences and joined to come up with a proposal that is doable and affordable. Better yet, it would work.

At the core of the Heritage Team B plan is an upgrade of the Navy's Aegis air-defense system to allow it to shoot down long-range and short-range ballistic missiles. The Aegis is a shipboard radar-tracking and interceptor system that directs surface-to-air missiles, also on ships, against enemy aircraft and cruise missiles. It is intended for use in combat theaters—for example, to defend the Marines from attack as they storm a beach.

The Navy is already working on an upgrade that would allow it to intercept missiles outside the atmosphere, in the "upper tier." The Upper Tier system would also be for theater use, though the upgrade would vastly expand the territory it could protect. The Team B proposal calls for Upper Tier to be upgraded even further, to shoot down missiles of any range. Given such a capability, if Upper Tier were deployed on ships scattered around the American coast, it would provide a protective shield against strategic missiles aimed at the U.S.

And therein lies the rub. For, incredibly, the United States has agreed not to defend itself against missile attack. This was the mad promise made 23 years ago in the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union. It is an even more reckless pledge today considering the growing threat of missile attack. A full upgrade of Upper Tier would violate the ABM Treaty since it could be used to defend the U.S. against attacks by strategic missiles.

If we proceed along the current track, Frank Gaffney, a former Reagan Defense official and a member of Team B, points out that a Navy Aegis commander in the Sea of Japan would be in the absurd position of being able to shoot down a missile the North Koreans aim at Tokyo, but incapable of shooting down one heading for Chicago. How on earth could it possibly be in our national interest to dumb down the Upper Tier system so that it can be used to protect our allies and our troops abroad, but not one heading for our homeland?

The experts on Team B say a fully upgraded Upper Tier system could begin to be

deployed in three years at a cost of only about \$1 billion. For a total cost of between \$2 billion and \$3 billion, 650 interceptors could be deployed on 22 Aegis cruisers by 2001. The reason this is so cheap is that the U.S. has already invested close to \$50 billion in the Aegis system; most of the necessary infrastructure is already there.

A fully upgraded Upper Tier alone wouldn't provide a perfect national defense, but it's a start. Team B also wants to expedite work on Brilliant Eyes, a space-based sensor capable of detecting missile launches and tracking missiles in flight. And it calls for putting more money into research on space-based defenses, which in the long run are the most effective and cheapest way to defend against missile attack.

It is hardly controversial to assert that it won't be all that many years before a pirate in a place like Baghdad or Pyongyang gets hold of a nuclear bomb and the means with which to deliver it. When that capability exists, it will of course be too late to start slapping together a national missile defense.

The House National Security Committee took a step in the right direction when it marked up a defense spending bill that would authorize more money for Upper Tier, Brilliant Eyes and missile defense in general. Similar legislation is making its way through the House Armed Services Committee.

That's the good news. The bad news is that the House bill makes it clear that all this must be done within the confines of the ABM Treaty. Even worse is the possibility that the ABM Treaty might be expanded to cover some theater missile defenses, as suggested in the agreement President Clinton signed in Moscow earlier this month. Some Members of Congress ought to ask their constituents whether they really want their government to consciously retard its defensive capability because of an antique Cold War treaty. It's now time for this country's political establishment to admit that future missile technology is likely to be carrying something much nastier than communications satellites.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE PRESIDENT RETIREES

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor Rear Adm. Joseph Charles Strasser for his faithful and dedicated service to the U.S. Navy. In June 1995, Rear Admiral Strasser will retire from the Navy. For the past 5 years, Admiral Strasser has headed the Naval War College, bringing outstanding instruction in strategy and military affairs to officers of our country.

Strasser was commissioned into the U.S. Navy in June 1963, after graduating from the Naval Academy. His initial assignment was as an exchange officer with the Argentine Navy. In July 1968, he began studying at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. There he earned a master's degree in international relations, a master's degree in international law and diplomacy, and a Doctor of Philosophy in political science. He went on to attend the command and staff course at the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, RI.

In January 1987, he was selected for promotion to rear admiral and in August of the following year he became the commander of