

Mrs. Edwin Wenta. On Sunday, June 11, 1995, Edwin and Charlotte will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary with their family and friends at the sky room of the Martinique Restaurant in Evergreen Park.

On June 9, 1945, Edwin and Charlotte were married at the San Buena Mission in Ventura, CA. It was near the end of World War II and Ed was on leave from the U.S. Navy.

Edwin and Charlotte have two children, son Terry and daughter Diane, and five grandchildren, Lisa, Nick, Deanna, Dierdra, and Gerald. The entire Wenta family joins me in saluting Edwin and Charlotte on this special occasion.

The Wentas are a role model of the family strength and integrity that has made America great. Their commitment to each other and their family is impressive and deserving of special recognition and honor. I am sure that my colleagues join me in congratulating Edwin and Charlotte on their many years of love and commitment. May their life together continue to be an adventure and offer them many more pleasant memories.

TRIBUTE TO NEW LOS ANGELES MARKETING PARTNERSHIP

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to my good friend Larry Fisher and others for launching the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership, a much-needed effort to counter the negative image of Los Angeles in the media. With a riot, an earthquake, fires and a sensational murder trial having dominated the news from Los Angeles in the past 3 years, the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership could not be arriving at a better time. I wish them all the luck in the world.

Seeing the outline of the program, which will officially kick off on June 7, I am confident it will achieve its goals. The participants truly love Los Angeles, and have a keen sense of what it is that makes this a great city, including climate, extraordinary ethnic diversity and a thriving entertainment industry. The chosen theme, Together we're the best, Los Angeles conveys the spirit of optimism guiding this project.

For the first 5 years, New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership will be reminding the people of Los Angeles County about the exciting place in which they live. This effort will be specifically targeted at all 88 cities in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Larry Fisher and the other members of the New Los Angeles Marketing Partnership, whose faith in the city of Los Angeles and dedication to improving its image is an inspiration to all of us who live and work there.

MEDICARE CUTS ARE A BAD IDEA

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is an old country and western song that goes,

"She got the gold mine, and I got the shaft." The Republican budget would give the gold mine to wealthy special interests and give the shaft to America's elderly—\$300 billion in tax breaks, \$300 billion in Medicare cuts.

The Republicans indignantly cry that these are not really cuts, they are only slowing the growth of Medicare. Tell that to the literally millions of people who depend on Medicare in Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and California, and all over this country, who will have \$3,500 more taken out of their pocket over the next 7 years in higher premiums, deductibles, and copayments. Tell those people that these are not really cuts.

The cuts in services which will pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, tax breaks for special interests, tax breaks for people who do not need these kinds of tax breaks—to people with the highest income in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support Medicare and ensuring that older Americans have access to health care services when they need them from the doctor of their choice. As Republicans move to make these cuts in Medicare, they are talking about rationing health care and limiting seniors' ability to choose their doctor.

We should reject that, Mr. Speaker. We should reject this kind of thinking. It is not good for America's elderly. It is not good for the American people.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN ADDEO: AP- PRECIATION FOR A GREAT CA- REER

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 9, 1995, Mr. John Addeo, Jr., of Ocean, NJ, will be honored with a retirement dinner at Squire Pub in West Long Branch, NJ. It is a great honor for me to pay tribute to Mr. Addeo on this occasion.

Mr. Addeo has served as the principal of the Woodmere School in Eatontown, NJ, since 1968. In total, Mr. Addeo has dedicated 34 years of his life to education. A 1957 graduate of Long Branch High School and a 1961 graduate of Monmouth University, Mr. Addeo began his teaching career in Asbury Park. He received his master's degree from Newark State College in 1968 and became principal at Woodmere later that year. He also was an instructor at Brookdale Community College and serves as a member of the Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association and the New Jersey Education Association.

John and Theresa Addeo are the parents of John Addeo III and Melissa Addeo Ardito. The list of Mr. Addeo's current and former community affiliations is a long one. He is a former member of the Italian-American Association and the Eatontown Lion's Club. He is a charter member and first vice president of the Eatontown/Tinton Falls Kiwanis Club, former Little League baseball and softball coach in Ocean Township, a former member of the Ocean Township Zoning Board of Adjustment and the organizer of Boy Scout Troop 376.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his career, John Addeo has exemplified the very best qualities

of America's proud tradition of public education. Generations of students who have passed through the Woodmere School—many of them fully grownup and now in important positions of responsibility, some of them now parents themselves—have benefited from his dedication and leadership. As his friends, colleagues, and students pay tribute on the occasion of his retirement, I am proud to add my voice in recognition of the fine job that John Addeo has done for nearly a quarter of a century in one of the most important jobs I know of: the education of our young people.

AN AGENDA FOR THE NATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 7, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AN AGENDA FOR THE NATION

Hoosiers continue to express to me their widespread discontent in the country, their unease with government, and anger at those who conduct its business. They understand changes are being made in government—that federal jobs are being eliminated, budgets are being trimmed, agencies are being eliminated—but believe more can and should be done to make government more responsive to the needs and demands of the average American.

The challenge facing Congress and the President is to make the changes that will restore the public's faith and confidence in government. Hoosiers mention the following reforms most often in my recent public meetings, and I think their views reflect the concerns of most Americans.

Deficit reduction: Deficit reduction should be a top priority. Congress acted last session to cut \$600 billion from the projected deficits. The House and Senate recently approved budget plans to eliminate the deficit over the next seven years, but the budget resolution only provides a rough outline for how deficit reduction will be achieved. The tough decisions on specific spending cuts lie ahead. I agree that the deficit must be reduced.

Investment: Americans favor steps to reduce the budget deficit that are fair and balanced. It makes no sense to try to balance the budget by slashing federal investment programs. The private sector is the engine for economic growth, but government can play a role by supporting training and education of our workers as well as investing in our infrastructure and our technology. Such investments are critical to economic growth, and without growth, balancing the budget becomes immensely more difficult. Most of the investment trends over the past several years have been in the wrong direction. We need a shift in federal priorities away from consumption and toward investment, and we need to emphasize both public and private investment.

Reinventing government: The federal government is bloated and should be downsized. Congress and the Executive Branch adopted significant measures last session to make government work better and cost less, from streamlining Pentagon procurement policies to eliminating outdated government agencies. These efforts can and should be expanded this year. Americans want bold changes in government today, and Congress and the President should support that.

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 RETIRES

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