

I am joined by Representative SAM GEJDENSON, the Ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations and Representative CHRIS SMITH, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, only when unrest or tragedy strike abroad do some Americans become aware of the work of the thousands of men and women who serve in the Foreign Service of the United States. The members of the Foreign Service take responsibility for helping Americans in danger. As we saw this past summer in Kenya and Tanzania, Foreign Service members and their families sometimes also become the victims of violence, along with other Americans stationed abroad and their families. We need to do more, and we will do more, to protect all the Americans we ask to work for us overseas.

Indeed, more American Ambassadors than American Generals have been killed abroad since the end of the Second World War, and many in the rank-and-file of the Foreign Service—and their families—have, tragically, fallen victim to terror or to the more mundane hazards of life abroad in the service of their country.

But every day, these dedicated individuals stand ready to promote the interests of the United States. They do this by carrying out tasks such as protecting the property of an American who dies overseas, reporting on political developments, screening potential entrants to the United States, promoting the sale of American goods, or securing American personnel and facilities overseas. They and their families often live in dangerous circumstances and are separated from their extended families and friends.

At home, the men and women of the foreign service perform essential functions in the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture, in the United States Information Agency and in the Agency for International Development.

The modern Foreign Service was established by the Rogers Act of 1924. We are quickly approaching the 75th anniversary of its enactment, on May 24. It is fitting at this time to congratulate the men and women of the Foreign Service and commemorate the sacrifices they have made in the service of their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of the Resolution to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H. RES. 168

Whereas the modern Foreign Service of the United States was established 75 years ago on May 24, 1924, with the enactment of the Rogers Act, Public Law 135 of the 68th Congress;

Whereas today some 10,300 men and women serve in the Foreign Service at home and abroad;

Whereas the diplomatic, consular, communications, trade, development, administrative, security, and other functions the men and women of the Foreign Service of the United States perform are crucial to the United States national interest;

Whereas the men and women of the Foreign Service of the United States, as well as their families, are constantly exposed to danger, even in times of peace, and many have died in the service of their country; and

Whereas it is appropriate to recognize the dedication of the men and women of the Foreign Service of the United States and, in particular, to honor those who made the ultimate

sacrifice while protecting the interests of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the Foreign Service of the United States and its achievements and contributions of the past 75 years;

(2) honors those members of the Foreign Service of the United States who have given their lives in the line of duty; and

(3) commends the generations of men and women who have served or are presently serving in the Foreign Service for their vital service to the Nation.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. BRYAN SWILLEY, OF PORTAGEVILLE, MISSOURI, WWI VETERAN AND CENTENARIAN

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1999

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 15, 1999, the American Legion Post 595 in New Madrid, Missouri, will be honoring Mr. Bryan Swilley at their annual Armed Forces Day Ceremony. At the age of 102, Mr. Swilley is the sole World War I veteran in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District, and his name will be added to the World War I veterans wall being constructed in Poplar Bluff, MO.

Mr. Swilley was born on December 27, 1897, to Tib and Louise Swilley in Portageville, New Madrid County, MO. During the over 100 years of his life, Mr. Swilley lived within a five mile radius of his current home in Portageville. He attended the local schools where he competed on the Country Track team and learned to play the violin.

After graduating high school, Mr. Swilley spent a few months in St. Louis with a high school friend. Mr. Swilley then returned home to New Madrid County to pick cotton. He usually picked 400 pounds of cotton in a day—placing it in a nine foot sack on which he had written his name with pencil in Old English. Through this experience, Mr. Swilley became so skilled in identifying the grades of cottons that in 1927 he won a \$10 gold piece for his high rank in cotton classing contests held in New Madrid, Caruthersville, and Kennett. Mr. Swilley also worked as a night watchman for Swift and Co. Oil Mill and taught at two local schools where he was beloved and respected by his students. During World War I, Mr. Swilley served at the Student Army Training Corps military camp located on the campus of Washington University in St. Louis.

Perhaps Mr. Swilley's greatest achievement was his 76 year marriage to Lena Frizzell. Mr. Swilley and Ms. Frizzell were married on September 8, 1920, and the couple had six children, Mozart, Neva, Bryan "Bo," J.K., B.W., and Donald. The Swilleys observed their 75th wedding anniversary the year before Lena's passing on February 20, 1996.

Mr. Swilley is truly a wonderful example of an American dedicated to family, country, and the rural way of life. I want to thank Mr. Swilley for the contributions he selflessly made to our country during the Great War. May he be in our thoughts and in our prayers on this Armed Forces Day.

A DANGEROUS TIME FOR AMERICA

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous time for America. Our nation has absolutely no defense against ballistic missile attack and our enemies are well-aware of this vulnerability. North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya and other rogue nations are currently developing long-range ballistic missiles to deliver chemical, biological, and nuclear warheads to our shores.

Communist China already has this capability. Just last year, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) confirmed 13 of China's 18 long-range nuclear-tipped missiles were targeted at U.S. cities. In 1996, China threatened to launch those missiles on American targets, including Los Angeles, if our country intervened on behalf of Taiwan during China's threatening missile "tests" over that country. China's Lt. General Xiong Guang Kai remarked that Americans "care more about Los Angeles than they do Tai Pei." Communist China still has over 100 CSS-6 missiles pointed at Taiwan and the number is expected to grow to 600 in the coming years.

Revelations China has been actively stealing U.S. nuclear warhead secrets from Los Alamos is no comfort either. The information China acquired concerns advanced, miniaturized nuclear warheads which will allow China to place multiple warheads on new intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). If China launches these missiles at the United States, Los Angeles could be but a fly-over mark on the way to Washington, Chicago, New York, and other "target-rich" cities.

China is aware the United States cannot defend against ballistic missile attack and actively exploits this weakness. Rather than investing resources in modern aircraft and warships, China is instead fully funding its missile programs. Over the next several years, China can be expected to field a new mobile intercontinental ballistic missile. China is also developing an impressive and advanced reconnaissance-strike complex utilizing satellite technology to provide precise targeting data to its highly accurate ballistic missiles.

While temporarily less aggressive, Russia remains a serious ballistic missile threat as well. Russia still maintains over 20,000 nuclear weapons and in 1993 issued a national security policy placing even greater reliance upon nuclear deterrence due to economic crisis and a sharp decline in conventional military capabilities. Not only do such economic and political difficulties enhance the threat of an intentional launch, but they heighten the prospects for an unintentional launch. The United States remains helpless and defenseless against any launch.

In response to the confirmed and escalating threats to our nation, both the House and Senate in March 1999 overwhelmingly passed legislation establishing U.S. policy to deploy a National Missile Defense. At the same time, the Clinton administration has taken every conceivable stop to oppose such a defense, to the point of championing an Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty the U.S. signed in 1972 with a country that no longer exists—the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has decided, as a matter of affirmative policy, not to

field a defense against long-range ballistic missiles.

Despite the stark differences between the Congress and the president in commitment and accomplishment relating to missile defense, however, President Clinton's National Security Council Advisor on April 12, 1999 was quoted in *Aviation Week & Space Technology* as remarking that lawmakers have been less productive than the president in advancing an effective missile defense. In the article, Robert G. Bell "assail[ed] [Congress'] focus on rhetoric, deadlines and parochial interests, while avoiding the hard work of helping guide the architecture of a National Missile Defense system."

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's National Security Council Advisor is dead wrong on the record of National Missile Defense. Therefore, I hereby submit for the RECORD, the full text of the letter I have today posted to Mr. Bell in response to his comments.

APRIL 30, 1999.

MR. ROBERT G. BELL,
National Security Council Advisor, The White House, Washington House, DC.

DEAR MR. BELL: Aviation Week & Space Technology (April 12, 1999, page 21) reported your admission the Clinton administration was late to recognize the threat posed by long-range ballistic missiles, and inaccurately downgraded in definition our previous ballistic missile defense program to a technology demonstration program. The article also indicated you graded lawmakers ever worse than the Clinton administration, "assailing their focus on rhetoric, deadlines and parochial interests, while avoiding the hard work of helping guide the architecture of a National Missile Defense system."

THREAT

Your admission the Clinton administration was late to recognize the threat of ballistic missiles is a positive development. Recent events have reinforced to Congress the knowledge that long-range ballistic missiles are indeed a clear and present threat to the national security of the United States. The high visibility of long-range ballistic missile threats, highlighted by North Korea's recent test of a missile capable of striking the United States, the warnings from Chairman Donald Rumsfeld and the Commission To Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States, and the transfer of critical ballistic missile and nuclear warhead technology to China, argue persuasively for the deployment of a comprehensive National Missile Defense (NMD) system.

In response to the growing threat from long-range ballistic missiles, both the House and Senate in March 1999 overwhelmingly passed legislation making it the policy of the United States to deploy a National Missile Defense. This legislation establishes definitive policy for deployment and sets the stage for follow-on legislation providing for a specific NMD architecture. Clearly, the Congress is actively working to ensure our country is protected from threat of ballistic missile attack.

Yet the Clinton administration, including Secretary of Defense William Cohen, has failed to acknowledge the United States has a need to deploy a National Missile Defense, even while recognizing the growing threat from long-range ballistic missiles. When the Clinton administration cannot even acknowledge the need to deploy a National Missile Defense, how can it credibly assail Congress for "avoiding the hard work of helping guide the architecture of a National Missile Defense System?"

The Clinton administration, hinging the very security of our nation on a single Na-

tional Missile Defense "readiness deployment program," refuses to acknowledge the existence of a threat warranting deployment and our technological capability to proceed with deployment. It appears the Clinton administration is waiting until nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles are aimed and inbound to the United States before it will concede the need for an effective missile defense system. The Clinton administration is negligent in its duty to protect the citizens of the United States.

RHETORIC

Defense Secretary William Cohen's January 20, 1999 comments regarding ballistic missile defense were highly suggestive of a new willingness of the Clinton administration to amend or abrogate the outdated and non-binding Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Yet, the Clinton administration's position has been refuted in practice by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's position of using the ABM Treaty as a reason to block development of effective ballistic missile defenses, particularly space-based ballistic missile defenses.

Why does the Clinton administration, publicly willing on the one hand to amend or abrogate the ABM Treaty, find itself on the other hand unwilling to develop ballistic missile defenses which may exceed ABM Treaty limits?

It has been documented Russia constructed a national missile defense system which violated the ABM Treaty. Furthermore, in April 1991, the author of the ABM Treaty, Henry Kissinger, recognized a changed atmosphere following the end of the Cold War, writing: "Limitations on strategic defenses will have to be reconsidered in light of the Gulf War experience. No responsible leader can henceforth leave his civilian population vulnerable."

It would appear President Clinton is indeed irresponsible by intentionally leaving our civilian population vulnerable to ballistic missile attack.

ARCHITECTURE

In 1993, the Clinton administration inherited a sophisticated ballistic missile defense providing global coverage utilizing Space Based Interceptors known as Brilliant Pebbles (which would have been ready for near-term deployment in roughly 4-5 years), Space Based Lasers, Space Based Infrared Sensors (SBIRS), and theater ballistic missile defenses, including Navy Upper Tier (Navy Theater Wide). Shortly after taking office in 1993, the Clinton administration canceled our space-based ballistic missile defense programs, including Brilliant Pebbles, and cut the Space Based Laser program to a token, not even equal to a technology readiness demonstration. These cuts have yet to be reversed by the administration, despite an acknowledgement of the inherent advantages of space-based ballistic missile defenses.

You clearly recognize the inherent advantages of such a defense, as quoted in *Aviation Week & Space Technology* (December 4, 1995, page 110): "At the other end of the scale is the Defense Dominance Model. It is central to High Frontier and the original vision that president Ronald Reagan had in articulating the Strategic Defense Initiative. Under this approach, if both sides build very tall defensive walls, including maximum use of the technical advantages that accrue from deployments in space [emphasis added], you achieve stability through counterpoised defenses, with requirements for offensive arms quite minimal."

Today, however, rather than seeking the "maximum use of the technical advantages that accrue from deployments in space," the Clinton administration instead proposes a

National Missile Defense architecture devoid of space-based deployments. The National Missile Defense system proposed by this administration will be inherently less effective and decidedly more costly than a National Missile Defense utilizing space-based deployments.

There is no reason for, nor intention of, the Congress to agree with a proposal for a National Missile Defense architecture of inferior design, particularly when the administration is aware it is deliberately compromising the defense of the American people.

SUMMARY

The Clinton administration is mistakenly attacking Congress for "avoiding the hard work of helping guide the architecture of a National Missile Defense system" at the same time it fails to even acknowledge the need for our nation to deploy a National Missile Defense. Furthermore, the administration's only proposed system architecture is of a notably inferior design.

It is the responsibility of the Executive Branch and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States to present a coherent and effective National Missile Defense architecture. The Executive Branch is led by a single individual capable of providing guidance for a National Missile Defense designed by a single architect, rather than by 535 architects in Congress.

Rather than providing for the common defense, rather than being vigilant in protecting the American people, rather than preparing the United States to counter the growing global threat of long-range ballistic missiles, President Clinton is willfully and deliberately leaving the United States defenseless, helpless, and vulnerable to long-range ballistic missiles. I take vehement exception to your remarks as quoted in *Aviation Week & Space Technology*.

We must defend our freedom. The United States must deploy a National Missile Defense which includes "the maximum use of the technical advantages that accrue from deployments in space."

Very truly yours,

BOB SCHAFER,
Member of Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. MATRICE ELLIS-KIRK

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1999

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the accomplishments and work of Mrs. Matrice Ellis-Kirk of Dallas.

Mrs. Kirk is of course known as our city's first lady, wife of Dallas Mayor Ron Kirk. However, it is an understatement when I say that she is a respected individual in her own right. Dallasites hold her in high esteem and regard because while being the Mayor's closest and strongest political ally, she is an Executive Search Consultant for an international executive search firm in Dallas and the mother of two beautiful children.

I join many men and women in Dallas in being particularly impressed by her commitment to serving the greater Dallas area community. She is focused in strengthening our city as she is in strengthening opportunities in her field and for her family.

Amid her great accomplishments as an executive, mother and first lady, Mrs. Kirk's personality is as such that she would not like us