

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

to focus on her contributions and service to Dallas. This attitude was instilled in her by her family growing up in Cleveland, Ohio and to this day, she continues to adhere to the qualities of humility, style and class. In this case, she is truly a good example of this city which is inherent of style and class.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those qualities, she took the lessons of achievement and excellence with her to the University of Pennsylvania, double majoring in Economics and Finance. Keenly focused on success as a woman in our society, she moved to a city that is a blueprint of success in Dallas. Before coming to Dallas, she spent time in New York until she learned where the real "first-class" city was in America.

Mr. Speaker, since that move, she has been a vigorous advocate of many community and social causes. Not only has Mrs. Kirk made her mark in her career, she has given back to a city that has yielded her opportunities. She recently chaired the 15th Annual African-American Museum Gala, which was a successful event under her stewardship.

She is also Chair Elect of the Texas Business Hall of Fame, an organization that awards scholarships to MBA's. As a model to

young women in our area, she is a member of the Advisory Board of Girls, Inc. and recently completed service on the YWCA Board.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Kirk was recently the cover story of an area magazine that focused on her three-pronged approach to life: Family, service and career excellence. In the article, Mrs. Kirk mentioned that she is blessed and has a lot to give. It is clear through seeing her great children, community involvement and strong support of her husband and this city, that Mrs. Kirk has truly given back to us and blessed us with a great example for all women.

---

HONORING AND RECOGNIZING  
SLAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFI-  
CERS

---

SPEECH OF

**HON. DENNIS MOORE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 11, 1999*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 165, and to recognize and

honor Sergeant Richard Asten, a fourteen year veteran of the Kansas City, Kansas, police department, who on June 11, 1998, was struck down in the line of duty.

On that fateful morning, just after 8 a.m., Sergeant Asten was filling in for a colleague who had taken sick when he was called to help stop a stolen vehicle. When Sergeant Asten placed a stop stick in the path of the vehicle, according to eyewitness accounts, the driver intentionally swerved to run him over. Sergeant Asten left behind his family: his wife, Margie Asten; and their three children, Lief Ray, Theresa Ray, and Scott Ray, who currently is serving our country in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, supporting this resolution affirms the invaluable service provided to our communities by police officers and their families. Sergeant Asten and his fellow peace officers form the thin blue line that stands between us and those who would do us harm. Passage of H. Res. 165 is the least we can do to honor and recognize police officers and families who have made the ultimate sacrifice so that we may enjoy freedom, safety and security.