

The terrorists are not after you, the United States, and not even after the coalition. The terrorists are after the Iraqi people. Every action—blowing up an oil line, blowing up a water line—hurts the Iraqi people, not the United States and not the coalition itself. That voice coming from the Iraqi leadership I think will be hugely helpful.

Iraqis do not like the U.S. occupation in and of itself. They are a proud people and they want that sovereignty. Yes, we are going from occupation to mission. Iraqis do want freedom. They do want democracy. But the President this week, with whom many of us had the opportunity to meet, and the Prime Minister said the goal is democracy.

Last week—and I will close shortly—the U.N. Security Council unanimously approved a new U.S. resolution. The resolution outlines that transfer of sovereignty to the new interim Iraqi government and the role of the coalition forces after June 30. The world community is now united behind the Iraqi people, and with every passing day the Iraqi people, with the coalition's help, are building the capacity to govern themselves.

As in the past, we must stay the course. We will stay the course. We will keep true to the principles. We will have continued faith in our superb Armed Forces. We know that history in the end will be on our side.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the unused leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Wyoming.

IRAQ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was very pleased to hear about the leader's trip to Iraq. Having been there several months ago, I think things have changed some, certainly. I think they are even stronger there than they were and things are better than we hear about here. So I say to the majority leader, I am delighted you were there.

DEFINING THE ISSUES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are faced now with a relatively short period of time to finish our work for this year. We are down to a certain number of weeks—not very many—to do many things. We have a short time to finish the jobs that need to be finished. So I

wish to comment a little on some of the things I have been thinking about in terms of the broader aspect of what our responsibilities are in the Senate.

In the Senate, we are faced, of course, with many and varied issues. We have to deal with all kinds of things that happen and all kinds of issues that are brought up which are very legitimate. I guess this is my point: Our job is also to define the kinds of issues that are appropriate to be handled in the Senate, to be handled in the Congress, to be a part of the Federal activity.

Sometimes I think we find ourselves having all kinds of issues come up in this Chamber which one could question as to whether this is the role of the Federal Government. Of course, our basic decisionmaking comes from the Constitution. But the Constitution is obviously fairly broad in its terms, so there is always a different kind of feeling, a different definition for what are the appropriate roles, the appropriate issues in which the Federal Government should be involved.

I guess I am sometimes reminded that the Federal Government is only one of the functions that we have in this country to carry out the leadership and the activities for our country.

It is the United States of America, so that the Federal Government's role is to bring together those things that affect a number of States, and the States to do those things that are involved in their State. They are closer to the people in the State.

We also, of course, have county governments. We have State governments, and we have city governments. We have nongovernmental units. We have voluntarism. We have all kinds of things that are there.

One of the elements of our work is to decide what should be treated as legitimate Federal issues and the kind with which we should be concerned here. I think we are challenged every day with that kind of definition. I am not going to try to cite all the different ones that come up, but I can tell you there are things that come up that you would have a hard time saying: Hey, that is the role of the Federal Government to decide.

It is particularly appropriate to bring this up, after having spent the weekend celebrating Ronald Reagan's work as President and the job he did in leadership. His basic thought, you remember, all through his whole involvement was less government rather than more and wanting it to be more efficient rather than less efficient. So it does seem appropriate that we talk about those kinds of things as we go about our struggle.

We are involved now, for instance, with the establishment of a budget. Frankly, a lot of people say: What do you want a budget for; you don't pay any attention to it anyway.

That isn't true. The budget is kind of that definition of where we are going, and the Federal Government has some

control in that if you go beyond the budget in the appropriations process, which often happens, then there is the defense mechanism that you can raise a point of order where it takes 60 votes to get it passed. So it is interesting to me that now we are having time for the budget. In fact, time for the budget has actually passed. Remember, this is the fiscal year that ends at the end of September, and we are supposed to have all of our appropriations finished by that time. To do that, you really should have a budget. And we are here on the cusp of having a budget, yet with some fairly insignificant differences why we are held up and don't have one.

I was struck the other day by reading a little quote from James Madison. He said:

In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place, oblige it to control itself.

That is difficult, a large event like we have in the Federal Government, to control the size and the activities of the Federal Government. So I think in many ways it has grown beyond what most people would have envisioned in years past. Whenever there seems to be a problem here, now we have continued to create the notion that you need some money for this, you need some money for that on the local level. Let's get the Federal Government to pay it. Then, on the other hand, we say: taxes are too high. Why should we be paying this much?

So there is this built-in contradiction that is always there. But we need to take a look at the dollars spent. We need to take a look at the size of the Federal Government, the number of employees in the Federal Government, the number of agencies we have, and more difficult than anything else is to kind of keep track of the number of programs that are funded by the Federal Government. It is difficult sometimes.

One of the difficulties is programs become established, and they continue. Times change. What was appropriate to do 10, 15 years ago may not be appropriate now, but it seems to be very difficult to ever do anything about the programs that exist, that sort of perpetuate themselves.

So I think it really is interesting to deal with this issue and, again, to think about the role of the Federal Government.

We are doing something in the committee that I chair, the Parks Subcommittee, where we have more and more heritage areas. We find ourselves having heritage areas most everywhere, and you get a little advantage locally. I understand that. But we are trying now to put down the definition of what a national heritage area ought to be. There are State heritage areas; there are local heritage areas; and then there are national ones, each of which has different characteristics. So these

are the kinds of things at which I believe we have to continue to look.

As we have grown, I wanted to bring a little exhibit. I asked the general services office to make for me a list of all the programs that are federally funded. This is the book of federally funded programs. I am not saying they are not all excellent, but I am saying this thing continues to get bigger, continues to get larger, continues to have more and more programs and not much of an effort to go back and evaluate them to see if they are still appropriate, to see if they need to be changed, to see, indeed, if they need to be there. We don't really evaluate as closely as we might the new programs that are thrown out there, whatever they may be, to see, is this an appropriate thing for us to do at the Federal level or, indeed, should it be done somewhere else.

So I have been feeling fairly strongly about this point. I am not sure we all recognize the size of the things that we do have. For example, how many employees do you suppose there are in the Federal Government? Quite a few? Yes, about 1.9 million. It has gone up the first part of this administration, and now it went down by about 29,000. Now it is 1.861 million employees. And they are good employees, I understand that. I am not critical of the employees. But I am saying this is the size of the Government. We try to do some things to hold down the size, to hold down the spending. Maybe even more importantly is to keep Government as close as can be to the governed. I think we see this regionally quite a bit.

I happen to be from a State in the West, a small population State. The kinds of programs, the kinds of administration, the kinds of governmental activities you need in our State are quite different from what they are in New York City or in Philadelphia. So having it closer to the people allows for the kinds of changes that need to be there. We are concerned about spending. Indeed, we should be. We spent, last year, about \$826 billion on discretionary programs, not defense and those others. As a matter of fact, non-military spending last year was up 8.7 percent over the last 2 years. So that is an awful lot of dough.

At any rate, I just couldn't resist the idea of saying, let's take a little look at each of these programs, and let's see if they are still current, if they are still doing the job they were designed to do, if they are appropriate to be done on the Federal level as opposed to some other level of government, and what can we do to make them even more efficient.

I was very impressed over the week-end with all of our recognition of President Reagan, his efforts to sort of do some of these things, keep them as small as possible, keep them as appropriate as possible. I think it is a job that we have as well, and one that I hope we will take up with more vigor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Arizona.

ENDING THE COLD WAR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I, too, would like to comment on one of the legacies of our late President Ronald Reagan, the legacy of ensuring that the free world would prevail over the Soviet Union in the cold war.

I thought it was interesting that in one of the comments about Reagan very recently made on National Public Radio, June 8 of this year, Mr. Gennady Gerasimov, spokesman for Mikhail Gorbachev, said this:

I see President Reagan as a grave digger of the Soviet Union and the spade that he used to prepare this grave was SDI, a Strategic Defense Initiative, so-called "Star Wars." The trick was that the Soviet leadership believed that this SDI defense is possible and then—because it's possible, we must catch up with the Americans. And this was an invitation to the arms race, and the Soviet economy could not really afford it and this way Reagan really contributed to the demise of the Soviet Union.

Who better to know that than the spokesmen for Mikhail Gorbachev who have said similar things? Twenty-one years ago, President Reagan posed a very important question to the American people. He asked us to consider whether the free people of the world should continue to have to rely upon the threat of a massive retaliation of nuclear weapons to prevent an attack by the opposition. He asked: What would it take to free the world from this threat? He answered as follows:

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. . . . But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

We began making that investment. It was one of the reasons we had a deficit during the Reagan years. It was part of the so-called defense buildup, to invest billions of dollars in the research—yes, there were failures, but there were many successes—to develop a Strategic Defense Initiative, an ability to defend ourselves against a ballistic missile attack from an enemy. A lot of Americans probably think we developed that strategic defense, that we have that capability today. They might remember that during the first Persian Gulf war Patriot missiles shot down some of the Scuds that were fired by Saddam Hussein.

But the grim reality is strategic defense is still not a reality. We still don't have the ability to defend against a missile attack. What happened during the Persian Gulf war? We used an air defense system to shoot down airplanes, and in the field, literally, as we shipped it from the United States to Israel and to Saudi Arabia and to Ku-

wait, made modifications in it so that we hoped it might work to shoot down some of the missiles that Saddam Hussein shot toward Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In fact, some of those missiles—roughly a third of them—were intercepted by the Patriot. It was a crude weapon that was modified in the field. It had never been tested against other missiles. Yet we used what we had at the time because of the threat that existed.

Throughout the Clinton years and the first Bush administration, research continued. Every time we got close to, as they say, bending metal, actually building a missile, somebody would object and say we are not quite there yet. We haven't proven it can work. It is going to cost a lot of money, or the Russians—then the Soviets—might be unhappy with it.

After the demise of the Soviet Union, we agreed to scrap the ABM Treaty, and both President Putin and President Bush agreed that there was no need for a treaty that would define how many missiles each country could have and how many nuclear warheads because, frankly, we didn't have the need for them anymore and they were costly to maintain. We would destroy as many of ours as we wanted to destroy, and they could destroy all of theirs that they wanted to destroy. It was too expensive to keep around. There are still some in Russia, I might add, where some believe it still might be worth trying to develop this offensive capability because the U.S. has never deployed a ballistic missile defense. There are those in China who believe the same thing, and also in North Korea, who I suspect believe we are bluffing.

Let me quote something from a high-ranking official in Iran, from Iran's clerical hierarchy, delivered at Tehran's Al-Hussein University very recently, and reported in the May 28 edition of a newspaper in London:

We have a strategy drawn up for the destruction of Anglo-Saxon civilization and for the uprooting of the Americans and the English. The global infidel front is a front against Allah and the Muslims, and we must make use of everything we have at hand to strike at this front, by means of our suicide operations or by means of our missiles. There are 29 sensitive sites in the U.S. and in the West. We have already spied on these sites and we know how we are going to attack them.

There is more that we could bring to the information from the intelligence community, that is open material that we are all aware involve plans by leaders in North Korea, Iran, and other places to try to develop missile technology and nuclear technology to attack places such as the United States. The North Koreans already have the capacity to attack Hawaii and Alaska, and we don't yet have a missile defense system in place to stop it.

Thanks to President Bush and the efforts of the Congress and the missile act that we passed, we have put into place a program to actually develop and deploy a missile defense system. It