

Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight. Frankly, I was shocked to find that the Department had not yet done their own study of this potentially huge future liability, and that is why I introduced this amendment.

It is vital that the Department of Energy obtain comprehensive and accurate information regarding the extent and valuation of natural resource damages at DOE sites. This is especially important if we are to make realistic budget assumptions today and set realistic budget goals for the future. Unfortunately, there has not been a reliable study done on this issue to date.

During the course of Superfund hearings held in the Environment and Public Works Committee, significant questions have been raised about the Department of Energy's liability for natural resource damages at their Superfund sites. Department officials first estimated liability in the hundreds of billions of dollars. Since that time, GAO has looked at the situation, as has CEQ. However, the CEQ and GAO estimates are quite different. GAO estimates a high range of \$15 billion while CEQ says the high range is \$500 million. The disparity between these two studies is troubling, as is the fact that DOE has never done their own study.

This amendment directs DOE to conduct their own study, to use realistic assumptions about liability based on the real world experience private parties have already had, and to report to the Congress 90 days after enactment. This real world experience is the methods in the current natural resource damages assessment regulations, and should be consistent with the position asserted by public trustees in suits against private parties and with the position supported by the administration pertaining to damages against private parties. While I would be happy to work with DOE to ensure they have enough time to do a credible job, it is important that they complete their work before we move to reauthorize the Superfund program next year and before next year's appropriations cycle.

Finally, I want to emphasize that the intent of this section is purely for oversight functions. This section in no way should be interpreted as a reflection of support for the current operation of the natural resource damages provisions of CERCLA. I in no way endorse the methodologies used by public trustees under the current natural resource damages regulations. I simply believe that if private parties face these regulations today, and if the Department of Energy is the single largest potentially responsible party in the country, then we ought to use the same standard in estimating DOE liability at these sites. I look forward to receiving this study and to possible future hearings on this issue.

Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman THURMOND and Senator NUNN for their help on this matter.

CABLE TELEVISION PROVISION

Mr. SMITH. I would like to engage the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee on section 833 of the conference bill, relating to cable television franchise agreements on military bases. That section implements an advisory opinion of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, which found that cable television franchise agreements on military bases are contracts subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation [FAR].

As chairman of the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee, I believe that when negotiating the settlement ordered by section 833(3), the parties should give due consideration to the fair compensation of cable operators terminated for the convenience of the Government in accordance with part 49 of the FAR. Factors to be considered may include, to the extent provided in the FAR, interest on capital expenditures, settlement preparation costs, and other expenses reasonably incurred by such operators in connection with constructing their cable systems or obtaining fair compensation.

Mr. THURMOND. I agree with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. NUNN. I also agree with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire.

SUBMARINE LANGUAGE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, in section 121 of the conference report I read that funds in this bill are:

* * *available for contracts with Electric Boat Division and Newport News Shipbuilding to carry out the provisions of the "Memorandum of Agreement among the Department of the Navy, Electric Boat Corporation (EB) and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company (NNS) concerning the New Attack Submarine" dated April 5, 1996, relating to design data transfer, design improvements, integrated process teams, and update design base.

Further, in the bill, under subsection (g) Design Responsibility, I read,

The Secretary shall ensure that both shipbuilders have full and open access to all design data concerning the design of the submarine previously designated by the Navy as the New Attack Submarine.

Mr. President, reading a portion of the aforementioned memorandum of agreement, a copy of which I am submitting for the record, NNS is to "be provided design deliverable information in a manner and scope that is generally consistent with that provided in the latest submarine program (SeaWolf). Design data transfer will be conducted in the most cost effective manner to support construction of follow-on ships at NNS." My interpretation of subsection (g)(1) of section 121 is that this subsection does not require the transfer of any design data between the shipyards which are not required by the memorandum of agreement. Am I correct in my interpretation of the intent of the conferees?

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I would say that the Senator from Connecticut

is correct in his interpretation of the language in the bill regarding the transfer of design data between the two shipyards. It was the intent of the conferees to reaffirm last year's requirement requiring the transfer of design data regarding the new attack submarine to Newport News Shipbuilding. It was not the intent of the conferees to change the terms of the memorandum of agreement. Further, it was the intent of the conferees that the appropriate US Navy official resolve differences of opinion about what information is required to be transferred under the MOA.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may I say that I fully agree with the distinguished chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee on this point.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I agree with my colleagues interpretation of this important subsection of the conference report.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, thank you for providing me the opportunity to clarify this most important section of the conference report.

NUNN-LUGAR-DOMENICI DEFENSE AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, after a truly heroic effort by both members and staff, before the recess we completed action on a conference agreement on the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill. I hope this agreement will be voted on by the Senate soon. I wanted to take a few moments to highlight one provision in that bill which relates specifically to a recent tragic incident that has hit all of us in our hearts and homes. The incident to which I refer is the terrorist pipe bomb that went off in Centennial Park—the heart of the Olympic celebration in Atlanta—in July, which killed 1, caused the death of another, and injured over 100 people.

But, Mr. President, at this point in history, we have to ask ourselves, "What if?" What if this hadn't been a crude pipe bomb? What if the individual who planted this terrorist device had used information readily available on the Internet and materials readily and legally available to concoct a chemical weapon? Or, worse, suppose he had concocted a biological weapon?

The answer seems too terrible to consider, but consider it we must. And that is precisely why Senator LUGAR, Senator DOMENICI, and I cosponsored the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act, an amendment—adopted by a unanimous vote in the Senate—to the Defense authorization bill that addresses this very threat. I am pleased to say that our colleagues in the House of Representatives also accepted this amendment in the conference report virtually as it passed the Senate.

Mr. President, the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Program, now title XIV of the Defense authorization bill, provides \$201 million—\$144 million to the Department of Defense and \$57 million to the Department of

Energy—to address the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

DOD is being given \$65 million to conduct a program to train, equip, and assist local first responders in dealing with incidents involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and related materials; \$10.5 million of this funding is specifically earmarked for DOD assistance to the Secretary of Health and Human Services in forming emergency medical response teams capable of dealing with these materials.

DOD is also being given \$30 million both to provide equipment and assistance to the United States Customs Service and to help train customs services in the former Soviet Union, the Baltic States, and Eastern Europe in an effort to improve our ability to detect and interdict these materials before they reach the hands of terrorists in the United States. An additional \$27 million is provided to DOD and DOE for research and development of improved detection technologies, which are badly needed.

Finally, DOD and DOE are provided additional funding to address the threat of proliferation at its source. In addition to being fully funded at the administration's request of \$327.9 million, DOD's Cooperative Threat Reduction Program is being provided \$37 million for projects designed to destroy, dismantle, and improve controls over the former Soviet Union's stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. DOE is being provided \$40 million for its programs in this area.

The provision also calls for the creation of a senior level coordinator to improve the Federal Government's efforts in dealing with the threat of proliferation and to coordinate Federal, State, and local plans and training. Some \$2 million is provided for the coordinator to use in focusing research efforts on improved planning, coordination, and training efforts.

Mr. President, the threat of attack on American cities and towns by terrorists, malcontents, or representatives of hostile powers using radiological, chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons is one of the most serious national security threats we face today.

This threat is very different than the threat of nuclear annihilation with which our Nation and the world dealt during the cold war.

During the cold war both we and the Soviet Union recognized that either side could destroy the other within an hour, but only at the price of its own destruction.

I have heard too many experts, whose opinions and credentials I respect, tell me that it is not a question of if but only of when terrorists will use chemical or biological—or even nuclear—weapons in the United States.

In July, the Commission on America's National Interests, cochaired by Andrew Goodpaster, Robert Ellsworth, and Rita Hauser, released a study that concluded that the No. 1 vital U.S. na-

tional interest today is to prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons attacks on the United States. The report also identified preventing the loss of control of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons-usable materials, and the containment of biological and chemical weapons proliferation as one of five cardinal challenges for the next U.S. President.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Governmental Affairs Committee held a series of hearings over the last year on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, at which representatives of the intelligence and law enforcement communities, the Defense Department, private industry, State and local governments, academia, and foreign officials described a threat that we cannot ignore, but for which we are virtually totally unprepared.

CIA Director John Deutch, for one, candidly observed "We've been lucky so far."

And, in fact, we have already received at least three loud warning bells. First was the release of deadly sarin gas in the Tokyo subway system. Second was the truck bomb which went off in the garage of the World Trade Center in New York City—a bomb that the trial judge believed the killers intended to be a chemical weapon which, had it deployed as intended, would have killed thousands. Third was the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. The pipe bomb in July in Atlanta serves as yet another warning that we must improve our preparedness for terrorist attacks in this country.

Mr. President, this legislation will significantly improve our ability to deal with this threat—an ability which today is clearly not up to the challenge. We have heard testimony in recent months at hearings held by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations that speaks clearly to the remarkable lack of domestic preparedness for an incident involving nuclear, radiological, chemical, or biological materials.

Fire chiefs said that they cannot plan on Federal emergency assistance to help in an emergency of this nature as it is simply too long in coming.

Local emergency first-responders—policemen, firemen, medical technicians—grimly said over and over again that they were incapable of dealing with a chemical or, especially, biological weapon or incident.

By providing funding and a mandate for DOD and DOE to share their experience, expertise, and equipment dealing with nuclear, radiological, chemical, and biological weapons and materials, we can address critical shortfalls in our domestic preparedness that have been specifically and repeatedly noted in congressional testimony and documentation.

Several modest exercises have been held to test how Federal, State, and

local emergency responders would deal with a nuclear, radiological, chemical, or biological attack.

In one large exercise, the first 100 or so emergency response personnel—police, firemen, medical personnel—arriving at the scene of a mock chemical weapon disaster rushed headlong into the emergency scene, and were promptly declared "dead" by the referees.

In a second exercise featuring both chemical and biological weapons, contaminated casualties brought to the nearest hospital were handled so carelessly by hospital personnel that, within hours, most of the hospital staff were judged to have been killed or incapacitated by spreading contamination.

In addition, a report recently forwarded by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to Congress on our preparedness for a nuclear, radiological, chemical, or biological terrorist attack noted that, "response personnel are relatively few in number and pieces of equipment necessary to provide adequate support to an NBC event are in some cases one of a kind."

I still remain fully convinced that the best way to prevent the use of these terrible weapons and materials on American soil is by stopping them before they get here. For this reason, this legislation provides additional resources and impetus for enhancing our ability here at home to detect and interdict nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and related materials before they get into the hands of terrorists or malcontents.

An extensive study by Arnaud de Borchgrave, Judge William Webster, former Director of the FBI and CIA, Congressman BILL McCOLLUM, and others, published earlier this year by the respected Center for Strategic & International Studies [CSIS], concluded that "there are few opportunities for detecting, interdicting, and neutralizing these materials once they are beyond the source site. * * * Attention and resources must be directed toward post-theft measures as well."

Mr. President, the single best way to deal with this threat is by preventing proliferation at its source, as far away from the United States as possible. That is why this legislation also bolsters the original concept introduced by Senator LUGAR and myself in 1991, which aims at helping the states of the former Soviet Union to improve their safeguards and controls over existing stockpiles of deadly materials.

The CSIS de Borchgrave-Webster study also found that:

The most serious national security threat facing the United States, its allies, and its interests is the theft of nuclear weapons or weapons-usable materials from the former Soviet Union. The consequences of such a theft—measured in terms of politics, economics, diplomacy, military response, and public health and safety—would be catastrophic.

de Borchgrave himself stated at a press conference that: "We have concluded that we're faced now with as big

a threat as any we faced during the cold war, when the balance of terror kept the peace for almost half a century."

Finally, Mr. President, this legislation attempts to improve the overall coordination of how we deal with the broad threat to our Nation posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

There are currently dozens of government agencies that deal with the various aspects of this threat, with overlapping authorities and programs, but with serious gaps.

Testimony provided in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations revealed that coordination between Federal agencies is seriously lacking, and that there is virtually no effective coordination or communication between the Federal Government and State and local agencies and organizations. This appears to be changing, at least in the case of the Olympic games in Atlanta.

I visited Atlanta during the Olympics and received a briefing by a group of representatives from various Federal agencies that were working together to provide security for the Olympic games. I strongly commend their joint efforts, but, this must become the pattern all over the country. We must build from this experience, improve in areas where we have weaknesses, and make this kind of interagency cooperative effort the norm.

Mr. President, I believe this legislation, while only a beginning, responds to a very urgent national security concern of our Nation. I commend all of the Defense authorization conferees for their swift actions in approving the inclusion of the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act in the conference agreement, and I look forward to the President signing this legislation into law.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill. I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator THURMOND, for putting together an outstanding bill. Senator THURMOND worked tirelessly to conclude the conference quickly and efficiently, and the product is a bill that we can all be proud of.

I also want to pay tribute to the ranking member, Senator NUNN. Senator NUNN has served on the Armed Services Committee with distinction for 23 years. Throughout that time, he has been steadfast in his support for a strong, capable, and highly prepared military. This will be Senator NUNN's final Defense authorization bill, and I want to take this opportunity to thank Senator NUNN for his outstanding work on behalf of the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Mr. President, the bill before us includes a much-needed increase of \$11.2 billion from the President's budget request for national defense. I want to

emphasize that even with this increase the total level of Defense spending remains \$7.4 billion below last year's level when adjusted for inflation. We are in the 12th straight year of decline in Defense spending.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I want to briefly summarize some of the highlights of this conference bill. The bill before us includes a 3 percent pay raise and a 4.6 percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters for our Armed Forces.

It directs the Secretaries of Defense and Health and Human Services to prepare and implement a demonstration program enabling Medicare-eligible beneficiaries to enroll in the Tricare, the DOD health care program.

The bill approves \$10 million in additional research funding to examine the relationship between service of our men and women in the Gulf war and the incidence of congenital birth defects and illnesses among their children.

It also includes \$201 million to carry out the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act which addresses the Nation's ability to deal with threatened or actual use of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons against American cities.

The bill provides \$40 million to complete development and testing of the Patriot Anti-Cruise Missile Upgrade Program.

It authorizes \$32 million for reactive jamming upgrades to the Navy's fleet of EA-6B electronic warfare aircraft.

It includes a \$24.5 million increase for night vision goggles and \$9.1 million for infra-red aiming lights.

It also directs that the Navy conduct a competitive evaluation of the ATD-111 and Magic Lantern Lidar systems to determine which system to acquire under the Airborne Laser Mine Detection Program.

It provides an increase of \$914 million for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, and \$134 million specifically for the space and missile tracking system.

Last, it approves an increase of roughly \$300 million for conventional delivery enhancements for the B-1 and B-2 bombers.

Additionally, Mr. President, I would like to briefly summarize some of the initiatives contained under the acquisition and technology section of this bill. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology, I have been troubled by the failure of the administration to adequately invest in long-term technology development. Modernization is the key to long-term readiness, and without effective investment in the technology base, we will be unable to preserve the technological edge that we enjoy today.

The bill before us includes a number of important initiatives to support efforts of the services to develop advanced operational concepts and technologies, to increase the use of commercial technologies for defense appli-

cations, and to make defense programs more affordable. For instance, the bill provides \$40 million to fund the Marine Corps' Sea Dragon experiments to develop new operational concepts that leverage technology and innovation; authorizes \$20 million for a joint services research and development program for nonlethal weapons and technologies; provides \$85 million for the dual use applications program; authorizes \$61 million for the manufacturing technology programs of the Army, Navy and Air Force; provides an increase of \$12 million to continue the procurement technical assistance program; and includes a provision to streamline the Defense Department's requirements for assessing the capabilities of the national defense technology and industrial bases, including cases of unacceptable reliance on foreign sources.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the many critically important initiatives contained in this bill. I would emphasize that these initiatives address the priorities established by the service chiefs and will directly enhance our national security.

I also want to emphasize that each of the issues that President Clinton's advisors indicated may trigger a Presidential veto have been resolved to the satisfaction of the administration. Thus, this bill enjoys strong bipartisan support and the indications are that the President will sign it.

Again, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member for their outstanding work in formulating a conference bill that enhances national security and reflects the vast majority of the Senate's priorities for defense. They have rendered an invaluable service to the Nation, and I am proud to support this important legislation.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the conference report, and I yield the floor.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEMILITARIZATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, I listened to my colleague from Kentucky with great interest as he expressed our mutual concern about the action taken by the conferees on the chemical demilitarization program. I share his disappointment that language which would have guaranteed an alternative technology program so clearly in the interests of our constituents was deleted in conference.

Let me review for a moment how we ended up in this situation and how I hope we can correct course. Several months ago, staff representing all of the Members who have chemical demilitarization facilities met in Senator FORD's office to review the status of demilitarization at each site. At the time, Senator FORD offered a proposal which required the Department of Energy, in conjunction with the Army office which currently manages the incineration program, to develop alternatives to incineration. Although I strongly supported the idea of alternative technologies, the Department of

Energy had no demonstrated experience with chemical weapons. Given the danger involves with this aging stockpile, appointing an agency which, in effect, would have to undergo on-the-job training did not seem a safe or suitable option.

As Senator FORD mentioned, both the Congress and the communities affected by these facilities have had serious problems with the Army office responsible for the baseline program. They have been adamantly opposed to considering any credible alternatives to incineration. This led me to the conclusion that assigning them any role for an alternative program was counterproductive so I found I was also unable to support this provision in Senator FORD's draft bill.

Being uncertain about two of the key provisions in Senator FORD's proposal I decided to pursue my concerns through the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Unlike the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee has an unusual number of Members with chemical weapons sites in their States. In addition to the distinguished chairman of the Committee, Senator HATFIELD and the ranking member on the Defense Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, Senators BENNETT, NIGHORSE CAMPBELL, SHELBY, BUMPERS and MIKULSKI each have an installation of grave concern to their constituents. As a result, Senator STEVENS was very responsive to our common interest in holding a hearing to consider the status of the Army's incineration program as well as the viability of alternatives.

In discussion following the June 4 hearing, Senator STEVENS agreed to include a provisions in the chairman's draft of the Defense appropriations bill which addressed my concerns. The language which passed the Senate and is now in conference, provides \$40 million for the initiation of a pilot program to identify and demonstrate not less than two alternative technologies to the baseline incineration process. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology is directed to assign a program officer to pursue this effort. The report language which accompanied the bill explicitly stated.

Under no circumstances shall the Under Secretary appoint a program executive officer who is, or has ever been, in direct or indirect control of the baseline reverse assembly incineration process.

Finally, the bill prohibits the obligation of funds to initiate construction in Kentucky or Colorado until 180 days after the Under Secretary has reported back on the pilot program.

It is my understanding that the amendment that Senator FORD offered which was accepted on a voice vote just before final passage of the Defense Authorization bill has been modified so that it was compatible with the language already included in the Defense appropriations bill. This final version of Senator FORD's proposal was clearly on the right track and I share his dis-

appointment about the outcome. I also agree with his assessment that the substitute language is in fact worse than the status quo in that it postpones serious consideration of alternative technologies and gives the managers of the current incineration program both the responsibility for studying alternative options as well as the right to veto any new ideas.

I have discussed Senator FORD's and my concerns with both the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. Since the Defense Subcommittee will begin conference tomorrow, it is my hope that we can reach a favorable solution to this unfortunate turn of events.

I am grateful to the sound guidance I have received from Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE. Both have extensive experience and a thorough understanding of the complexities of this issue and both I and my constituents will look to their leadership and count on their continued good advice.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, title XXXI, subtitle F of the 1997 Defense Authorization Act is an amendment I sponsored in the Senate to clear up several unnecessary and delaying bureaucratic requirements that currently exist in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act—Public Law 102-579-WIPP. This title will allow the WIPP facility to open, meet a major environmental objective, and save the taxpayer money.

The purpose of the WIPP is to provide for the safe disposal of transuranic [TRU] radioactive and mixed wastes resulting from defense activities and programs of the United States. These materials are currently stored at temporary facilities, and until WIPP is opened, little can be done to clean up and close these temporary storage sites.

Idaho currently stores the largest amount of TRU waste of any State in the union, but Idaho is not alone. Washington, Colorado, South Carolina, and New Mexico also store TRU waste.

The agreement recently negotiated between the State of Idaho, the DOE and the U.S. Navy states that the TRU currently located in Idaho will begin to be shipped to WIPP by April 30, 1999. This legislation will assure this commitment is fulfilled by clearly stating that it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Energy will complete all actions needed to commence emplacement of TRU waste at WIPP no later than November 30, 1997. The opening of the WIPP will solve a nagging and ongoing problem at the INEL—what to do with this nuclear waste that has accumulated over the years at the Idaho site.

We cannot solve the environmental problems at sites such as the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Rocky Flats Weapons Facility, Savannah River and others without WIPP. The reason is obvious. Without a place to dispose of the waste, cleanup is impos-

sible, and without cleanup, further site decommissioning can not occur.

The goal of this bill is simple: To deliver on Congress' longstanding commitment to open WIPP by 1998.

This bill amends the Waste Isolation Land Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act of 1992 in several very significant ways.

It deletes obsolete language in the 1992 act. Of particular importance is the reference and requirements for test phase activities. Since the enactment of the 1992 act, the Department of Energy [DOE] has abandoned the test phase that called for underground testing in favor of above-ground laboratory test programs. Thus the test phase no longer exists as defined in the 1992 law and needs to be removed so it does not complicate the ongoing WIPP process.

Most important, this amendment will streamline the process, remove duplicative regulations, save taxpayers dollars—currently, the costs of simply watching over WIPP exceed \$20 million per month.

This bill does not remove EPA as the DOE regulator of the WIPP. DOE has stated numerous times that it does not want to self-regulate. The Department believes that having EPA as the regulator will instill additional public confidence in the certification process and the facility itself, once it opens.

I am skeptical regarding EPA. EPA has a poor record of meeting deadlines. The WIPP, as a facility, is ready to operate now and is basically waiting on EPA's final approval. The schedule DOE has established to meet the opening dates is an aggressive timetable. It is successful only if EPA can accomplish its tasks on time. I strongly encourage them to do so.

Idaho and the Nation need to have the WIPP opened sooner rather than later. Each day of delay is costly (nearly \$1 million per day in taxpayers' dollars), and the potential dangers to the environment and human health resulting from the temporary storage of this waste continue.

It is time to act. We must, if we are to clean up sites such as the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. We must act to dispose of this nuclear waste permanently and safely for future generations. The passage of this Defense authorization bill clears the way for that to happen.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization conference report. The conferees have done an admirable job of crafting a well-balanced bill that will ensure our national defense needs are met in the coming fiscal year.

At \$265.6 billion for fiscal year 1997, the conference report is \$11.2 billion above the President's budget request. Much of the additional funds will go toward much-needed weapons modernization, with \$6 billion more for procurement and \$3 billion more for research and development. Despite the increase over the budget request, however, the bill is actually \$7.4 billion below the

fiscal year 1996 spending level for Defense in real terms. The conference report authorizes a responsible level of defense spending given the threats to our national security which exist in the post-cold war era.

The conference report preserves our readiness to respond quickly to military emergencies like the one precipitated within the past 2 weeks by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It emphasizes modernization and new weapons procurement in an effort to begin turning around the steep 71 percent decline in funding for military procurement over the last 10 years. It also continues crucial research and development of promising new defense technologies. These programs include the design of an effective ballistic missile defense system, quieter submarines, and multi-use fighter aircraft.

While effective and state-of-the-art military hardware are crucial to maintaining our defense advantage, the best military equipment in the world is of little value without the highly-trained and hard-working service men and women on whom the success of our national defense ultimately depends. I am therefore pleased that the conference report authorizes a number of initiatives directly benefiting military personnel, retirees, and their families. Among these are a 3-percent military pay raise, a 4.6-percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters, \$466 million for new housing, and a dental insurance plan for retired service members and their families. My one regret is that the conference agreement dropped the Murray-Snowe amendment adopted by the Senate which would have repealed the ban on abortions at overseas military hospitals.

Mr. President, I am especially pleased that the conference report supports a strong and efficient Aegis destroyer program. Bath Iron Works of Maine is one of two private shipyards which build this important Navy ship. The conference report authorizes \$3.4 billion for four guided-missile Aegis destroyers in fiscal year 1997 and \$520 million in advanced procurement for an additional Aegis destroyer in fiscal year 1998. I am particularly gratified that the conference report includes approval for the Navy to implement a stable three-ship-per-year procurement plan for the Aegis from 1998 through 2001. The plan will result in efficiencies that will save \$1 billion in construction costs for the Aegis destroyer.

The end of the cold war has uncapped a host of long-simmering regional conflicts around the globe, some of which have threatened important U.S. interests. Combined with the proliferation of nuclear and missile technology as well as chemical and biological weapons, these limited conflicts carry the potential for far wider consequences. I am pleased that the conference report includes \$122 million to strengthen our domestic preparedness against the use of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. We must recognize that the

world is still a dangerous place and that maintaining a high level of military preparedness must continue to be a national priority.

The fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization conference report will maintain the strength of our national defense forces for the coming year. I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I commend the fine leadership of Chairman STROM THURMOND of South Carolina and Senator SAM NUNN of Georgia. Together, they worked to achieve strong bipartisan support of this year's Defense authorization bill.

The conference bill before us provides for an \$11.2 billion increase to the President's Defense budget request. The increase, when adjusted for inflation, is still \$7.4 billion less than last year's Defense budget. I wish to stress this point because the trend toward lower defense spending is an issue that concerns me. Given the uncertainties and adversaries our Nation will continue to face, slashing defense spending or force structure without a coherent military strategy is not the answer to preserving our military superiority into the 21st century. By the same token, the familiar path of the past—as convenient as it may be—will be less likely to lead us to the future we hope to shape. In that regard, I believe much debate remains in addressing the future of our national defense.

This bill addresses many of the fundamental concerns of our military. It will improve the quality of life of our Armed Forces by increasing their pay and authorizing the construction of new barracks and military family housing. It also moves to address the critical modernization issues our military's senior leadership raised during their testimony before Congress this year. In that regard, the bill supports the Army's efforts toward battlefield digitization, modernization of tactical aircraft for the Air Force and Navy, and funds the modernization of our National Guard and Reserves.

Also included in this bill is what I consider to be a major step forward in the debate over the future of our Armed Forces in meeting the national security requirements of our Nation. The Military Force Structure Review Act of 1996 is a provision I cosponsored with Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator MCCAIN, Senator ROBB, and many other distinguished colleagues in the Senate. This act will establish an independent nonpartisan, nine-member National Defense Panel that will conduct a long-range assessment of future threats, military force structure, and operational concepts in support of our national security strategy. It is our hope that this panel will challenge the Defense Department to be more forward thinking as it moves beyond the Bottom-Up Review, and develops a strategic construct to guide our military forces into the next century.

Mr. President, the bill before us addresses critical issues facing our men

and women in uniform—improving readiness, their quality of life, and their need to modernize weapons systems in order to keep pace with rapid technological changes. As recent events have demonstrated, our military must be ready and capable of responding to myriad, uncertain threats. We must be willing to provide our military with the funding they need today, and tomorrow, to prepare for these unforeseen contingencies. I urge the final passage of the Defense authorization conference bill for 1997.

AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT CRIMINAL BOMB- MAKING INSTRUCTION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to express my great concern and disappointment with the conferees named by the other body who insisted on striking section 1088 of the Senate's DOD authorization bill. Section 1088, an amendment by Senator BIDEN and myself would have prohibited teaching bombmaking for criminal purposes.

As my colleagues will recall, this amendment was accepted in the Senate as part of the antiterrorism bill last summer in addition to being part of the Senate DOD authorization bill. Regrettably, as happened this time, the other body dropped it from the bill.

The bombing in Centennial Olympic Park is only the most recent pipe bombing. In just 10 days, from July 21 to July 31, my staff found seven newspaper accounts of bombing incidents.

A 15-year-old boy, in Irving, TX, blew off three fingers with a bomb he learned to make using the Anarchist's Cookbook from the Internet.—Dallas Morning News, July 26, 1996.

A high school student from Providence, RI, assembled a foot-long bomb after obtaining instructions from the Internet.—Newsday, July 28, 1996.

A 16-year-old boy from Plainview, TX, lost a finger when a homemade bomb exploded. The Bomb was made using information from the Internet.—Newsday, July 28, 1996.

In Pennsylvania, three teenagers carrying a list of 20 ingredients needed to build a bomb were arrested after breaking into the Penncrest High School chemistry lab. They downloaded this list from the Internet.—Chicago Tribune, July 23, 1996.

In Rancho Palos Verdes, CA, sheriff's officials believe information available over the Internet was used in a series of pipe bombings which destroyed four mailboxes, a guard shack and a car. Four teenagers were arrested in this case.—Los Angeles Times, July 27, 1996.

In Orange County, CA, police believe four teenagers used the Internet to get instructions on building acid-filled bottle bombs. One of those bombs burned a 5-year-old boy at a school playground in April.—Los Angeles Times, July 27, 1996.

A 23-year old man, from Torrance, CA, used a 10-inch-long pipe bomb which blew out three windows in his home. He obtained the bomb making instructions from a manual on homemade bombs.—Los Angeles Times, July 27, 1996.

In addition to the explicit explanations on how to make all sorts of bombs, the Terrorist's Handbook, downloaded by my staff from the Internet, also encourages criminal behavior. Let me read a section entitled, "Check-list for Raids on Labs."

In the end, the serious terrorist would probably realize that if he/she wishes to make a truly useful explosive, he or she will have to steal the chemicals to make the explosive from a lab.

This section ends with the needed lists of solid and liquid chemicals needed to make most bombs.

This amendment would have prohibited the teaching of bomb making if a person intends or knows that the bomb will be used for a criminal purpose. Additionally, the amendment prohibits the distribution of information on how to make a bomb if a person intends or knows that the information will be used for a criminal purpose.

This information is not something that one would use for a legitimate purpose or information that can be found in a chemistry textbook on the back shelf of a university library.

What my amendment targets is detailed information that is made available to any would-be criminal or terrorist, with the intended purpose of teaching someone how to blow things up in the commission of a serious and violent crime—to kill, injure, or destroy property.

This provision could give law enforcement another tool in the war against terrorism—to combat the flow of information that is used to teach terrorist and other criminals how to build bombs.

Some question the constitutionality of this provision. Common sense should tell us that the first amendment does not give someone the right to teach someone how to kill other people.

The right to free speech in the first amendment is not absolute. There are several well known exceptions to the first amendment which limit free speech. These include: Obscenity; child pornography; clear and present dangers; commercial speech; defamation; speech harmful to children; time, place and manner restrictions; incidental restrictions; and radio and television broadcasting.

I do not for 1 minute believe that the Framers of the Constitution meant for the first amendment to be used to protect the teaching of methods to injure and kill.

However, knowing that there would be concern over the first amendment, I carefully crafted this amendment with constitutional scholars. I'd like to read you some of what they said about this amendment.

I think the language . . . is about as tight as it could be . . . the reasonable-knowledge, explosive materials, and furtherance-of-a-criminal purpose language is all clear enough; these are legal terms of art and unlikely to be found void for vagueness.—Richard Delgado, University of Colorado at Boulder.

The rigorously-protected talk anticipated by the first amendment is, in brief, political

discourse, in the widest sense of that term. This kind of talk does not include routine commercial speech (including advertisements), pornography and obscenity, planning for criminal activity, and related forms of expression. Commonsense distinctions should be apparent here. These distinctions would rule out anyone's instructing others in how to make explosives, especially when it is known to the instructor that the explosives being talked about are to be made and used by his students as part of an illegal enterprise.—George Anastaplo, Loyola University of Chicago.

Some civil libertarians attempt to immunize virtually all talk from government regulation, but a stable community would be difficult if not impossible if this should ever become the rule. Others have gone so far as to justify actions, including some violent actions, as forms of expression that are entitled to freedom-of-speech protection. But even these theorists are reluctant to argue that blowing up public buildings should be considered a form of expression protected by the First Amendment.—George Anastaplo, Loyola University of Chicago.

In today's day and age when violent crimes, bombings and terrorist attacks are becoming too frequent, and when technology allows for the distribution of bombmaking material over computers to millions of people across the country in a matter of seconds, some restrictions are appropriate. Specifically, I believe that restricting the availability of bombmaking information, if there is intent or knowledge that the information will be used for a criminal purpose, is both appropriate and required in today's day and age.

My amendment to this bill was an important, balanced measure to confront the problems presented by today's rapid growth in technology, and I am extremely disappointed that it was removed during conference.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 has the principal goal of funding our Armed Forces to keep them the best-trained, best-equipped, best led, and most ready military in the world. In large measure, the bill is well-designed to achieve this goal, and I support it.

Nonetheless, I am concerned about the inclusion in this bill of over \$11 billion in spending authority above the amount requested by the President. The Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that the budget presented by the President is enough to provide fully for the defense needs of the Nation during the next fiscal year. The \$11.3 billion added to the budget far exceeds those needs. The authorized level is a ceiling, and I urge the President and the Secretary of Defense to exercise their authority to spend at a lower level than provided in this bill.

On arms control, the conference took an important step by refusing to adopt provisions that would have infringed on the President's constitutional treaty-making authority, and that would also have undermined the ABM Treaty, the cornerstone of nuclear arms control. The House provisions would have undermined U.S. leadership at the very moment when we stand on the thresh-

old of achieving the most important nuclear arms control agreement of the post-cold-war era, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The bill also authorizes \$365 million for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs, under which the United States works with the States of the former Soviet Union to reduce the nuclear threat to all nations. It also provides funds for new programs to improve our ability to prevent attacks using weapons of mass destruction.

I am also pleased that the conferees rejected several objectionable provisions contained in the House version of the authorization bill. One House provision would have required the mandatory discharge of all service members who are HIV-positive. This discriminatory provision would have singled out HIV-positive men and women from among the much larger pool of service members who suffer from chronic medical conditions, yet who can still serve in many worthwhile capacities. The House provision was motivated by bigotry, and the conferees treated it appropriately by dropping it from the conference report.

The conference report also excludes the House repeal of the Department's don't ask/don't tell policy on gays in the military. This provision would have reinstated the practice of antigay witch hunts abolished by the Clinton administration. In this instance too, the conferees were right to drop the House provision.

Despite these positive elements, there are two other objectionable aspects to this bill that cannot be overlooked.

First, the conference report does not adopt the Senate provision repealing the current ban on privately funded abortions at U.S. military facilities overseas. This provision would ensure that women in the armed forces serving overseas can exercise their constitutional right to choose safe abortion procedures.

Our servicewomen should not lose rights granted by the Constitution when they serve their country in foreign lands. This is a basic issue of fairness. Women in the armed forces serve on military bases around the world to protect our freedoms. But they are denied access to the same range and quality of health services that they could obtain in the United States. In many countries where our forces serve, adequate care is difficult to obtain in the best of circumstances, and in many cases it is not available at all.

Without adequate care, abortion can be a life-threatening or permanently disabling procedure. We can easily avoid such risks by making the health facilities at U.S. overseas bases available for this procedure and it is irresponsible not to do so.

In addition to the health risks of the current policy, there are travel costs, delays, and privacy violations that women serving in the United States do not have to endure and should not have to endure while serving overseas.

A woman's decision to seek an abortion is difficult and personal. It is unfair and unreasonable to continue to make this decision even more difficult and dangerous for women who serve our country overseas. Congress should be protecting constitutional rights of women in the armed forces, not turning them into second class citizens.

Finally, I commend Chairman THURMOND and Senator NUNN for their leadership in achieving this bill. This is Senator NUNN's last Defense Authorization Act. We have served together on the Armed Services Committee for 14 years, and it is obvious that his reputation for fairness and integrity, and as the Senate's preeminent expert on national defense is eminently deserved. The entire Senate, the entire Nation, and the entire free world will miss him.

In addition, our colleagues, Senator EXON and Senator COHEN will be ending their long, outstanding service on the committee at the end of this season. Senator EXON, as ranking member, and formerly chairman, of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, has worked to defend our Nation against nuclear threats. In particular, his leadership on achieving a nuclear testing moratorium and support for a comprehensive test ban treaty have brought us to the threshold of an international treaty to ban nuclear explosions.

As ranking member of the Seapower Subcommittee, I have had the honor to work closely with Chairman COHEN. He is an able leader on defense issues, resourceful, and has worked tirelessly to ensure a strong national defense. I commend him for his leadership and commitment, and I wish him well in his career beyond the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, since both sides are using this quorum to their advantage, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided to each side when we are in a quorum so no one side will be unduly punished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield the able Senator from Oklahoma such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me and for the fine job that he has done in preparation on his committee of the Department of Defense authorization bill. It has been a very difficult and arduous time that we have had in trying to get this done with objections from the White House every step of the way.

Since the beginning of our country's history, national security has been our Government's most solemn obligation to its citizens. In order to honor this obligation, sufficient resources must be given to the forces that protect us. These forces do not ask much of us for their service. But they do need a certain amount of support from their Government in order to carry out their duties and protect the security of the United States as well as maintain our status as the world's preeminent military power.

In order to allow our military to honor their sworn duty, we have to provide them with the means to do many things. We must give them the authority to retain ample manpower in the form of adequate end strengths. Our military must have the means to recruit high-quality personnel to carry us into the 21st century. In addition, in order to keep our high-quality personnel, and protect the high quality of life which is so important in maintaining morale, we must provide them with equitable pay and benefits—including a 3-percent pay raise to protect against inflation—and appropriate levels of funding for the construction and maintenance of troop billets and military family housing.

We must keep the sword sharp by providing enough resources to maintain current readiness, and to continue modernization efforts to provide the capabilities needed for future wars. Our military must also be given the means to field the type and quantity of weapons systems and equipment needed to fight and win battles decisively, with minimal risk to our troops, just as they did in the gulf war.

An important lesson learned in the gulf war was that we need to be able to protect our troops from ballistic missiles, missiles that are capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction. Whether it is nuclear, chemical, or biological, we must protect our forces while they are in the field and we must protect their families at home. The way we do this is through the development and deployment of missile defense systems: land- and sea-based theater missile defense systems, which can protect U.S. and allied forces against cruise and ballistic missiles while deployed in the field; and a national missile defense system to defend America itself.

The missile defense funding authorized in this bill is not sufficient to put

in place the robust system I would like to see. It is a life support program, designed to keep as much of our program viable until a Republican President is elected. At that point, we will be able to move more aggressively toward building a national missile defense system, just as the American people expect us to.

We know that most Americans think we have a missile defense capability, and we know that they are outraged and frightened when they learn that we do not. They hear the administration cite intelligence estimates to justify waiting and waiting on missile defense. But any American who witnessed Pearl Harbor in 1941, or the invasion of South Korea in 1950, or the invasion of Kuwait in 1990—and that's most of us, Mr. President—knows that intelligence estimates are wrong as often as they are right, and that even good intelligence gets misread by political leaders. I would rather have a defense and hope my intelligence was correct than have complete faith in intelligence; the Clinton administration apparently disagrees.

I am particularly concerned by this emphasis on future threats because the administration uses it to justify doing nothing. They say that the missile threat isn't here yet. But isn't defense all about getting out in front of threats? And what about the technology that threatens us today? Russia and China have missiles—in the case of Russia, thousands of missiles—which could be accidentally fired at us today.

More than 20 other nations are developing the technology. Terrorists and rogue nations, with enough money and some perseverance, will buy their way into the nuclear club. And until we get a missile defense system in place, there will be nothing we can do about it.

Missile defense is complex. Sophisticated defense technology is seldom produced precisely on schedule. This is why we need to start now. We will have a national missile defense system; the question is whether or not it will be before or after the first time we need it.

I have spoken about what we must provide for our military. I would also like to point out what burdens we should remove from them. We can eliminate defense spending that does not contribute directly to the national security of the United States; such as policing of the Olympic games. More importantly, we should stand back and evaluate U.S. involvement in nontraditional military operations, and its impact on combat readiness, budgeting, and our national interests. Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti; these and other police actions—some of them going on today—drain defense funds and put a strain on personnel who are already being stretched beyond their breaking point.

In this part of our foreign policy, mistakes have certainly been bipartisan. George Bush, a Republican President, began the Somalia commitment. It took a humiliating defeat and the

deaths of 18 Rangers in Mogadishu for us to learn about the limits of that humanitarian operation. Operations in Bosnia will have cost American taxpayers more than \$3.5 billion in defense dollars if our troops leave by December. I say "if" because neither I nor anyone else in this body believes we will be out of Bosnia by December. The American people were truly deceived by the administration on this commitment.

I went to Bosnia last November, before the IFOR mission began, and I watched experienced U.N. and NATO leaders laugh at the idea that we would be through in Bosnia after 1 year. One U.N. commander, General Huakland of Norway, said that involvement in Bosnia was like putting your hand in water—when you take it out, nothing is different. If the administration intends to keep troops in Bosnia longer, they owe it to us and to the American people to say so before our Presidential election. But I do not expect them to shoot straight on this, either.

Some people, it seems, never seem to see a breaking point for our military. They say we are spending enough on defense. I have criticized the administration's defense priorities, but I am also dismayed by some of the voices I have heard in this chamber. I cannot believe that some of my colleagues believe their own antidefense rhetoric. Let me examine some of the most common attacks on this responsible defense budget that I've heard recently, four arguments that we hear over and over and over again:

First: "This is money the Pentagon has not asked for." My liberal friends make this statement as if they believe that the defense budget request is decided by admirals and generals based on what they need to fight and win wars. In fact, because each of the services and the Department of Defense itself is run by administration-appointed civilians, the Pentagon's budget request is based on the administration's priorities. It is then modified by Congress, just like every other Government agency's budget.

It is the Congress' constitutional responsibility to review and either increase or decrease this and all department budgets based on our view of the Nation's needs. Congress never blindly accepts the Pentagon budget request. When the Reagan administration asked for increases in the defense budget in the 1980's, my liberal colleagues never suggested that the Congress accept them without argument. That is exactly the kind of argument we're having today—the President thinks we should continue to cut defense sharply, and we disagree. It is our view that military spending has been cut too deeply and is well below the minimum required for a sound national defense.

The fact is that the real Pentagon agrees with us. This year the four service chiefs, in a public repudiation of the administration, made it clear that they need \$20 billion a year more in

procurement funding than what the Clinton administration has requested. Each warned of the dire consequences of the continued aging of their weapons and equipment. So when we consider "what the Pentagon asked for," I intend to listen to the chiefs who have made a career of preparing for war, not the President's political appointees.

Second: "This budget focuses on the wrong threats." Of course there are growing unconventional threats to the United States and her citizens, including terrorism and information warfare. In fact, some of our additional spending on R & D is going toward programs such as counter proliferation support and chemical and biological defense. But we should not be forced to choose which threat to remain exposed to—as we address these new threats, we have to still be prepared for conventional warfare.

I urge my colleagues to remember that defense spending is not an investment, but an insurance policy. And we need different kinds of insurance. Their odds of having a car accident may be far greater than the odds that their house will burn down, but most Americans have both car and fire insurance. This same logic underlies our continued readiness on conventional threats even as we prepare for the unconventional threats of the future.

Third: "Why buy advanced weapons when American weapons are already the best in the world?" It is true that American weapons are the best in the world today. But as threats evolve and weapons technology throughout the world improves, we must stay ahead. When we go to war, we don't want a fair fight—we want to overwhelm the enemy with speed, stealth, and lethality. This costs money, but what is our alternative? To ask our troops to get closer to the enemy, to expose themselves more to enemy fire, to fight longer and harder in order to win?

We need look no further than the gulf war. We sent a half-million troops to the other side of the world, where they won a major land war in less than 100 hours of ground combat. We suffered 146 killed and 354 wounded in that war, and mourned each and every one of them. But how many more would we have lost if we had not invested billions in the 1980's in stealthy aircraft, cruise missiles, Aegis ships, and advanced land combat systems? We bought those weapons in the 1980's at a time when we also had the most technologically advanced force in the world, and many opponents of the Reagan budgets criticized those purchases. In the end, I would argue that President Bush was very lucky to fight his war with Ronald Reagan's military. I often wonder how a future President will feel about fighting a war with Bill Clinton's military.

Fourth: "We spend far more on defense than other countries." Of course we spend more money on defense than other countries. But there are two problems with this comparison: it as-

sumes that all countries are equal, and it suggests that the comparison between how much the United States spends versus other nations, accurately predicts which side will prevail in conflict.

But because of geography, all things aren't equal. We are separated from our potential enemies by two great oceans. And rather than fighting wars in our own backyard, Americans prefer to fight over there. Because we prefer to fight abroad, it will naturally cost us much more than it costs our enemies to field the same force, since we have to transport, sustain, and operate our fighting force in a place where the enemy already is.

Each of these activities—moving, sustaining, and fighting far away—increases the cost of our military without significantly changing the friendly-to-enemy force ratio. This cost is raised further if we want to field a force that is not just equivalent to our enemy's, but one that can defeat his force with minimal casualties, just as we did in the gulf war. The question, therefore, is not whether we will be paying more for our Armed Forces than our enemy does, but rather how much more we must pay. Is the right number three times as much, as with Russia, or more?

More than 2,000 years ago, Sun Tzu said you should have five times the strength of an enemy to assure success. Well, there have been some changes in warfare since Sun Tzu's time. We now have tanks, and planes, and submarines, so the ratio has changed a little. And we can stand here and argue until we are blue in the face over what the proper force level is; two times, three times, five times as much as the other guy. But the cost of our unique geography makes any comparison between what we pay and what our enemies pay irrelevant. The point is: if you want to fight over there, and win, decisively, with minimal losses, then you can expect to pay many times what the enemy pays for his military. So this argument is cruel and invalid.

Now, the people who make these and other statements about this defense bill are smart. They know that we must cross our oceans to fight. They know that what we consider defense spending may not be what our enemies consider defense spending: First, there is the high cost of our high-quality volunteer military: recruiting, paying, providing medical care, and retirement. Many people don't realize it, but two-thirds of our defense budget is spent on paying people. Then there is the cost of supporting our world-wide surveillance network, our nuclear deterrent and so on. They know these costs are unique to the United States but they choose to ignore it in their arguments. Why? Because it supports their view of proper levels of defense spending. We can disagree about what it takes to field a given capability, but we should drop these invalid comparisons and deal with the facts.

As we prepare to vote on the fiscal year 1997 Defense bill, I am truly concerned about the effects that decreasing levels of defense spending have had upon our armed forces. If the general public fully understood the severity of defense cuts under the Clinton administration, they would be outraged. In my State of Oklahoma, I have heard this message already. We can see the cuts all around us and it is time to put these reckless defense cuts to an end. History has demonstrated that superpower status cannot be sustained cheaply, nor can it be sustained by budget requests which do not provide for adequate funding of our forces. I am committed to maintaining America's superpower status, just as I am convinced that the Clinton administration is not.

I was deeply disappointed by the administration's fiscal year 1997 budget request for defense spending. The administration's fiscal year 1997 budget request was \$18.6 billion less in real terms than the level enacted for fiscal year 1996. In real terms, since the end of World War II, there have only been 5 years that the United States has spent less than the Clinton administration is recommending for fiscal year 1997. Only in fiscal year 1947, fiscal year 1948, fiscal year 1949, fiscal year 1950, those years immediately following World War II, and fiscal year 1955 immediately after the Korean war, has defense spending been less than the President's recommendation for this year. Not even during the hollow force years of the 1970s, when we could not afford spare parts to keep our equipment running, have we spent so little on defense. Clearly, it is the responsibility of Congress to address these shortcomings.

Now we know that events in the Persian Gulf over the past several days have gotten President Clinton's attention. He appears to have reversed his earlier threat to veto this bill. But I wonder if he has considered the deeper ramifications of Saddam Hussein's recent activity. This latest round of cruise missiles has reminded me of two basic facts. One, of course, is that the Persian Gulf, like many other regions, remains a very unstable place. The second is that we must be prepared to project power on the other side of the world on very short notice.

It is one thing to throw a few cruise missiles at easily identified desert targets. But what if more is required? What if the missiles do not stop Saddam's advance? Then we are right back where we were in 1990—we must build up a force, move it to the gulf, and fight Saddam Hussein the old fashioned way, of course with overwhelming firepower, but also perhaps man to man and tank to tank.

My friends, should this worst-case scenario arise, we will have a problem. Why? Because, in terms of military strength, we are not right back where we were in 1990. In fact, we aren't even close. Listen carefully! We fought

Desert Storm with 11 Army divisions plus two larger Marine divisions, 10 Air Force tactical fighter wings, and 6 carriers, and 100 ships from the Navy. We drew this Desert Storm force from an Army with 28 divisions, an Air Force with 38 tactical fighter wings, and a Navy with 15 carriers and 566 ships.

But look at today's numbers: instead of 28 Army divisions in 1991, we have just 15 today; instead of 38 Air Force wings, we have 20 today; and instead of 566 ships and 15 carriers, our Navy has roughly 350 ships and 12 carriers today. This means, for example, that while we used about 42 percent of the Army's combat power in 1991, we would use more than 70 percent today. So what would we fight a second war with?

It only gets worse—these comparisons assume that the administration's budgets will hold our forces at today's levels. But most outside analysis—General Accounting Office, Heritage Foundation—shows that the Clinton 5-year budget plan is more than \$150 billion short of the amount needed to buy the force level that the President himself says is necessary. This is worse than a difference of opinion over priorities—this mismatch between what we say we will do and what we actually can do is dangerous. It undermines confidence among our allies, invites miscalculation by the Saddam Husseins of the world, and gives the American people a false sense of security. No government should do this.

It is our duty, as U.S. Senators, to do our part in providing for our national security. In doing our part, we must vote for a defense bill which gives our military the means to do their part. Our forces do not ask much of us for their service, but they do need a certain amount of support from their Government in order to carry out their duties and protect the security of the United States of America.

I feel it is time we take a more responsible approach to defending this Nation. I urge my colleagues to make a good start, by supporting the fiscal year 1997 DOD authorization bill and its attempt to slow the administration's deep cuts to our Nation's military modernization. Even this level of funding is inadequate; however, it is the best we will be able to do until we have a President who remembers that his first responsibility is not to try to change Americans' behavior with gimmicks in the tax code, but to protect their lives, liberty, and property from threats around the globe.

As inadequate as it is, we must pass this defense authorization bill. It is the best we can get until we change Presidents.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able Senator from Oklahoma for the excellent remarks he just made here on the floor of the Senate on this bill. The Senator

from Oklahoma is a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and a very valuable member. He has made outstanding contributions to our defense on that committee. Again, I commend him.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Defense authorization bill we have before us. I think it is an important step as we consider the appropriations bills that are left before us. I want to specifically commend the leadership of the Armed Services Committee, Senator THURMOND, the chairman, Senator NUNN, the ranking member, for bringing this bill to us.

I also want to specifically thank Senator MCCAIN who worked on the floor during Senate consideration of the authorization bill on both my amendment on B-52's and on my national missile defense amendment.

I also want to commend those retiring members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Senator Bill COHEN, the chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, announced he was not running for reelection. Senator COHEN will be missed here in the U.S. Senate. He has always been somebody who is respected on both sides of the aisle, someone who many of us look to for leadership not only on defense issues but others as well.

Senator EXON of Nebraska, who is the ranking member on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, and the former chairman of that subcommittee, has announced that he is retiring. And he, too, will be sorely missed in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle. And, of course, Senator NUNN, the ranking member and former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has achieved respect not only in this Chamber but across the country as well as a defense expert.

I think we should also recognize the outstanding staffs that have worked on this legislation. I want to single out Les Brownlee, the majority staff director, Eric Thoemmes, also on the majority side who was very important in working with us on the amendments that I have talked about, minority staff director Arnold Punaro, and minority strategic forces expert Bill Hoehn. All of them we worked closely with in the development of this legislation. We appreciate their outstanding service to the committee, to the Senate, and to the country.

Mr. President, I cannot help but respond to some of what I heard from my colleague from Oklahoma. I am supporting this Defense authorization bill. I think it is the right course to take. But I must say, we ought to put some of this in perspective. I mean, we have to remember here the cold war is over. We do not have any force on the face of the globe that in any way rivals the

military strength of the United States. Thank goodness that is the case, but it is the case. We also have to remember that we are still running budget deficits in this country, \$116 billion in the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, we have to keep our eye on the ball. We just cannot spend money on everything everyone would like. And that includes our armed services. We have to make tough decisions. We have to stay on this course of deficit reduction if we are to prevent fiscal calamity in the future.

It is true we have made enormous progress on the budget deficit. In 1992 it was \$290 billion. This year it is projected to be \$116 billion, a dramatic improvement, without question. But we also know that we face the time bomb of the baby boom generation, and that requires us to continue to put spending under the microscope. We have to look at every part of the Federal budget, and that includes our defense budget. Let me just say that I think everybody in this Chamber understands that the pressure will continue on every part of Federal spending, and that is as it should be.

Mr. President, there are some parts of this bill that I want to discuss specifically because I think they are critically important in light of what has just happened with respect to the action in Iraq.

Section 1302 of the conference report wisely prohibits the retirement of any strategic systems pending Russian ratification of START II. But we go even further with respect to our B-52's. Those bombers must be retained under these provisions whether or not START II is ratified in recognition of their conventional capabilities.

Mr. President, the amendment that I offered, that has been retained, stipulates that none of the 28 B-52's that were not funded in the Department of Defense request can be sent to the boneyard and that all must be kept fleet standard in a fully maintained attrition reserve. I believe the recent cruise missile strikes in Iraq bring into sharp focus why retention of these provisions in conference was wise.

Mr. President, if I could turn to the charts that I have brought with me, I would like to just point out for a moment the B-52 advantage—global reach, global power. Mr. President, in the recent action against Iraq, the B-52's responded immediately from the United States. Naval vessels could only participate in cruise missile strikes because they had completed a deployment process that can take days or even weeks. Other land and sea forces can take weeks or even months to arrive. The B-52 is able to be there in a matter of hours.

No. 2, B-52's did not require in-theater basing. The United States could not use land-based forces in-theater because of political considerations. The B-52's can operate from the continental United States and from bases in Guam and Diego Garcia, thousands of miles from combat operations.

No. 3, the B-52's placed few lives at risk. Air, land, and sea forces in forward deployments involve hundreds of thousands of personnel in combat operations. But more than one-quarter of the cruise missiles we fired in the first round were launched by only 14 Americans on two B-52's.

No. 4, B-52's were the least expensive system involved. Naval vessels and in-theater forces have large personnel complements and costly support requirements.

No. 5, the B-52 was the only bomber for the mission. The B-52 is the only bomber that at this point carries cruise missiles.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense suggested that we not fund 28 of our 94 B-52's. We believe that would have been a serious mistake. Retirement is clearly unnecessary. These B-52's have been comprehensively upgraded. I have been told by the former head of Air Combat Command that these planes are good until the year 2035. Often we hear people say B-52's are older than the pilots flying them. Mr. President, that is with respect to the name plate on the B-52's. Many of these airframes were, it is true, constructed in the 1960's, but what people forget, there have been billions of dollars of upgrades to these planes, including new skins, new everything.

Mr. President, General Loh, head of the Air Combat Command, told me these planes are good until the year 2035 because, if you look at the landings, you look at the flying hours, there are far fewer landings and flying hours on these airframes than on commercial planes. As a result, these planes, with all of the upgrades that have been done, are good until the year 2035. We should not be sending a single one of them to the bone yard.

Mr. President, in addition, reengining, the proposal by Boeing, could produce \$6 billion in savings, enough to finance retention of the 28 that were unfunded in the DOD budget. This makes great sense to reengine these planes, put on commercial engines that will experience some 40 percent in fuel savings, make these planes even more responsive and even longer lasting in our force inventory.

I believe that retirement of any of our B-52's would be ill-advised. I want to salute the committee for taking this position, as well. I believe it is unwise to retire B-52's for the following reasons:

No. 1, it endangers arms control. A B-52 retirement reduces Russia's incentive to ratify START II. We ought not to be taking down strategic systems before there is a Russian ratification of START II. That makes no sense. I am very pleased that under the leadership of Senator THURMOND and Senator NUNN, the committee has taken that position. That is a wise and prudent position. The committee ought to be saluted for taking it.

No. 2, retirement of these strategic systems now preempts the 1997 defense

studies. We have major studies underway, Mr. President, to determine the appropriate force structure for the future. We ought not to preempt those studies now.

No. 3, to retire B-52's would sacrifice a superior global bomber. B-52's have a longer range than the B-1 or the B-2. They have the greatest versatility because they are fully dual capable and the only bomber with cruise missiles allowing standoff operations, as we saw in the Iraqi confrontation.

No. 4, they have the largest total payload of any bomber.

No. 5, they are the least costly to maintain and operate.

Finally, Mr. President, and perhaps most important, to reduce any of our bombers would only add to the existing bomber gap. Some have asked me, what do I mean by bomber gap? Mr. President, let me make clear, the Bottom Up Review said we need at least 100 deployable bombers—100 deployable bombers—in order to prevail in two MRC's simultaneously.

Mr. President, today we only have 92 deployable bombers, 92 deployable; the Bottom Up Review said we need 100. Mr. President, to send any bombers to the bone yard in this circumstance makes very little sense.

I might add that I believe the new efforts that are underway to evaluate our strategic systems will disclose that 100 deployable bombers are not sufficient. In fact, I believe 100 deployable bombers is sadly insufficient to meet the requirements of two MRC's. We will have a chance at a later time to go into the assumptions that have been made to establish the 100 deployable bombers as the appropriate target.

Mr. President, it certainly makes no sense to be adding to the bomber gap at a time when, I think, it is in great question whether or not 100 deployable bombers is sufficient to meet the contingency of two MRC's.

Let me just close, Mr. President, by again thanking the committee leadership and the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee for working with us to put together the Conrad amendment that calls for retaining our B-52 force and also for the national missile defense provisions that are included in this conference report. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator THURMOND. I want to thank the ranking member, Senator NUNN, and I want to thank their very able and professional staffs for the assistance they have provided to us. I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I believe the vote on this bill is set for 2:15 tomorrow; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ARNOLD PUNARO

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Arnold Punaro, the minority staff director.

At the close of this session, Arnold Punaro will be leaving the Senate after almost 24 years of service, both on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on Senator NUNN's personal staff.

During his service on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Punaro served in the following positions: 1983 to 1987, minority staff director; 1987 to 1995, staff director; 1996 to the present, minority staff director.

Throughout his tenure on the committee, Mr. Punaro played a key supporting role in virtually all legislation that the Armed Services Committee considered, including the Goldwater-Nichols legislation and creation of the Special Operation Command.

In addition to his superb work on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Punaro serves in the Marine Corps Reserves. He currently holds the rank of brigadier general and is commanding general of the Marine Corps Reserves Support Command.

Mr. President, I know I will be joined by all members of the Armed Services Committee in thanking Mr. Punaro, for his dedication and hard work on behalf of our Armed Forces and for the service he has rendered to our Nation.

Mr. President, I wish him and his family continued success in the years ahead.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Marine Corps Lt. Mark Kerber. He is currently part of a fellowship program assigned to my office. He is a recent graduate with distinction from the U.S. Naval Academy and next week will actually be headed to basic training at Quantico and then the flight school at Pensacola.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am pleased to rise in support of the 1997

Defense authorization conference report.

The conference report takes a number of steps to strengthen our Nation's defenses and improve the quality of life for our brave men and women in uniform.

The conference report authorizes a 3-percent pay raise for American military personnel and a 4.6-percent increase in the basic allowance for housing, an issue on which we have spent a great deal of time and we know there certainly is a need.

The conference report provides \$466 million for the construction of new barracks, dormitories, and family housing.

The bill also continues efforts to address the No. 1 problem identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the lack of modernization of our military equipment. The bill provides for increased procurement of ships and planes, missiles, trucks, communications systems, and night vision devices that our forces need to maintain the qualitative edge against possible foes.

The bill also increases funding for operations and maintenance to provide training needed to keep our military forces ready for action.

The conference report also rectifies a past wrong by authorizing the President of the United States to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to seven African-American soldiers who were denied this award after World War II. While six of these awards will be awarded posthumously, the one living recipient, Vernon Baker, is a resident of St. Maries, ID. I have spoken to Mr. Baker, and I can tell you of the great pride that he shares in knowing he will receive that award.

The bill also authorizes \$5.5 billion, an increase of \$100 million above the President's request, for environmental cleanup and waste management at Department of Energy facilities around the country.

The conference report reduces redundancies in existing law and streamlines the regulatory process to expedite the opening of the Waste Isolation pilot project [WIPP] facility in the State of New Mexico. The bill also provides additional funding can make sure the WIPP facility can accept waste on time.

The bill also provides greater authority for site managers at DOE facilities to move funds from different accounts to address problems developed during the fiscal year. This authority was requested by site managers at a hearing that I chaired earlier this year. We expect this increased efficiency to save the taxpayers money.

The conference report also establishes technology demonstration zones at major DOE facilities to allow site managers to apply new technologies to the nuclear cleanup problems across the Department of Energy complex.

The conference report also authorizes major privatization efforts at the Hanford site and the Idaho National Engi-

neering Laboratory to pay private contractors for the amount of waste treated.

At my request, the conference report creates a high-level commission to address the problem of recruiting the next generation of nuclear weapons scientists. This is another problem identified during this year's hearings.

The conference report before the Senate is a good bill that reflects reasonable compromises between the House, the Senate, and the administration. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report. I was pleased to hear the President plans to sign this important piece of legislation.

I thank the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator STROM THURMOND, and the distinguished ranking member, Senator NUNN, for their counsel and guidance throughout this difficult process. As always, Chairman THURMOND's tireless leadership and his determination have resulted in a strong Defense authorization bill reaching the Senate floor. Just as he has done through so many different periods of this Nation's need when we have turned to strong individuals, once again he is leading us, as he has done so many times in service to the country.

In addition, this is Senator NUNN's last defense authorization conference report. I feel honored to have served on the same committee as Senator NUNN. The knowledge and skill of the senior Senator from Georgia will be missed, and the whole Senate and the Nation will feel his absence.

This also will be the last conference report that will include the Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN. I can tell you, there have been tremendous insights and improvements that he has made throughout this process. Senator COHEN will be missed.

The Senator from Nebraska, JIM EXON, with whom I had the pleasure of serving—we had a particular trip in Russia, where we spoke to those that head up the nuclear defenses there in Russia. Again, Senator Jim EXON will be missed as well.

Also, I acknowledge the contributions of Senator SHEILA FRAHM, the Senator from Kansas, in her tenure in serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee. We wish her the very best with her future as well.

In conclusion, as we saw last week in Iraq, despite the end of the cold war, the world remains a dangerous place. American military power is required to ensure stability and protect democracy and free trade. There is no substitute for a strong America. The pending conference report will ensure our military forces can respond to any threat to U.S. national interests. When we think about people in the military services, such as Lt. Mark Kerber, we know it is our duty to make sure they have the best training, equipment, and facilities so, when they respond to any crisis anywhere in the world on behalf of this Nation, we know they are doing it as the best.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. I want to express my appreciation to the able Senator from Idaho for the kind words he had to say about my service as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Senator KEMPTHORNE has been a devoted, able member of that committee and has rendered the defense of this country great service. Our country is indebted to him for all that he has done to promote a strong defense in this Nation. Again, I am proud of his friendship and proud of his service to his Nation.

Mr. President, I understand this has been cleared on the other side of the aisle. I have been authorized to yield back all debate time on the Defense authorization conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THURMOND. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, September 6, the Federal debt stood at \$5,220,377,655,156.41.

One year ago, September 6, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,969,749,000,000.

Five years ago, September 6, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,623,922,000,000. This reflects an increase of more than \$1,596,455,655,156.41 during the 5 years from 1991 to 1996.

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADM. EDWARD M. STRAW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Vice Adm. Edward M. Straw, U.S. Navy, who will retire on October 25 after a distinguished 35-year career. Admiral Straw will relinquish control of the Defense Logistics Agency, which is also known as the DLA, on the day he retires. He has served as Director of the DLA since 1992.

DLA is the largest combat support agency in the Department of Defense. If it were a private company, it would be the 78th largest company in the Fortune 500. Admiral Straw's performance

in directing 50,000 civilian and military members, and in managing \$14 billion in annual funding, has been recognized both inside the Department of Defense and in the private sector as a model of highly effective management. Under his leadership, DLA became one of the first Federal agencies ever to win a Ford Foundation Innovations in Government Award.

During his tenure, Admiral Straw re-engineered and completely revamped the DLA. His fine efforts have saved our \$10 billion to date, and are expected to yield an additional \$20 billion in savings and cost avoidance over the next 6 years while significantly improving responsiveness to customers.

Admiral Straw began his military service in 1961 when he was commissioned upon graduation from the U.S. Naval Academy. He served numerous sea duty assignments and held senior policy positions within the Department of the Navy. These include Vice Commander, Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer of the Naval Supply Systems Command, and Director of Supply Policy and Programs on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations. In 1994, he organized and successfully conducted the Defense Performance Review. He will also receive the Society of Logistics Engineers' annual Founders' Award for 1996, later this year.

Mr. President, our Nation owes Admiral Straw its appreciation for his truly distinguished service. I wish him and his wife, Chris, continued success and happiness in all future endeavors.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, under a unanimous consent agreement, the Senate has obligated itself to consider the Chemical Weapons Convention later this week.

The timing is fortuitous. Getting the Senate to this point has taken much longer than was needed or one would have hoped, but, if the Senate does indeed decide this week to consent to the ratification of the convention, we will be in on the setting up of the organizations required by the convention—a conference of all the states parties, a 41-member executive council, and a technical secretariat, which will be the international body responsible for conducting verification activities.

As of this point, 62 nations have ratified the convention. The convention will enter into force 180 days after it gains the 65th party. If the Senate acts now, our action will enable us to be in on every aspect of the setting up of the convention. Moreover, we will surely bring others with us and, thus, help ensure widespread adherence to the treaty and do much to ensure its effectiveness.

This treaty represents a serious and important step in our continuing effort to curb and to end the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction to us, our friends and allies, and to the world.

The Chemical Weapons Convention, when it enters into force, will ban the

production, acquisition, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons.

In it each state party undertakes never, under any circumstances, to:

Develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, or retain chemical weapons, or transfer, directly or indirectly, chemical weapons to anyone;

Use chemical weapons;

Engage in any military preparations to use chemical weapons; and

Assist, encourage, or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a state party under this convention.

It is very important that we be involved every step of the way. Particularly important is our involvement in a leading role during the 180-day period when so much is done to prepare for the entry into force of the treaty. Simply put, during this crucial period for the treaty, we simply cannot afford to be on the outside looking in. If we stay out, we will have no say over the activities of the governing body. We will not be involved in the establishment of the inspection regime, which, if done as envisaged, could be very important in providing information as to the presence or absence, worldwide, of chemical weapons programs. If we are not a party, we will certainly avoid having the minor inconvenience of international inspections in our country, but at the price of having no expert Americans on inspection teams worldwide looking for illicit chemical weapons activity.

These would be major prices to pay for failure to participate in this important undertaking. There is another major price to be made if we do not become a party. Our failure to join the treaty would constitute a major body blow to our critically important chemical industry, which supports ratification in overwhelming numbers.

The problem that failure to ratify would cause for the industry was put clearly to the Committee on Foreign Relations by the president of the Chemical Manufacturers Association, Mr. Frederick Webber, who said:

Mr. Chairman, honest businesses have nothing to fear from this treaty. On the contrary, the real price to pay is for not taking action. The United States, as I am sure you know, is the world's preferred supplier of chemical products. Chemical exports, last year, topped \$60 billion. Indeed, we are the leading exporting industry in America.

Those exports, that \$60 billion figure, sustained 240,000 high-paying American jobs throughout the land. That makes us the nation's largest exporter. More than 10 cents of every export dollar is a product of the chemical industry.

We are a fast, reliable, high-quality supplier to customers in every corner of the globe. But we could lose that distinction, we could lose it if the U.S. does not ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The Convention sharply restricts trade in chemicals with countries who are not parties to the treaty. If the Senate does not ratify, our customers will cut us off. They will drop us, and find other suppliers.

Unfortunately, we will be lumped in the same categories as nations like Libya, Iraq, and North Korea. We do not believe this is an acceptable option.