

warheads not deployed. That is far more than we need for our security, and poses more of a danger than we should accept. We need to continue the reductions begun by the START process, and reduce to the lowest level possible, including the other nuclear weapon states in the process at the appropriate time.

At the hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Perry was asked about further reductions in nuclear forces. He stated that further reductions are desirable and planned: "I have always believed that we should reduce to the maximum extent we can, compatible with the threats and the potential threats from other countries. I think we can make dramatic reductions, though, beyond where we are today, if we have favorable political developments continu[ing] as they have been in the last 5 years or more."

Secretary Perry was then asked when he envisioned the nuclear weapon reduction process, which has been bilateral so far, involving the other acknowledged nuclear weapon countries to conclude further reductions. Secretary Perry gave the following reply:

At the time when we start getting down to levels of nuclear arms which are on the same order of magnitude of the levels of the other nations. So far, even at the level of 3,000, we have many, many more nuclear weapons than any—we and Russia—than any other country. But we certainly envision deeper cuts beyond the level of 3,000 to 3,500. And as we start going down in the hundreds instead of in the thousands of nuclear weapons, then I think it's not only appropriate; it would be necessary to bring in the other countries who have nuclear weapons.

When asked what specific steps he envisioned to get to further nuclear weapon reductions, he stated the following:

The sequence of events which I see is, first, we need to get START II ratified in the Senate and the Duma. Secondly, we need to get an agreement on implementation—on accelerating the implementation between ourselves and the Russians. Third, we need to mutually phase together the accelerated draw-down. Fourth, we begin a discussion of START III, which has enabled us to make further deep reductions. We've already looked at those deep reductions, have pretty good feelings about how far we can go. We believe they ought to be bilateral. I think it is appropriate, at that stage, though, to begin discussions with other countries, because if the START III reductions are deep enough we're going to get down to levels where we need to be talking with other countries about this.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, the evidence is both compelling and overwhelming: The START II Treaty is unquestionably in our security interest. It is long overdue for Senate action, and I welcome the opportunity for this body finally to ratify this treaty. I know the outcome will be very strong support for the treaty, and I hope the Russian Duma can take it up soon and then we can begin implementing the treaty soon.

I would like to close by quoting the conclusion of General Shalikashvili's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee on March 1, 1995:

The START II Treaty offers a significant contribution to our national security. Under its provisions, we achieve the long-standing goal of finally eliminating both heavy ICBM's and the practice of MIRVing ICBM's, thereby significantly reducing the incentive for a first strike. For decades, we and the Russians have lived with this dangerous instability. With this treaty, we can at last put it behind us.

The Joint Chiefs and I have carefully assessed the adequacy of our strategic forces under START II. With the balanced triad of 3,500 warheads that will remain once this treaty is implemented, the size and mix of our remaining nuclear forces will support our deterrent and targeting requirements against any known adversary and under the worst assumptions. Both American and Russian strategic nuclear forces will be suspended at levels of rough equivalence; a balance with greatly reduced incentive for a first strike. By every military measure, START II is a sound agreement that will make our Nation more secure. Under its terms, our forces will remain militarily sufficient, crisis stability will be greatly improved, and we can be confident in our ability to effectively verify its implementation. This treaty is clearly in the best interests of the United States.

On behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I recommend that the Senate promptly give its advice and consent to the ratification of the START II Treaty.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I make a request that I understand may be objected to. I was going to ask, as in executive session, that the yeas and nays on the resolution of ratification accompany START II be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. NUNN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. There is 1 minute for debate.

Mr. DOLE. I yield the time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLINGS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Abraham	Baucus	Biden
Akaka	Bennett	Bingaman

Boxer	Gorton	McConnell
Bradley	Graham	Mikulski
Breaux	Grams	Moseley-Braun
Brown	Grassley	Moynihan
Bryan	Gregg	Murkowski
Bumpers	Harkin	Murray
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Byrd	Hatfield	Nunn
Chafee	Heflin	Pell
Cochran	Hutchison	Pressler
Cohen	Inouye	Pryor
Conrad	Jeffords	Reid
Coverdell	Johnston	Robb
Craig	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Roth
Daschle	Kennedy	Santorum
DeWine	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dole	Kohl	Simpson
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Snowe
Exon	Leahy	Specter
Feingold	Levin	Stevens
Feinstein	Lieberman	Thomas
Ford	Lott	Thompson
Frist	Lugar	Thurmond
Glenn	Mack	Warner
	McCain	Wellstone

NAYS—4

Ashcroft	Inhofe
Helms	Smith

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell	Faircloth	Kyl
Coats	Gramm	Shelby
Domenici	Hollings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 87; the nays are 4; two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

EXTENDING THE CURRENT FARM PROGRAM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I will simply take 1 minute on an issue many of us are concerned about on both sides of the aisle. I have previously offered unanimous-consent requests to extend the current farm program for a year, provide planting flexibility, and forgive advanced deficiency payments in the process of doing that. I am very concerned that the Congress provide an answer to farmers about what the farm program will be.

I want to work with Members on both sides of the aisle here in Congress to get that done. Maybe we could hear a bit from the majority leader. I think there are some plans, perhaps next week, to address this, which I think will be a real step forward.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1523

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I know he is constrained to object tonight, but let me ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1523, the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. President, S. 1523 is the bill I just mentioned with respect to the extension of the farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me indicate I

have discussed this with the Senator from North Dakota. We are in the process—the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator LUGAR, Members on both sides of the aisle, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, Senator PRESSLER from South Dakota, the Democratic leader and others on both sides—to see if we cannot come to some agreement by Thursday of next week.

It is my hope we can lay out some process where, first of all, we would try to bring up or at least proceed to the bill we passed one other time. We would have to obtain cloture. That would probably not be invoked.

Then perhaps the Senator from North Dakota could lay down his 1-year extension, and if at that time we should have a bipartisan compromise, we would offer that as a substitute. That is what we have been discussing. I have talked to the Democratic leader two or three times today. I know the farmers are anxious in all parts of the country. We hope we can work it out. It may not be possible to do it that quickly, but we are working on it. Our staffs will continue to work in a bipartisan way, and we hope we can have it done by next Thursday.

Therefore, I feel compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for one moment, I understand that, and I hope we can reach a bipartisan compromise on this. I think, to the extent we will move to it and address it next week, that is real progress. I think farmers and others in rural America will be pleased by that, and I hope we can make some significant progress next week on this issue. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. I will just indicate to my colleagues, I know others have planes to catch. I will come back on the floor later. It is quite possible we will be in session on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week for morning business.

I think on Tuesday there will be maybe 3 hours equally divided, on Wednesday 4 hours equally divided, and on Thursday it would be my hope that we could have completed the telecommunications conference by then and have that conference report on the floor; also, that we might have some agreement on the farm legislation, at least on the Senate side, and have that vote on Thursday, and any other votes that may come up. We could have a vote on Thursday of next week. I do not anticipate any votes prior to Thursday. If something should occur so that those votes should become unlikely, we could still be in morning business. But we would notify our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me thank the majority leader for that in-

formation. We have had a good discussion about the schedule next week, and I am pleased that there is a possibility that we could address both the farm legislation and the telecommunications bill. So next week could be a very productive week, and hopefully we can continue to ensure that that can be done on Thursday.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN TERPSTRA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Democratic Policy Committee's assistant editor, Lynn Terpstra, will retire from the Senate next week. This marks the end of the long and productive career of a vigilant and dedicated congressional staff member.

Hers is a career that spans 25 years, from 1969 to 1996.

Lynn Terpstra began her congressional career in July, 1969, on the staff of Senator George Aiken of Vermont. Her next Senate assignment was on the staff of the Commission on the Operation of the Senate. In February 1977, she brought her quick mind and diligent habits to the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Her technical skills and her grasp of how to help organize the ever-increasing DPC graphics and publications workload made Lynn an invaluable player on the DPC team.

Lynn Terpstra's keen eye, creative talent and dedicated approach to the work of the Senate's Democratic Policy Committee will be missed. The DPC is grateful for her contribution to our work, and I want to thank Lynn and wish her well in her future endeavors.

I yield the floor.

BILL READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1541

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished majority leader, Mr. DOLE, I send a bill to the desk and ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1541) to extend, reform and improve agricultural commodity, trade, conservation, and other programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, given this turn of events, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Tuesday, January 30, 1996, for the majority leader or his designee to file a cloture motion with respect to the farm bill to be introduced this evening.

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

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair. I will simply say, parenthetically, this is the farm bill that has been referenced by the majority leader, and cloture will attempt to be obtained on this. I appreciate the procedure of the Senate.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to take a moment, if I might, to congratulate the Senator from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, on which I am pleased to serve, and his counterpart on the Democratic side, Senator Sam NUNN from the State of Georgia. They did an exceptional job in getting finally a defense authorization bill approved that the President said he will sign after vetoing the previous bill.

I thought the President was right in that timeframe when he vetoed the bill. I am not happy completely with the bill, as I outlined earlier in remarks on the Senate floor before the vote. But certainly the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Georgia did an admirable job in eliminating some of the most obnoxious parts of the defense authorization bill originally and coming to a successful conclusion today where we have passed it in the U.S. Senate.

START II TREATY

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to move on and thank my dear friend and colleague who has just spoken with regard to the START II Treaty. There is nothing that has a better chance for the hope of mankind in the future than the overwhelming approval of the START II Treaty. When it is implemented, it will reduce the number of nuclear warheads both in Russia and the United States of America. I congratulate the ranking member and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for a job very well done.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I want to say what a wonderful job the chairman, Mr. HELMS, and my fellow floor manager, Senator LUGAR, have done. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his kind remarks.

I think this is truly a historic day. I am glad my retirement from the Senate is coming after this and not before.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend, Senator PELL, so very, very much.

TOUGH TALK ON THE FARM BILL IS DOUBLETALK

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on another matter, very briefly—and I will not tie up the Senate, it will take me 3 or 4 minutes—I want to talk briefly about what I was surprised to see, which I term "Tough Talk on the Farm Bill Is Doubletalk."