

the bill is tantamount to serving notice that we are going to move in our own independent direction.

At some point, we may have to do that, but I do not think the year is now, and I do not think it is time now to give up on a mutual approach that can save us billions and billions of dollars and also increase the security of our people. I do not think that hope should be written off.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I certainly agree with the goals as articulated by the Senator from Georgia. We have some slight difference as to how to get there, but he certainly has articulated the issue well.

I ask at this point, if there is no one else who desires to speak, even though there be time remaining, if there is no other person desiring to speak other than the leaders, that it would be possible to yield back any remaining time and proceed to allow leaders to speak as they desire and then to hold the cloture vote at 2:15 or as soon thereafter as appropriate.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I agree with the suggestion of my friend from Arizona. There is apparently no one else on this side who plans to speak at this point in time. I certainly would agree to that procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time has been considered yielded back. Leaders will be accorded an opportunity to speak prior to the cloture vote, which will be when the Senate reconvenes.

RECESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

There being no objection, at 12:35 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. COATS].

DEFEND AMERICA ACT OF 1996— MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 411, the "Defend America" bill:

Bob Dole, Strom Thurmond, John Warner, Trent Lott, Bob Smith, Rick Santorum, Jesse Helms, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Dan Coats, Dirk Kempthorne, John McCain, Jon Kyl,

Pete V. Domenici, Bill Cohen, Lauch Faircloth, Ted Stevens.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1635, a bill to establish U.S. policy for the deployment of a national missile defense system, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Gorton	McCain
Ashcroft	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Hefflin	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—46

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Hollings	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Exon	Levin	
Feingold	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—1

Frist

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, and the nays are 46. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of

morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could add, for the information of all Senators, this is so we can have a discussion with the democratic leadership and get an understanding as to how we will proceed from here on the time for the balanced budget discussion.

I yield the floor and 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. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEFEND AMERICA ACT OF 1996

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, Let me emphasize that I regard the Defend America Act of 1996 as a vital piece of legislation—one which provides a clear and concise blueprint for protecting the American people from the growing threat of attack from ballistic missiles carrying nuclear chemical or biological warheads. I am also convinced, Mr. President, beyond peradventure, that it is critical that the United States begin immediately the 8-year task of building and deploying a national missile defense. Finally, I am disappointed that this legislation is being subjected to a filibuster.

This past winter, shortly after the Clinton administration vetoed the missile defense provisions in the 1996 Defense Authorization Act, I, along with others, questioned the wisdom of the administration's stated assumption that no country "other than the declared nuclear powers" would threaten the "continental" United States with a ballistic missile for at least 15 years. An incredible statement. I was astonished then and I am astonished now, when I think about it, by the intellectual bankruptcy of such a statement.

Mr. President, I shall make four points in this regard: First, I continue to wonder how the administration could so cavalierly make decisions about the deployment of a national missile defense, while explicitly excluding declared nuclear powers from the threat calculus. One has only to consider China, which fields dozens of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, hundreds of warheads on heavy bombers, roughly 24 medium and long-range ballistic missiles, and has several crash modernization initiatives in progress. Moreover, China intends to deploy, by the end of this century, four new types of ballistic missiles. Furthermore, the United States has very clear indications that Red China is, at this very moment, pursuing MIRV technology.

Now, then, Mr. President, this is the very same country, mind you, that has

just finished flexing its military might by conducting live missile-firing exercises in the Strait of Taiwan, in a clear effort to bully and cower a valued and longstanding ally of the United States. This is the same country—China—that issued thinly veiled threats this spring suggesting that nuclear weapons would be used against the United States if the United States intervened on behalf of Taiwan. Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord acknowledged that Chinese officials had declared that the United States, “wouldn’t dare defend Taiwan because they [China] would rain nuclear bombs on Los Angeles” if we did.

Now, if this is not nuclear blackmail, it will do while the Clinton administration folds its hands until the first nuclear missile hits the west coast. China’s ability to hold the United States hostage to such threats is made possible by the fact that a band of latter-day Luddites here in Washington have consistently refused even to consider building the very strategic missile defenses necessary to protect the American people from such an attack.

Mr. President, it is time for the defenders of the ABM Treaty to give up their pious devotion to an antiquated arms control theology and come to grips with the realities of the post-cold-war world. Dr. Henry Kissinger, the architect of the ABM Treaty, put it best when he recently wrote, “The end of the cold war has made . . . a strategy of mutually assured destruction largely irrelevant. Barely plausible when there was only one strategic opponent, the theory makes no sense in a multipolar world of proliferating nuclear powers.”

He went on to say that MAD, mutually assured destruction, would not work against blackmail with nuclear weapons. Yet, that is exactly what we are faced with when China blatantly threatens Los Angeles, U.S.A.

Second, I cannot fathom the administration’s sensibilities when it drew a distinction between threats to the United States and threats to the continental United States. The last time I checked, nearly 2 million U.S. citizens live in Alaska and Hawaii. These people and their families are no less deserving of protection than anyone living in Arkansas or North Carolina or Washington, DC, or anywhere else. It is simply incredible that those who oppose ballistic missile defense are doing so based on their view of the threat to only 48 out of the 50 States of the Union. This is all the more galling since it is an indisputable fact that North Korea is developing a series of missiles capable of striking both Alaska and Hawaii.

Third, I call Senators’ attention to a key caveat in the much publicized 1996 threat assessment that has been largely overlooked. That assessment declared that “foreign assistance is a wild card that can sometimes permit a country to solve difficult developmental problems relatively quickly. Such

external assistance can hinder our ability to predict how soon a system will become operational.”

Good Lord, Mr. President, this one statement alone unravels the whole ball of yarn. Foreign assistance is the norm in the development of ballistic missile systems, not the exception. The Soviet Union collaborated on ballistic missiles with 14 countries around the globe, all of whom can now field some type of Soviet-made missile.

Russia recently was caught shipping entire missile sections to Iraq. Both Libya and Egypt have transferred missiles to other countries. China has sold intermediate-range missiles to Saudi Arabia and missile technology to Iran, Syria, and North Korea. In turn, Iran is working with North Korea and Syria on various missiles, and North Korea is supplying both missiles and missile production facilities to anybody who is prepared to pay for them with cash.

Recently, Mr. President, I was astounded to discover that Russia and Ukraine may be concluding a secret deal with China to transfer ICBM components. A report by the Defense Intelligence Agency concluded that Communist China is seeking to enhance its strategic arsenal with components from Russia’s most lethal type of intercontinental ballistic missile—the SS-18.

Dubbed “Satan” by Western intelligence services, the SS-18 is the world’s most destructive weapon to date. It has the ability to drop 10 megaton-rated warheads within 600 feet of their targets. Acquisition of just the booster stage of this missile would give China the ability to launch nuclear warheads against any and every city in the United States of America—a strategic reach of up to 6,820 miles that China, thank the Lord, does not yet possess.

Mr. President, I am deeply troubled that Secretary of Defense Perry has held open the door to the possibility that SS-18 boosters could be used commercially by the Chinese to boost satellites into orbit. He stated during an interview with reporters from the Washington Times that “I guess our answer would be only if it’s very tightly controlled, so you can have great confidence this technology is not being diverted to some other application. That would be the only exception I would make.”

Well, speaking just as one Senator, I must say, in no uncertain terms, that I believe any such exception would be made at the peril of the national security of the American people. The Defense Intelligence Agency has specifically noted that “China’s interest in using SS-18 boosters in its civilian program seems odd because the SS-18’s engine characteristics may be incompatible with many sensitive satellite payloads.” I might add that the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am chairman, recommended Senate ratification of the START II Treaty subject to the understanding that the treaty

would rectify a longstanding inequity of previous arms control agreements by completely eliminating this monster missile forever. Secretary Perry’s comment appears to open the door for Satan’s coming under the red flag of Communist China.

For the record I should mention that the START II Treaty specifically prohibits Russia from transferring SS-18’s to any recipient whatsoever or whomsoever, and does so from the date of START II’s signature. The Foreign Relations Committee even attached a condition stating that “space-launch vehicles composed of items that are limited by the START Treaty or the START II Treaty shall be subject to the obligations undertaken in the respective treaty.” Case closed. In my judgment, there should not be any question about whether the transfer of SS-18 technology to China is acceptable. I contend that it absolutely is not.

The truth of the matter is that no amount of policy reformulation by the administration can change the fact that the United States is vulnerable to nuclear-tipped missiles fielded by China, or anyone else. Rectifying this dangerous deficiency requires leadership and action. It is an all the more pressing issue because the current course charted by the administration fails to recognize the inherent danger in China’s pursuit of an advanced nuclear arsenal.

Mr. President, any further delay in the development by the United States of a flexible, cost-effective national missile defense is unconscionable. I am honored to be a cosponsor of the Defend America Act and urge Senators to support this legislation to ensure that the American people in all 50 States are protected from attack by ballistic missiles.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to celebrate a birthday. June 4, 1996, marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the National School Lunch Act by President Harry Truman. While turning 50 is not a happy occasion for most of us, the celebration of this birthday is one that should make all of us happy.

The link between proper nutrition and a child’s ability to grow and to learn is undisputed. The School Lunch Program was founded in part, because President Truman saw the alarmingly large number of World War II draftees who failed their physicals due to nutrition-related problems. President Truman declared it a “measure of national security to safeguard the health and well being of the nation’s children.” President Truman was right.

Numerous scientific studies have documented the nutritional benefits of the program—children who eat school meals perform better on achievement