

City, multiply that by 1,000, it gives you some idea. Maybe it is the fact that this magnitude is more than we can comprehend. I do not know.

Mr. KYL. If I could make another comment. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma would want to add to this, too.

Let us go back a little bit and put this in perspective. The weapon that killed 28 Americans in Saudi Arabia during the gulf war was a conventional explosive organ, just high explosives they call it, and yet the single largest number of American casualties occurred in that one instant. And 28 Americans died when that 1 Scud missile hit the barracks in Saudi Arabia. That was a relatively crude Scud missile with a range of maybe 300 miles or thereabouts.

The point is that every year countries learn how to cause their missiles to go farther and farther and farther, and they put heavier payloads on them, and they make them more accurate in terms of where they will fall.

What our intelligence has been telling us about the North Korean missile is that they are on a subsequent generation now. They have already developed missiles that will go these intermediate distances. They are working on missiles that will go farther and farther and farther. So what we are trying to do is estimate just when will it be that they will have advanced to the point that they can deliver that warhead all the way to the United States? We cannot tell that with precision. We do not know when that will happen. But the information we had suggested they were now getting along to the point where it would be perhaps within 3 to 5 years that they had that capability. That is what we are talking about here.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KYL. Yes.

Mr. INHOFE. I think that is interesting because it was a week ago today in the New York Times that a story came out about China, making reference to the fact that they were talking about possible missile attacks against Taiwan. But do not worry, they said, because the Americans are not going to go to Taiwan's defense because they are more concerned about Los Angeles than they are about Taipei.

What does that tell you? Certainly there is an interpretation on that that could be very close to a warning to us. It just bothers me that we in this country have adopted a policy, just during this administration and specifically this year, that we are going to be downgrading our nuclear capability, our missile technology, our capability when, as the Senator from Arizona states, the rest of the countries are raising theirs up.

If there is one lesson from the Persian Gulf war that the American people learned, it is that the leader of that country is capable of doing anything. If he had a missile, I do not doubt that

most people in America believe he would use it.

Mr. KYL. If the Senator from Oklahoma would like to respond to this: Is it not a fact that Saddam Hussein said that if he had had the bomb, he would have used it? I know Muammar Qadhafi said that, the leader of Libya.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. KYL. It seems to me Saddam Hussein said the same thing.

May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. INHOFE. He went on to say, "If we waited, if the war was 2 years from now, we would have the capability."

Mr. KYL. The nuclear capability.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. KYL. Suppose it is 3 or 4 years from now and the North Koreans have a missile which has enough range now to finally hit the continental United States or even, Mr. President, Alaska or Hawaii—maybe even just Japan, although presumably they are already there. North Korea clearly could get into Japan at this point.

But suppose they had a missile that could get to Hawaii or Alaska, and they decide that they have had it with Taiwan, that they have threatened Taiwan long enough and it is time for them to incorporate Taiwan into China, not only in a rhetorical and political sense, but in an actual and military sense; therefore, they are going to threaten Taiwan with obliteration if it does not agree to become an effective part of the Chinese Government—they call themselves a state now, but they are not subject to the government in Beijing—suppose that China begins rattling its sword and says, "We are now going to do this," and Taiwan has to go along. And the United States says, "No. We have a treaty obligation, or we have obligations, in any event, if not rising to the level of a treaty, which have commitments to Taiwan to protect them in the event you attack." And the North Koreans say, or the Chinese, either one, says, "Well, we have weapons that we know can reach Alaska and Hawaii, and you know that, too. So we would suggest that you not step in the way of China taking over Taiwan or step in the way of North Korea taking over South Korea," whatever the target between China and North Korea would be.

What do you think the United States would do in that event, if we knew that if the Chinese taking over Taiwan or the North Koreans taking over South Korea could launch a missile against the United States and we could not stop them? Would we intervene militarily to protect South Korea against North Korea or Taiwan against China?

Mr. INHOFE. I will respond to the Senator from Arizona. It is even more complicated than that, assuming we continue our present course of blindly adhering this to the provisions of the ABM Treaty. Taking the same scenario, if we have an Aegis ship in Sea of Japan, and two missiles are launched from, say, China or North

Korea—one bound for Taiwan and one bound for Los Angeles, we could very well be in the absurd position of being fully able to intercept the one bound for Taiwan, but not the one bound for Los Angeles, because that would be a violation of the ABM Treaty.

We have debated this before as to the fact that the ABM Treaty does not have valid application today. In fact, it was Henry Kissinger, the architect of the treaty, who said to me—and you can quote me, he said, "It's nuts to make a virtue out of our vulnerability."

So this is the environment that we are dealing with. I am very thankful to the leadership of the Senator from Arizona and a few others who share our concern over the vulnerability of the United States.

Mr. KYL. I appreciate the Senator from Oklahoma bringing this issue up. I also know that the Senator in the chair, the Senator from New Hampshire, has a very strong voice speaking in favor of the development and deployment of the U.S. ballistic missile defense system, and I thank him.

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. May I inquire of the Chair what is the current order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1541, the farm bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, I spoke on the floor of the importance of this Senate dealing with farm policy in a timely manner that sends the appropriate signals to American agriculture of what they can expect in the reform policy that the 104th Congress is proposing.

This afternoon, I earlier spoke of the commodity programs and how they would be affected as we move with production agriculture much closer to the market and away from a Government program with which to farm.

There is a good deal more that Government can do for agriculture and still stay out of the business of telling them what to grow and how to grow it, because I think that is the responsibility of the family farmer, and I think that family farmer, or anybody in agriculture today, ought to be attuned to the market and ought to be farming to the market and deciding what his or her business may be, to what the world needs and what our consuming public needs than what a Government program will provide them or not provide them in telling them what to do.

In other words, what I am saying, Mr. President, is there are legitimate roles for the Federal Government in its association with agriculture. I think some

of those obvious areas are in the area of research, trade and conservation. I say that because where Government should involve itself is where the individual farmer or family farmer really cannot help themselves or cannot help themselves in an individual way.

American farmers, without question, lead the world in productivity. One American farmer today, and we have all heard it said, produces enough for himself or herself and 120 other citizens. It was not very long ago, at least it was not very long ago in this Senator's mind, when I was traveling as a national officer for the Future Farmers of America in the 1960's, the midsixties.

I remember well giving speech after speech where I spoke of the productivity of the American farmer. I often-times said that the American farmer produces enough for himself and 52 other Americans or 52 other citizens of the world. I just got through saying in 1996 that the American farmer produces enough for himself or herself and 120 other Americans or world citizens. Is it possible that productivity has more than doubled in 30-plus years? That is absolutely right, Mr. President, and the reason it has is because of research, the kind of research long term that has been done in direct association with the Federal Government where we, as taxpayers and as policymakers, can recognize the importance of long-term investment in the research area and that is, of course, where our land grant colleges and universities and our ag research stations have worked so very well over the years.

That is a legitimate role. That is the right kind of role that Government can play an important part in doing and, of course, that is where we ought to continue to work so closely together.

The different varieties, the E. coli bacteria problem that has cost lives in this country, can be dealt with and solved by the simple application of some research and by the proper education that can be a part and should be a part of a Government's role in participating with production agriculture.

In my State of Idaho, there are some extraordinary things being done. Just recently, I was part of an announcement between USDA and the Department of Energy working cooperatively in a new research program. You scratch your head and say, "Well, what is the Department of Energy doing in agriculture?" Because of the kind of technology that has been developed in DOE, in sensors, in the ability to use satellite and satellite technology, USDA and DOE are coming together in a project out in Idaho that literally links the farmer and his or her tractor and applicator on the ground with a satellite back to a computer to tell them exactly where they are in the field, how much fertilizer to apply or not to apply. Phenomenal efficiencies come from the application, a greater sense of environmental control comes from the application and, as a result,

cost savings and extremely high levels of productivity.

Could that be done by the individual farmer? No, it certainly cannot be done. Can it be done by industry? Not very well. When the kind of research and turnaround time is measured in decades, that is where Government can play a role, and that is where this Congress recognizes Government should play a role. It is a much better place for Government to be associated with agriculture than telling the farmer what to farm, telling them how to farm it, and oftentimes then saying, "And we'll provide you a safety net at the end."

While we recognize the importance of those kinds of commodity programs, what our bill says and what we are clearly saying in the 104th Congress, as we have said over the last decade to production agriculture, learn to farm to the market and not to the program.

The other area that I mention this afternoon is in the area of trade. Obviously, if we are as highly productive as I mentioned we are, then we have to have a market for our crops. That kind of productivity, absent the market, says that we are not going to get the kind of price for the product that deserves to be had and certainly provide that kind of profitability. Therefore, it is important that we have a strong domestic trade policy and, as we know, trade means you have to involve governments, you have to cross political boundaries, and that cannot be accomplished very well oftentimes by the individual farmer unless it is the Government working with their farmers to accomplish that.

In my State of Idaho, almost three-fourths of our annual wheat crop is exported. It has to move in world markets to maintain levels of profitability. In addition, we send large amounts of meat, peas, lentils, dairy products, and potato products to other countries around the world. Since the passage of NAFTA, we have seen some positive and some negative results. Cattle producers in my State are increasingly worried about the slaughter cattle moving in across the boundary, both from Mexico and from Canada.

Now and in the future, we must be assured that our trade negotiations and our trade policy fairly represents American agriculture, and if we are to walk away from and work with agriculture to move away from the kind of direct Federal payment and safety net to productivity in the marketplace, we have to make sure that they have full access to foreign markets. That is a legitimate role of Government associated with agriculture.

We also must continue our effort to develop and maintain the foreign market by investing in those markets, by working with production agriculture to teach foreign consumers how to consume the agricultural products of this country. That is an important and successful partnership that has worked time and time again over the years,

whether it is actually the development of wheat products in China that my State has been involved in with the Federal Government and our wheat growers, to the marketing of lentils somewhere in the Middle East and to a market use and expanded diversity in their use in the recipes of the Mideasterners. That is all a role, once again, that Government plays very successfully.

So let me urge my colleagues to support all of these approaches. It is one thing to say we are going to simply provide for agriculture, and historically that is some of what we did to what we have been saying for the last decade: American agriculture, farm to the market, be productive, do what you know how to do and do it well, and then we will help you break down the foreign barriers which will access you to the world so that you can be productive.

The third area that I believe Government can play a cooperative partnership role in is in the area of conservation. For example, the CRP program, while originally quite controversial in its introduction, has proved to be a highly successful program in the saving of topsoil and the improving of water quality and wildlife habitat.

In my State of Idaho, almost 850,000 acres went into CRP. The record is now very, very clear of the tremendously positive effect, converting those acres into sod bases, and what allowing them to rest undisturbed has done for all of the areas I have mentioned, including wildlife habitat. Upland game bird population increases in my State have been very dramatic as a result of these programs.

So that, again, is the kind of partnership that the Government can associate itself with, and I think oftentimes should. Targeting truly erodible lands, we can continue a successful program under a voluntary participation. I believe, Mr. President, voluntary is the key when we discuss agricultural conservation. We have made some changes over the years that I have not liked and that American agriculture has not liked.

We, historically, did allow Government to work in a voluntary, cooperative way with production agriculture, except in the mid 1980's, when we started making some changes and making conservation policy mandatory, and dictating. We started saying to the USDA, "You are going to be the cop out in the field saying, 'You are doing it wrong, and you have to do it differently or suffer the consequences.'" When that kind of news hit the ground—and we saw it in the late 1980's—relationships and partnerships began to change. There was no longer the voluntary aspect that had caused the conservation program to be as successful as it was. And we heard about it, very loudly and clearly, this year as we held hearings on this issue in the subcommittee, which I chair.

Conservation, partnership, cooperation, and voluntary relationships have

proven very successful over the years. Any other form and our resource base suffers, and it should not have to suffer. Farmers and ranchers, in my opinion, always have been, and must always be, the original environmentalists. We are the groundskeepers, the stewards of the private land, and the private land is the largest base in this country. If we are going to have a positive environment, that private property base must recognize the responsibility it has, and it has successfully done so over the years, whether it is erodible lands or whether it is the wetlands that we dealt with in the sod buster provisions of the farm bill of a few years ago and now, working with that again, to not make it so punitive, to make it cooperative, to include wetlands in the CRP base, so that you reward the farmer for moving that land out of production and into a protected type of classification, is what we ought to be doing, because we all recognize the value of wetlands to our Nation as a habitat and as a filtering system to the aquifers and to the productive sector of our country. That is cooperation, partnership, and that is the way it ought to be.

I am certainly pleased that the kind of legislation that I have helped craft this year in revamping and bringing forth the new farm bill fits these criteria and moves us in a direction that I think most of production agriculture wants to move in. It puts Government in a relationship that it ought to be in.

Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a few minutes ago, I was occupying the chair, as the Senator from Arizona is now, and I witnessed, first, a few remarks by the Senator from Arizona regarding the two-thirds supermajority vote for a tax increase, legislation that he is planning to introduce. And later, hearing the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE, come down and engage in a debate on both that issue with the Senator from Arizona and the issue of ballistic missile defense, I was very much taken by the debate.

First of all, I want to compliment both the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Oklahoma for the distinguished service they have given their country just in allowing this dialog to come to the forefront. In the case of the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Oklahoma, I have worked very closely with both of them on this ballistic missile defense matter, taking that issue first, knowing that here we have a situation where the entire defense authorization bill was held hos-

tage by the President of the United States because he did not want national missile defense. Not only did he not want national missile defense, he did not even want language talking about national missile defense. So in order to get a pay raise for our military, whom the President of the United States sent to Bosnia, we had to agree to take missile defense language out of the bill.

What came to my mind as I listened to the debate between my two colleagues was one simple line: Elections have consequences. I found myself saying that if a President sat down at the White House who shared the philosophy of the Senators from Arizona and Oklahoma, sticking to missile defense, we would have had a Defense authorization bill not only with language, but with a real direction to move toward building a defense against incoming ballistic missiles against the people of the United States of America. We now do not have that.

As the Senator knows, there have been a number of focus groups where people throughout America have been asked one very basic question: If the United States were fired on by a ballistic missile from another country, what would the United States do? Overwhelmingly, the response is, "Shoot it down." In fact, we know we cannot shoot it down.

It is shocking to me that a President, and many of the colleagues in his party, would hold a Defense authorization bill hostage to simply get that language out. I am outraged by it, to be candid about it. I think that what the Senator from Oklahoma brought to the floor with this intelligence information is shocking. I said to him, privately, as he was leaving the floor, "I hope that both of you Senators, who are members of the Intelligence Committee, pursue this diligently because it goes really to the heart of our democracy here." If, in fact, those charges are true, or even remotely true, as they appeared in the Washington Times, that somehow this was falsified, this is a very, very serious matter because the defense of the United States of America is at stake.

I just cannot understand why anyone would not want to do what needs to be done to defend American cities and American people. That is our obligation. That is one of the primary obligations of the U.S. Congress, certainly, as outlined in the Constitution. Yet, we have this situation where a report—and the Senator well knows we heard reports to the contrary. I am also on the Armed Services Committee. We heard reports to the contrary that this could be a problem within 2, 3, 4, 5 years. Now we are hearing maybe it is 15 years, or even further down the road.

Something is wrong, Mr. President, because you and I both know of the technology that is out there. We know it is being shipped all around the world. The Chinese have this missile technology, the Iraqis have it, the Ira-

nians have it, the North Koreans have it, and Qadhafi would like to have it, and he may have it soon. It goes on and on and on.

The Senator from Arizona, the occupant of the chair, made an excellent point, which reminded me—and I want to accent it, comment on it a little further, expand on it a little further—that when those 28 brave men and women were killed in the Persian Gulf by that missile, that is the first time in the history of America that a missile—in this case a theater missile, but a missile—attacked, hit, and killed American service men and women.

I find myself thinking, what if we had not had Jack Kennedy, to his credit, as you mentioned, and Ronald Reagan in the positions they were in at the time to see to it that we had even just the remotest possibility of defending against that missile. As the Senator knows, the missile that was used to shoot that missile down was not designed for that purpose, it was not designed to do that. So this is a very, very serious matter. We investigate a lot of things in the Congress, but if the intelligence community truly has information that says that the threat of attack from an incoming ballistic missile from one of those countries I mentioned, or another one, is possibly 15 years down the road, then I think they need to prove that to the Intelligence Committee.

I do not believe that is going to be the case. I do not think they can prove it. We know the range of these missiles. We know how this technology is being exported. We know our own technology has in some cases been bought and in some cases stolen and has been shipped around the world and in some cases encouraged to be sold by the current administration—certain types of technology which may or may not be used in building these missiles.

It is a perfect example, again, of one of the basic differences between the two political parties. So much focus has gone on the budget debate, and rightfully so, that we are trying to turn around 4 years of big government spending. That is a huge issue in and of itself, but also this issue of defending America, the basic responsibility that we have as Government servants of the people of the United States to preserve, protect, and defend our country is at stake here.

I am certainly going to be pursuing this, as well, on my own and in conjunction with my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee to find out the facts. I hope that we are not going to find that somehow this thing was inflated to be something that it is not, and that some pressure was put on to play this down, because I have been in some meetings over the past several months and years that I have been on the Armed Services Committee where I have heard the contrary from very high-ranking administration and military officials, as I am sure the Senator from Arizona has. I am looking forward