

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

to hearing the results of this investigation. I think it should be on the front burner.

TAX INITIATIVE

Mr. SMITH. Let me also say in regard to the tax initiative that the Senator brought up a few moments ago, this again goes to the heart and soul of the differences between our two parties.

George Bush said recently on national television that it might be nice if the American people just gave—it has not happened since 1952—one party, in this case the Republican Party, the opportunity to govern. The Democrats have had that opportunity once under Clinton, under Carter, to do it, and we did not see the debt go down. We did not see deficits diminish. On the contrary, we saw the opposite. Give us a shot at it. If we do not do well, throw us out. That is fair. Give us a shot. That is what President Bush said.

There is such a dramatic difference. How many times have we heard the debate from our friends on the other side that somehow growth is bad, making a profit is evil, that there is something wrong with that; and yet at the same time this debate occurs we see dollars being taken away, almost stolen, from the families of America. So we promote big government with the dollars taken from our families and at the same time denying them the opportunity to do the things that they would like to do for themselves, including education, getting a job, and being able to be productive in society.

There are no jobs, as the Senator pointed out, if there is no growth in America and if there is no opportunity for businesses to create those jobs. Government should not be in the business of creating jobs. The economy—business—should be creating jobs. That is what we are all about.

Somehow we have gotten into this debate that it is evil for anybody to make any money. I am pleased to hear when people make money. It delights me because I know somebody is getting dollars when somebody is making money.

The Senator brought up the point about the luxury tax, which I am proud to say I opposed and voted against, where all the people who built boats and luxury cars lost their jobs because of the tax increase, and people did not buy them.

When are we going to get the message that the greatness of America—we grew more at any time in the history when we did not have an income tax. Again, it is taking dollars. If all of the dollars that have been taken away from the American families throughout especially the last 40 or 50 years—if it worked, welfare would have been a success. We would not have all the crime we have today. We would not have to be spending money on crime or on welfare and other things that we find we are not satisfied with in America. The

truth is, it has not worked. Since it has not worked, we should try something new.

What we have—and you hear the American people say they are tired of the gridlock, the deadlock, tired of you fighting with each other. Again, the issue here is standing for principle, standing up for principle, because we believe deep in our hearts that these principles we espouse are right, they are correct, and we need to move this President. He is not moving. We understand that. If he is not moving, and we go as far as we go, we go to the American people, and essentially the decision is, very simply, we either move on with more debt and more deficits, or we move toward more growth, more economic prosperity, and more revenues to the Treasury, as the Senator pointed out.

Again, going back to the issue of missile defense, same thing—two very, very, important issues, if not the two most important issues that we face today in America, and a President with a distinctly different position than the House and the Senate.

I really want to compliment the Senator from Arizona, who is now in the chair, and the Senator from Oklahoma for two very, very worthwhile points in bringing to the attention of the Senate—although it is in the middle of the debate on a farm bill. Sometimes when other Senators are not here to participate in that debate, we have the opportunity, under Senate rules, to make these points. They are excellent points. I want to compliment both Senators.

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

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

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1541.

AMENDMENT NO. 3184

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to S. 1541 to the desk. In doing so, let me say this amendment is in behalf of myself, Senator LEAHY, Senator LUGAR, Senator BREAUX, Senator DOLE, Senator JOHNSTON, Senator COCHRAN, Senator GRAHAM of Florida, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator JEFFORDS and Senator MCCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], for Mr. LEAHY, for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr.

LUGAR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DOLE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 3184.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 substitute amendment to S. 1541, the farm bill.

Larry E. Craig, James M. Jeffords, Don Nickles, John H. Chafee, Robert F. Bennett, Thad Cochran, Ted Stevens, Trent Lott, Richard G. Lugar, Craig Thomas, Alan Simpson, John Warner, Larry Pressler, Dan Coats, Connie Mack, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this cloture and another one I filed earlier will occur back-to-back beginning at 1:30 on Thursday.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the amendment that has just been filed for Senator LEAHY and myself and others is a substitute to S. 1541 as I earlier introduced this afternoon. This substitute is an effort to put together a bipartisan coalition of Senators with all of us very intent on producing farm legislation as soon as possible to do exactly what I talked about doing earlier today; that is, sending a clear message to the agricultural community of this country as to the certainty and the timing of key farm bill legislation. There are a variety of adjustments in the substitute—the language which deals with \$100 million per year in additional mandatory funding for crop-oriented conservation cost-sharing programs similar to S. 854 that was introduced by Senator LUGAR and LEAHY earlier this year.

There is a grazing lands conservation initiative program which will encourage innovative rangeland management techniques across the country. Certainly in my State of Idaho and other States, this can be a valuable resource in improving livestock grazing lands. State technical commitments would make it possible for farmers to serve on these committees where they now do not have standing.

There are some nutritional reauthorizations that would reauthorize food stamps and other nutritional programs for the period of time of this legislation. Much of this will be corrected and adjusted when the House, the Senate, and the President agree on welfare legislation.