

from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the CHINASAT project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1996.*

REPORT CONCERNING WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS RELATIVE TO THE MABUHAY PROJECT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 115

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the MABUHAY project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1996.*

REPORT CONCERNING WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS RELATIVE TO THE COSAT PROJECT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 116

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to waive the restrictions contained in that Act on the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S.-origin satellites insofar as such restrictions pertain to the COSAT project.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1996.*

REPORT OF THE BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 117

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on the Budget.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with 31 U.S.C. §1105(a), I am transmitting my 1997 budget to Congress.

This budget provides a thematic overview of my priorities as we continue to discuss how to balance the budget over the next seven years. It also includes the Administration's new economic assumptions.

Because of the uncertainty over 1996 appropriations as well as possible changes in mandatory programs and tax policy, the Office of Management and Budget was not able to provide, by today, all of the material normally contained in the President's budget submission. I anticipate transmitting that material to Congress the week of March 18, 1996.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 5, 1996.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, on February 2, 1996, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2657. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

H.R. 2924. An act to guarantee the timely payment of Social Security benefits in March 1996.

S. 652. An act to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the enrolled bills were signed on February 2, 1996, during the recess of the Senate by President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND.]

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 2, 1996 he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 652. An act to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 627. A bill to require the general application of the antitrust laws to major league baseball, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-231).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1558. A bill to provide for reimbursement of States, political subdivisions, and persons that donated services, material, funds, or other things to allow the continued operation, during a period of time when appropriations were not available for the purpose, of all or any part of a public educational or recreational facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HEFLIN):

S. 1559. A bill to make technical corrections to title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1560. A bill to require Colombia to meet anti-narcotics performance standards for continued assistance and to require a report on the counter-narcotics efforts of Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1561. A bill for the relief of the individuals whose employment at the White House Travel Office was terminated; read the first time.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 1562. A bill to require the President to give notice of the intention of the United States to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. Res. 224. A resolution to designate September 23, 1996, as "National Baseball Heritage Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1558. A bill to provide for reimbursement of States, political subdivisions, and persons that donated services, material, funds, or other things to allow the continued operation, during a period of time when appropriations were not available for the purpose, of all or any part of a public educational or recreational facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN LEGISLATION

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this bill would require Federal agencies to reimburse States, localities, and individuals who donated funds and services to maintain operations at Federal recreational and tourist facilities during the recent Government shutdowns. Without these generous donations, attractions such as Grand Canyon National Park, Mount Rushmore, Carlsbad Caverns, the National Gallery of Art, Liberty Bell, and Independence Hall could not have continued operations during the lengthy Government closures last year. Thanks to the generosity of private citizens, States, and local governments we were able to ensure that innocent people were not turned away at the gates and that further economic loss was avoided.

Grand Canyon visitors and local businesses particularly benefited from State and private donations during the most recent Government shutdown. As you know, Grand Canyon National Park officially closed for the first time in its 76-year history on November 16, 1995, during the first Government shutdown last year.

The economic impact of the park's closure has been estimated at a loss of about \$1 million per day in tourism revenue to the park and surrounding areas. By entering into an agreement with the Department of the Interior, the State of Arizona and private individuals donated almost \$400,000 to prevent another park closure during the most recent Government shutdown which began on December 15, 1995, and lasted for more than 3 weeks.

It is only right that we reimburse those who so generously donated their funds and services in order to shoulder the Federal Government's responsibility. I trust that my colleagues agree and that we can pass this bill expeditiously.●

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. HEFLIN):

S. 1559. A bill to make technical corrections to title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE BANKRUPTCY TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1996

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Bankruptcy Technical Corrections Act of 1996. This bill will correct technical errors in the bankruptcy code resulting from the 1994 Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1994 as well as pre-existing technical errors. I am introducing the bill with support of Senator HEFLIN, my good friend from Alabama and the ranking minority on the Courts subcommittee.

Mr. President, with one exception, this bill makes purely technical changes in the Code. It is my hope that the bill will pass this body quickly and by unanimous consent.

The sole substantive change contained in this bill relates to the special procedures set up for single asset real estate ventures. These procedures

speed up the bankruptcy process in certain unique business situations. The 1994 bankruptcy bill passed the Senate overwhelmingly without a cap for the value of single asset cases, and the bill I am introducing today does no more than restore that provision.

Again, I wish to thank Senator HEFLIN for expert assistance and help with this bill, and I urge the swift passage of the bill.●

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1560. A bill to require Colombia to meet antinarcotics performance standards for continued assistance and to require a report on the counternarcotics efforts of Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF COLOMBIA LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have seen a variety of events in Colombia that raise serious doubts about the extent to which the Government of Colombia is taking the steps necessary to ensure full cooperation with the United States on the issue of drugs. We are now approaching the annual period for certification. Under U.S. law, the President is required to certify annually whether major drug trafficking and producing countries are cooperating fully with the United States to end drug production, trafficking, and related drug activities.

Last year, we saw the Government of Colombia—facing the possibility of congressional sanctions—take more vigorous action to arrest several key figures in the Cali cocaine empire. Until that point the Government of Colombia had done little to arrest or prosecute these individuals. This was true even though their whereabouts was commonly known and they were frequently strutting around the streets of Colombia's major cities. I, among others of my colleagues, was encouraged by the steps taken to finally put these thugs behind bars. The courageous actions of Colombia's prosecutor general and the leading counterdrug police official—both brave and incorruptible individuals under daily threats of death—were welcome signs that despite massive corruption, Colombia was prepared to take effective action.

But I did not believe then nor do I believe now that these arrests are enough. I indicated to the Government of Colombia on several occasions when senior officials visited me, that it was follow through that meant everything. I have written the Colombian ambassador and have indicated verbally to various cabinet members on state visits to the United States my concern that arrests were only a beginning.

I also asked these various individuals for assurances that the major drug lords were under proper control. That they were not able to continue to direct their drug empires while living at state expense. That they would face serious punishment. That they would

lose their stolen fortunes built on selling poison in this country. That they would give up information leading to efforts to dismantle their drug empires. And that adequate steps would be taken to deal with the corruption of Colombia's political system. A corruption that gave these kingpins freedom to violate Colombian, United States, and international law with impunity.

I was assured that all these things were being done. But in the last several weeks, what do we see? Just a few weeks ago, one of the major Cali drug lords simply walked out of prison. It was hours before anyone even knew he was gone and steps were taken to find him. It is clear that his escape was arranged by his prison guards in his employment. It is also clear that he was never under adequate supervision. He remains at large trying to negotiate even better terms for his return to custody. If this is true for Santacruz Londono, it is also true of the other drug kingpins. If they can carry on these types of activities in jail under the very eyes—and often with the cooperation of their jailers—then what does this say about guarantees that they are not continuing to direct their business empire while in custody?

I must say I have been very disappointed by these developments. But these are not all. In the last several days we have seen a former cabinet minister and close friend accuse the President of Colombia of knowingly collaborating with drug lords. These accusations come on top of similar reports from the former financial manager of the President's election campaign and from some of the Cartel leaders themselves. Tape recorded conversations indicating connections between senior government officials and drug lords are now part of the public record. These come in an environment in which our own sources indicate that there is extensive corruption of Colombia's legislative process stemming from these same drug lords. Just recently, the Colombian Congress only narrowly defeated a provision that would have given virtual amnesty to the drug lords and a guarantee that they could keep their illegal fortunes. In addition, massive shipments of cocaine in cargo jets and in commercial traffic continue to flood northward, while money laundering and financial manipulation are commonplace.

All of these various developments come at a time when the President of the United States, as he is required to do by law, is considering whether or not to certify Colombia as fully cooperating with the United States in suppressing the drug trade. I am seriously concerned that the present state of developments in Colombia raises the most serious doubts about that certification. The fate of Colombia's president, whether he resigns or not under a cloud, is a purely Colombian matter. I leave that issue in the hands of the good citizens of Colombia. But the issue of certification is purely an

American matter. It is a policy concern for the President and for this body.

Given the history I have just related, I must voice my serious concerns about whether Colombia meets even minimal standards for fully cooperating with the United States as is defined in the law. Moreover, as evidence accumulates about the degree of official corruption in Colombia at the highest levels, we must also consider a further requirement of the law that enjoins the President to suspend United States assistance. That is section 487 of the Foreign Assistance Act. This provision requires the United States to suspend assistance to institutions or governments when there is sufficient reason to believe that the assistance is going to known or suspected drug traffickers or their confederates.

Mr. President, given current developments in Colombia. Given growing doubts about the integrity of the prison system. Given doubts about the integrity of the very political authorities who must receive and administer United States assistance and who are charged with enforcing Colombia's counterdrug policies. I believe it is time to reexamine our certification of Colombia.

Last year, even though there were serious doubts about Colombia's cooperation, the President of the United States gave Colombia a national interest waiver. With the arrest of major cartel figures, it seemed as if we and Colombia were making progress in restoring confidence in Colombia's seriousness in dealing effectively with the drug cartels. Recent events, however, put all of that progress in doubt. They raise serious questions as to whether any of the arrests, as welcome as they are, have any real meaning. In a climate of high-level corruption, in an environment in which the cartel leaders can come and go as they please, I must admit to a degree of disappointment after the assurances that I received to the contrary.

In this regard, I am introducing a bill to limit United States assistance to Colombia and to require a thorough review of our relationship. This bill would require the President of the United States to review full decertification of Colombia and to consider what economic steps might be taken to force Colombia to take the steps that have so often promised but that have fallen short so many times. This is not a welcome step, but the drugs flowing to this country because of the activities of the Colombia drug lords must be stopped. We and the Colombians must recognize that promises and half measures are not sufficient.

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to commend my colleague from Iowa for introducing this bill that will help to curb the international flow of drugs, particularly into the United States.

Narcotics have become a scourge in our country and it is about time that we start to take action to eradicate it

at all levels. Since illegal drugs found on our streets are most often produced in other countries, foreign nations must also take action to prevent the production, transportation and distribution of illegal drugs. So far, there has been very little action to make foreign countries accountable for the drugs trafficked in the United States. This bill, which focuses on Colombia, will do just that.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, cocaine production, transportation and distribution has been managed primarily by the Colombian drug cartel, making cocaine available everywhere in the United States. The Cali cartel controls about 80 percent of the world's cocaine trafficking.

The Colombian Government has not done enough to put an end to the drug problem. Last year, United States officials expressed disappointment with the cooperation level of the Colombian Government in the counternarcotics effort. However, the administration sought to waive the certification for Colombia and permit United States aid to continue for development in Colombia. In an effort to justify the financial assistance, this bill would require the President to certify to Congress that Colombia has begun to take the appropriate measures to limit the power of the drug traffickers and squash the flow of illegal drugs. Such methods include: the eradication of drug crops, interdiction of drug shipments, and the strengthening of the Colombian law enforcement and judicial authorities.

It is only fair that American taxpayers, who pay for the foreign aid to Colombia, receive some assurance that the Colombian Government will attempt to reduce the production and distribution of drugs. With the recent disclosure of the ties between the Cali cartel and officials of the Colombia Government, the timing of this bill could not be any better.

Various insiders of the Cali mafia have recounted the influence exerted by the Cali mafia on high level Colombian officials, all the way to the President of Colombia. A former campaign manager for President Ernesto Samper Pizano is currently jailed for soliciting contributions from drug traffickers in order to finance the Colombian presidential campaign. Fernando Botero Zea, who also served as Colombia's former defense minister, claims that Colombian President Samper knew about the money from the drug traffickers. It is suggested that his presidential campaign accepted \$5.9 million from the Cali cartel.

Colombia should be accountable for its failure to actively participate in the counternarcotics effort. This bill places pressure on the Colombian Government to take steps to control the drug problem in Colombia. Any steps taken will have a direct effect on the flow of narcotics into the United States. But a failure to participate in the international counternarcotics effort should result in

the loss of financial assistance provided by the United States.

In light of recent developments in Colombia, I am pleased that my colleague is offering this bill and am proud to co-sponsor this important measure. •

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 1562. A bill to require the President to give notice of the intention of the United States to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic-Missile Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE STRATEGIC ANTI-MISSILE REVITALIZATION AND SECURITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there has never been a greater champion of ballistic missile defense than that great American, Ronald Wilson Reagan, and today happens to be President Reagan's 85th birthday. I decided this morning to introduce the Strategic Anti-missile Revitalization and Security Act of 1996—for short we call it the "STARS Act"—legislation proposing to begin the timely and complete withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, and to clear the way for implementing President Reagan's vision of a national strategic missile defense system to protect the American people from ballistic missile attack.

Today's greatest emerging threat to America's national security lies in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We all know that. According to the CIA, at this moment more than 30 countries possess ballistic missiles, and more than 25 others either have, or are in the process of acquiring, nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Many of these nations—for example, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and North Korea—are clearly hostile to the United States. It is indeed probable that in the not-too-distant future a hostile tyrant will possess ballistic missiles capable of reaching major population centers in the United States.

Obviously, Mr. President, with such an ominous threat emerging, one would assume that the United States would be actively developing defensive technology to protect the American people against this danger; and one would assume that the Clinton administration surely is working, in cooperation with a bipartisan majority in Congress, to make certain that the United States is never, never exposed to the danger of a hostile nuclear attack by a terrorist regime.

Well, such assumptions are wrong. The Clinton administration in fact has aggressively blocked every effort by Congress to implement a national missile defense system to protect the American people from this very real threat.

Why? Because, the administration argues weakly, developing such defenses would violate an antiquated arms control agreement—a relic of the cold war known as the ABM Treaty.

Mr. President, the ABM Treaty is not only out-of-date and unnecessary—it

has become a threat to America's national security. Like latter-day Luddites, the opponents of ballistic missile defense are now using the ABM Treaty as a tool to obstruct any and all progress toward the deployment of missile defense technology.

During debate over the defense authorization bill, for example, the opponents of ballistic missile defense stood on the Senate floor and used the ABM Treaty in a last-ditch effort to prevent Congress from passing legislation to deploy a national system to protect U.S. citizens against weapons of mass destruction. When they lost, President Clinton then used the ABM Treaty as an excuse to veto the defense authorization bill, thus preventing approval of funding for national missile defense.

Mr. President, this treaty has become nothing more than an excuse for inaction. But the time for excuses is over. The United States needs a national missile defense. And if the ABM Treaty is preventing us from building and deploying essential defenses to protect the American people from even the most limited ballistic missile attack, then the time has come for the United States to withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

Mr. President, my legislation will do just that. The STARS Act does three things:

First, it directs the President to notify Russia of United States intent to withdraw from the ABM Treaty 1 month after enactment of the act, as legally permitted by the ABM Treaty.

Second, it prohibits the use of Federal funds to enforce the ABM Treaty beginning 7 months after the bill's enactment.

Finally, it requires the President to certify to Congress that the United States has abrogated the ABM Treaty on the date of U.S. withdrawal.

Mr. President, through its blind allegiance to this obsolete treaty, the Clinton administration appears to be ready to leave the American people strategically naked as hostile nations rush forward to their relentless pursuit of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Indeed, in their zeal to stop Congress from deploying national missile defenses, this administration seems willing to say or do anything to argue that the ballistic missile threat does not exist.

I must say I was stunned when I noted the politicization of the most recent National Intelligence Estimate [NIE] to support the administration's position in this regard. The 1996 National Intelligence Estimate declared that no country other than the "declared nuclear powers" would threaten the "continental United States" with a ballistic missile for 15 years. Note carefully that they said the "continental United States". First, this is simply not so. The 1995 estimate concluded, for example, that North Korea may be able to threaten the United States in 5 years because it is an indisputable fact that North Korea is developing a series

of missiles with ranges in excess of 3000 kilometers.

Second, I am astonished that this administration has somehow managed to write two of the 50 States of the Union completely out of the Union. I cannot understand why this administration draws a distinction in the 1996 NIE 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. Are these people less deserving of protection than people living in Arkansas, or Michigan for that matter? I think not.

Third, it boggles the mind that this administration can make decisions about the ballistic missile threat to this country, while explicitly ignoring the arsenals of declared nuclear powers. Communist China not only fields two dozen submarine launched ballistic missiles, several hundred heavy bomber warheads, and roughly 24 long- and medium-range ballistic missiles, but has several modernization initiatives underway. China is developing for deployment by the end of the millennium four intermediate-range and long-range ballistic missile systems, and we have unambiguous evidence that China is pursuing MIRV-technology.

Nor can we afford to dismiss Russia's massive nuclear capabilities. Russia still has 12,000 nuclear warheads in its arsenal, as it slips and slides back down the slippery-slope of political reform. When President Clinton declared in his State of the Union address that today, for the first time no Russian nuclear missiles are pointed at the United States, he just happened to omit the fact that it requires only about 8 minutes of reprogramming to turn those Russian missiles right back at us.

We must not ignore in such cavalier fashion the trends to reinstate and restore communism in Russia. It is growing increasingly possible that Russia's massive nuclear arsenal could fall into the hands of authoritarian leaders with uncertain intentions before the end of this century. We of course hope this will not happen, but we must prepare for the possibility.

Even those who unwisely discount the possibility of direct conflict with potentially hostile regimes in Moscow and Beijing, must not discount the possibility of an accidental launch, nor the cooperation and collaboration between countries engaged in the development of ballistic missiles. We know, for example, that China has sold extensive missile technology to Iran, Syria, and North Korea; we know that Iran is working with North Korea and Syria on various missiles. We know that 14 countries around the globe have the capability to field some type of Soviet-made missile, and we know that Russia recently was detected shipping ballistic missile parts to Iraq.

These are all real threats that the administration would ignore at the peril of the American people, because the fact is, the proliferation of weapons

of mass destruction and ballistic missile technology is rampant, the threat of ballistic missile attack on the United States is a present and growing danger, and nothing is being done to protect the American people from it. The administration has an almost messianic devotion to the ABM Treaty which I find bizarre. There is, you see, far more concern about protecting a treaty not worth the paper it is written on, than with protecting American citizens against horrible nuclear attacks.

So, Mr. President, the STARS Act, which I am introducing today, will remove the ABM Treaty as an obstacle, and instead pave the way for the deployment of defenses when necessary to protect American citizens against weapons of terror. And the sooner, the better. We cannot afford to wait until the administration wakes up and opens its eyes. By then, it may be too late. It takes years to move from the enactment of legislation in Congress to the deployment of a defensive system.

If Congress passes legislation funding such a system this year, it may take as long as eight years before the system is operational.

It may, in fact take longer. Think back. Did any Senator predict 8 years ago the advanced stages of North Korea's nuclear program? Did anyone here know, before the fact, how close Iraq was to obtaining a nuclear weapon just prior to the start of the Gulf War? Is any Senator prepared to stake the security of the American people on blind faith? There are questions that we must confront.

I am not. We must begin consideration of the STARS Act. Removing the ABM Treaty is critical to any strategy for protecting U.S. citizens against chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons mounted on ballistic missiles. In the coming months, I anticipate the introduction, under the auspices of the distinguished majority leader, of a comprehensive bill identifying the critical aspects of a ballistic missile defense. In support of this effort, and in connection with the STARS Act, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will of which I am chairman, will hold hearings as soon as practicable to undertake a comprehensive review of the ABM Treaty. Providing for the defense of America against these weapons must be among our highest priorities during this session of Congress.

Mr. President, Ronald Reagan said it best back in 1993, in one of his last public speeches—he had learned of the Clinton administration's decision to gut the Strategic Defense Initiative: "I may not be a Rhodes Scholar" he told the graduating cadets at The Citadel, "but I do know one thing: if we can protect America with a defensive shield from incoming missiles, we should by all means do so. . . . (And) if the new Administration thinks we are no longer at risk, they need to open their eyes and take a good hard look at the world."

Amen, Mr. President, and, again to you, sir, out there in California, happy birthday. It was a joy to hear your voice today on the telephone. God bless you—and as you always used to say—God bless America.

Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strategic Anti-Missile Revitalization and Security Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Constitution vests in the Government of the United States responsibility to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the American people.

(2) Due to limitations imposed by the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the United States is prohibited from deploying a national missile defense capable of defending America against even the most limited of ballistic missile attack.

(3) The concept of mutual assured destruction which underlies the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is technologically and geostrategically outdated and cannot serve as a basis for stability in a multipolar world characterized by rampant proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile technology.

(4) The possibility of ballistic missile attack upon the United States by a rogue country constitutes a clear, present, and growing threat to the supreme interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT TO GIVE NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL.

No later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall give notice to the Russian Federation of the intention of the United States to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, as permitted under Article XV of that Treaty.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITIONS.

Beginning 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, appropriated funds shall not be obligated or expended for the purposes of proscribing, enforcing, or implementing any provision of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

SEC. 5. ACTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.

On the date that is 180 days after the date of the notification of the President to the Russian Federation under section 3, the President shall certify to Congress that the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is no longer interpreted to apply to the development, deployment, or operation of any missile defense system or air defense system of the United States, including any component of such a system or upgrade of such a system or component.

SEC. 6. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term "Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty" means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, signed at Moscow on May 26, 1972, with related protocol, signed at Moscow on July 3, 1974.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 295

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Virginia

[Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to permit labor management cooperative efforts that improve America's economic competitiveness to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

S. 673

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 673, a bill to establish a youth development grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 930

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 930, a bill to require States receiving prison construction grants to implement requirements for inmates to perform work and engage in educational activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1166

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1166, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, to improve the registration of pesticides, to provide minor use crop protection, to improve pesticide tolerances to safeguard infants and children, and for other purposes.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1219, a bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1400

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1400, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue guidance as to the application of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to insurance company general accounts.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to establish a demonstration project to provide that the Department of Defense may receive medicare reimbursement for health care services provided to certain medicare-eligible covered military beneficiaries.

SENATE RESOLUTION 217

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator

from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 217, A resolution to designate the first Friday in May 1996, as "American Foreign Service Day" in recognition of the men and women who have served or are presently serving in the American Foreign Service, and to honor those in the American Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty.

SENATE RESOLUTION 219

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 219, A resolution designating March 25, 1996 as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

AMENDMENT NO. 3184

At the request of Mr. LEAHY the names of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3184 proposed to S. 1541, a bill to extend, reform, and improve agricultural commodity, trade, conservation, and other programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3202

At the request of Mr. GREGG the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3202 intended to be proposed to S. 1541, a bill to extend, reform, and improve agricultural commodity, trade, conservation, and other programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3289

At the request of Mr. GREGG the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of amendment No.