

that imposes restrictions on our ability to defend ourselves and reject the upgraded system, or the treaty, as it comes before us and take this opportunity to defend America.

We have an opportunity to get out from under the restriction imposed upon us by the ABM Treaty.

We have an opportunity to elevate our Aegis system.

We have an opportunity to defend America.

After all, Mr. President, isn't that what we are supposed to be doing?

I ask unanimous consent that a decision brief from the Center for Security Policy be printed in the RECORD.

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

A DAY THAT WILL LIVE IN INFAMY: 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE A.B.M. TREATY'S RATIFICATION SHOULD BE ITS LAST

(Washington, D.C.): Twenty-five years ago tomorrow, the United States ratified the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty; this Friday will mark the 25th anniversary of that Treaty's entry into force. With those acts, America became legally obliged to leave itself permanently vulnerable to nuclear-armed ballistic missile attack.

It is highly debatable whether such a policy of deliberately transforming the American people into hostages against one means of delivering lethal ordnance against them (in contrast to U.S. policy with respect to land invasion, sea assault or aerial attack) made sense in 1972. It certainly does not today, in a world where the Soviet Union no longer exists and Russia no longer has a monopoly on threatening ballistic missiles or the weapons of mass destruction they can carry.

#### THE REAGAN LEGACY

Indeed, as long ago as March 1983, President Reagan dared to suggest that the United States might be better off defending its people against nuclear-armed ballistic missile attack rather than avenging their deaths after one occurs. And yet, while Mr. Reagan's address spawned a research program that became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)—into which tens of billions of dollars have been poured over the past fourteen years, the ABM Treaty remains the "supreme law of the land." As a consequence, the United States continues to fail what has been called "the one-missile test". No defenses are in place today to prevent even a single long-range ballistic missile from delivering nuclear, chemical or biological warheads anywhere in the country.

This is all the more extraordinary since Republicans and like-minded conservatives have generally recognized that such a posture has become not just dangerous, but also reckless in the "post-Cold War" world. In fact, one of the few commitments of the 'Contract With America' that remains unfulfilled was arguably among its most important—namely, its promise to defend the American people against ballistic missile attack. Successive legislative attempts to correct this breach-of-contract have all foundered for essentially two reasons.

#### WHY ARE WE STILL UNDEFENDED?

First, most Republicans have shied away from a fight over the ABM Treaty. Some deluded themselves into believing that the opportunity afforded by the Treaty to deploy 100 ground-based anti-missile interceptors in silos at a single site in Grand Forks, North Dakota would allow the U.S. to get started on defenses. Even though such a deployment

would neither make strategic sense (it would not cover the entire United States from even a limited attack) nor be justifiable from a budgetary point of view (while estimates vary widely, costs of this minimal system could be well over \$10 billion), some missile defense proponents rationalized their support for it by claiming that the anti-defense crowd would not object to this "treaty-complaint" deployment and that it would be better than nothing. To date, however, all these "camel's-nose-under-the-tent" schemes have come to naught.

Such a system would create a basis for addressing new-term missile threats and complement space-based assets that may be needed in the future. The only problem is that the ABM Treaty prohibits such an affordable, formidable sea-borne defensive system. It must no longer be allowed to do so.

#### THE BOTTOM LINE

As it happens, the opening salvos in what may be the endgame of the ABM Treaty fight were sounded this weekend at the first International Conservative Congress (dubbed by one participant "the Conintern"). One preeminent leader after another—including House Speaker Newt Gingrich, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, once-and-future presidential candidate Steve Forbes, former UN Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, Senator Jon Kyl and nationally syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer—denounced the idea of making it still harder to defend our people against ballistic missile attack. Several, notably Senator Kyl and Mr. Forbes, have explicitly endorsed the AEGIS option to begin performing that task.

In an impassioned appeal for missile defenses as part of a robust military posture, Lady Thatcher said yesterday:

"A strong defense, supported by heavy investment in the latest technology, including ballistic missile defense, is as essential now, when we don't know who our future enemy may be, as in the Cold War era. And my friends, we must keep ahead technologically. We must not constrain the hands of our researchers. Had we done so in the past, we would never have had the military superiority that in the end, with the dropping of the atomic bomb, won the war in the Far East and saved many, many, lives, even though it destroyed others. We must always remain technologically ahead. If not, we have no way in which to be certain that our armed forces will prevail. And the research and technology of the United States is sheer genius, and it always has been."

With such leadership, there now looms a distinct possibility that the American people can finally be acquainted with the ominous reality of their vulnerability and empowered to demand and secure corrective actions. Thanks to the Clinton ABM amendments and the new technical options for defending America, we have both the vehicle for getting out from under an accord that was obsolete even in Ronald Reagan's day and the means for making good and cost-effective use of the freedom that will flow from doing so.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, about 10 days ago the Senate adopted the appropriations bill on defense. I sit on the appropriations committee. I was one of five Senators who voted no. I think the bill passed 95 to 5.

I don't enjoy voting against a defense budget. I am not running again, so I am not worried about somebody accusing me of being soft on defense. That has always been the mortal fear of Members of the Senate when you are voting on weapons system, that their opponent in the next election will accuse them of being soft on defense.

Sometimes I think we should be accused of being soft in the head. We passed a bill that contained \$247.5 billion for defense, and that did not include nuclear weapons and weapons development. That is all handled in the energy and water appropriations bill. And it did not include military construction, which is also in a separate bill. When you add those together, the appropriations for national defense total \$268.2 billion. That is right up there with what we spent in the cold war.

If, in 1985, you had asked the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, indeed, if you had asked all the chiefs, "If the Soviet Union were to suddenly be dissolved and disappear, how much do you think we could cut the defense budget," I promise you the answer would have been anywhere from \$50 billion to \$100 billion. Today the Soviet Union has been dissolved. It does not exist anymore. The military forces of Russia are in shambles. And we are appropriating \$268 billion—big, big figures.

What are we thinking about? There is not a major enemy in sight. How much do we spend? And who are we afraid of? Here is a little chart that I believe my colleagues will find interesting. When we appropriate \$268 billion, we are spending twice as much as all of the eight potential enemies we could possibly conjure up. Here is what the United States spent, \$268 billion; Russia, \$82 billion; China, \$32 billion; and the six rogue countries, \$15 billion. So we spend twice as much as all of those countries, twice as much as Russia, China, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Libya, Cuba combined. And when you add the NATO alliance, Japan and South Korea to what we are spending, it comes to four times as much. The United States and its allies are now spending four times as much for defense as virtually everybody else in the world.

That is the macro overlook of what I think is terribly wrong with the way we are appropriating money. But within that \$268 billion, let me just tell you some of the reasons I could not stomach it. Between 1998 and 2001, under that bill, we are going to retire 11 Los Angeles class submarines that have an average of 13 years left on their lives. What are we doing? When we appropriated the money to build Los Angeles class submarines, we were assured these submarines were the best in the world and that they had a 30-year life.

Everybody beat themselves on the chest and said isn't that wonderful, we are building submarines that have a 30-year life. So now we are retiring 11 of them that still have 13 years left on their lives. Why? So we can build one new attack submarine in fiscal 1998 at a cost of \$2.3 billion.

You talk about penny-wise and pound-foolish; we are going to spend \$3.4 billion for four DDG-51 destroyers. That is even one more than the Pentagon requested. How are we going to pay for that? Well listen to how we are going to pay for it. First of all, I am offended because they are retiring a ship that Betty Bumpers is the chief sponsor of. We christened the CGN-41, a guided missile nuclear ship, back in 1979. That ship had a life expectancy of 38 years, and we are about to scrap it. It is as modern as tomorrow. We are going to scrap it so we can build four new DDG-51 class destroyers, to keep the shipyards busy. We are retiring one of the most beautiful ships you will ever see, and it has 18 years left on its life.

We are also retiring three Perry-class frigates that have 20 years left on their life. What in the name of all that is good and holy do we care what the life expectancy of a ship is if we are going to retire them in order to make room for some more ships? The first thing you know, we will be building them and retiring them before they go into service so we can keep the shipyards busy.

Then, Mr. President, there is the \$331 million in this bill for the B-2 bomber. Let me say in all fairness, as long as William Jefferson Clinton is President, we are not going to start building B-2 bombers. I heard him speak on that subject. But what are we doing? We are saying, "Well, Mr. President, we know you don't like the B-2, so what we're going to do is give you \$331 million to start building nine more B-2 bombers, but if you don't want to do that, then spend this money on spare parts on the ones we have."

The Pentagon and the Air Force didn't ask for an additional \$331 million in spare parts, and we are not going to build the B-2. Why in the name of all that is good and holy are we putting \$331 million in the budget?

I come finally to the two items that really burn me worse than any other part of the budget. First, the F-22 fighter. When you start seeing full-page pictures in the New York Times and the Washington Post and in Roll Call and The Hill newspaper of this magnificent F-22 fighter, you can bet your bottom dollar the full-court press is on. I have no more ability to stop the F-22 fighter than I can keep the Earth from revolving. Once a plane like that develops the kind of momentum the F-22 has, nobody can stop it. Nobody can stop it no matter how foolish it is.

Let me wedge the F-22 fighter for you in between two other fighter planes. Right now we are beginning to

build a new version of the Navy's F-18 fighter plane called the F-18 E/F. It is the most advanced version of the F-18 to date. Cost? Mr. President, \$90 million each. Number? Probably around 600.

The Navy says, and the intelligence community confirms, that the F-18 fighter will be superior to any other non-American fighter plane in the world through the year 2015. I repeat: The 500 to 600 F-18 E/F's we are going to build will be superior to any non-American fighter plane known in the world between now and the year 2015. The Navy says it will provide air dominance until the year 2020. I am for it. We are building it. It is a magnificent airplane.

So what are we going to do now in the year 1998 to 2000? We are going to start building this F-22. Do you want to know the cost of that? Sixty-two billion dollars for 339 airplanes. That comes to somewhere between \$180 million and \$190 million each, which makes it precisely twice as expensive as the most expensive fighter plane ever built in the United States.

If we needed it, we might justify the cost. But if we don't need it, we couldn't justify it at any cost. An Air Force official has said, "I promise you, we will build these 339 planes for \$61.7 billion."

We just happened to be debating the authorization bill for defense at that time. I said, "OK, we'll take you at your word. I can't stop the plane, which I would divinely like to do, but we will hold you to your word. You say you can build it for \$61.7 billion. Let's put that in the bill, that you may not spend more than that."

Do you know what? They are already hollering like a pig under a gate: "We can't live with it."

So when you talk about a \$190 million airplane, that is what they are saying today. Anybody who has been in the Senate as long as I have knows they are not about to build that plane for that. They already cut the number of planes because they faced a \$16 billion cost overrun.

To proceed with the sequence, in the year 2005, we are going to start building what we call the Joint Strike Fighter, and we are going to build about 2,800 of those. I happen to support the Joint Strike Fighter because it is going to be used by the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. It is supposed to cost much less than \$100 million each and be a state of the art fighter plane.

So why are we sandwiching this F-22 fighter at a cost of \$62 billion between the F-18 and the Joint Strike Fighter? Why? Because the lobbyists have the power to make it happen, not because we need it. It is a cold-war relic.

You might ask, "Well, who dreamed up the F-22?" I will tell you who dreamed it up. The Russians. Back when the old Soviet Union kept us from sleeping at night, they announced in the early 1980's, back in the heyday

of the Soviet Union, "We're going to build a fifth-generation fighter that's going to be superior to anything ever built in the history of the world."

That is all you have to do to get the Pentagon's attention. So the Air Force went to the drawing board and started designing the F-22 to meet the threat of the Soviet Union and their fifth generation fighter.

What happened? The Soviet Union went bankrupt, and the fifth generation remained on the drawing board where it is today, unless they have lost it. What are we doing? We are getting ready to produce an airplane designed to compete with a plane that is still on the drawing board in Russia and may never come off the drawing board.

The F-22 has virtually no ground-attack capability. They put a couple bombs on it just so they could say it has ground-attack capability. It is a good airplane. I am not arguing that. You can build all kinds of airplanes that are good airplanes, but I want to tell you something, while it has a good air superiority capability, in Desert Storm and Iraq, we flew four times more ground-attack flights than we did flights to achieve air dominance and air superiority. Mr. President, this cold war relic should never have been built.

Finally, the argument that I thought I was going to finally win—I don't win many arguments on defense. I don't know of anybody who ever tries to kill a weapons system or bring some sanity to defense spending that ever wins. I can only remember two or three weapons systems in my 23 years in the Senate that we have ever stopped. They take on a life of their own, and the minute Congress starts looking at them, the manufacturers start running full-page ads in every newspaper and magazine in the United States, giving the American people the impression that we will be seriously threatened if we don't build that particular weapons system.

The one I thought I was going to win was to stop plans to backfit our Pacific fleet submarines with new ballistic missiles. We have 10 Trident submarines in the Atlantic and 8 in the Pacific. The ones in the Atlantic are furnished with what we call the D-5 missile. A fine missile, very accurate. It is the most modern, accurate ballistic missile we have. Our eight Trident submarines in the Pacific are equipped with an older missile called the C-4.

The C-4 is not quite as accurate as the D-5. Do you know what the difference is, Mr. President? According to unclassified data from the Congressional Budget Office, the C-4 lacks having the accuracy of the D-5, and the accuracy shortage is about 450 feet, or the distance from where the Presiding Officer is sitting right now to where the Speaker of the House is sitting down the hall.

When you consider the smallest warhead that goes on these missiles, the 100 kiloton W-76 warhead, would wipe the District of Columbia completely off

the map, why, again, in the name of all that is good and holy are we getting ready to spend \$5.6 billion to take the C-4 missiles off our Pacific fleet and replace them with the D-5 missiles? Do you know why? Because the Navy wants it, and the Navy and the industrial complex have the power to get it.

We had a serious debate in the appropriations committee on this, and as I started to say earlier, I thought I had won that debate. I thought the committee was agreeing with me. I thought the committee agreed that it would be the height of foolishness to retrofit those submarines in the Pacific when the warheads and the missiles on them will last longer than the submarines. No question about it.

So what are we going to do here when the cold war has long since ceased to exist? We are going to scare the life out of the Russians by modernizing our ballistic missile submarine fleet and spend \$5.6 billion that we could save doing it. We may also keep the Russians from ratifying START II.

Oh, I could go on and on about what an utter waste of money that is. Did you know that those C-4 warheads I just described for you and the missiles on which they sit will last longer than the submarines? We are not even going to backfit four of the submarines because they are going to be retired before the C-4 missile will have lived out its usefulness.

So, Mr. President, I do, indeed, get agitated about these things, and I get frustrated.

The people sent us here to do a job as best we see fit.

When I see the needs of this country, when I see an educational system that needs to be fixed, when I see a planet threatened by environmental concerns, and when I see us fighting over who is going to get highway money to take care of the 200 million vehicles in this country, I get frustrated. Mr. President, do you know, just sort of digressing for a moment, when I was a young marine in World War II, I remember seeing in one of the papers in California that we had 30 million vehicles on the road.

You know how many we have today? Two hundred million. By the year 2050, at the rate we are going, we will have 400 million. Mother Teresa was the exemplification of a woman who lived the consummate Judeo-Christian life, God bless her soul, but she was fighting a losing battle from the very beginning. When she was a young novitiate, India had 250 million people. Today, they have almost 800 million. Mother Teresa was fighting a losing battle.

The highway commissions in our respective 50 States are fighting a losing battle, too. They are trying to build more highways, wider highways to accommodate 30 percent of all the vehicles in the world. Those 200 million vehicles in this country are 30 percent of all the vehicles in the world.

We are going to have to think differently and act differently if we are

going to deal with our transportation needs in the future, or every city in America is going to be in gridlock.

In that connection, in putting that in the context of another burning issue around here called global warming, those 200 million vehicles contribute 27 percent of all the world's greenhouse gases that the United States throws into the stratosphere.

When you think of what it is going to cost to clean up all the Superfund sites in this country. To try to keep our water and air clean, and when I looked at the kind of money we spend on defense, so much of which is wasted, I had to come to the floor to make this speech.

I did not want to vote against the defense budget. I just simply say I thought it was too much money. It was a lot more than too much money. It was putting weapons systems in mothballs that have long lives left. It was buying weapons systems we do not need. It was cold war mentality at its worst when the cold war is over.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. KOHL. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### CHILD SAFETY LOCKS

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today eight of the largest gun manufacturers voluntarily agreed to include safety locks with every handgun they sell. I rise today to commend the President and the gun industry for their historic efforts.

This agreement addresses a very serious problem. Every year, many hundreds of children die from accidental shootings and thousands more try to take their own lives with guns. Encouraging parents to use safety locks will not save all of these young lives, to be sure, but it will save many of them. It will make a difference.

This deal, however, would not have been possible without the public outcry over these tragedies and the growing momentum for bipartisan child safety lock legislation. Our measure, which lost by a single vote in the Judiciary Committee this summer, requires the sale of a safety lock with every handgun.

Mr. President, in my opinion voluntary action is always better than Government regulation. For that reason, when we entered into negotiations with gun manufacturers, we asked them to take this dramatic step on their own initiative. Today we are very pleased that most of the industry has responded so that 80 percent of all handguns manufactured in the United States will now be sold with child safety locks. But we will continue to push until the half million more handguns, including those manufactured abroad, are also covered.

We will also continue to encourage voluntary compliance, but until we

have the support of the entire industry, we will move to enact our legislation. It should be easier now because most of the industry is already on board.

Mr. President, today's announcement is an important step for safety and a victory for families and children everywhere. We should all be grateful.

I thank you and yield the floor.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

#### TERRORISM

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I would like to speak to an issue which confronts us nationally and which we, as a nation, seem to be ducking. I am talking about terrorism. I am talking about the need for this country to stand up and be counted in its fight against international terrorism whenever and wherever it occurs.

Today, Americans are threatened by two very distinct but serious kinds of terrorism. The first is international terrorism.

Mr. President, I am proud of my efforts that helped to pass the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, a law designed to stop two renegade nations from having the means necessary to finance international terrorism—by punishing those companies who do business with them. The French oil company, Total, is trying to test our resolve. Total has struck a lucrative oil deal with Iran. This company is thumbing its nose at the United States. I believe it is incumbent upon us to remain strong in the face of these efforts to undermine our fight against terrorism. I call upon the French Government to join the fight against international terrorism, not to thumb its nose at the United States, not to applaud the efforts of Total.

I believe that our laws must be enforced and its strict sanctions must be brought to bear on Total. Every Member of this body, Mr. President, voted for the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act.

It is only when we see planes being shot down, it is only when the victims and their families come and say, What are you doing? that we stand up and take action. Every Member of this body should be outraged that Total has thumbed its nose at this ban. They did so deliberately. Its actions are an insult not only to this body but to all of the nations of the world who should be working together in a united front against terrorism.

Fighting international terrorism requires every nation to unite together, and it requires that we remain resolute. It requires that we put corporate greed and profits on the back burner. Many of our own companies are so worried about international profits.

But let me tell you, when terrorism strikes here, when you see what takes place, then an aroused American public gets us to do something. Only when we see the bombing at the World Trade Center—that is real; impacting people's lives—and when we see the Iranians