

constructed by the transferee under such subsection (c)(1)(B).

(f) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the consideration to be provided under subsection (c)(1). Such determination shall be final.

(g) SELECTION OF TRANSFEREE.—(1) The Secretary shall use competitive procedures for the selection of a transferee under subsection (a).

(2) In evaluating the offers of prospective transferees, the Secretary shall—

(A) consider the technical sufficiency of the offers and the adequacy of the offers in meeting the requirements for consideration set forth in subsection (c)(1); and

(B) consult with the communities and jurisdictions in the vicinity of Fort Sheridan (including the City of Lake Forest, the City of Highwood, and the City of Highland Park and the County of Lake) in order to determine the most appropriate use of the property to be conveyed.

(h) DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a) and the real property to be conveyed under subsection (c)(1)(A) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the transferee selected under subsection (g).

(i) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator SIMON, I offer this amendment which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey real property and military family housing at the former Fort Sheridan, IL, to a competitive bidder in exchange for a parcel of real property and a newly constructed Navy neighborhood of excellence; and, two, authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey real property at former Fort Sheridan, IL, to a competitive bidder in exchange for a parcel of real property and newly constructed Army Reserve facilities. These property changes are at fair market value.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it has been cleared. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague. This is an issue that has been before the committee on which the Senator from Nebraska and I serve. We would note that Senator Dixon tried to lay foundations for this many years ago. It has been considered by the committee through the years, and I strongly support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

So the amendment (No. 2450) was agreed to.

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

Mr. WARNER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MISSING SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, before we conclude consideration of the fiscal

year 1996 Defense authorization bill, I would like to make a few comments regarding section 551, which addresses the determination of whereabouts and the status of missing persons. Section 551 is the direct result of S. 256, the Missing Service Personnel Act of 1995, which I introduced on January 20 of this year. I want to thank Senator COATS, the Personnel Subcommittee chairman, for his efforts to include as much of the original bill in the Defense authorization bill as was possible. It wasn't easy. DOD had its objections, as did a number of our colleagues.

The original intent of S. 256 was to reform the Department of Defense's procedures for determining the status and location of missing personnel of the Armed Forces. Legislation concerning those missing in action has not changed in the past 50 years. Since the Vietnam war, the Department of Defense and the United States Government have been criticized for their handling of the POW/MIA issue. Some of that criticism is justified. The Government's own actions—or inaction—has provoked legitimate criticism. S. 256 was an attempt to correct these problems and establish a fair and equitable procedure for determining the exact status of missing personnel. At the same time, it was my hope that we might restore some of the Department's credibility on this issue and renew the trust between the public and the Federal Government.

I realize that some who supported S. 256 are concerned that section 551 is not identical. I agree, it is not everything we had hoped to achieve. However, I do believe that section 551 represents the best language we could pass in the Senate. There are reforms we had hoped to achieve but which are not reflected in the Defense authorization bill. But our colleagues in the House have included this matter in their version of the Defense authorization bill. In my view, some of the House language better reflects our original bill. When the Senate goes to conference, it is my hope that all of the essential provisions of the original bill will be included in the conference report.

So, again, I would like to thank Senator COATS for his efforts. Section 551 centralizes oversight and responsibility for accounting for missing persons, it establishes new procedures for reviewing cases of missing persons, and it protects the missing service member from being declared dead solely based on the passage of time. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the conference report includes all of the necessary reforms outlined in S. 256.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. THURMOND, again has asked that I urge Senators to come forward with their amendments. We are making some steady progress this morning. I believe we are about to receive instructions from the majority leader that the Senate will stand in recess.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, just before we recess, if I may make a brief statement, I thank once again the chairman of the committee for his cooperation.

I thank my friend from Virginia. For the last few minutes we have worked together to pass a whole series of amendments that were not controversial. I simply say that we are making remarkable progress, and I understand that when we reconvene at 2:15, following the statement the Senator from Virginia is about to make, we will be moving forward and tentatively have unanimous consent on an agreement that is going to collapse about an hour and a half of time which would otherwise be required, followed by another amendment the Senator from Nebraska had intended to offer if this amendment does not pass, which I understand will now.

So I am overjoyed to announce to Senators that we are making remarkable progress under the bipartisan cooperation of both sides. It would appear to me that if we can continue this remarkable speed, we could have a chance of passing both the defense authorization and appropriations bills at a very fair and early hour this evening. I thank my friend from Virginia and those on that side of the aisle for their cooperation.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague. It is always a pleasure to work with him as we have now 17½-plus years.

RECESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in accordance with the usual schedule of the Senate on Tuesday, there will be the caucus luncheons, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:42 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DEWINE).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2429

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the Exon amendment No. 2429.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to clarify the intent of section 3135 of the Senate's 1996 National Defense Authorization Act which provides \$50 million for the preparation of hydronuclear experiments below a 4 pound TNT explosive equivalent at the Nevada test site. This provision does

not authorize hydronuclear experiments. So there is no problem with this part of Senator EXON's amendment.

Furthermore, this provision does not amend or repeal the requirements of section 507 of Public Law 102-377, which is also known as the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell amendment on nuclear weapon testing.

The amendment proposed by Senator EXON basically invokes the restrictions of the 1992 Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell amendment on U.S. nuclear weapons testing. It is my understanding that the Hatfield amendment was not meant to encompass hydronuclear experiments under 4 pounds.

Therefore, as long as the proposed Exon amendment is not construed to make low yield hydronuclear experiments subject to the Hatfield amendment's ban on all nuclear weapons testing after September 30, 1996, I would have no problem with the second portion of Senator EXON's amendment.

I would like to make some further remarks pertaining to section 1315. The Senate passed this provision as an element of the Thurmond-Domenici amendment to the 1996 National Defense Authorization Act on August 4, 1995. On that same day, after vigorous debate, the Senate rejected an attempt to remove this provision from the bill by a vote of 56 to 44. I maintained then, and I maintain now, that this was a prudent decision. I do so in spite of the fact that 1 week after the Senate vote on this subject, the President called for a zero yield comprehensive test ban treaty. I say this because hydronuclear experiments are the single remaining tool available to the United States that is relevant to assessing potential safety problems which may arise in the fission trigger, or primary stage, of our nuclear weapons as they approach and exceed their original design lifetimes. These are not tests of nuclear weapons output. These are not tests aimed at development of new weapons. They are experiments aimed at primarily assessing the safety of the unboosted implosion of the fissile core assembly from a nuclear weapon.

Now, during our debate on this subject, the executive summary of a report of hydronuclear experiments by the JASON committee came up and was reported into the RECORD. This report has been represented to be a purely scientific study, but a careful reading shows that its conclusions are based on preconceived politics and policy. The report concludes that we don't need to do hydronuclear experiments under 4 pounds. Although the JASON report says that low yield hydronuclears were useful for safety assessments, it concludes that we don't need to do hydronuclears because the JASON's don't anticipate safety problems with the current stockpile. This is simply an unsupported assertion.

We found out some other interesting things about the JASON report after the debate. First, we asked DOE for the full classified JASON report. We were

told that it was not finished and that it would be available in 3 or 4 weeks. Evidently, the nuclear weapons laboratory officials with the ultimate responsibility for the stockpile were not given an opportunity to review the JASON report before the President's announcement on a zero yield comprehensive test ban treaty. Second, we found out that the individuals selected for this JASON committee were not experts in nuclear weapons and that they called on the services of four current and former nuclear weapons laboratory experts to serve as consultants to the JASON members. Why did DOE not go to its own experts to begin with? So we talked to the two lab experts who dealt with the JASON's. They both agreed that tests in the 500 ton range would be of greatest value to the U.S. nuclear weapons program. On hydronuclear experiments below 4 pounds, these two had a genuine technical disagreement. The expert who found hydronuclear experiments to be of value told us that his material was dropped from the report by the JASON's chairman. He told us that his material "wound up on the cutting room floor."

Upon further inquiry we found that the chairman of this particular JASON committee is an expert in high energy physics. His resume also says that he is an arms control specialist. In fact, he has been a Director of the Arms Control Association in Washington, DC. He is a close adviser to Secretary O'Leary. Why should the nuclear weapons experts from our Government-owned laboratories have to have their work filtered through individuals with a clear track record in the arms control arena? This has not been the case in the 50-year history of the U.S. nuclear weapons program. Last year I alerted this body to my concerns about the fact that the Secretary of Energy had surrounded herself with many career anti-nuclear advocates. Nothing seems to have changed.

Mr. President, this Senator does not believe that this is an objective way to form a committee nor to elucidate expert opinions on a subject of such import to national security.

We then asked DOE for the results of the DOE stockpile confidence meeting that took place at STRATCOM in Omaha from the 1st to the 3d of June of this year with the nuclear weapons laboratories participating. It turns out that the position of the nuclear weapons laboratories at this meeting concluded that good confidence in the safety and reliability of the enduring stockpile could be maintained with a combination of 500-ton tests and the science based stockpile stewardship and management program. If 500-ton tests were excluded, then we could retain good confidence in weapon safety with hydronuclear experiments and the science based stockpile stewardship and management program. Without 500-ton tests and hydronuclears, the laboratories concluded that there would be a period of vulnerability in

our stockpile confidence between the end of testing and the realization of the goals of the science based stewardship and management program. You will not see these conclusions discussed publicly by the administration.

I caution my colleagues to watch this situation closely and not to allow the administration to trade real declines in stockpile confidence for potential gains on the arms control area. This concludes my remarks.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that this amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2429) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend for a moment? Was the Senator referring to Exon amendment No. 2429?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, what is the item before the Senate at this point? What is the business of the Senate at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business before the Senate now is Brown amendment No. 2428.

AMENDMENT NO. 2428, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have been in conversation with both Members of our side of the aisle and the Democratic side of the aisle. Senator GLENN has had some positive suggestions for my amendment.

At this point, I send a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2428), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, COLORADO.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Aurora, Colorado has been recommended for closure in 1995 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990;

(2) The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center and the University of Colorado Hospital Authority are in urgent need of space to maintain their ability to deliver health care to meet the growing demand for their services;

(3) Reuse of the Fitzsimons facility at the earliest opportunity would provide significant benefit to the cities of Aurora and Denver; and

(4) Reuse of the Fitzsimons facility by the local community ensures that the property is fully utilized by providing a benefit to the community.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Therefore, it is the sense of Congress that upon acceptance of the Base Closure list—

(1) The federal screening process for all military installations, including Fitzsimons Army Medical Center should be accomplished at the earliest opportunity;

(2) To the extent possible, the Secretary of the military departments should consider on an expedited basis transferring appropriate facilities to Local Redevelopment Authorities while still operational to ensure continuity of use to all parties concerned, in particular, the Secretary of the Army should consider an expedited transfer of Fitzsimons Army Medical Center because of significant preparations underway by the Local Redevelopment Authority;

(3) The Secretaries should not enter into leases with Local Redevelopment Authorities until the Secretary concerned has established that the lease falls within the categorical exclusions established by the Military Departments pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(4) This section is in no way intended to circumvent the decisions of the 1995 BRAC or other applicable laws;

(c) REPORT.—180 days after the enactment of this Act the Secretary of the Army shall provide a report to the appropriate committees of the Congress on the Fitzsimons Army Medical Center that covers—

(1) The results of the federal screening process for Fitzsimons and any actions that have been taken to expedite the review;

(2) Any impediments raised during the federal screening process to the transfer or lease of Fitzsimons Army Medical Center;

(3) Any actions taken by the Secretary of the Army to lease the Fitzsimons Army Medical Center to the local redevelopment authority;

(4) The results of any environmental reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act in which such a lease would fall into the categorical exclusions established by the Secretary of the Army; and

(5) The results of the environmental baseline survey and a finding of suitability or nonsuitability.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this modification incorporates the suggestions of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN. It clarifies some of the aspects of the sense of the Congress relating to Fitzsimons and broadens some of the sense of the Congress measures included therein, including a wish that the procedures involved in disposing of facilities be expedited for not just Fitzsimons, but other facilities as well, when it is appropriate.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that this amendment has the approval of both sides. I ask at this time for its adoption.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I understand it is acceptable on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 2428), as modified, was agreed to.

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

Mr. BROWN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, again, I urge all Senators who have amendments to the defense authorization bill to come to the floor and offer those amendments. We want to finish this bill today. We do not want to stay here until 12, 1, or 2 o'clock tonight. I urge all Senators—and I hope the staffs will tell them if they are here, and I hope the offices will listen and let the Senators know—to come and offer their amendments, if they have any.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I compliment the work of Senator THURMOND. I have great respect for him, as well as the work of Senator NUNN, the ranking member. I agree with much of what they do in their work in the Senate. I think both of them have a good grasp of defense issues.

Therefore, it is with reluctance I take the floor today to say I am going to be voting against both the Defense authorization bill and the Defense appropriations bill.

Again, let me say that I think much of the work they do is work that is extraordinarily important for our country and for the defense of our country, but there are some things in this legislation that give me some real pause, one of which I simply cannot overcome. That is the issue of star wars. I call it star wars; I know others will call it the antiballistic missile system or other names.

No matter what you call it—an ABM system; star wars; or SDI, space defense initiative—it is in this legislation, an initiative at this time when we are up to our neck in debt in this country, when we have very serious fiscal policy problems, and when we are tightening our belt and cutting back on job training, saying we will make it more expensive for people to send their kids to college because we will cut back on student loans, we will make deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. We are told we do not have the money. At that very moment we now say, by the way, all of that concern about spending, do not pay much attention to what we were saying there. In this legislation, the authorization and appropriations for defense, we say we want to spend more. We want to spend more

money than the Secretary of Defense asks for. In fact, this legislation says we say we want to buy more trucks than the Secretary of Defense says he needs. We want to buy more jet fighters than the Secretary of Defense says he wants. We want to buy more submarines than the Secretary of Defense says are necessary—more than are necessary for the defense of this country. This bill says we want to spend \$7 billion more than the Secretary of Defense has asked for. It also says we want to commit ourselves to a star wars program, or ABM program, that, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will cost between \$40 and \$48 billion.

So this legislation says let us initiate a star wars program and spend \$300 million more just this year for this program to require an early deployment—an initial deployment by 1999 and full deployment by the year 2003 of a multiple-site national missile defense program.

This, after the Soviet Union has largely vanished. There is no Soviet Union. This, at a time when Russia and others are now destroying warheads and missiles as part of our arms control agreement. In fact, START I and START II, which, when fully ratified, will mean there will be 6,000 fewer warheads in the Russian arsenal, warheads that used to be aimed at America—American cities, American population centers—6,000 fewer warheads because they will be destroyed under START I and START II.

However, this legislation says, even while all this is going on, let us begin a new weapons program. Let us begin a new arms race. Let us spend \$48 billion we do not have on something this country does not need.

The so-called bipartisan agreement is an agreement that changes a few words that create, for me, a distinction without any difference at all. It says in this agreement,

It is the policy of the United States to deploy, as soon as possible, affordable and operationally effective theater missile defenses capable of countering existing and emerging theater ballistic missiles and developing for deployment a multiple site national missile defense system.

Then it says, “initiate negotiations with the Russian Federation as necessary to provide for this national missile defense system,” because they acknowledge the so-called star wars program would violate the ABM Treaty so they would have to negotiate with the Russians to change the treaty so we can build a multiple-site system, “and to consider,” they say, “if these negotiations with Russia fail, the option of withdrawing from the ABM Treaty.”

The ABM Treaty is the foundation on which all of the arms control agreements we have are based. We sat for years with a policy in which we had a nuclear triad with nuclear warheads aimed at our adversary—in this case the Soviet Union—and they with their nuclear triad with nuclear weapons aimed at us. The beginning of the end

of the cold war was the agreements by which, with ABM and START I and START II, we now have circumstances where missiles and warheads are being dismantled and destroyed, warheads and missiles that previously were in silos aimed at the United States are now being destroyed and dismantled.

This legislation says that the very agreement upon which those reductions in missiles and warheads is based will be renegotiated and changed and destroyed, effectively, because we say we are not satisfied. We now want to build a national missile defense system. Against whom are we going to deploy a national missile defense system? And for what?

As always seems to be the case when you debate defense spending issues on the Senate floor—when you are talking, on the one hand, about spending for a hot lunch program, for a feeding program, for a nutrition program, for college education help, for financial aid, for Medicare, for Medicaid—what we have is a bunch of arm wavers in this Chamber who shout and wave their arms and say that those on this side of the Chamber are a bunch of big spenders, wild-eyed big spenders on some drunken spending spree; every day in every way all they want to do is spend the taxpayers' money.

Now things have changed. This is not about milk. It is not about nutrition for kids. This is not about health care. This is about building a brand new star wars program. Now the big spenders are on the other side of the room. They say: We do not care what the Secretary of Defense says, we want to build it. We do not care what the Department of Defense says, we need it. We do not care what the intelligence experts claim, we think it is necessary. So they say: Let us build a brand new, gold-plated boondoggle called the star wars program at the very time that we have spent months trying to figure out how to balance the Federal budget.

I do not know all the answers on how you balance the Federal budget. But I do know this. You do not start by continuing digging. You know the old southern expression, when you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. Apparently, some in this Chamber think the solution is you start passing out shovels. You do not solve the deficit problems by deciding to embark on these kinds of weapons programs. If I felt the security needs of the country required this be built, it would not matter to me what it cost, then we ought to build it. If it were essential to the security of this country that the star wars program be built in order to defend America, then there is not any logical question left; this country would have to proceed. But there is no credible evidence, not a shred of evidence anywhere that I have seen that justifies this project.

People say, "It is Saddam Hussein. It is North Korea. It is some ayatollah in Iran." Does anybody seriously believe that the risk from Saddam Hussein, or

a terrorist country, is a risk that they will get hold of an intercontinental ballistic missile with which they will launch a nuclear warhead against the United States? Does not everyone here, in a thoughtful moment, at least, understand the far more credible threat is with a truck bomb, as was evidenced by a couple of nut cases who built a bomb, put it in a rental truck, and parked it in front of a Federal building?

Is it not more likely that we will see nuclear terrorism by a suitcase nuclear bomb, by a nuclear bomb placed in the trunk of a rusty car parked by a dock in New York City? Is that not the far more likely threat of nuclear terrorism? Everyone understands that. It is even more unlikely that you would see a terrorist nation, if it were inclined to launch a nuclear attack against the United States, as ill-advised as that would be to do, to do so with an intercontinental ballistic missile. It would be with a cruise missile, which would be easier to obtain; certainly easier to build. This star wars program is not a defense against cruise missiles. No one here, I think, would stand and claim it is.

No, this is, unclothed, a jobs program. It is like every single other weapons program I have ever seen here in Congress. It gets life because somebody believes it is important to their State and it will create jobs.

The fact is, the first site under this will be built in North Dakota, likely, although I think there is also a potential that those who want multiple sites, probably, down the road foresee changing the ABM system so they will not have to build a site in North Dakota. But the fact is, whether it is built in North Dakota or not, I do not think we ought to have it, I do not think the country needs it. I do not think the country can afford it. I think it is preposterous for us, at this point, to be debating, in a defense authorization bill, whether we ought to build a \$48 billion star wars program.

The time has passed. This was a 1983 proposal by President Reagan at the height of the cold war when the Soviet Union represented our arch enemy. The cold war is over. The Soviet Union does not exist. Russia now, by agreement with us, is reducing its nuclear arsenal by the thousands, destroying and dismantling. Now we have this proposal? It is completely out of step with reality, in my judgment. But it is not alone. It is simply the biggest and, I think, the most serious problem in this bill.

As I said, this bill builds trucks which the Defense Department did not ask for. It builds planes which the Defense Department does not need. It builds submarines which the Defense Department does not want. In fact, the authorization bill on page 125 says the committee recommends \$60 million to begin the development of an airship and missions system that is militarily significant in scope which is operationally capable of developing a counter-

cruise-missile capability. What this does not quite say—because legislative language is always artfully drafted so you cannot understand exactly what they are talking about—is on page 125, the \$60 million is actually intended to buy blimps. Yes, blimps.

So there is more than one focus of hot air in Washington. Some say it is only in the Chamber of the U.S. Senate. It is on page 125. Lighter-than-air air service—\$60 million for blimps. With no hearings, no discussion, let us just spend \$60 million on blimps. It is, in my judgment, the hood ornament on bad judgment: star wars, blimps, trucks, planes, and ships that were not asked for and were not needed.

I would be happy to vote for the bulk of this legislation to provide for the defense needs of this country, to provide the kind of equipment and to provide for the salaries and benefits of the men and women in the Armed Forces that we need to make sure America is strong and free. But I will not be part of an effort to decide we should write another \$7 billion in to buy equipment the Secretary of Defense says he does not need. And I certainly will not be a part of those who now decide they want to abrogate the ABM Treaty and they reach a compromise in language that is a distinction without a difference in which they talk about developing for deployment.

You see, the bill's original language said we are going to deploy star wars. So we have a bunch of meetings and people exhaust themselves. And after hours and days and weeks, they come up with their master compromise. Do you know what the master compromise is? They say, "Well, instead of saying we are going to deploy a multiple-site national missile system," they say, "We are going to develop for deployment a national multiple-site missile system."

I am sorry, I went to a school that was small. I graduated from a high school class in which I was in the top five. But, you know, it was a small school. I guess I have never quite understood with that education the niceties or the subtleties of legislative language that allows someone to believe after they have negotiated an agreement to say, "Well, it used to say we are deploying it now," and in which they simply have said, "We are developing for deployment." And there is a difference. There is no difference. They are still talking about initial development in 1999. They are still talking about full deployment in the year 2003 and still requiring that the ABM Treaty be renegotiated with the Russians. There is no difference here. A distinction maybe. Yes. But a distinction, in my judgment, without a difference.

So I regret to, in a longer fashion than I had intended, say again today that I will not be voting for the appropriations or the authorization bill. I hope that one of these days when we have another discussion about who the wild-eyed spenders are, who the big

spenders are in the Congress, that we can discuss who really wants to spend billions that were not asked for, who wants to spend billions writing in special projects, who wants to start a star wars program.

I also hope maybe we can ask them, "Where are you going to get the money? Who are you going to ask to pay for these, or is this going to be charged to the taxpayers' credit card like so much of the spending is?"

Mr. President, I, if no one else is seeking the floor, ask to be allowed to speak for 5 minutes in morning business on a subject unrelated to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. In 5 minutes, Mr. President—because I suspect at the end of that time some others will want to move on some additional defense issues—I wanted to comment on something that happened during the Senate's recess. About two weeks ago we received notice about America's trade deficit for the first 6 months of this year, and the report was met with a giant yawn because nobody cares much about the trade deficit. Nobody writes about it. The major press does not treat it seriously in this country.

The trade deficit is largely a function of the trade policy that allows big American corporations to profit for their stockholders by accessing cheap labor in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Malaysia, or Indonesia, and selling the products of that cheap labor in Pittsburgh and Fargo and Devils Lake and Denver. All of that might make sense for stockholders and profits, but it means a wholesale exodus of jobs out of this country.

The trade figures showed that in the first 6 months of this year, we have the largest trade deficit in America's history, and that by the end of this year we will have a merchandise trade deficit approaching \$200 billion. Let me say that again. By the end of this year, our merchandise trade deficit will approach \$200 billion. By contrast, the Federal budget deficit will be \$160 billion in this year.

Let me give you some examples of where we are. Japan: At a time when we have a weak dollar, you would expect our trade situation with Japan would be improving. It is not. Japan has a \$65 billion annual trade surplus with the United States; China, over \$30 billion.

We just entered into NAFTA with Mexico and Canada in January of 1994. Prior to that, we had a surplus with Mexico, a \$2 billion trade surplus. Guess what? It is going to be an \$18 billion deficit this year.

I would like just one of those folks, one of those apostles for change, that came here and preached the virtues of the free trade agreement with Mexico, to come and stand in this Chamber and

tell me how this makes sense for America, how it makes sense for American workers, how it makes sense for the people who want good jobs and good income in this country.

We went from a \$2 billion trade surplus with Mexico before NAFTA to an \$18 billion trade deficit projected for 1995. Mexico, China, Japan—our trade strategy is a disaster, one that requires, in my judgment, emergency action in this country to stop the hemorrhaging.

You can make the point—I do not, but you could make the point—on fiscal deficits in this country, that the deficit is money we owe to ourselves, and even though it probably is disproportionately owed you can make the point that it is not a significant deficit. However, the trade deficit must be and will be repaid eventually in this country with a lower standard of living in America.

We have to take emergency action to stop this hemorrhaging. The hemorrhaging is the loss of good jobs moving outside of our country with the enormous trade imbalances.

Some people say, "Well, but the trade deficits relate to the fiscal deficits. If we did not have a fiscal deficit, we would not have trade deficits." The fiscal deficit came down \$280 billion to \$160 billion. The trade policy deficit is going up sharply at exactly the same time.

I would like the company economists to answer that. The fact is, this is a disconnected reality. International corporations, many of them Americans, have devised a strategy by which they say, "We have a plan. Our plan is to maximize profits." We want to maximize profits by producing overseas and selling here. The dilemma with that is it means you are losing good manufacturing jobs, which is the genesis of good jobs and good income and good security in our country, all for the sake of profits. Profits are fine for stockholders. But the fact is, jobs are important for the American wage earner.

We must somehow in some way decide that there is something called free trade, but there is something more important called fair trade. Should we continue to allow producers to decide to produce in countries where they can hire 12-year-old kids to work 12 hours a day and pay them 12 cents an hour and then ship the product to be sold in North Dakota or Wyoming or New York? Should we allow producers to produce in countries where there is no worker safety standard, no child labor standards, no minimum living wage standard, and then ship the product to be sold in Pittsburgh or Wyoming or North Dakota? I do not think so. I think it hurts our country, and I am not a protectionist. I am not someone who believes we ought to build walls around our country. But I believe this country ought to stand up and insist on fair trade and stop the hemorrhaging of trade deficits that injure and weaken America's economic system.

I very much would like one day in some way to see the press and the corporate structures and others in our country, especially Congress, take seriously what I think is an emergency in this country; and that is a failed trade strategy that is a bipartisan failure. It has been a failure for 20 years.

Our trade policies have not essentially changed since the end of the Second World War. During the first 25 years after World War II it was almost totally a foreign policy, foreign aid strategy. In those first 25 years it did not matter because we were so big and so strong that we just won the world economic race by waking up in the morning.

However, in the last 25 years that same trade policy has been a disaster. Sixty percent of the American families now have less income than they did 20 years ago, and less jobs and less opportunities.

That is why this is an important issue that this country must begin to address and begin to address on a bipartisan basis and do it soon.

Mr. President, thank you for the time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 2157

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered this morning by the Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, technically the Senator will have to have someone yield him time at this point.

Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator may need.

Mr. GLENN. I am opposing the amendment. I guess I am ranking on the bill, so I will yield myself time.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, to reduce by \$100 million the \$1.2 billion cap on the costs of renovating the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I do not plan to seek a rollcall vote on the amendment, but I do ask that when the vote on this amendment occurs, I be recorded as being opposed to this amendment.

My principal objection to the amendment is its timing.

Mr. President, I support every attempt to make prudent cuts to the cost of this enormous 15-year renovation project, but I believe that lowering the