

should we not allow the Pentagon to pursue those? The amendment I am offering leaves the \$75 million in the bill which is presently there for tactical ASAT technology, without specifying what technologies we might be using it for. It eliminates the mandate forcing the use of the kinetic energy ASAT by the Pentagon. The amendment instead directs that the kinetic energy ASAT option be explicitly evaluated by General Dickman for the space control architecture, but it leaves the choice of whether to fund that option to the Pentagon. The Pentagon must also give Congress the results of its space control study by March 31, 1997.

This is the way in which we normally proceed when the Pentagon defines a threat, as they have in this case, and launches an effort to deal with that threat. We do not impose our solution to a highly complex problem before we have heard the Pentagon's own recommended solution.

Mr. President, the only testimony which the Senate received this year on this whole issue was from Gil Decker, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Acquisition, who told the Armed Services Committee that this is not an Army priority. This funding did not appear on any service wish list. This is hardly the basis for imposing this kinetic energy ASAT system on the Pentagon.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. That concludes my statement in support of it and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senator from New Hampshire will be seeking some time to respond to the Senator from New Mexico and will be available to speak shortly. Let me just state we appear, now, to be making some progress on the bill. Relevant amendments are being debated and discussed and time limits are being sought. To the extent Members with amendments can notify us of their amendments and we can work out a time agreement, that would be preferable to keep us working late into the night.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—INTERNATIONAL NATURAL RUBBER AGREEMENT OF 1995, TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-27

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on June 19, 1996, by the President of the United States.

International Natural Rubber Agreement of 1995, which is Treaty Document No. 104-27.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I further ask the treaty be considered as having

been read for the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1995, done at Geneva on February 17, 1995. The Agreement was signed on behalf of the United States on April 23, 1996. The report of the Department of State setting forth more fully the Administration's position is also transmitted, for the information of the Senate.

As did its predecessors, the International Rubber Agreement, 1995 (INRA), seeks to stabilize natural rubber prices without distorting long-term market trends and to assure adequate rubber supplies at reasonable prices. The U.S. participation in INRA, 1995, will also respond to concerns expressed by U.S. rubber companies that a transition period is needed to allow industry time to prepare for a free market in natural rubber and to allow for the further development of alternative institutions to manage market risk. The new Agreement incorporates improvements sought by the United States to help ensure that it fully reflects market trends and is operated in an effective and financially sound manner.

The Agreement is consistent with our broad foreign policy objectives. It demonstrates our willingness to engage in a continuing dialogue with developing countries on issues of mutual concern and embodies our belief that long-run market forces are the appropriate determinants of prices and resource allocations. It will also strengthen our relations with the ASEAN countries, since three of them—Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand—account collectively for approximately 80 percent of world production of natural rubber.

Therefore, I urge the Senate to give this Agreement prompt consideration and its advice and consent to ratification to enable the United States to deposit its instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 19, 1996.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana retains the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4058

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I wonder if I can inquire from the Senator from New Hampshire what amount of time he requests we yield on this?

Mr. SMITH. I believe under the request I had 20 minutes. Probably very close to that amount of time.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, may I just make a unanimous-consent request before the Senator makes his statement? I ask unanimous consent that Linda Taylor, a fellow in my office, be given the privilege of the floor during the pendency of S. 1745.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. COATS. I yield all time remaining to the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, some things are very predictable around here. One of the most predictable is that somebody every year gets up there in the authorization debate and tries to kill the ASAT Program. This is not a harmless amendment. This is a very serious amendment that can do damage to the national security of the United States.

I might say very bluntly and honestly, I do not have any parochial interest in this. I have a national interest in this. There is not anybody working on this in my State. It is not a jobs issue in my State. This is a national security matter, and year after year I stand up and engage in debate on this, and in committee, as the opponents continue to go after this program.

This amendment is designed to kill ASAT, to kill the kinetic energy program plain and simple. That is exactly what it is designed to do. That is what they are trying to do. We have invested \$245 million in this program. We have 2 years left, at approximately \$75 million a year, to complete this program. This technology works. It has already been tested. It works. We are going to throw it down the tube, throw it away.

What is ironic to me is that some of the things that Senator BINGAMAN has said on this issue are reasonable. In fact, I offered to work with the Senator in committee to address his concerns over the section dealing with the space architect. But, we could not reach a compromise. There was no interest in having a compromise. He wants the whole thing. He wants to defeat it.

So here we are again, rather than simply addressing the concerns that he has over the space architect issue, the Senator from New Mexico now is going after the entire program—all or nothing.

The truth is, this amendment circumvents the authorization and appropriations process totally. It allows the space architect to singlehandedly decide if the Pentagon spends the money that has been authorized and appropriated in both 1996 and 1997 for ASAT.