

capital funding for Amtrak have greatly inhibited Amtrak's ability to operate an efficient, and financially stable national passenger rail service. Congress must act on this matter as soon as possible.

I also support the Conference Committee's decision to provide \$4.8 billion in Federal transit assistance. Though ISTEA has not yet been reauthorized, I strongly believe that making investment in public transportation a top priority will bear rich economic, social and environmental dividends for the Nation.

The Conference Committee is to be commended for the fiscal year 1998 Coast Guard budget. This budget represents a significant increase from fiscal year 1997 funding and certainly represents Federal dollars well spent. But I must add that my enthusiasm is somewhat tempered by my deep concern regarding the current state of resource allocation and usage within the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard's responsibilities have grown with the many new fisheries enforcement requirements that came with the passage of the Sustainable Fisheries Act last year and continuing pressure in the constant battle in the war on drugs. I am concerned that, in the effort to cover all of these responsibilities, we may be making tradeoffs that may come back to haunt us later.

As you well know, I represent a coastal State that has a 200-year-plus history of reliance on the Coast Guard. For that reason, I probably have a better understanding than many Senators of the value of the Coast Guard to the citizens of our Nation that make a living in the coastal regions or on the high seas. In fact, the Massachusetts coastal zone contributes 53.3 percent, or \$70.7 billion, to the state economy. Further, there are over 10,000 fishing families in New England that depend on the Coast Guard for their safety and are in fact viewed as their "real" guardian angels. One of many concerns that I have for these families is that with the recent catastrophic failure of the New England groundfish fishery that our fishermen are traveling further, in rougher weather, to catch fewer fish. Additionally, because of the personal financial hardship that has resulted from the collapse of the fishery, I fear that they are cutting corners to save a dollar such as not outfitting their boats and crews with the vital safety equipment that are required by law. I am concerned that we may be cutting corners at their expense.

We may be at a point where we need to stop and reassess the current condition of the Coast Guard. As we continue to examine the Federal budget for those areas where cost savings can be achieved, we need to realize that there exists a point beyond which most Americans are not willing to go in order to save a dollar, and I believe we are at a point where we need to take a strategic look at the ability of the Coast Guard to continue to meet the

demands of the American public into the 21st century.

In sum, taking the concerns I have voiced into account, I support this bill because it approaches transportation spending from a national perspective, and it strives to maintain and improve the transportation infrastructure that is so vital to the economic well-being of our Nation. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I have an agreement we have worked on which basically says that on some appropriate vehicle in the future I will work with Chairman STEVENS and other members to include a technical correction to this conference report to accomplish the following:

At section 337(c) we will insert, after the words: "House and Senate Committees on Appropriations," "and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation."

I am doing this at the suggestion of Senator HUTCHISON from Texas, and we have agreed to this.

Mr. President, at this time I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from New Jersey will.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. SHELBY. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the conference report accompanying H.R. 2169 is agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 12 minutes as if we were in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1284 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

THE ABM TREATY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 10 days ago was the 25th anniversary of a policy in this country that was articulated in a treaty called the ABM Treaty. It was a treaty that many of us at that time did not think was in the best interests of this country. It was a treaty that came from the Nixon administration, a Republican administration. Of course, Henry Kissinger was the architect of that treaty in 1972.

Essentially what it did was say to any adversaries out there that we will agree to disarm and not to be prepared to defend ourselves if you agree to do the same thing. Some people refer to it as mutual assured destruction, a policy I certainly did not adhere to at the time, did not feel was good policy for this country. However, there was an argument at that time, because we had

two superpowers—we had the then Soviet Union and of course the United States—and at that time we had pretty good intelligence on them, they had pretty good intelligence on us, so I suppose we would be overly critical if we said there was just no justification for that program, even though I personally disagreed with it at that time.

Since that time, starting in 1983 in the Reagan administration, we have elevated the debate that there is a great threat out there and that threat is from the many countries that now have weapons of mass destruction. Over 25 nations now have those weapons, either chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. The critics, those who would take that money and apply it to social programs as opposed to defending our Nation, use such titles as "star wars," and they talk about the billions of dollars that have been invested.

Anyway, we are at a point right now where something very interesting has happened just recently. That is, on this 25th anniversary, we have found that the Clinton administration, just about 10 days ago, agreed to create new parties to the ABM Treaty. That would be Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Russia. This is going to have to come before this body. I think this is an opportunity that we need to be looking for, because all it would take is 34 Senators to reject this multilateralization of the ABM Treaty.

Right now we have a number of systems that we are putting into place to defend the United States of America, both the national missile defense as well as a theater defense. Certainly, with what is going on right now in Russia and Iran, the need for such a system has been elevated in the minds of most Americans.

We have right now, as we speak, 22 Aegis ships that are floating out there in the ocean, already deployed. They have the capability of knocking down missiles when they are coming in. All we have to do is take them to the upper tier, and we will have in place a national missile defense system. Certainly that is something that could take care of our theater missile needs. So several of us feel that we should go ahead and conclude that is the system that we need. However, that does violate, probably violates, the ABM Treaty, as it is in place today. So I believe we should take this opportunity that is there, when it comes before this body for ratification, to reject this and thereby kill the ABM Treaty, which certainly is outdated.

By the way, it is interesting, the very architect of that treaty, Dr. Henry Kissinger, someone whose credentials no one will question, even though they may question some of his previous policy decisions, Dr. Kissinger, who is the architect of the 1972 ABM Treaty, now says it is nuts to make a virtue out of your vulnerability. He is opposed to continuing the ABM Treaty at this time.

So I hope we will take this opportunity to get out from under a treaty

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.