

programs were only authorized to the year 1997. This allowed the committees of jurisdiction to undertake a reevaluation of the way in which Federal dollars are allocated to research facilities that are operated by the Department of Agriculture and that are used for grants for research and extension service activities at colleges and universities throughout the country.

As a result of that review, this legislation was produced. It improves the way those funds are allocated. It targets those funds to the highest priority subjects for agriculture research in our country. It is this Senator's hope that the Senate will approve the conference report and we can proceed to consider other related legislation.

I point out the fact that we are in the appropriations process now for the next fiscal year. The passage of this conference report will facilitate the handling of the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government. If we are sent back to rewrite the bill in conference on a motion to recommit, it will slow down the process. It will make it more difficult to achieve the kind of coherent funding procedure that we would otherwise be able to enjoy.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—  
S. 1873

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at this point in the order of business, the majority leader had indicated that it would be appropriate to call up Calendar Order No. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense bill.

On behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMERICAN MISSILE PROTECTION  
ACT OF 1998—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar Order No. 345, S. 1873, and I send a cloture motion to the desk on behalf of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provision of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense system legislation:

Trent Lott, Thad Cochran, Strom Thurmond, Jon Kyl, Conrad Burns, Dirk Kempthorne, Pat Roberts, Larry Craig, Ted Stevens, Rick Santorum, Judd

Gregg, Tim Hutchinson, Jim Inhofe, Connie Mack, R. F. Bennett, and Jeff Sessions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have been authorized to announce to the Senate on behalf of the majority leader that this cloture vote will occur on Wednesday at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after notification of the Democratic leader.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this legislation was introduced by me and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUE, last month. It is legislation that would change the policy of our country with respect to the deployment of a national missile defense system that would protect our Nation against limited ballistic missile attack. Since its introduction, 48 other Senators have joined us as cosponsors of the legislation, and the Senate Armed Services Committee has reviewed the legislation and reported it for the consideration of the Senate. The committee report is available as Calendar Order No. 345, and I invite the attention of Senators to the report.

The legislation was produced because of the findings of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, which I chair, which conducted hearings over the past year looking into the threat caused by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means for delivering those weapons of mass destruction, particularly missile systems.

We had numerous expert witnesses who talked about the basics of how missile systems are developed, how the Atlas system was developed in our own country. General Bernard Schriever, who was the manager of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile program, told of the challenges faced by those who worked to build this first long-range missile system for the United States almost 50 years ago. He told of how, with the passage of time and the development of new technologies and communications systems and the easy access to scientific and technical information, those hurdles that were so difficult to overcome back then are now not difficult at all; that nation states who are intent on developing the capacity to deliver weapons of mass destruction over long distances now can achieve those results not with a 10-year program, but almost overnight if they have the determination, are willing to commit the dollars necessary to acquire the component parts, and have access to outside assistance in the form of either components or technical expertise.

You can see evidence of that and why that is really a new concern for us as a

country without a national missile defense system, without the capacity to defend ourselves against an accidental launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile, or an unauthorized launch from another country possessing these systems, or from a rogue nation which puts all of these ingredients together without our being able to detect it and threatens the security of this country.

So this is an effort to change our national policy from the current 3+3 program of the administration, which is to develop within 3 years, starting in 1997, a national ballistic missile defense capability, and then, if a threat is perceived to exist thereafter, to deploy such a system within 3 years from the date that the threat is perceived to exist. That is the 3+3 program of this administration. We are seriously concerned that this is inadequate to meet the threat that currently exists.

First of all, the 3+3 program assumes that there is no threat at this time to the security of the United States or to the citizens of the United States. The legislation we have introduced says that there is a threat, we are vulnerable. There could be—although it might be unlikely—an accidental or unauthorized missile attack from Russia or from China, both of whom, as we know, have intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities right now.

There is also an emerging threat that exists right now, because of events that have occurred over the last several years that we have not been able to detect or discover through our intelligence gathering agencies. I am going to cite some examples. And I invite the attention of Senators to the bill itself, which recites a series of facts that were uncovered during the course of the hearings our committee conducted last year.

The case of Iran is a good example. When that country was provided missile components from Russia, we realized that they were capable of acquiring new expertise not discernible by the Central Intelligence Agency. As a matter of fact, during testimony that was provided to the Senate, the Director of Central Intelligence indicated that it was anticipated that Iran would not be able to develop a medium-range missile system for some 8 years or 9 years into the future.

Now, 1 year after that testimony was delivered to the Senate in 1997, the Director of Central Intelligence suggested that because of outside assistance obtained by Iran from other countries, it appears that they would be able to deploy a medium-range ballistic missile much sooner than had been earlier predicted. Even though the Director of Central Intelligence did not say exactly when that capability could be fielded, a State Department witness told the Senate that, within a year or a year and a half, that missile system could be deployed by Iran.

So what had been viewed as a threat which could occur 8 or 9 years in the