again. As it stands now, we will have two votes when we return, either on August 31, or the 1st of September. The first one will be on the adoption of the Texas low-level waste conference report. There will be 4 hours of debate on that, equally divided, and then a vote. Then we will have a vote on the conference report to accompany the military construction appropriations bill, which will be broadly supported, probably 99–0 or 100–0. As is usually the case, if we don't vote on an appropriations bill when it goes through the Senate the first time, we do usually want to have a vote on the final conference report.

Again, I thank all our colleagues for their cooperation over the last couple of weeks. I think we made some really good progress. We have cleared eight appropriations bills, and the ninth, Treasury-Postal Service is probably within 30 minutes or an hour of completion. I hope we will be able to do that the first week we are back.

We do expect to take up other appropriations bills when we return. I don't know the exact order now, but we have the foreign operations appropriations bill, the Interior appropriations bill, the District of Columbia appropriations bill, and the Labor-HHS, Education appropriations bill. We expect, also, to take up the bankruptcy legislation that came out of the Judiciary Committee. And we do have the trade package from the Finance Committee. I will need to talk with all interested Senators about exactly when and how to schedule that.

I wish all my colleagues a very restful and productive August break. We will look forward to seeing our colleagues then.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 2393

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk awaiting a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2393) to protect the sovereign right of the State of Alaska and prevent the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior from assuming management of Alaska's fish and game resources.

Mr. LOTT. I object to further consideration of the bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

COMPLIMENTING THE MAJORITY LEADER FOR HIS REMARKS AT THE MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR J.J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN GIBSON

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, as long as the majority leader is still on the floor, let me repeat what I told him a couple days ago. The remarks he made on the occasion of the public ceremony in the Rotunda for the two fallen Capitol Police officers, I thought, were extraordinary, right on the mark, and I very much appreciate his representation of the Senate at that occasion. This Nation has now spent 1 week thinking very carefully about what the meaning of the events of just a week ago are. I think that his remarks and the remarks of other speakers on that occasion certainly help to bring proper perspective to those events for all Americans as well as those of us here in the Congress.

THE RUMSFELD COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to talk this morning about something called the Rumsfeld Report.

There has been a lot of discussion about the Rumsfeld Commission Report in the news media here in Washington. But around the country I have noted there is less coverage of it.

I want to talk a little bit about it today, because I think that the Rumsfeld Commission Report issued to the Congress about 2 weeks ago is probably the most important report that this Congress has received and that it is one of the most important events of the last 2 years with respect to the obligations of the Congress and the administration to ensure the national security of the United States. Of course, when all is said and done, our first responsibility is to the defense of the American people.

By way of background, in the 1996 defense authorization bill we ensured that there was an amendment that required the establishment of the National Missile System by the year 2003.

During the debate on that amendment, however—this was on December 1, 1995—Senators CARL LEVIN and DALE BUMPERS received a letter from Joanne Isham of the CIA's Congressional Relations Office. That letter claimed that the language in the DOD bill relating to the threat posed by ballistic missiles—I am quoting now—". . . [overstates] what we currently believe to be the future threat" of missile attack on the United States."

This is a letter from the CIA directly to Members of the Senate in opposition to an amendment that is pending on the floor.

The letter also said, again quoting, it was "extremely unlikely" that nations would sell ICBMs and that the United States would be able to detect a homegrown ICBM program "many years in advance," again quoting the letter.

The statements in that CIA letter were based entirely on a new National Intelligence Estimate—an NIE. The title is "NIE 95–19." It was entitled "Emerging Missile Threat to North America During the Next 15 Years." It was released in its classified form in November 1995.

But the key judgment of that NIE is, quoting: ". . .[no] country, other than the major declared nuclear powers, will develop or otherwise acquire a ballistic missile in the next 15 years that will threaten the contiguous 48 States or Canada."

President Clinton vetoed H.R. 1530, the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1996, on December 28, 1995, in part because the National Missile Defense System called for pursuant to our amendment, in his words, addresses ". . . [a] long-range threat that our Intelligence Community does not foresee in the coming decade."—end of quote of the President.

In reaction, Mr. President, many Members of the Congress rejected the conclusions of that NIE as incorrect. Some of us on the Intelligence Committee believed that the information that we possessed suggested that the conclusions were inaccurate. Our concerns, frankly, centered on flawed assumptions underlying the key judgment of the NIE. The unclassified assumptions are—there are several. Let me tell you what they are:

First, concentrating on indigenous development of ICBMs adequately addresses the foreign missile threat to the United States.

What that means is, we can focus just on what these countries are able to build all by themselves and that that is going to be adequate in telling us what the threat posed by these countries will be in the future.

Second, foreign assistance will not enable countries to significantly accelerate ICBM development.

In other words, we are not going to look at what other countries might sell or give to these powers that we are concerned about, again relying on the notion that whatever they do they are going to do all by themselves without any help from the outside.

In other words, third, that no country will sell ICBMs to a country of concern.

Fourth, that no countries, other than the declared nuclear powers with the requisite technical ability or economic resources, will develop ICBMs from a space launch vehicle.

In other words, they are not going to use the rockets that are used to launch satellites for military purposes to convert those missiles or rockets for military purposes.

Another assumption: A flight test program of 5 years is essential to the development of an ICBM.

Of course, when the United States and the old Soviet Union did research on a new missile, it would take 5 years for us to test it to make sure it worked properly, because it was always a new concept.