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the floor of the Senate to strongly dissent from the way it was done.

I understand the rules. I understand what it is all about when people have figured out a way to roll Senators. I think that is what the majority leader, the Senate majority leader, and House Majority Leader Armey have done. I think that is what the Republicans have done in this conference committee. There is no question about it.

But I want people in Minnesota to know that we will continue to speak out about this, even as we see less and less opportunities for our leverage. We will fight in whatever way we can. We will certainly not be silent about this.

When this bill comes over, I would think, I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator Feingold, we can probably expect a considerable amount of discussion about not only the impacts on dairy farmers and what it is going to mean for a lot of people who are going to go under who are already struggling enough, but I think also. I say to Senator Feingold, who has been such a reformer, the way it has been done, the whole process, which I think is profoundly antidemocratic, with a small 'd'—not up-or-down votes, late at night, tucked into a report; by whom, when, how, not at all clear, and then design rules in such a way you can just roll it through—we will certainly be speaking out loudly and clearly about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

A PRODUCTIVE SESSION AND
ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while presiding, speaking to some of my distinguished colleagues talking about the lack of productivity of this session of the legislature, there are a few things that were very productive and that we can be very proud of when we go home and say we were able to get certain things done.

Before doing that, though, and to ensure I get one point out before using up the time that is allotted, the distinguished Senator from Illinois named a number of issues that he thought were somewhat disgraceful—for example, the fact that we do not have more gun control legislation.

Maybe because of my roots back in Oklahoma, I find it very difficult to understand this mentality, that somehow guns are the culprit as opposed to the people, and somehow that honest, law-abiding Americans should have to be disarmed, should have to give up their guns, while the criminal element would not be giving up their guns.

Time and again, every survey that has been done, every study that has taken place, has come to the conclusion that the problems that we have are of a criminal element. There are people out there who are not getting adequately punished, and they will continue to have firearms that I will just make one statement. It seems incredibly naive to me anyone could believe that if we pass a law that makes it illegal for all citizens to own guns, somehow the criminal element, who by their very definition and nature, are criminals, will comply with the law.

Also, it seems very frustrating to me that we have a President of the United States who wants to have all kinds of legislation to take away guns from law-abiding citizens and at the same time turns 16 terrorists loose on the streets of America; that we have a President of the United States who will make speeches—as this President made some 133 times, including in two States of the Union—so that we now have over, for the first time in contemporary history, the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not one—I repeat, not one—missile aimed at American children tonight. When he made that statement, he knew full well that in at least one country, China, there were a minimum of at least 13 American cities that were targeted at that very moment. So we are living in a very dangerous world.

I listened to the concerns that we have on the nuclear test ban treaty. As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I would like to kind of lead into that to at least explain to thinking people that we did the right thing by not unilaterally disarming with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which is not verifiable.

First of all, I can say—and I do not think anyone can challenge this statement—we are now in the most threatened position we have been in, in the history of America. By that, I mean for things that have happened in the last 7 years in three broad categories.

First of all, we have a President of the United States who, through his veto messages, starting in 1993 in vetoing the defense authorization bills, and then succeeding bills since that time, has done so, so that we would have to cut the size of our military to places and they no longer have the force strength of one-half of what we had in 1991 and 1992 during the Persian Gulf war.

It is not a matter of the President vetoing defense authorization bills and making money out of our defense system to put into his favorite domestic social programs, but at the same time he has deployed our troops to places all over the Earth where we have no national security interests. So now we have troops in places.

I remember in December of 1995, when we were on the floor trying to pass a resolution of disapproval, to stop the President from sending our rare military assets to places such as Bosnia. We lost it by three votes. The President said: Let me make this clear, if we defeat this resolution, and if we get to send troops into Bosnia, I promise they will be home for Christmas 1996. Here we are. We are getting close to Christmas 1999 and the troops are still not home. There is no end in sight.

We have the same thing in Kosovo. We have had serious problems. I have gone over to Kosovo, I am sure, more than any other Member has, only to find out this is a war that has been going on for 600 years, a war where the two sides alternate in who is the good guy and who is the bad guy. Ethnic cleansing has taken place historically for 600 years on both sides; both on the Serbian side and the Albanian side. So it was a horrible awakening I had when we put in place, right after we went in there with cruise missiles, where we had refugees in different places such as Tirana, Albania. I can remember walking through the refugee camp. The people were well cared for. They were doing quite well. But then they looked at me and said: When are you and America going to do something about our problem?

I said: What is your problem? They said: Well, we’re refugees.

I said: Why should we in the United States be as concerned about that as other countries?

They said: Because it is because of you that we are refugees. It is because the ethnic cleansing was not accelerated until the time that the bombs started being dropped on that town.

So we now have a weakened defense system because we have starved it into a degree of weakness. Yet we are living in a time when virtually every country has a force or divisions of massive proportion.

And now we find out that in conventional warfare we are not superior any more. Wake up America. We are not superior anymore. We found out the other day that two of our Army divisions are ranked as C-4, which means they are not capable of combat. And what are these divisions? These divisions are the 10th Army Mountain Division in Bosnia and the 1st Infantry Division in Kosovo.

It is not the fault of our troops. They are put in place, and they no longer have combat training, so they are not capable of combat without coming out of there and training for at least 6 months.

So if we are down to 10 Army divisions because of this President, and 2 of them are rendered incapable of combat, that is 8 Army divisions. We had 19 during the Persian Gulf war. So that is what has happened to our military.

Just the other day I was very proud of Gen. John Jumper, who had the courage to stand up and say publicly that we are no longer superior in air-to-air and air-to-ground combat. Our strategic fighters are not superior to
those others on the market. He stated the
SU-35, as made by the Russians, is
on the market right now, the open
market. It is for sale. Anyone can buy
it—Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, anybody
else—and it is better than anything we
have, including the F–15 and the F–16.

We have to face up to this. It is a
threat from the conventional side as
well as from missiles.

I will make one comment about the
missiles. Again, we hang this on Presi-
dent Clinton. In that same veto mes-
sage in 1993, President Clinton said: I’m
vetoing this bill. And I’m vetoing it be-
cause it has money in it for a national
missile defense system, which we do
not need because there is no threat out
there. Yet we knew from our intel-
ligence that the threat would be there
and imminent by fiscal year 1998. And
sure enough, it was.

So here we are with the combination
of all these countries out there that
have every kind of weapon of mass de-
struction: Biological, chemical, or nu-
clear. Yet we have countries such as
China and Russia and now North Korea
that have the capability of delivering
those warheads to anywhere in Amer-
ica right now, when we are in Wash-
ington, DC. They could fire one from
North Korea that would take 35 min-
utes to get here. There is not one thing
in our arsenal to knock it down be-
cause this President vetoed our na-
tional missile defense effort.

Now the American people have awak-
ened to this, and we have enough
Democrats who are supporting Repub-
licans to rebuild our system and to try
to get a national missile defense sys-
tem deployed. Unfortunately, it
couldn’t happen for another 2 years,
maybe 2½ to 3 years.

That brings us to the Comprehensive
Test Ban Treaty about which my dis-
inguished colleague from Illinois
was talking. I think probably the best
type of weapon is to disarm. In fact, dur-
ing the course of the debate, both China
and Russia said they would not comply
with the zero yield. There is no way in
the world we can detect that, that
we would know what our adversaries
were doing. That would, for all practical
purposes, be unilateral disarmament.

I am asked back in Oklahoma by peo-
ple who have good street sense, why is
it the liberals in Congress are so com-
mitted to disarming our country, to
taking our money that we are supposed
to have to defend America and putting
it into these various discretionary so-
cial programs? I have to explain to
them that the people in Washington,
and some of the Senators in this Cham-
ber, are more like the people of Okla-
hom. I think President Clinton hon-
estly believes that if we all stand in
a circle and hold hands and we unilater-
ally disarm, everyone will love each
other and it won’t be necessary to have
a defense system.

That is what we are up against. In a
very respectful way, I have to disagree
with many of the things my dis-
inguished colleague from Illinois stated.

I think we have had a very successful
session. We have ensured a sound So-
cial Security retirement system. We
have improved educational opportuni-
ties for our children. Along this line,
the major disagreement we had was
that the Democrats thought the deci-
sions should be made here in Wash-
ington: Republicans want to use the
same amount of money but not make
the decisions in Washington but send
that money to the school districts. The
school board in Tulsa, OK, is much bet-
ter equipped to know what their edu-
cation needs are in Oklahoma than we
are in this August body of the Senate.
The Democrats say the answer is not
school buses, not computers, not the
physical facilities that are available; it

is 100,000 teachers. I think the more we
can send these decisions back to the
local level, the better the people of
America will be served.

I believe we have had a good session.
I am not pleased with the way it is
turning out right now. The old saying
we have heard so many times in the
past that there are two things you
ever want to watch while they are
being made—one is sausage and the
other is laws—becomes very true dur-
ing the last few days of legislative ses-
sions.

I think we have done a very good job.
I think we did the right thing in de-
feating the unverifiable test ban trea-
ty. I think we have passed legislation
of which America will be very proud. I
am anxious to end all this fun we are
having and go home and tell the people
at home what we accomplished.

I yield the floor and suggest the ab-
sence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.
Bunning). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded
to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING
BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that the period for
morning business be extended to the
hour of 2 p.m. and that the time be
equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence
of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded
to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. 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. HATCH. 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. HATCH. I suggest the absence
of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded
to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded
to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent to speak for up to
15 minutes in morning business.