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

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

FEDERAL MEDDLING IN OREGON

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to take a few minutes to discuss Federal meddling in the internal affairs of my home State of Oregon.

As many of my colleagues know, the people of my State have been discussing at length the concept of assisted suicide. In fact, the people of Oregon have spoken twice on this issue. It is a very difficult issue, and after months of thoughtful debate and intense media scrutiny, the voters of my State have voted to allow physicians to assist their terminally ill patients in ending their lives.

Mr. President and colleagues, let me say that I have deep personal reservations about the concept of assisted suicide. I have voted twice as a private citizen against assisted suicide, and once on the floor of the U.S. Senate I voted against Federal funding of assisted suicide. But let me also say that the voters of my State in a recent ballot measure have voted no on the question of repealing the matter of assisted suicide they voted for earlier.

My question today is, what part of no does the Federal Government fail to understand? We saw just a few hours after the Oregon vote some of the most powerful Members of the U.S. Congress and the Clinton administration looking to overturn the popular will of the people of Oregon. Within hours of the Oregon vote, a letter emerged from the Drug Enforcement Administration to the Members of Congress who control the budget for the Drug Enforcement Administration. In effect, the Drug Enforcement Administration indicates they want to declare war on physicians in Oregon and those they serve by threatening to revoke the drug dispensing privileges of any physician who abides by the law that Oregon has now passed on two separate occasions. In effect, the Drug Enforcement Administration is interested in thwarting the will of Oregonians.

Now, Mr. President and colleagues, let me repeat again, I have deep personal reservations about assisted suicide. Going back to my days with senior citizens as codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers, I have been most interested in looking at medical advances in pain management and hospice care, and I don't think there has even been a beginning at those efforts, and certainly those are the first efforts that governmental bodies at every level ought to be trying to support.

But when the people have spoken, and in this case the people of my State have spoken twice, it is time for the Federal Government to back off. It is not as if this town doesn't have enough to do already on this floor. It is obvious that important legislation needs to be passed as it relates to a number of Federal agencies. Certainly, the Drug Enforcement Agency has important work to do. I don't see any evidence that they have stemmed the flow of cocaine and heroin and methamphetamine to our kids. It seems to me the Clinton administration and the Drug Enforcement Administration has plenty to do right now other than to meddle in the internal affairs of the State of Oregon.

Now, I have great respect for the Members of Congress who are interested in this issue. A number of them are personal friends and individuals with whom I have worked on a bipartisan basis on health care legislation such as the Food and Drug Administration and health care legislation to protect our youngsters. I have great respect for the Members of Congress, the leaders of the committees that have jurisdiction over the budget for the Drug Enforcement Agency, and I respect them and have worked with them on many occasions.

However, I say to those Members of Congress and to the Clinton administration that it is an inappropriate exercise of our responsibilities to impose personal or religious views on the voters of Oregon. Those voters have spoken. My personal views notwithstanding, I want the Federal Government to get that fairly simple concept known as ''No.'' The people of Oregon have spoken on this issue, and it seems to me if there were a constitutional question involved, perhaps you could understand why the Congress and the Clinton administration would be interested in this Oregon ballot initiative. But in fact, a Federal court has recently ruled against a constitutional challenge to Oregon's law, and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld that ruling.

Mr. President, the citizens of my home State have now made law with respect to what they consider to be compassionate care on the part of Oregon physicians. It was not a rush to judgment. There were two very extensive debates in my State, and I have already indicated that my view with respect to assisted suicide is that I still have deep reservations about the concept.

But the voters of my State have spoken. It would be wrong for those at the Federal level to meddle with that decision. It would be wrong to override the judgment of Oregon voters. And it is my view, Mr. President, that neither this Congress, nor the Clinton administration, nor the DEA, should trample on the judgment of Oregon voters on an issue that the courts have already decided is a matter that should be decided in my home State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REDUCING THE RISK OF UNAUTHORIZED OR ACCIDENTAL LAUNCH OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as hard as it is for me to believe, it was 8 years ago this month that the Berlin Wall came tumbling down. Who among us can forget the stirring pictures of that moment? The entire world watched as jubilant Germans, separated for 38 years by a man-made scar running the length of their country, breached this once impregnable barrier. In so doing, they not only united Germany, they brought together a continent.

The dismantlement of the wall dramatically symbolized to all that democracy had at last triumphed over totalitarianism. The fall of the wall set in motion a series of incredible events. In June 1991, Boris Yeltsin became the first democratically elected Russian President. Two months later Yeltsin disbanded the Communist Party. By the end of 1991, the Soviet Union itself ceased to exist. And the Warsaw Pact, the once fearsome military alliance established to counter and defeat NATO, was officially dissolved.

After five decades of tension, the loss of thousands of lives, and the expenditure of several trillion dollars, the cold war was over. However, as the euphoria of this historic occasion began to melt away, leaders in the United States, Europe, and Russia began to realize that the national security paradigms they had used for nearly half a century no longer applied. They would be required to think anew—a task that presented both challenges and opportunities.

President George Bush took the first steps toward aligning our national security posture with the emerging post-cold war realities in September 1991.

Acting on the advice of Gen. George Butler, the commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, President Bush ordered the U.S. Air Force to stand-down the portion of our strategic bomber force it had kept ready to fly at a moment's notice for most of the cold war. Shortly thereafter, the nuclear weapons on-board these planes were removed and placed in storage. President Bush would also take off alert status those strategic missiles earmarked for elimination under the START I Treaty.

President Clinton has also contributed to solving our post-cold war security concerns. Under his leadership, the Senate ratified the START II Treaty, which limits the United States and Russia to no more than 3,500 strategic weapons. President Clinton completed negotiations on the Chemical Weapons Convention and secured the Senate's approval this past April. The CWC treaty would eliminate the scourge of chemical weapons from the face of the Earth. And finally, just 1 month ago, President Clinton submitted to the

Senate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If enacted, this treaty would be a useful tool in our efforts to stem proliferation. I hope the Senate will be allowed to act on this treaty when we return.

While we have made some progress in realigning our national security policies to more fully reflect the realities of the post-cold war world, we still have much more to accomplish. Perhaps the most startling and dramatic indicator of how far we have to go is the fact that, as I stand here today—8 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall—the United States and Russia still possess roughly 14,000 strategic nuclear weapons and tens of thousands more tactical nuclear weapons. And even more alarming, both sides keep the vast majority of their strategic weapons on a high level of alert.

In a recent editorial, former Senator Sam Nunn and Dr. Bruce Blair assert that each nuclear superpower maintains roughly 3,000 strategic nuclear warheads ready to launch at a moment's notice. According to Nunn and Blair, while this practice may have been necessary during the cold war, ''today [it] constitutes a dangerous anachronism.''

Mr. President, I believe we can and must do much more to address the threat posed by nuclear weapons. On September 17, I sent a letter to the Congressional Budget Office asking them to assess the budgetary and security consequences of a series of measures designed to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons and the likelihood they would ever be used.

I expect to receive preliminary results from this inquiry by early next year. In addition, I conducted a meeting earlier this week to explore one particular means of reducing the risk of unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons—removing from alert status some fraction of the strategic ballistic missile force.

As a result of this meeting and a series of discussions with Senator Nunn, Dr. Blair, and General Butler, I am convinced that it is time to seriously consider de-alerting at least a portion of our strategic ballistic missile. I say this for several reasons. First, the likelihood of a surprise, bolt-out-of-the-blue attack of our strategic nuclear forces is unimaginable if not impossible in today's world.

Keeping large numbers of weapons on high alert status fails to recognize this reality.

Second, concerns are growing about the reliability and condition of the Russian early warning and command and control systems. United States security depends on the Russians' ability to accurately assess the status of United States forces and to control their own forces. Public reports indicate their early warning sensors are aging and incomplete, their command and control system is deteriorating, and the morale of the personnel operating these systems is suffering as a result of the lack of pay and difficult working conditions.

It is in our interest to have Russian missiles taken off alert and Russian leaders given more time to interpret and respond to events.

Third, de-alerting a portion of our strategic missile force now could strengthen the hand of those in the Russian Duma who support START II and other United States-Russian security measures. De-alerting some United States strategic missiles could send an important signal at a crucial stage in Russia's consideration of the START II Treaty. In addition, when President Bush took unilateral action to de-alert a portion of our strategic forces, President Gorbachev reciprocated by removing from alert a number of Russian land- and sea-based missiles.

Finally, de-alerting a portion of our strategic missile force would not sacrifice U.S. security. The United States has already indicated a willingness to reduce its total strategic force to as few as 2,000 weapons. Even if we were to de-alert the entire MX force, the United States would retain roughly 2,500 weapons on alert status, and several thousand more could be made ready to launch. Moreover, should circumstances warrant, the United States could reverse any de-alerting measures it may take.

Mr. President, despite the fact that the Soviet Union dissolved and the cold war ended, the risks posed by nuclear weapons persist and evolve.

I plan to do what I can to explore options for reducing these risks. I believe de-alerting a portion of our missile force merits further study in this regard. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the administration in the next session of Congress to fully explore this measure as well as any other that could lessen the dangers of nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be able to speak as if in morning business for up to 20 minutes, and I further ask unanimous consent that at the completion of my remarks Senator BOXER be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

FAST-TRACK LEGISLATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, there has been a lot of debate on the floor over the last several days about fast-track authority, and a lot of it has run against my grain. I don't think it has been at a very high level. What I would like to do is respond to a few of the main arguments that have been used against it that I have heard from some of my colleagues about both the nature of fast-track authority and the need for fast-track authority.

Before I begin I would like to say that West Virginia's economy depends and will continue to depend enormously on strong growth in its exports. So any vote which is taken which does not support the proposition of promoting exports from West Virginia is one that I would question. Indeed, the U.S. economy is moving very strongly forward. I don't believe myself that the growth will continue in West Virginia as strongly as it might have if fast track does not pass this Congress, if we do not give that authority to the President. West Virginia had $1.3 billion in exports in 1996. That's about a 35-percent increase in exports since 1992. That is quite remarkable. West Virginia's specific exports to Japan, which is our second-largest export market, went up 128 percent in 3 years. Just think about that, Mr. President—a 128 percent in 3 years; increasing exports increases West Virginia—and that dramatic increase has been with just one country—Japan. And, in fact, that means West Virginia exports to Japan totaled about $116 million in 1996, which is not a lot in some States, but it is a lot in West Virginia. U.S. exports increased by $125 billion last year alone—a lot of this because of trade arrangements.

One thing is undeniably true—denying the President fast-track authority will not create a single new job in West Virginia. Nobody can make that argument with a straight face. It won't save a single job either to deny the President fast-track authority. It will only hamper our ability to sell goods to new markets, which is what this is about, and hurt the growth of a critical sector of our economy, and one that I have personally been working on very hard over the last 10 to 15 years.

I think most of the arguments about the revolutionary provisions of fast track are highly overstated, and highly dramatized. Fast-track authority isn't anything new. And, because it is a procedural mechanism, I don't think there is anything to be feared about it. I recognize that others don't think so. Some have good arguments. Most have rather poor arguments, I think. Fast track is a mechanism simply that helps the United States keep up with the changing world economy and deal with our trading partners in 21st century management.

So, let me take a moment to respond to a few of the persistent arguments which are used against fast track. These are just a few of them.

Is there sufficient congressional consultation accompanying fast-track authority: Very big contentious deal. Right? We are ceding all of our authority to the President of the United