With our leadership and support, it is certain that these disturbing trends of drug use and increasing school violence will be reduced. I am committed to providing our young people with a positive learning environment free of drugs and safe from harm.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee spoke on the floor of the Senate on the subject of arms control. He is a distinguished Member of the Senate, someone for whom I have high regard, but someone with whom I have strong disagreement on this subject. I will speak this morning about the presentation he made yesterday and its relationship to a range of other issues we face.

The front page of the Washington Post this morning has a headline: ''Helms Vows to Obstruct Arms Pacts, Any New Clinton Accord With Russia Ruled Out.'' It is a story about the presentation made yesterday by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in which he stated that any arms control agreement negotiated by this administration is going to be dead on arrival in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With all due respect to the Washington Post, that is not news. The Foreign Relations Committee has been a morgue for arms control for a long time. In fact, this Congress has been a morgue for arms control. Everything dealing with arms control has been dead on arrival in this Congress and in that committee for several years.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference is now being held in New York. At that conference the world is looking to this country for leadership in stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons and stopping the spread the missiles, submarines, and bombers with which those nuclear weapons are delivered. Regrettably, this country has abandoned its leadership on the arms control issue.

I will include in the RECORD several editorials: one is the April 26 edition of the Chicago Tribune entitled ''Russia Takes Arms Control Lead.'' It discusses the Russian Duma's approval of Start II and the approval of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban treaty by the Russians. Another is from the April 26 Milwaukee Journal Sentinel entitled, ''Will the United States Lead or Follow on the Issue of Arms Control.'' Another is from the April 27 Dallas Morning News with the title ''Arms Control, the Senate Needs to Stop Playing with Nuclear Fire.'' And the last is this morning's column in the Washington Post by Mary McGrory entitled ''Nuclear Family Values.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent these four editorials be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the statement made yesterday by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was a statement that says, we don't know what you might negotiate. It has not yet been negotiated; a proposal does not yet exist. But whatever it is and whatever it might be, we intend to kill it. It will be dead in my committee.

That is not what this country ought to be doing with the subject of arms control. As we meet in the Senate discussing a range of things, and especially discussing, more recently, the case of Elian Gonzalez, which seems to have co-opted so much attention in this country, other countries around the world aspire to acquire nuclear weapons. The spread of nuclear weapons is a very serious matter. Will more and more countries have access to nuclear bombs and the means by which to deliver those nuclear weapons, or will this country provide leadership in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons?

Arms control agreements have worked. Those in this Congress who have stopped arms control agreements and who have said any future agreements will be dead in our committee or in this Congress are wrong. It is the wrong policy for this country. Our country should instead be saying we embrace thoughtful, reasonable, arms control agreements that make this a safer world.

This picture shows some of what the Senate and the Congress have done in the past on arms control agreements and why they work. This is a picture of a missile silo. This used to hold an SS–19, a Soviet and then Russian missile. The missile in this silo had several warheads aimed at the United States of America. The threat from those warheads doesn't exist anymore. The missile is gone. The silo was filled in. The ground is plowed over and there are now sunflowers on top. Is that progress? You bet your life it is progress.

But it is not just missile silos. Here is the dismantling of a Russian Delta class ballistic missile submarine. This used to be a submarine that would find its way stealthily through the waters with missiles and nuclear warheads aimed at American cities and targets. It is no longer a submarine. Here is a piece of copper wire that is ground up that used to be on that Russian submarine. Did we sink that submarine in hostile action? No. Through the Nunn-Lugar threat reduction program, the Pentagon actually dismantled that Russian submarine.

More than that, we are sawing the wings off Russian bombers. Here is a picture of the Nunn-Lugar program cutting the wings off TU–95 heavy bombers. Why is the Pentagon cutting the wings off those bombers? Because we have had arms control agreements with Russia that have called for the reduction of bombers, missiles, nuclear warheads. Six thousand Russian nuclear warheads have been eliminated—6,000. That is the explosive equivalent of 175,000 nuclear bombs like those dropped on Hiroshima. Let me repeat that. Arms control agreements with Russia have eliminated the threat from nuclear weapons with destructive power equivalent to 175,000 bombs the size of the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

We have people in the Congress who say: We don't like arms control. We want to build new things. We want to build new missiles. We want to build new missile defense systems. We want to build and we want to spend money building. What they do is light the fuse of a new arms race.

Without some new effort in arms control to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, we will see a new arms race—expensive, dangerous, and one that will hold the world hostage for some time to come. Our job ought to be to find ways to reduce the nuclear threat, not expand it; to find ways to create arms control agreements that work.

Again, I have deep respect for all of my colleagues, even those with whom I have serious disagreements. I certainly have serious disagreements in this circumstance. But I don't understand an announcement that says, whatever the President might negotiate in arms control, even though it is not yet negotiated, even though we don't know the specifics, whatever it might be with respect to arms control, we pledge to you that it is dead. That is not leadership. That is destructive to good public policy. If we can negotiate with the Russians and others sensible, thoughtful arms control agreements that advance this country's interests, enhance world safety and security, then we ought to be willing to embrace it, not shun it.

I regret very much the announcement that there will be no hearings on any negotiations on arms control. We are quick to hold hearings on the Elian Gonzalez case. We have people doing cartwheels around the Chamber saying: Let's hold hearings; let's investigate. We can hold hearings on the Elian Gonzalez case, but somehow there will be no movement, no hearings, no discussion on the issue of arms control if, God forbid, we should be able to achieve some sort of breakthrough in an arms control agreement with the Russians or others.

In conclusion, it is our responsibility, it falls on our shoulders in the United

States to be a world leader on these issues. It is our responsibility to lead. We are the remaining nuclear and economic superpower in the world. It is our responsibility to lead, not towards another arms race but towards more arms control and towards stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

Let's not have more countries joining the nuclear club. Let's not have more proliferation of the technology of missiles and submarines and nuclear weapons spread around the world. To those who say we are threatened by North Korea being able to send a missile with a warhead to threaten the Aleutian Islands, I say this: Almost anyone who thinks through this understands there are a myriad of threats our country faces. The least likely is a threat by an intercontinental ballistic missile from a rogue nation. It is far more likely that a truck bomb, far more likely that a suitcase bomb, far more likely that a deadly biological or chemical agent would be used to threaten or hold hostage this country. It is far more likely that a cruise missile would be used. It is, in my judgment, the least likely option that a rogue nation would have access to and acquire an intercontinental ballistic missile and use that as a threat against this country.

Having said that, I think we will now have a struggle between those who desperately want to build a national missile defense system at any cost in taxpayers' money, at any cost in arms control, at any cost, as contrasted with those of us who believe it is still our responsibility to make this a safer world by understanding that arms control has worked and has reduced the number of nuclear weapons. But we are not nearly finished. We must move to START III, we must preserve the ABM Treaty, and we must have new, aggressive, bold and energetic leadership in the U.S. to say it is our job to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to make this a safer world.

That burden falls upon this country and, regrettably, this Congress has not been willing to assume that responsibility. It is, in fact, all too often marching in exactly the opposite direction. We need to put it back on track and say it is our job, and we willingly and gladly accept that responsibility to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, to negotiate good arms control agreements that don't threaten our security, but enhance it by reducing the threat of nuclear weapons.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 26, 2000]

RUSSIA TAKES ARMS CONTROL LEAD

In just one week's time, Russia has broken a legislative logjam that had stymied for years any action on reducing its formidable nuclear arsenal and forestalling the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

With passage of START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Russian Duma has handed president-elect Vladimir Putin major victories and created, for the United States, something of a dilemma.

Russia can claim to be a leader in arms control and point its finger reproachfully at the U.S. Russia can say America is now the laggard. Russia can say America is seeking to destabilize the bedrock agreement of mutual deterrence during the Cold War—the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

The U.S. is seeking changes in that treaty to permit it to develop a missile defense intended to protect the nation against attacks from rogue nations such as North Korea and Iraq. The technology is unproven and the cost estimates already skyrocketing, but there is support in both parties for a missile defense of some kind.

This is an unwelcome change in global public relations. Until last October, the U.S. could rightly argue it was doing all it could to lead the movement to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world, and that Russia was the obstinate player. The U.S. Senate in 1996 ratified the START II treaty—calling for the nuclear arsenals of the U.S. and Russia to be cut roughly in half. The test ban treaty had not been ratified by the U.S.—but it hadn't been ratified by Russia either.

Last October, though, the U.S. Senate rejected the test ban treaty. Now Russia has agreed to it. That puts Russia in the company of Britain and France—also among the five early nuclear powers—which have signed and ratified the CTBT. And it lumps the U.S. with the only other early nuclear power that has not—China.

Though it might argue as such, this is not exactly a case of Russia acting out of nobility. Russia has significant economic as well as strategic reasons for moving on these long-stalled arms treaties. It cannot afford to maintain its existing nuclear arsenal, and any reduction in warheads helps free up scarce resources for other military needs.

As well, the CTBT vote places no immediate demands on Russia. Though the treaty has been signed by more than 150 nations and ratified by 52, its ban on test explosions would take effect only after each of the 44 nations deemed to have some nuclear capability ratifies it.

Regardless of motives, Russia has taken the lead and put the U.S. on the defensive—and that's not a comfortable position for this nation.

[From the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel, Apr. 26, 2000]

WILL U.S. LEAD, OR FOLLOW?

During the Cold War, the United States was the world champion of nuclear arms control, and the Soviet Union was the unwilling partner that had to be dragged along. In the post-Cold War era, the tables have not been exactly turned; but the furniture has been rearranged, putting the U.S. in the unbecoming role of Dr. No.

Last week, the lower house of parliament in Russia approved the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. As its name suggests, the treaty bans the testing of nuclear weapons and thereby constrains their development. Just the week before, the Russian parliament approved another major accord: the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which nearly halves the nuclear arsenals of both the U.S. and Russia.

Putting themselves firmly on record in support of the arms-control process, the Russian lawmakers conditioned their approval of these treaties on continued U.S. adherence to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, which prohibits national anti-missile defense systems.

Compare these impressive and unambiguous Kremlin decisions with the dismal U.S. record in recent years. The Senate beat the Russians to the punch on START II, ratifying that treaty in 1996. Since then, U.S. leadership on arms control has all but died.

In October, the Senate refused to ratify the test ban treaty, partly because the Clinton administration never bothered to campaign for it. Meantime, the administration—pushed by Repubicans—is considering whether to deploy a limited missile shield that would violate the ABM treaty.

The White House is trying to persuade the Russians to amend that treaty to allow for a missile defense, but the Russians are having none of it. Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, has said the U.S. should withdraw from the treaty if the Russians refuse to revise it.

Thus, the U.S. threatens to dismantle an arms control structure that has taken years to build, while Russia bolsters it. This role reversal would be justified were arms treaties obsolete. But they aren't. If nuclear war has been averted over the last half-century, it is partly because of these agreements.

It's time for the U.S. to make a U-turn. The administration should start lobbying Congress and the country in behalf of the test ban so that it can be ratified by the Senate next year. And, rather than weaken or withdraw from the ABM treaty, the U.S. should see that it is strengthened.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 27, 2000]

ARMS CONTROL

SENATE NEEDS TO STOP PLAYING WITH NUCLEAR FIRE

Good news! Russia's parliament ratified the START II nuclear arms-reduction treaty this month. The U.S. Senate ratified it in 1996.

Therefore, the treaty, which would reduce the deployed warheads in each country's arsenal to no more than 3,500 from 6,000, may at last take effect, right?

Wrong.

The treaty won't take effect until the U.S. Senate ratifies protocols to the treaty that the countries signed in 1997. The protocols extend the arms-reduction deadline to 2007 from 2003 and formally designate Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine as successors to the 1972 U.S.-Soviet anti-ballistic missile treaty.

One would think that the Senate would leap at the chance to ratify the protocols for the sake of achieving verifiable reductions in Russia's nuclear arsenal. But the body isn't interested. Its Republican majority adamantly wants to build a defense against missile attacks by rogue states, which is illegal under the U.S.-Soviet anti-ballistic treaty.

No problem. President Clinton is trying to negotiate amendments to the anti-ballistic missile treaty that would permit the United States to build a limited national missile defense. It's a worthwhile project. Once he convinces the Russians to agree, the Senate will ratify the amendments and the protocols so that START II could be implemented, right?

Wrong again.

The Republicans want a granddaddy missile defense. They want, in effect, ''Star Wars.'' Twenty-five of them, including Texas' Phil Gramm and Kay Bailey Hutchison and Majority Leader Trent Lott, wrote Mr. Clinton on April 18 that his proposed limited defense was too limited.

It takes only 34 senators to defeat a treaty. So even if Mr. Clinton succeeds in amending the anti-ballistic missile treaty, the Senate would probably defeat it and the protocols, which means no START II. If the United States should proceed to build an ample missile defense more to the Republicans' liking, Russia might carry out its threat to abrogate the entire range of bilateral arms-reduction treaties with the United States, which would spell the end of arms control as we know it.

The United States is beginning to look as if it isn't interested in arms control. The Senate last year rejected a good treaty that would have permanently banned nuclear tests. The lower house of Russia's parliament approved the same treaty on April 21. Now, the Senate is holding START II hostage to amendments to an anti-ballistic missile treaty that it probably would not ratify.

Meanwhile, U.S. negotiators keep telling their Russian counterparts that the limited missile defense would defend against rogue states, while hawkish senators hold out for a full-blown system whose principle object would be to defend against Russia.

To its credit, the administration is talking with Russia about a START III treaty, which would reduce the number of deployed warheads to no more than 2,500. But those talks are hampered by the stalemates over START II and missile defenses.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 2000]

NUCLEAR FAMILY VALUES

(By Mary McGrory)

The fate of mankind vs. the fate of one 6-year-old Cuban boy? It is not a contest in the U.S. Senate. Elian wins going away.

Russia's new president, Vladimir Putin, can't get anyone's attention on Capitol Hill, even though his first moves in office could have beneficial effects on the whole world and are at least as noteworthy as Janet Reno's pre-dawn raid on Elian Gonzalez's Miami home.

Putin passed two treaties through the Russian parliament with wide majorities, indicating at a minimum that he had a grip on the legislature and some idea of a new image for Russia: START II reduces the number of nuclear weapons, and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which the Senate rejected last year, bans all tests.

But is anyone hailing a new day in arms control? Is anyone rejoicing? No. Putin has done very well. But his name is not Gonzalez.

On the Senate floor, Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is just as much a dictator as Castro, from whom many Republicans want to save Elian, announced that there would be no hearings on this wicked nonsense from Putin. But there will be emergency hearings on Elian, beginning next week.

When Putin on April 15 put it to Bill Clinton that he could have a choice between fewer nuclear weapons and a national missile defense system, the reaction of Republican senators was outrage. Led by their majority leader, Trent Lott, they dashed off a letter to the president, warning him that it was all a plot to foil a version of Ronald Reagan's Star Wars.

The national missile defense system doesn't work and it costs $60 billion going in. But hang the tests and hang the expense, the Republicans want to start pouring concrete. Not that they are talking about it, mind you. They are busing planning to air for the country all the recriminations and second-guessing since a petrified Elian was hauled out of a closet by a helmeted, goggled creature with bared teeth and an automatic weapon.

The Republicans love that picture almost as much as they love Star Wars, and they are not going to let it go. They quizzed Attorney General Reno for almost two hours Tuesday morning. In the afternoon, Leader Lott, fairly vibrating with anticipation, explained that the public had a right to know just what state the peace negotiations had been at the time of the dawn raid. Janet Reno's answers had not been satisfactory.

All day in the halls, Senate Elian-celebrities were giving interviews. There was Republican Sen. Connie Mack of Florida, who had been stood up by Elian's great-uncle Lazaro Gonzalez, Lazaro's operatic daughter Marisleysis, and Donato Dalrymple, one of Elian's rescuers. There was Florida's other senator, Bob Graham (D), who also had a grievance. He kept telling anyone who would listen that the president of the United States, sitting in the Oval Office, had given his personal word that no snatch would be undertaken at night. You can almost hear Bill Clinton triumphantly responding, ''It was 5 o'clock in the morning.''

Perhaps the most put out was Republican Sen. Robert C. Smith of New Hampshire, who had taken Lazaro's troupe to the Capitol when they landed after their dramatic dash in hot pursuit of their little boarder. They have been turned away at the gate of Andrews Air Force Base, twice. ''Wait until defense appropriations time,'' growled veteran Republican lobbyist Tom Korologos.

Republicans have been warned by their pollsters that the public, by a wide margin, has thought all along that Elian should be sent home to his father. The public hated the picture of the child at gunpoint but they loved pictures taken at Andrews—pictures that showed a beaming Elian leaning on his father's shoulder and playing with his baby stepbrother.

What legislation would come out of hearings is hard to imagine. There's little hope of wisdom, either. Maybe Marisleysis Gonzalez should be asked about her enviable health plan. She's been in and out of the hospital eight times in the past month, suffering from the vapors visited on a surrogate mom. And somebody might want to inquire of the attorney general if she had considered dispensing with the helmet and the goggles that made the Immigration and Naturalization gunman such a sinister figure. Wasn't a machine gun sufficiently intimidating? Did she make it clear to the crew that the child is not a drug lord? While all this melodrama was swirling around, the Senate in its chamber was tampering again with the Constitution—an amendment for victims' rights. The Constitution should not be messed with. Another document better left alone is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

We need that handsome woman who threw the blanket over Elian on Saturday morning and rushed him off the scene. She should do the same for the Senate until it gets a grip on its priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that under the time reserved for Senator DURBIN I may speak for such time as I may consume.

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

THE JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the last several days, we have been debating a victims' rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and that is an interesting and thoughtful debate. But I think we can do something else, which is try to prevent victims in the first place. We can do that by passing the juvenile justice bill, which contains sensible controls on handguns in this society.

A few days ago we saw another incident involving a handgun at the National Zoo, a place we have recognized for decades as a source of solace and education and recreation in the Nation's Capital. But, in a moment, it was turned into a place of violence and terror because a young man, apparently with a handgun, shot several young people.

The tragedy in this country is that each year 30,000 Americans die by gunfire. Every day, 12 children are killed by gunfire. We can stop that and we must stop that.

The most recent incident is another indication that we have to act not someday but immediately. These seven children have been harmed and their families have been forever changed. This is a tragedy that they will live with, but it is a tragedy that we don't have to live with as a nation indefinitely.

We took several appropriate and responsible steps after the Columbine shooting last year in which we passed legislation that would close the gun show loophole, require safety locks on handguns to prevent their use by children, and other measures. Yet these measures languish today in a conference committee that has met only once since last year, which is not seriously attempting to address the critical issues of violence in this country.

Each day we wait, another incident takes place. Again, last year on the floor of the Senate as we debated the juvenile justice bill, if any of us had stood up and said a 6-year-old child would walk into first grade in America and shoot another 6 year old, some would have said it was hysterical demagoging.

That happened. If anybody said that on a Sunday or a weekday afternoon at the National Zoo random gunfire would break out and seven children would be shot down, we would be accused of hysterical demagoguery. It happened.

We can prevent this, and we should, by acting promptly to pass the juvenile justice bill with those provisions included. Many in the Congress call for stricter enforcement of handgun laws. I agree with that. We should enforce the laws. But the reality is that we have to prevent these incidents rather than, after the fact, arresting people.

It is against the law in the District of Columbia to possess a handgun, as it was possessed, apparently, by this young man. But the District of Columbia is not an island. It is a metropolitan area between other States that have much less strict gun control laws. Virginia, for example, is a State which is a shell-issue State. That means that practically any person who is not a felon can carry a concealed weapon with a license and without showing a special need to do so.

Private sales of handguns, including gun show sales, are common throughout Virginia, and there you can in fact buy a weapon without a background check if you are buying from an unlicensed gun dealer. There is no waiting period in Virginia to buy a handgun. Now there is a law that prevents the purchase of more than one handgun a month, and that is good because it prevents trafficking in firearms. But it