

have to shoot it down. All we had to do was help buy some saws to saw the wing off and dismantle that plane piece by piece. That bomber that carried nuclear bombs that threatened our country no longer exists.

Is that progress? I think it is.

So we have what is called the Nunn-Lugar program that we have funded. Despite this success, as I indicated, we have something more than 30,000 to 40,000 nuclear weapons left in the world, the bulk of them in the United States and in Russia. They have a total yield, it is estimated, of somewhere around 6,000 megatons. That is 6 billion tons of TNT. That is the equivalent power of 400,000 Hiroshima-type bombs—400,000 Hiroshima bombs.

The Hiroshima “Little Boy” bomb killed about 100,000 people. It was calculated the “Little Boy” bomb dropped on Hiroshima produced casualties 6,500 times more efficiently than the ordinary high-explosive bomb.

So the question for us is: Is there more to do in arms control, arms reduction? Is there more to do in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons? Will this country be a leader in those areas?

The answer for me, clearly, is yes. Yet today we consider the administration's nomination to be the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control, Mr. John Bolton, who has little experience in the area. But more alarming in my judgment, is that the expressions he has made about this subject in recent years suggest that he does not care a whit about arms control.

He seems to believe, as this administration does, that arms reductions are not part of a strategy that makes much sense for this country. Treaties, arms control talks, somehow represent a display of weakness, apparently, and that, if we could, we should just decide to go our own way, build national missile defense, not care what others do in reaction to it, and believe it doesn't matter how many nuclear weapons exist in the hands of the Russians, or how many nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles the Chinese might desire to consider in the coming years. It just doesn't matter, they say.

I think that is a very serious mistake for this country to believe that. In my judgment, it is a very serious policy mistake. I think if ever there is a case of a fox in a chicken coop it is Mr. Bolton's nomination to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control. He is the wrong person in the wrong place.

Let me conclude as I started. I do not know Mr. Bolton personally, and I do not mean by my presentation to suggest he is not a perfectly good man, perhaps someone who is well educated—bright I am certain. I just feel very strongly, with respect to the consent requirement of the Senate, I want someone in the position of Under Secretary for Arms Control who believes

in arms control. I would like someone who believes in a missionary need for this country to provide world leadership in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. I want someone who has passion about trying to engage with those who have nuclear arms and delivery vehicles in treaties and talks and agreements to reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

I do not suggest we do that from a position of weakness. We clearly do it from a position of strength. But those who suggest what happens in the rest of the world is irrelevant and the only thing that is relevant is what happens here are just plain wrong.

So I will be voting against Mr. Bolton's nomination. I hope others will do so as well. I hope perhaps with that vote we can send a message from this Senate to this administration that this is not the direction the American people want. This is not the direction the American people expect in terms of trying to reduce the threat of nuclear war, trying to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons, and trying to increase the opportunity to reduce the nuclear weapons that exist.

Madam President, I yield the floor. I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I ask consent to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

THE RELEASE OF VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have come to the floor repeatedly in recent years on the issue of violent offenders being released from prison early and in behalf of the people they have murdered while they have been on early release from incarceration for previous violent crimes.

I noticed in the last couple of days, once again we had a case—I wanted to certainly give the judges here their due—the case of a fellow named Robert Lee Dyer, reported in the papers. He is from Suitland, MD, arrested almost a year ago, charged with being a principal in the first degree in the shooting death of a man trying to withdraw money from an ATM machine. He was arrested with Antwon Reid, who was charged with murder in the first. Reid pleaded guilty, and is now serving a life sentence. Mr. Dyer had two bond hearings to determine whether he would be released on bond. The first hearing was before Judge Patrice Lewis. She gave

the defense attorney the authority to set up a property bond and come back in 1 week to see if it would be allowed.

At the second bond hearing, Judge Thurmond Rhodes set the bond of \$75,000. Mr. Robert Lee Dyer was released. So for \$75,000, this fellow, who had been involved in a murder crime, allegedly, was released.

The State's attorney vehemently opposed releasing him on bond. But Judge Thurman Rhodes nonetheless released him. The trial for that was scheduled to begin May 21 of this year. On May 2 of this year, this Mr. Dyer was arrested for killing Jamel Stephon Zimmerman. Dyer was the alleged shooter. It is said that there is a very strong case against him. A new bond hearing was scheduled for today at 1:15 in front of Judge Robert Heffron.

There is something fundamentally wrong when time after time after time people are either released from prison or, in this case, released on bond when we know they are violent. And yet they are released back to the streets to kill again.

I have spoken at great length about the case of Bettina Pruckmayer—and six or eight other cases—a young woman aspiring to begin a new life in Washington, DC; a young attorney, public spirited, working for a nonprofit organization, who pulls up to an ATM machine only to meet Leon Gonzalez Wright to be stabbed over 30 times and killed. Leon Gonzalez Wright had committed murder before, was let out early, picked up for hard drugs while he was let out on probation, and nobody puts him back in jail. Instead, he was walking the streets to kill Bettina Pruckmayer.

That and six or eight other cases I have described is going on all across this country. It is good time for good behavior, and release them early. In this case, don't keep them in jail. Let them post \$75,000 where they are on America's streets, and the result is innocent men and women are being murdered.

There is something wrong with the criminal justice system. I think what we ought to do is describe the differences that exist between those who commit violent crimes and those who commit nonviolent crimes. We ought to have people in this country understand that if they commit a violent crime, they are not going to have good time for good behavior. Whatever the judge says, their sentence is going to be that the jail cell number is going to be their address until the end of their sentence, and no good time off for good behavior.

The average sentence served for murder in this country is just over 8 years. The fact is, people are released early for a range of reasons. We know they are violent and they are back on America's streets.

A young woman from my State of North Dakota, who I have spoken

about previously, was driving along a quiet road, Highway 2, from Williston, ND, to Minot, ND, one afternoon after attending a League of Cities meeting in Williston. She stopped at a rest stop, and she was unlucky enough that afternoon to be confronted at the rest stop by a violent felon from the State of Washington. He had been let out early and should have been in jail. But he wasn't. He slashed her throat. And while she lay there bleeding, people thought she would die. Someone came along that road that day, and it turned out they had a cell phone. The woman in the car knew something about nursing and she saved Julie's life.

The fact is, that young woman, while her life was saved, is now going through years and years of therapy to be able to talk normally once again. Her throat was slashed very badly when she was assaulted by this felon. He was chased by the police and he committed suicide some miles down the road. But he should not have been on the roads and highways and should not have been threatening Julie Schultz. Yet he was.

It is true of Mr. Robert Lee Dyer, except that if Judge Thurman Rhodes had not let him out on bail he would have been incarcerated. Instead, Jamel Stephon Zimmerman is now dead.

I hope this criminal justice system, judges, prosecutors, and I hope finally this Senate and the House will find a way to pass legislation saying we are going to distinguish between those who commit nonviolent crimes and those who commit violent crimes.

Everyone should understand this. Commit a violent crime, and you are going to spend your time in jail until the end of your term. You are not going to be released early to commit another violent crime against an innocent bystander.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—S. 1

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, following the 10:15 a.m. vote on the Bolton nomination, the Senate proceed to the vote in relation to the listed amendments in the following order: Craig amendment No. 372; Kennedy amendment No. 375.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2001

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 8. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of the Bolton nomination as under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR RECESS FOR PARTY CONFERENCES TO MEET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will have 45 minutes to complete debate on the Bolton nomination beginning at 9:30 tomorrow morning. A vote on confirmation of the nomination will begin at 10:15 a.m. with votes on amendments to the education bill stacked to follow. Following votes, the Senate will resume consideration of the education bill. Amendments will be offered and, therefore, votes will occur throughout tomorrow's session.

Senators should also expect votes throughout the week in an effort to make significant progress on the education bill and to complete action on the conference report to accompany the budget resolution.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WELLSTONE.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I think Senator WELLSTONE is expected on the floor soon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERT BOLTON TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY—Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for their graciousness. I did want a chance to speak about the nomination of John R. Bolton to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs. I thank colleagues for providing me this opportunity. My understanding is that we are going to adjourn soon. I hope I have not inconvenienced everyone.

Mr. President, filling this position is a critical responsibility of the new administration. Crafting the Nation's arms control agenda is a formidable, serious task that directly affects our national security. Moreover, the administration needs to have its arms control team in place as soon as possible. For these reasons, I do not oppose John Bolton's nomination lightly.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am convinced that the position of Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs must be filled with an individual who is committed to advancing the entire Nation's agenda. He or she must carry out arms control responsibilities in the spirit of idealism that characterizes the best tradition of America's public servants.

The individual who is confirmed by the Senate must provide deliberate and thoughtful advice to the Secretary of State, independent of political party allegiance or affiliation. He or she must be objective in his analysis of exceedingly complex issues. He or she must be committed to protecting our national security, to reducing the world's immense stockpile of nuclear weapons, and to making the world a safer place for all mankind.

After careful consideration, I have concluded that John Bolton is not the right man for Under Secretary for Arms Control and Non-proliferation. I believe John Bolton is too conservative and too partisan; his views are too extreme for a position of this importance and he does not represent the kind of bipartisan cooperation needed to advance the Nation's arms control agenda. Finally, I do not believe that John Bolton possesses the requisite arms control experience to carry out the responsibilities of this job effectively.

I want to make clear that I do not question John Bolton's integrity or his commitment to public service. I had a chance to meet with him, and I do not question this at all. He has a long career in senior appointed positions in the administrations of Presidents Reagan and George Herbert Walker Bush. I respect his willingness to serve our Nation again. I recognize the prerogative and responsibility of Presidents to nominate their foreign policy