

Throughout his teaching career, his commitment to serving others was something that was impressed upon all of his students. When I was an undergraduate at SDSU, Dean Cheever taught me more about the importance of public service than I could have imagined possible, and there is no doubt in my mind that he helped steer me down the career path that I eventually chose to follow.

The impact Dean Cheever had on me wasn't confined to his work as an educator. He was also instrumental in helping shape my interest in politics. Dr. Cheever and I volunteered together on George McGovern's race for the Senate in 1968. It was a true pleasure for me to work alongside him during that exciting time.

Later, Dean Cheever took leave from SDSU to help Dick Kneip remain governor, and to direct the South Dakota Democratic Party. Politically—and luckily for me—Herb Cheever has worked on behalf of the Democratic Party. However, as everyone who knows him can attest, that is the only venue in which he plays favorites. Dean Cheever's commitment to education and his community, and his passion for public service have made a deep and lasting impression on thousands of young people on SDSU's campus over the years, and I am pleased that I was fortunate enough to be among them.

I am proud to call Dean Herbert Cheever a friend, and I am pleased to join Sydna, their friends and family in wishing him the best as he begins the next important chapter of his life. While his colleagues and students will undoubtedly miss his daily presence in the classrooms of SDSU, I am confident that he will continue to touch many lives.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, just a few days ago, the Congressional Budget Office released a paper entitled "Budgetary and Technical Implications of the Administration's Plan for National Missile Defense." I bring this paper to the Senate's attention because I believe it is misleading and confusing. It has given support to critics of the program who also have contributed to the confusion.

Some reporters and editors have characterized this study as a "budget estimate" of our National Missile Defense program which shows that the costs will be far higher than previously predicted. This is not so.

The paper is not a budgetary scoring of legislation that the CBO traditionally engages in. This is a paper of a kind the CBO occasionally produces in response to Congressional requests, providing it can spare analysts from their other duties. The request for this paper was recently made by members of the Senate and the CBO acknowledges that it had insufficient time to fully consider all of the questions it was asked to address.

The paper puts the total cost for a National Missile Defense system at \$49 billion. I say "a" National Missile Defense system because the CBO paper did not examine the program actually in place and for which we have received estimates in the past, but rather one that its analysts thought should be in place. Mr. Ken Bacon, the Defense Department spokesman, characterized the estimate as an "apples to gold apples" comparison.

The Defense Department has stated previously that acquisition and operation of a single site NMD system with 100 interceptors would cost \$25.6 billion through 2015. The CBO estimate of \$49 billion is for a dual site NMD system with 250 interceptors. Some news reports, such as one published in the Wall Street Journal on April 25th have erroneously reported a figure of \$60 billion for this year, which they arrive at by adding the cost of Space-Based Infrared Satellites. However, even the CBO paper correctly notes that those satellites will serve other missile defense programs, as well as other entirely different mission areas, and are not part of the cost of the NMD system.

Mr. President, I am convinced that a single interceptor site by itself will be insufficient to adequately protect the United States from missile attack, and additional capability will be needed. Whether that should be a second ground-based site, as the CBO paper assumes, one based at sea, or some other approach remains to be determined. But we should not confuse the CBO's "golden apple" estimate with the estimates we have received previously, which address a different, single site NMD system.

Even where the CBO paper tried to make a direct comparison, it still based its estimate on the program it thought should exist rather than the one that does. For example, the paper determined that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization should buy 75 percent more interceptor missiles than it plans to for testing and spares in the so-called "Capability 1" single site system. It made different assumptions about construction costs, using the 30 year old Safeguard system in North Dakota as its model. And it based its costs on 30 operational flight tests over the first five years of system operation, three times the number actually planned.

Projecting costs for a complex weapon system still under development is an uncertain enterprise, and different analysts can reasonably reach different conclusions about what assumptions are warranted. It would have been reasonable for CBO to present its conclusions to those who are actually building the NMD system and seek their views on whether the different assumptions were warranted. This, after all, is the procedure followed by the General Accounting Office when it produces such a study. It sends out a draft for comment by the relevant agencies and either incorporates the comments of

those agencies or explains why it does not agree. Unfortunately, we have been told by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization that, despite repeated offers to assess the CBO findings, CBO declined to present its conclusions before publishing this paper. That is unfortunate; had it done so, there might be less confusion about what this paper says.

I believe it is also important to note some costs that CBO did not consider in this study.

The study doesn't examine the potential costs to the United States of not having a missile defense system. We should keep in mind that the NMD program is not like a new tactical fighter or guided missile destroyer or armored vehicle, replacing an earlier generation. We have no defense against long-range ballistic missiles launched against our territory. That means that should the day come when some nation—for whatever reason—launches a missile at the United States, without a National Missile Defense system we will have no choice but to watch that missile strike its target. If that missile is equipped with a weapon of mass destruction, the results would be the most catastrophic event ever to take place in the United States. An assessment of these costs is nowhere to be found in the CBO report.

Nor is the cost to U.S. leadership of our continued vulnerability to missile attack. A missile doesn't have to be used to be useful in deterring actions by other nations, and we need only look at our own experience to confirm that. The United States has spent hundreds of billions of dollars on ballistic missiles over the last 40 years, none of which have ever been used. We did so because we believed those weapons would deter other nations from taking certain actions that would harm our interests.

The United States can be deterred, too, by the threat of missile attack. Our former colleague, Secretary of Defense Cohen, provided an example of how that can happen when he spoke to our Allies in Munich in February. He said,

If Saddam Hussein had five or ten or twenty ICBMs with nuclear warheads, and he said that, if you try to expel me from Kuwait, I'll put one in Berlin, one in Munich, one in New York, one in Washington, one in Los Angeles, etc., one in Rome—let's spread the wealth, one in England, London—how many would have been quite so eager to support the deployment of some five hundred thousand convention troops to expel him from Kuwait? We would have had a different calculation, asking, "What kind of a risk are we running? . . .

We never want to be in the position of being blackmailed by anyone who will prevent us from carrying out our Article 5 obligations or responding to any threat to our national security interests."

There are significant costs to the ability of the United States to act in its national interests if it is vulnerable to missile attack. This report from the CBO doesn't place a dollar value on that.

Mr. President, while our debates on various defense programs can be served by additional views, I think this new paper from the Congressional Budget Office has done more to create confusion than to contribute usefully to the debate. I urge Senators to keep its limitations in mind as they consider it.

QUEST FOR MIDEAST PEACE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I had the privilege of chairing a hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee on April 5 that examined the status of U.S. efforts to resolve still open questions of compensation and restitution arising from the tragedy of the Holocaust, and that looked broadly at the persistent phenomenon of anti-Semitism that inspired and enabled that monstrous crime.

Extraordinary witnesses appeared before the Committee—led by Dr. Elie Wiesel, who called on us and all civilized men and women to stand firm against the dark forces of bigotry and other hatreds, and Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Stuart Eizenstat, who described the efforts of the United States and other countries to finally and squarely confront with painful truths and achieve some level of justice for the Holocaust's victims and its survivors.

One subject that was analyzed for the Committee in great detail was the current reach and impact of anti-Semitism, and I feel particularly indebted to David Harris, Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee, for his thoughtful and comprehensive testimony on this grave matter. This presentation reviewed not only the scourge of anti-Semitism in Europe but the increasingly troubling incidence of this form of bigotry in the Arab world.

At the same time that countries across the Middle East are engaged in a peace process guided by Washington that promises a new era in relations between Arabs and Israelis, old anti-Jewish enmities are too often tolerated, or even fanned, by important institutions in the Arab world. Anti-Jewish and anti-Israel propaganda of the most grotesque nature is commonly available—on the newsstands, in schools, in professional societies and political conferences—and almost universally tolerated, even by governments committed to pursuing peace.

As the American Jewish Committee asserted, this sanctioning of hatred against Israel and Jews in general, profoundly complicates the search for Middle East peace, fostering a climate in which compromise, accommodation, trust and understanding—on both sides—may be unattainable. This virulent hatred is simply incompatible with the search for peace, and it is the obligation of the region's leaders to act firmly against its continuing dissemination.

I am grateful that the American Jewish Committee distilled the essence of its testimony on this subject in an ad-

vertisement that ran on the Op-ed Page of the New York Times on Tuesday, April 11. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the AJC ad be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, April 11, 2000]

HATRED VERSUS PEACE

A comprehensive and durable Arab-Israeli peace requires more than signed agreements. What is needed are concrete steps to build a culture of peace.

As Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak takes bold and courageous initiatives to achieve a permanent settlement with the Palestinians, to withdraw Israeli forces from southern Lebanon, and to negotiate with Syria, hatred of Jews seethes in the Arab government-controlled media, and in many Arab schools, religious institutions, and professional societies.

Some recent examples:

The Palestinian Authority-appointed Islamic Mufti of Jerusalem last month publicly trivialized the Holocaust just before meeting with Pope John Paul II, echoing a view often published in newspaper articles and editorials across the Arab world.

Syrian textbooks are replete with anti-Semitism, Holocaust denial, and open calls for the extermination of Jews.

Professional societies in Egypt and Jordan, countries formally at peace with Israel, prohibit contact with Israelis. The Jordanian Journalists' Association expelled one member for committing the "crime" of visiting Israel and compelled three others to sign an apology.

While Israeli diplomats originally invited to a University of Cairo conference on March 28 were turned away at the door, the Arab League, also meeting in the Egyptian capital, called for an immediate end to Jewish immigration to Israel.

The Palestinian Authority's official news outlets regularly assert that Israel is spreading viruses throughout the Arab world.

Arab media have depicted, in words and cartoons, Israeli Prime Minister Barak and Foreign Minister David Levy as Nazis.

Such virulent anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial in the Arab world must no longer be tolerated.

The spreading of hatred and the pursuit of peace cannot coexist. Which will it be? The fate of the region may depend on the answer.

SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES, DIFFERENT OUTCOMES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last week, as the one-year anniversary of the Columbine shooting approached, rumors of copycat violence prompted panic among teachers and students. Principals and administrators sensitive to such rumors heightened security by bringing in police protection and extra security guards. Other districts relied on parents and community volunteers to monitor school activity, and still others canceled classes altogether rather than suffer the fate of a school shooting, or even the threat of one.

For the most part, on the day the nation remembered Columbine, the rumors turned out to be just that—rumors. But the day did not go by without an act of copycat violence. The tragedy occurred, not here in the United States, but in Ottawa in the province of Ontario, Canada.

An article in the Ottawa Citizen describes the attack by a 15-year-old boy as one directly linked to the Columbine killings. The teen-age boy was apparently obsessed with the school massacre, and reportedly had photographs of the Columbine killers posted in his school locker. Students remember the accused counting down the days in eager anticipation of the exact moment Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold began their reign of terror.

In many ways, the student in Ottawa had similar experiences to those of Harris and Klebold. Classmates teased him because of his appearance. He felt depressed and suicidal. He longed to be noticed, and perhaps thought this act of violence would give him the notoriety he craved. And so, exactly one year and a few minutes after the Columbine massacre began, a boy in Ottawa picked up his backpack and pulled out his weapon.

Both scenarios seem similar but there is one critical difference between the now infamous April 20th act of violence in Littleton and the more recent one in Ottawa that garnered virtually no attention. That crucial, critical difference—the weapon.

Despite the Canadian boy's obsession with Columbine, his copycat crime was not carried out with an arsenal of semiautomatic guns, but with a kitchen knife. The weapon he pulled from his backpack caused great pain and anguish, but in the end, none of the five people he stabbed sustained any life-threatening injuries. By comparison, the Columbine rampage left fifteen dead and more than two dozen injured, some of whom still have fragments of ammunition lodged deep in their bodies.

The circumstances of these cases were similar, but the outcomes were different because one country successfully limits access to firearms among young people, and one does not. In Canada, citizens are subject to licensing and registration requirements and have limited access to handguns and certain assault weapons. In the United States, our gun laws are so riddled with loopholes a 15 year old can legally possess an assault rifle.

I've often made the point that Canadian children, who watch the same movies and television programs, and play with the same toys and video games, are far safer than their American counterparts. The key difference between these children is not morals, religion or family, the difference is access to guns.

How else can one explain that in 1997, the U.S. rate of death involving firearms was approximately 14 per 100,000, compared to Canada's rate of 4 per 100,000? In 1997, in my hometown of Detroit, there were 354 firearm homicides. In Windsor, the Canadian town that is across the river, there were only 4 firearm homicides for that same year. Accounting for population, Detroit's firearm homicide rate was 18 times higher than Windsor's.