

this would mean if it fell into the hands of terrorists. They could theoretically steal a nuclear device and either arm it or disarm it. That is the kind of information for which we cannot account.

Earlier today this body voted 97-0 to confirm the new czar, Gen. John Gordon, who has been waiting since May for confirmation. It had been held up by Members on the other side who had a hold on his nomination. The question of responsibility is a reasonable one. We had the assurance of the Secretary of Energy that he bore the responsibility for security in the laboratories after we had the Wen Ho Lee incident. That was widely publicized; it was widely debated. Not only that, at that time, Members will recall, there was a special commission set up. This commission came as a result of a report from the House. That report ultimately resulted in the appointment of a former respected Senator, Warren Rudman, who has since retired. The purpose of that report was to analyze the security at the laboratories at that particular time.

I will read a couple of inserts and findings from that report because I think they bear on the credibility of what we are hearing from the Department of Energy. One of the findings stated:

More than 25 years worth of reports, studies and formal inquiries—by executive branch agencies, Congress, independent panels, and even the DOE itself—have identified a multitude of chronic security and counterintelligence problems at all of the weapons labs.

Critical security flaws . . . have been cited for immediate attention and resolution . . . over and over and over . . . ad nauseam.

They haven't been corrected.

Further, the report again was the Rudman report. The open-source information alone on the weapons laboratories overwhelmingly supports a troubling conclusion: Their security and counterintelligence operations have been seriously hobbled and relegated to low-priority status for decades.

That, again, is associated with the Wen Ho Lee security breach.

Finally, Senator Warren Rudman indicates:

The Department of Energy is a dysfunctional bureaucracy that has proven it is incapable of reforming itself. Accountability at DOE has been spread so thinly and erratically that it is now almost impossible to find.

Well, we heard this morning that the Secretary is going to appoint—or has appointed—our respected colleague, Senator Howard Baker, and a very distinguished House Member, Lee Hamilton, to give a report on the findings as to the security adequacy at the labs. Well, I welcome this in one sense, and I reflect on it with some question in another, because clearly what Senator Rudman recommended in his report, "Science at its Best; Security at its Worst" was not followed by the Department of Energy.

The action taken by both the Senate and the House in the manner in which

we proceeded with legislation to authorize an energy czar was objected to by the Secretary of Energy through the entire process, almost to the point of eluding congressional intent in the law, and the fact that others felt inclined to hold up his nomination until the vote today, 97-0. I think that reflects on the squeaky wheel theory. The wheel squeaks enough today, and we finally put our czar, Gen. John Gordon, in a responsible position.

But the barn door has been left open, and it is inconceivable to me that we have not had adequate explanations of how this could occur. You can go to the library and get a card, take out a book, and they know who took out the book. If you are overdue, you pay a penalty. But not in the Department of Energy secured area. They have their so-called nest people who have access to this. It is estimated that that number is 86 or so. They take this material in and out.

What happened is rather interesting on this particular day, according to the testimony we had. I will leave you with this concluding thought: On May 7, the fire was moving toward the laboratory. The obligation of this nest group is to ensure that if the laboratories were to fall victim to the fire so that no one could get in for a period of time, they would have these hard drives available if somewhere there were a nuclear device that was prepared to or exposed somewhere to go off, that this team could take this technology on these two hard drives and go off and disarm them. They had that obligation. So they proceeded to go into the secured area and they asked permission and got permission from one of the deputies to enter. They went to remove the two hard drive disks, and they found that they were gone; they weren't there.

Now, what they did is rather interesting. They didn't notify their senior officials. They simply moved over to another shelf where a duplication of these hard drives was available and they took those. Then, after the fire, they went back and searched the place, could not find it, and finally they reported it, I think, on May 24. It was a timeframe from May 7, when the fire started, and on May 24 a team went back and searched again, and then at about the end of May, they called the DOE and in early June the story broke.

Those are the facts up until now. When you hear the explanations, you just shake your head and say, how could this happen? And then, of course, the questions we have are: Who might have this information? If they had it, what might they be able to do with it?

Some of these questions have to be responded to in a secure environment because of the national security interest. Some have said, well, the appropriators didn't give them enough money to ensure a foolproof system. They asked for \$35 million and I think they got \$7 million. It doesn't take \$7 million to put in a foolproof checkout system. They don't even have cameras in these secured areas. They don't know

who is going in and out—other than they have to have a certain security clearance to go in. But there is no checkout system. It is unbelievable.

We need answers and we are going to pursue this matter. As a consequence of the situation to date, clearly, the DOE and the labs have not been under control. I hope now that we have cleared the nomination, with the vote of 97-0, of the National Nuclear Security Administrator, that process can get underway. But there are a lot of questions that remain. The two missing hard drives contain secrets about every nuclear weapon in the world—just not ours. We should pursue this matter because clearly the buck has to stop somewhere.

When Congressmen NORM DICKS and CHRISTOPHER COX in their report concluded that China had design information—the Wen Ho Lee case—that should have been enough. The report by Senator Warren Rudman should have been an alarm, and the action by the Senate and the House to establish the energy czar should have been enough. But it wasn't. Today, as I said, the squeaky wheel got some grease. We have Gen. John Gordon in the position, but we have a lot of questions unanswered and a lot of people who assured us that they bore the responsibility that everything was under control. We found out today that it isn't.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

#### THE SITUATION AT LOS ALAMOS LABORATORIES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I, too, was attending the joint committee hearing this morning on the situation at the laboratories at Los Alamos that FRANK MURKOWSKI chaired, along with RICHARD SHELBY.

I must tell you that it was shocking and angering to watch an administration that recognized a problem and failed to do anything about it—or very little—and then to ignore a Congress that recognized the problem after extensive hearings and which passed legislation last year into law, and we have a Secretary of Energy who ignored it and openly denied that he would do it. And then for the Secretary not to show up this morning at a hearing—I am not sure how we respond to it.

But I will tell you how the American people ought to respond to it. They ought to say: Mr. Secretary, you have failed and you have failed us in the security of our country. We ask that we find someone better to serve in that capacity.

That is what the American people ought to be saying. And I hope they will.

#### THE RIGHT TO SELF-DEFENSE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have come to the floor for the next few minutes to talk about something that is

very important to our country. Last week, I rose in defense of the second amendment to our Constitution. Why? Because it is under relentless attack at this moment by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is under relentless attack by the White House and has been now for nearly 8 solid years. They want to deny that there is a second amendment, or that there are legitimate rights under that amendment, and they simply want to control or shape what many Americans believe to be their constitutional right under the second amendment, and that is the right to own a firearm in this Nation.

The second amendment reads:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

It is a simple amendment, but, oh, what a powerful force it brings; and, oh, what important emotions it engenders in our country.

The enemies of the right to keep and bear arms tell us that because the word "militia" is present, the second amendment only protects the right of the Government to keep and bear arms.

If anyone in this body is a student of American history and understands the thinking of our Founding Fathers, they recognize their hostility toward a central government and their willingness to control a central government and give the citizens the greater expression of freedom but, most importantly, power over that central government.

Somehow, our colleague would like to ignore those thoughts and the mind set and the belief of the framers of our Constitution. But let me tell you that our framers knew what they were talking about. They said, "A well regulated Militia" means, in the words of George Mason, "the whole people"—"the whole people" was the regulation militia—"except a few public officers."

So never mind their restrictive reading of the Constitution. I think our scholars of history have widely recognized and rejected the idea that there is a narrow interpretation.

They tell us the second amendment only protects hunting and sport shooting. Read the Constitution. It is so very clear. It doesn't even mention the words "hunting and sport shooting." I don't believe the term "sport shooting" was something used in those days. Hunting certainly was perceived to be a right, and even a responsibility, and a necessary tool of many families to put food on the table.

They cite Supreme Court cases—such as *United States v. Miller*—that state the second amendment protects private ownership of military-style weapons; then they try to ban private ownership of military-style weapons. How can you use the argument to argue its purpose and then turn and try to do quite the opposite?

I will simply point out for a few brief moments this afternoon the real inconsistencies in the argument that is presented by my colleagues on the other

side and the blatant ignoring of our Constitution by the White House. But then those of us who are observers of the White House are not terribly surprised by that.

Am I being harsh? I don't think so, Mr. President. I think I am being very clear in what I say.

Senate gun controllers have said they do not want to confiscate the guns of Americans. But then other leaders in other countries—including Great Britain, Nazi Germany, Cambodia, Australia, Cuba, and Soviet Georgia—have said the same, and they would only license and register, and not confiscate. And, of course, they did license, they did register, and then they confiscated.

With my time remaining, let me point to a few examples as to why our Government said there was a right and why our Founding Fathers said under our Constitution there is a right.

Every 13 seconds, the stories I am about to tell you are repeated across this Nation. Every 13 seconds in America, someone uses a gun—not to kill someone else, but to stop a crime, to protect their property, to protect their life. Every 13 seconds across America, our citizens do what our Founding Fathers knew they must do as a free citizen; that is, protect themselves in the right of self-defense. That is so much what our second amendment is about.

Let me tell you about this lady, whom I show here on the chart, from Spring Hill, FL, May 24 of this year. It says: "A pistol-packing grandmother with a license to carry calmly approached a man with a knife who was scuffling with employees at a Wal-Mart and ordered him to drop" the knife. He dropped the knife. She held him at bay. They called the cops, and the cops arrested him.

Thank you, grandma, for being willing to defend your rights and the integrity of others.

Let me talk about someone who invaded the home of one of our citizens in Benton Harbor in Berrien County.

Prosecutor Jim Cherry announced Thursday he will not file homicide charges against a man who shot and killed Rodney Lee Moore last month at a Benton Harbor housing complex.

Why? Because this man was defending his life and defending the life of his family. He had been attacked. He had been injured. And yet, he struggled, he found his gun, and he protected his person by taking the intruder's life.

That is the right of a free citizen in a free society—to defend oneself and one's property.

One more example. I know there are other colleagues on the floor who wish to speak on other issues. But it is an important example.

It was the night of January 31 of this year in Apache Junction, AR, 25 miles from Phoenix. It began when a woman was getting into her SUV in a Wal-Mart parking lot in nearby Chandler. She was approached by a man riding a bicycle. He pulled out a gun, forced her into her SUV, and made her drive to an

isolated area 15 miles away. He raped her. Then he abandoned her in the desert.

According to the Chandler Police Department sergeant, Ken Phillips, "He left her in a desert area and starts to drive away, but turns around, comes back, and he shoots her twice." The woman, suffering from bullet wounds in her face, her chest, and her arm, was miraculously able to walk a quarter of a mile for help.

This dangerous criminal then drove his victim's SUV to the home of his former boss, Jeff Tribble. In that home, Mr. Tribble, his 28-year-old wife Bricie, and their 9-year-old nephew resided. The criminal broke into their house. What happened? Sergeant Phillips said that this gentleman's wife, Mr. Tribble's wife, got her gun and shot the criminal twice—once in the face and once in the chest—and he dropped dead. Then she called 911 to report the shooting of an intruder who had just hours before raped and shot another person.

Those are the stories that are not being told to America today. And they happen every 13 seconds across our Nation. Two and one-half million Americans annually use the second amendment right to protect themselves, their property, their children, and their spouses. That is the right of a free citizen. That is why the second amendment is in the Constitution.

I do not in any way by these statements fail to recognize the tragedies that occur when a gun is misused in our society. It is misused much too often. But it is time we speak out.

I have said several times to those who may be listening or who might read my statement to call me or write me. Tell me about your story. Tell me about what happened in your community. Literally, citizens are now doing that. Tell me about the right of the free citizen to protect themselves and their property.

It is very simple. It is, LARRY CRAIG, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC, 20510.

I would like to hear from you. I think it is time America is heard, about how other Americans use their sacred right of the second amendment to protect themselves and their loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### UNITED STATES NONMILITARY ARSENALS

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, Chairman WARNER, and also the ranking member, Senator LEVIN, for the amendment I offered, that they have accepted, I am told. My amendment addresses the situation with our Nation's military arsenals.

We have the Rock Island arsenal in Rock Island, IL. It lies on an island in the Mississippi River between the border of Illinois and Iowa. The Rock Island Arsenal dates back to just about