

project, which was funded by the U.S. Cooperative Threat Reduction Program under the Nunn-Lugar Act. The law was named for its sponsors, Sen. Richard G. Lugar, Indiana Republican, and then-Sen. Sam Nunn, Georgia Democrat.

A torpedo factory in Almaty that had been converted to civilian work was assigned to manufacture big steel canisters in which four or six of the plutonium-rich assemblies—some “hot,” some “cooled”—were packed together and sealed before being returned to the cooling pond.

Weighing more than a ton, the filled canisters are far too heavy to be handled by anything but a large robot, and all of them now emit lethal doses of radiation.

Last month, after nearly three years and \$43 million in U.S. support, the 478th and last canister was welded shut and lowered into the pond.

At the plant, Mr. Crane said, there are now manned gates, closed-circuit TV cameras, X-ray machines and turnstiles with magnetic cards, along with sensors that monitor the nuclear materials around the clock.

The packing is designed to last 50 years, but the plutonium isn’t destined to stay at the closed Aktau plant that long.

Eventually, under a decree signed six months ago by Mr. Nazarbayev, the canisters will be taken 2,750 miles by train to the former nuclear-testing grounds at Semipalatinsk, on the other side of this country four times the size of Texas.

There, silos will be dug into the steppe and the fat cylinders will be buried, using a technique perfected in the United States.

“It will be the longest rail shipment of plutonium ever attempted,” said Miss Dedik. “They will have to design special transportation casks.”

And since the rail line wanders through what is now Russia and Kyrgyzstan, special loops will have to be built so that the plutonium stays in Kazakhstan during its whole voyage.

CONTROLLING THE PROLIFERATION OF SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, last week I came to the floor to express my concern about U.S. policy at the U.N. Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

This was the first effort by the international community to address the issue of the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons at the United Nations. I believed it was imperative that the United States take a leadership role in the conference rather than being an impediment to progress.

It seemed to me, that the position staked out by Undersecretary Bolton in his opening statement at the conference—a position which I found to be unwarranted and unwise—had created the very real possibility the conference, because of the U.S. position, would be doomed to failure.

The conference did not fail—a consensus on a program of action was achieved. But the conference was far from a total success.

The conference had presented the international community with an unparalleled opportunity to take meaningful and concrete steps to develop and implement a clear international plan of action.

Instead the program of action, approved by the conference, is all too often silent on important issues, and all too often weak and equivocal in places where a course of action is needed.

The program of action does contain provisions addressing such critical issues as: establishing national regulations on arms brokers; the need for greater security of weapons stockpiles held by states; a commitment to carry out more effective post-conflict disarmament and demobilization programs, including the destruction of surplus stocks; and, criminalizing the illegal production, possession, stockpiling, and trade of small arms and light weapons.

If individual nations and the international community are able to effectively follow through in these areas it will mark a significant step forward on this issue.

And, just as importantly, the program of action calls for a follow-up conference, no later than 2006, the time and place to be determined by the 58th United Nations General Assembly.

Unfortunately, consensus on the program of action was only achieved after lengthy and sometimes acrimonious negotiations.

Many of the participants—especially those from sub-Saharan Africa, which has been hit so hard by the scourge of small arms and light weapons—have come away with a deep sense of disappointment that more was not accomplished.

And they are laying the blame for much of the conference’s shortcomings squarely at the feet of the United States.

A number of critical issues were left out of the final program of action, including: failure to reach a commitment to negotiate international treaties on arms brokering or the marking and tracing of weapons; absence of any reference to regulate civilian ownership of weapons; no reference to protecting human rights; and, a lack of commitment to greater transparency on the trade in small arms and light weapons.

In addition, in all too many cases the forward looking action that was agreed on is to take place “within existing resources” rather than with the additional resources that are required to address this issue—or to only be carried out “as appropriate” allowing wide latitude for interpretation.

Considering the strong commitments for such issues as international agreements on brokering and the marking and tracing of weapons in the earlier drafts of the Program of action, it is very disappointing that these items were blocked from inclusion in the final document.

While some of the blame must also be allotted to others, the United States must face up to the role it played in impeding action on some of these issues—including in areas where the United States itself already has strong laws on the books.

For example, there were legitimate questions about what the appropriate language for the program of action should have been regarding private ownership of small arms and light weapons. But it is important to recognize that U.S. law and numerous Supreme Court rulings recognize that government regulations on private ownership of weapons is legitimate, notwithstanding somewhat spurious arguments about the nature of the Second Amendment raised by some who influenced the U.S. position at the conference.

The National Firearms Act and the assault weapons ban are just two of the laws that the United States has on the books which control private ownership of small arms and light weapons and pass constitutional muster.

For the United States to stand in the way of a non-binding document suggesting international efforts to seek ways, consistent with individual national constitutional and political structures, to control private ownership of small arms and light weapons is, to me at least, mind boggling.

This is especially important given the clear nexus between legal trade and private ownership and the growth of the international black market in small arms and light weapons.

According to the independent Small Arms Survey 2001 by the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, Switzerland, the black market often operates on a individual basis, where a small numbers of legally purchased guns are sold to illegal buyers across international borders.

Such individual black market transfers have a dramatic cumulative effect. The United States, with its huge stores of privately-held firearms, is both a source, a supplier, and a recipient of these transfers.

Although it is very difficult to quantify illicit arms trafficking in the United States, there are clear indicators that a number of criminal gangs operating on U.S. territory are active in the trafficking of small arms and light weapons into Canada and Mexico.

The United States is the largest source of illegal weapons for Mexico, for example, with this arms trade directly linked to the drug trade.

I believe that Ambassador McConnell and Assistant Secretary Bloomfield and others on the U.S. delegation acted to the best of their abilities to represent the United States. But I am also concerned that the unrelenting unilateralist position taken by the United States has served to undermine and damage our reputation as a leader in the international community.

The majority of delegations at the conference expressed displeasure with the U.S. attitude and approach to the meetings, sometimes in terms that verged on the undiplomatic.

For example, Camilio Reyes of Colombia, the president of the conference—who deserves recognition for

his hard work on this issue—said at the conference's close that: "I must express my disappointment over the conference's inability to agree due to the concerns of one State on language recognizing the needs to establish and maintain controls over private ownership of these deadly weapons and the need for preventing sales of such arms to nonstate groups." Both of these issues were blocked by the United States.

As I stated on the floor last week, I believe that the global flood of small arms is a real and pressing threat to peace, development, democracy, human rights, and U.S. national security interests around the world.

These weapons are cheap: An AK-47 can be bought for as little as \$15 in sub-Saharan Africa.

They are durable and easy to transport and to smuggle across international boundaries.

And, with little or no training, anyone—including children—can use these weapons to deadly effect.

According to the independent Small Arms Survey 2001, small arms are implicated in well over 1,000 deaths around the world every single day.

The goals of the United Nations conference was not to infringe on national sovereignty or to take guns away from their legal owners. And it would not have, in my opinion, even with the inclusion of some of the language to which the United States objected.

The freedoms and rights of American citizens would not have been diminished by a stronger, more forward looking program of action.

As Secretary General Annan stated, the goals of the conference were to address the problems created by "unscrupulous arms dealers, corrupt officials, drug trafficking syndicates, terrorists and others who bring death and mayhem into streets, schools and towns throughout the world."

The conference's program of action represents an important first step by the international community toward developing an international framework for cooperation and collaboration to promote better national and international laws and more effective regulations to eliminate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

In fact, the United States has not formally consented to the program for action, so this is a step I urge the Administration to take as soon as possible.

And much more will be needed in the future. Many important issues that should have been addressed by the conference were not and other issues that were did not receive sufficient emphasis.

I am hopeful that, looking ahead, the United States will be able to play a more constructive leadership role as we work towards developing real and binding international norms and agreements on these issues.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 28, 1993 in New York City. Two gay men were beaten with a golf club by three men outside a Greenwich Village gay bar. Noel Torres, Joseph Vasquez, and David Santiago were charged in connection with the assault.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

HONORING THE HISTORY OF THE U.S.S. CASSIN YOUNG, DD-793

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise today to call attention to an important date in the history of a valiant ship, the U.S. Navy Destroyer U.S.S. *Cassin Young*, DD-793.

The ship today is moored with the U.S.S. *Constitution* in Charlestown, MA, and has been open to the public under the custody of the National Park Service since 1981.

The *Cassin Young* was constructed at the Bethlehem Steel Shipyards in San Pedro, CA, and commissioned on December 31, 1943. She was named for Captain Cassin Young, a true naval hero who received the Medal of Honor for valor during the attack on Pearl Harbor and who later lost his life during the great naval battle off Guadalcanal on Friday, November 13, 1942.

From early 1944 until the end of World War II in 1946, the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* was involved in active combat operations. She suffered strafing off the island of Formosa in 1944 and withstood two Japanese kamikaze attacks, one of them causing heavy damage. Despite this damage, the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* was repaired locally and returned to the battle line. The ship was the last destroyer to be struck by a kamikaze during the fight for Okinawa, a battle that was so destructive to the U.S. destroyer fleet. The U.S.S. *Cassin Young* lost 21 crew members and saw approximately 100 others injured in combat.

At war's end, the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* rested in mothballs until the Korean War brought expansion of the U.S. fleet and she was recommissioned on September 7, 1951, in Long Beach, CA. During her second tour of active duty, the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* operated with both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean Fleets and completed a voyage around

the world to the Philippines and Korea. She returned to the western hemisphere via the Panama Canal and joined the Atlantic Reserve Fleet in April 1960.

In addition to her many Service Ribbons and Battle Stars, the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* received the Navy Unit Citation and the Philippine Presidential Unit Citation for her actions during World War II and also was given the Korean Presidential Unit Citation during the Korean War.

In 1978, the National Park Service acquired the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* and painstakingly restored her to the configuration under which she sailed in the 1950s. Ceremonies commemorating the second commissioning of the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* are scheduled to take place on August 18, 2001, when the ship will undertake a towed sea trial of Boston Harbor. Some 500 individuals, including many of the original crew members from both of her tours of duty, will be on board the ship as it tours the waters off Massachusetts' capital city. Former crew members and friends of the ship have created the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* Association, which counts more than 400 men and women among its members.

Through the U.S.S. *Cassin Young*, the citizens of this country and visitors from abroad have the opportunity to experience firsthand an heroic vessel that represents the sacrifices of our Naval personnel during not one, but two, wars.

It is my sincere desire that the U.S.S. *Cassin Young* remain available to the people of this country far into the future so that she and those who served aboard her may continue to receive the honor they so deserve.

PRAISE ON THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I rise today in praise of the Americans with Disabilities Act on the occasion of its 11th anniversary. The advances in law, health care, education and technology promoted in this historic legislation over the past 11 years have given Americans with disabilities a new lease on life.

Today, 53 million Americans live with a disability, and 1 in 8 of them is severely disabled. According to the most recent data available, there are approximately 117,701 individuals sixteen years or older living with a disability in South Dakota and 57,233 who have a severe disability. Yet due to the landmark Americans with disabilities Act, the stereotypes against these persons are crumbling and they are able to lead increasingly integrated and fulfilled lives. The Act has guaranteed that people with disabilities be able to live in the most integrated settings possible in their communities. The Americans with Disabilities Act has also spurred research and improved care for seniors, children and mentally