Mr. President, before the

Senator from Connecticut leaves the

floor, I wish to thank him and acknowledge

all the work he has done

over the past year or more on this

issue. He has, in a sense, exercised

some forbearance in the past when he

thought it might have been more appropriate

to make a stronger move, but

because of circumstances within Russia

and our bilateral relations and the

hope—not expectation—that there may

be a way to get this done, he has cooperated.

I think everybody should understand

the reason this issue has

stayed so much on the forefront is because

of his vigilance and his effort. I

thank him for that. I thank him as

well, along with other colleagues, for

entertaining some of the changes that

Senator LEVIN proposed. I think this is

a much better bill. I agree with him; I

think enough time has passed to demonstrate

that this may be the only

course left open, and hopefully it will

work.

In a strange sense, the Senator and I

have had occasion separately and individually,

as the Presiding Officer has,

to meet with members of the Russian

Duma, members of the Russian Government,

and members of the leadership of

the various Arab states. I find it

counterintuitive that they don’t understand,

quite frankly, that what is happening

in Iran and their quest for this

missile technology is literally a greater

threat to them than it is to us. It is

no greater threat to anyone than

Israel; nonetheless, it is an incredibly

significant threat to our friends in Europe,

as well as our Arab friends. What

is going on in North Korea is a threat

to China and Russia in the long term,

not only Japan and South Korea. What

is going on in Iraq is a greater threat

to our French friends—who seem to

support Iraq against their own interests—

than it is to us.

I am wondering when reason will

take hold. I am a little bit dismayed,

and more than a little bit miffed, by

the ability of our friends, as well as

those who are not viewed as our close

friends, to dismiss reality. What do

they think? If Russia is worried about

the radicalization of the Moslem populations

within the former Soviet

Union, the Trans-Caucasus, and other

places, why in the devil do they not understand

that what is going on in Iraq,

as well as in Iran—if it does not take a

drastic change in course—is inimical to

their interests? Ironically, the second

largest former Communist state—the

former Soviet Union—seems to be the

ultimate capitalist in this regard; but

they can’t add very well. This is, I

think, more about money than anything

else. Hopefully, as I will lay out

in my statement—and I don’t want to

delay the Senator any longer—they

will see the virtues of looking to the

West and not to Iran and Iraq for the

source of their economic survival. At

any rate, I thank the Senator very

much for his leadership. I wish the driver of that

express a lot of luck.

Maybe what Mr. Putin, who is the

Acting President and likely soon to be

elected President, it appears—maybe

we should send my mom over to see

him. My mom had an expression, from

the time we were kids, when you would

do something against your own interest

out of anger, or out of pique, or

misunderstanding. My mother would

say, ‘‘Don’t bite your nose off to spite

your face.’’ Well, we have a whole lot of

Russians seeming to bite their noses

off to spite their faces. I find it absolutely

astounding what they appear to

continue to do.

The bill before us is called the Iran

Nonproliferation Act. That is the context

in which we should talk about

this, and I think we should understand

this. The purpose of this bill is not to

punish, but rather to restrain. The goal

that we pursue is not to invoke sanctions,

but rather to make this a safer

world for all of us, including the Russians.

The means to that end is to

make this a world with fewer weapons

of mass destruction and with fewer delivery

systems able to deliver weapons

of mass destruction, notably long range

ballistic missiles.

Long-range ballistic missiles are a

curious invention. They are awesome,

frankly, but they don’t amount to

much as a military weapon unless they

are armed with a powerful warhead.

Now, the sort of long-range missile

that Third World countries might build

—and that the countries I have mentioned

are attempting to build, or have

built—those missiles cannot carry big

enough warheads to do much damage

with a conventional high explosive, a

plain old bomb; they are too heavy.

The missile is not big enough, powerful

enough, does not have enough throw

weight to carry conventional weapons.

So the irony is that a country which

develops or buys long-range ballistic

missiles is all too likely, therefore, to

seek weapons of mass destruction, such

as nuclear warheads that are lighter

and have much more—no pun intended

—bang for the buck than a conventional

weapon, or even potentially a

lighter payload, with chemical weapons

or biological weapons on top of these

missiles. The irony is that as they develop

a long-range ballistic missile capacity,

they are led inextricably—if

they are going to be of any ‘‘value’’

militarily—they move toward weapons

of mass destruction with which to arm

the missiles.

North Korea has been trying to build

a nuclear weapon. Iraq has built chemical

and biological weapons and is

seeking a nuclear capability. They

were close to building a nuclear weapon

a decade ago. Similarly, Iran has a

covert nuclear weapons program. Even

the Government of Russia admits that.

Iran has also developed and used chemical

weapons. Now, again, that is chemical

weapons that, based on the missile

technology they may have acquired,

even if they have a range of 2,000 miles,

as my friend from Connecticut indicated,

doesn’t get them to Washington,

DC. It doesn’t get them to any U.S. territory.

But it does get them to a lot of

areas of the world where our friends—

in this case, the Russians—can be affected.

We have to stop this as best we can.

The world must move toward fewer

weapons of mass destruction, not more

of them. We have to reduce the number

of long-range ballistic missiles in the

world, not increase them. Unfortunately,

some foreign persons—and I say

‘‘persons’’ because that is the legal

word in this legislation for officials or

entities; by ‘‘entities’’ we mean the

Russian agency comparable to our

space agency, NASA, or the agency in

Russia comparable to our Defense Department,

or institutes, or companies.

In Russia, institutes or companies cannot

be separated very clearly from the

Government.

Unfortunately, some of these foreign

‘‘persons’’—in Russia, China, and North

Korea—are deaf to the world’s call for

nonproliferation and apparently tone

deaf to their own interests. The countries

or entities are so desperate for

cash or so angry at the West that they

will risk Armageddon by helping Iran

build long-range ballistic missiles or

even nuclear weapons.

As ironic as this sounds, this legislation

is designed in part to save them

from their own destructive impulses.

The United States has imposed sanctions

at times on entities from all

three of these supplier countries.

Again, by the ‘‘supplier’’ countries I

mean North Korea, China, and Russia.

The United States has imposed sanctions

on entities from these countries

and is continuing negotiations with all

of these countries to secure an end to

their assistance to Iran. While we may

hope for success in the months or years

to come, however, there has been little

success so far.

Today the Senate will vote to make

the President list the offending ‘‘persons;’’

to increase his powers to impose

sanctions against them; and to limit

United States support for Russian work

on the international space station if

any entities under the Russian Aviation

and Space Agency continue to assist

Iran, which we have reason to believe

they have.

It is important to understand that

H.R. 1883, which we will shortly pass, is

not an anti-Russian bill. Rather, it is

simply and overwhelmingly a nonproliferation

bill. Both I and the Senate

sponsors of this bill would like

nothing better than to have this bill

result in no sanctions whatever against

Russia.

While we try to crack down on entities

that assist Iran’s long-range ballistic

missile programs, we also support

nonproliferation of assistance to Russia.

We continue to help Russia reduce

its unneeded strategic weapons

through the Nunn-Lugar program, protect

its sensitive nuclear materials,

help it find new careers for excess

weapon scientists, and improve its export

control laws. Those are the laws

that are on the books, and should be

enforced, which would prevent any

agency or company within Russia from

transferring usable information to aid

and abet Iran in their long-range missile

programs.

We are helping Russia in other ways,

as well, so this should not be taken in

isolation. This is part of a continuum

of efforts on our part to deal with the

interests of our country as well as Russia.

The United States Government,

with the support of many in this body,

also continues to work with Russia on

many other vital issues. We seek continued

strategic arms reductions,

through the so-called START process.

We support the sharing of missile

warning data. We are working to preserve

the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty,

the ABM Treaty, with an amendment

that allows for—again, in Russia’s interests—

a limited ballistic missile defense.

Again, we pointed out that North

Korea and Iran present a greater danger

to them than they do to the United

States.

The United States and other Western

countries also offer the investment on

which Russia’s economic development

depends. United States companies even

buy ballistic missile engines from Russia’s

top design bureaus. Our American

companies are purchasing directly

from Russian design entities. We are

buying engines that they are producing,

from which they are making

substantial money. Iran cannot begin

to match the power of the United

States to sustain and transform Russian

industry. In other words, they will

make a heck of a lot more money doing

the right thing, dealing with the

United States and with the Western

Europeans and Japan, than they will

ever make from selling technology to

Iran. I urge Russian leaders to think

about that.

I wonder, with all the chaos that is in

place in Russia, whether anybody at

the top has ever really focused on this.

In pure unadulterated dollars and

cents, what is in Russia’s economic interest

is to sell to the West rather than

to sell to Iran. If the choice is starkly

made, which we are about to do, I hope

they will focus more logically on their

alternatives.

This bill and the Senate are not anti-

Russian, but we are manifestly antiproliferation.

We will not tolerate vicious

and venal persons plunging the

world into a new cold war, let alone a

hot one in which weapons of mass destruction

would be a freely traded currency

of death. If Russia or China or

North Korea should choose the path of

proliferation—and they have to some

degree already done that—we will show

that there are better paths to power

and prestige than proliferating ballistic

missiles and weapons of mass destruction

to Third World countries

with unstable regimes. There is still

time to stamp out proliferation and to

put the world on a more peaceful path,

but we must not and we will not collaborate

in sowing the seeds of global

destruction through proliferation.

It is unfortunate that the Senate action

occurs only weeks before next

month’s Presidential elections in Russia.

The need to pass this legislation is

not our fault, that is Russia’s fault.

Some in that country between now and

those elections may try to use our action

to stir up a nationalistic reaction

for their own political purposes in the

upcoming Russian election. That would

be both unwise and ill founded. It is

also unfortunate that the House authors

of this bill insisted upon triggering

Presidential reporting and possible

sanctions based upon a very low

standard of evidence. In practice, however,

no President will impose sanctions

unless he is convinced that

wrongdoing has occurred, notwithstanding

the fact that the House standard

of evidence is too low a threshold.

Finally, I regret that this bill does

not permit the President to authorize

extraordinary payments for work on

the international space station, if

those payments should be needed, to

protect sensitive intelligence information.

Neither does it permit payments

to a sanctioned entity if such payments

are needed to prevent significant

dangers to the crew of the space station.

I do not think either of those are

wise restrictions, and I hope these concerns

can be addressed in conference

between the House and Senate.

The important fact is, however, that

the Senate action today is a measure

not of anti-Russian sentiment, nor of

any impulse to bully. Rather, it reflects

the depth of our concern and also

our frustration over the increasing risk

that Russian and other entities will

recklessly open Pandora’s box, against

their own interest as well as ours.

I earnestly hope that in the coming

weeks, our President and the newly

elected President of Russia can put us

back on the track of peaceful cooperation

to make this a safer and more

prosperous world. That is a real prospect

for both countries, if Russia would

only accept that its profit and its destiny

lies in the West, not in the East.

Perhaps passage of this bill will help

to bring about such a reevaluation. If

so, then prospects for the new century

on which we have just embarked would

truly be improved. If not, it puts us on

a perilous slope to more proliferation

and colder, not warmer, relations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.