

And some of my colleagues have been waiting for years to nail me to the wall. So . . . [laughter]

And I remind you of an old axiom: "beware of what you wish for." In fact, I understand, as Senator Mitchell has indicated, that I'm to be hung in the Senate lobby—out of sight from the public but not far from where distinguished Members have been known to lie down and take a nap.

[laughter]
So if nothing else, I'll be there to disturb your sleep.

[laughter]
I also want to thank the artist for doing something that eluded a host of high-priced campaign consultants and spin doctors: making me look presidential.

[laughter]
Mr. Kinstler certainly made the most of what he had to work with. It calls to mind the story of Abraham Lincoln, who was running for the Senate from Illinois against Stephen A. Douglas. At one point in the campaign, Douglas called his opponent two-faced. "I leave it to you," Lincoln told the audience. "If I had two faces, do you really think I would use this one?"

[laughter]
I know that actually happened because I was in the audience. So . . .

[laughter]
Coming back to this place is more than an exercise in nostalgia. If it feels like a homecoming—and it does—it is because of two families to whom I owe so much. Elizabeth, Robin, Gloria, my sister Norma Jean, and Gladys, my sister Gloria, of all the blessings bestowed on me, none can match your love and support. I want to thank you for being here today and for being there whenever in the past.

And then there is the Senate family. And like most families, it sometimes appears dysfunctional to those outside its ranks. So doubt could be a little—no doubt it could be a little more efficient, maybe a little less verbose. But we should never forget that all the talk and all those rules are put in place to safeguard our liberties. How much better are the raised voices of debate than the dull unanimity of the cell or the grim silence of the Gulag?

Standing in this room where so much history has been made, I can't help but reflect on lawmakers who not only made me a better Senator but a better person. And some are here today. Many are here today. In both parties. Others—too many others—are present in memory only. I think of Everett Dirksen and Hubert Humphrey and Barry Goldwater and Pat Moynihan, for starters. Each of them a patriot before he was a partisan.

But the Senate family is hardly limited to Senators. Rod, who just spoke, and Sheila Burke and Bob Lighthizer and Joyce McCluney, thank you for uncovering me today and for covering for me over the years.

[laughter]
You serve as stand-ins for hundreds of other dedicated staff members—many of whom are with us today—who made me look better than any artist could. Some of you greeted constituents or wrote press releases. Others crafted legislation or chased down missing Social Security checks or made certain that the voice of ordinary Kansans was heard in this capital city. Whatever you did, each of you has a place in the Senate's history and always a place in my heart.

When I left this building ten years ago, I said it was up to the electorate to decide my future address. And in their wisdom, they decided they'd rather see me in commercials than in the Oval Office.

[laughter]
And I have discovered that there is, indeed, life after the Senate.

If not like that other Senator.

So my final acknowledgment is to those to whom I owe my greatest debt: to the people of Kansas who came to my aid many, many times when I needed it and did it for many—more than 35 years. You honored me with your confidence and you entrusted me with your interests and ideals. And after today, thanks to the kindness of my colleagues, part of me will forever be joined in this—to this institution. But the greater part will be at home on the Kansas prairie, from which I draw whatever strength of character I brought to these halls.

So again, I thank you very much for being here. And may God Bless the United States Senate, and God Bless America. Thank you.

[applause]
Mr. REID: We've all heard people, including Senator Dole, say funny things about him. But everyone in this room should understand and acknowledge that we have a rare opportunity today to stand in the presence of a great man, a man who has changed the history of this country. Think about him.

He came from Kansas, went to fight in the war, was grievously wounded in that war. Spent not days, not weeks, not months, but years in a hospital with Senator Inouye—the same hospital—trying to make a new life out of a life that had been changed dramatically as a result of the physical damage to their bodies as a result of that war. Fought back. Decided he'd enter government and has done that to the betterment of us all.

Bob Dole, candidate for President. Bob Dole, Member of the United States Senate. Bob Dole, Majority Leader of the United States Senate. And he's done it with such grace and humor.

I've learned a number of things from Senator Dole. I've learned that you should try to be funny. But no one can be humorous like Senator Dole. I asked my staff, I said, "find some things that he said were funny." And there were volumes of stuff. But none of them seemed very funny reading them because it's his delivery. It's his delivery.

He said, "as long as there's only three or four senators on the floor, the country's in good shape. It's only when you have 50 or 60 of them on the floor you have to be concerned."

[laughter]
On seniority—he invented this. It's been used by many. "I used to think that seniority was a terrible thing when I didn't have any."

[laughter]
After his 1996 campaign: "Elizabeth's back at the Red Cross and I'm walking the dog."

[laughter]
And again after that same campaign, he said, "at least Elizabeth is the president of something."

[laughter]
Senator Dole has worked with Senator Byrd, Senator Mitchell, Senator Daschle. And as Senator Mitchell said, Senator Dole was a great advocate. I was there to witness his advocacy. But the thing about Senator Dole working with these three Senators that I've mentioned was that they all said things in a civil fashion to each other. And I—if I had to say in a sentence what Senator Dole has meant to me, it's this. And this is a quote. "Your political opponent does not have to be your enemy." We should all remember that, those of us who serve in public office. Just because you have someone that you're opposed to, a particular piece of legislation, that person's not an enemy.

So, Senator Dole, on behalf of the Reid Family, the Senate Family and our country, thank you very much for your service.

[laughter]
I would ask that Senator Dole, Elizabeth Dole come forward; Robin Dole, his daugh-

ter; Sheila Burke, who we all know; Robert Lighthizer, former staff; Joyce McCluney, former staff, please come forward.

[applause]
[inaudible conversation]
Mr. REID: There will be a reception in S-207. Everyone's invited.

A FEW BAD APPLES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, analyses of gun trace data has consistently found that a tiny percentage of our Nation's licensed gun dealers contribute to the vast majority of our Nation's crime guns.

This finding was first revealed in a 1995 report produced for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—ATF—by a team of researchers at Northeastern University. The report used trace data to identify patterns of firearm trafficking. It found that less than one percent of licensed gun dealers account for almost half of the traced crime guns.

Later analyses confirmed these findings. A report published by Senator SCHUMER used 1998 trace data to identify 137 dealers nationwide that sold more than 50 guns traced to crime. The 13 worst dealers were the source of 13,000 guns used in crimes that year.

In the "Commerce in Firearms" report released in February 2000, the ATF reported that only 1.2 percent of dealers, or about a thousand dealers, accounted for 57 percent of the crime guns that year. A smaller subset of only 330 dealers accounted for approximately 40 percent of the crime guns. Again, the trace data showed that a relatively small number of gun dealers were responsible for the diversion of a tremendous number of guns into the illegal market. The report also recognized that trace data should be used by manufacturers of firearms to ensure retail sellers act responsibly to prevent the diversion of guns into the illegal market.

In 2004, the Americans for Gun Safety Foundation released a report based on trace data introduced into evidence in a lawsuit brought against the gun industry by the NAACP that named the gun dealers who sold the most guns traced to crime. Dealers that sold 200 or more crime guns from 1996 to 2000 were listed by name and location. The publication of the report not only allowed local communities to know where high trace gun dealers were operating, but also handed the gun industry a specific list of dealers who were contributing the most guns to the illegal market.

In 2005 the ATF released a study that found that 97 rogue gun dealers had 11,840 guns "disappear" from their shops. These dealers accounted for 96 percent of the guns identified as missing from 3,083 Federal firearm licensees that the ATF inspected.

Over the last few years, crime gun tracing has produced a great deal of valuable information on how the illegal gun market is supplied. A small number of rogue gun dealers are playing a tremendous role in aiding gun

crimes by supplying thousands of guns to the criminal market. We must use this type of information to help point the way to policies that keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

COST ESTIMATES

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for three cost estimates from the Congressional Budget Office to be printed in the RECORD.

These estimates are for three important bills which the Committee on Foreign Relations has already reported to the Senate. They are S. 2489, S. 3709, and S. 3722.

The Standing Rules of the Senate require that committee reports on bills or joint resolutions contain cost estimates for such legislation.

When the Committee on Foreign Relations reported these bills earlier this year, the committee had not received the Congressional Budget Office's cost estimates.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 2489—U.S. Additional Protocol Implementation Act

Summary: S. 2489 would implement the obligations of the United States under the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America (hereafter called the Additional Protocol). The Additional Protocol was signed by the United States in 1998 and ratified by the Senate in 2004 (Treaty Document 107-7). The bill would authorize government agencies to conduct vulnerability assessments at government and commercial facilities to protect national security interests. The bill also would authorize the U.S. government to seek search warrants when owners of commercial facilities bar the government from entering the location in support of the IAEA inspections and would establish guidelines for conducting environmental sampling at both government and commercial locations.

CBO estimates that implementing S. 2489 would cost \$17 million in 2007 and \$72 million over the 2007–2011 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts.

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. CBO has thus not reviewed the bill for intergovernmental or private-sector mandates.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 2489 is shown in the following table. The costs would fall within budget functions 050 (national defense), 270 (energy), and 370 (commerce and housing credit). CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2007 and that the estimated amounts will be appropriated each year.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION					
Estimated Authorization Level ..	23	13	13	13	13
Estimated Outlays	17	15	14	13	13

Basis of estimate: Enacting S. 2489 would enable government agencies to implement the Additional Protocol. Specifically, the bill would:

Authorize government agencies to conduct vulnerability assessments at government and commercial facilities.

Designate government agencies to provide outreach programs to the commercial facilities and to issue regulations in order to implement the provisions of the Additional Protocol.

Authorize the federal government to seek search warrants when the owner of a commercial facility refuses to give consent for inspection by the IAEA, and

Set guidelines for the IAEA to conduct environmental sampling at government and commercial facilities.

CBO expects that most of the assessments would be performed by the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Department of Energy (DOE) at universities, fuel-fabrication plants, and commercial manufacturing sites currently working on DoD projects, as well as DOE labs. Although DoD and DOE already have the authority to perform such assessments, CBO believes that those agencies will not perform these assessments unless S. 2489 is enacted. Based on information from those two departments, CBO estimates that the Department of Defense would conduct about 50 assessments a year, while the Department of Energy would conduct about 50 assessments in 2007 and about 10 assessments each year thereafter, at an average cost of about \$200,000 per assessment. Accordingly, CBO estimates that conducting vulnerability assessments would cost \$15 million in 2007 and \$65 million over the 2007–2011 period, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts.

CBO expects that most of the outreach efforts would be performed by the Department of Commerce (DOC). DOC is developing a new database to support the reporting requirements of the Additional Protocol. The department also would conduct outreach, training, and inspection support programs at commercial facilities. CBO anticipates that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) staff would revise regulations to include the new requirements for implementing the Additional Protocol and would prepare guidance documents for its commercial licensees to prepare for the IAEA inspections. Under current law, 90 percent of the additional costs for the NRC would be covered by fees paid by operators of nuclear power plants. Based on information provided by DOC and NRC, CBO estimates that the net cost of these efforts would be \$2 million in 2007 and \$7 million over the 2007–2011 period.

CBO expects that most facilities would cooperate with the inspections and that the costs to seek and execute warrants required under the bill would be insignificant. Also, based on information from the State Department, CBO believes that the IAEA would not be able to conduct environmental sampling at government or commercial facilities because the United States, as a lawful nuclear weapons state, would forbid such sampling under existing treaty rights. Thus, CBO estimates that the U.S. government would incur no costs related to such sampling.

Intergovernmental and Private-Sector Impact: Section 4 of the UMRA excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international

treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. CBO has thus not reviewed the bill for intergovernmental or private sector mandates.

Previous CBO Estimate: On August 10, 2006, CBO transmitted an estimate for S. 3709, a bill to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 United States exports of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India, and to implement the United States Additional Protocol, as ordered reported on July 20, 2006. Title II of that bill is identical to S. 2489, and the estimated costs are the same in both estimates.

At the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, CBO prepared an analysis of the costs associated with ratifying the Protocol Additional to the Agreement Between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency Regarding Safeguards in the United States (Treaty Document 107-7). In that analysis, dated March 5, 2004, CBO estimated that one-time costs to the U.S. government for implementing the Additional Protocol would total between \$20 million and \$30 million, and recurring costs would total between \$10 million and \$15 million a year, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts. Those estimated costs are similar to the costs described in this estimate.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Raymond J. Hall; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell; Impact on the Private Sector: Tyler Kruzich.

Estimate Approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 3709—A bill to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 United States Exports of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India, and to implement the United States Additional Protocol

Summary: S. 3709 would exempt India from the current-law prohibition on the transfer of nuclear materials and technology to countries that are not signatories to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In addition, S. 3709 would implement the obligations of the United States under the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America (hereafter called the Additional Protocol).

CBO estimates that implementing S. 3709 would cost \$17 million in 2007 and \$72 million over the 2007–2011 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts.

Section 4 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that because title II of this bill would implement the Additional Protocol, it falls within that exclusion. Other provisions of the bill contain no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 3709 is shown in the following table. The costs would fall within budget functions 050 (national defense), 270 (energy), and 370 (commerce and housing credit).