vote for the elimination of the penalty, and let us bring this important tax relief bill to the American people together.

The marriage penalty has endured for too long and harmed too many couples. It is time to abolish the prejudice that charges higher taxes for being married. It is time to take the tax out of saying ''I do.''

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD reflect the purpose of my absence during final passage of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act. I departed Washington this morning to attend the wedding of my youngest son, Joshua. I would add that my absence would not have changed the outcome of this vote. If I had been present, however, I would have voted ''aye.''

## VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 14, 1999: Robert Clayton, San Francisco, CA; River P. Graham, 39, Oklahoma City, OK; Lonzie Harper, Detroit, MI; Angelo Rhodes, 20, Philadelphia, PA; Torris Starks, Detroit, MI; Terrance Wilkins, 28, Nashville, TN; Nathan A. Williams, 26, Oklahoma City, OK; and an unidentified male, 27, Charlotte, NC.

## THE ARREST OF KAZAKHSTAN'S OPPOSITION LEADER

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight the troubled transition from communism to democracy of the largest of the new states in Central Asia, Kazakhstan. That transition is in serious jeopardy because of the authoritarian behavior of Kazakhstan's President, highlighted by the recent capricious arrest of the leader of the political opposition.

There are high-stakes, competing forces at work in Kazakhstan: the promise of huge sums of money to be made from exploiting the country's vast natural resources, and the pull of old dictatorial ways against the nascent democratic movement.

Last month, I met with a man who could help lead Kazakhstan toward true democracy—a former Prime Minister and outspoken critic of the current regime, Akezhan Kazhegeldin.

Unfortunately, the Government of Kazakhstan is doing everything within its power to see that Mr. Kazhegeldin not get this opportunity.

Two days ago, he was detained in Rome on an INTERPOL warrant instigated by the Kazakh Government. The charges, which range from terrorism to money laundering, are regarded by our State Department as trumped up and political in nature.

This morning word came from Rome that the Italian authorities have shared our Government's assessment of the case and that they have released Mr. Kazhegeldin.

But, although I am gratified at this development, the very fact of Mr. Kazhegeldin's arrest is a cause for deep concern for every American who hopes that democracy can take root in every country where Soviet despotism once reigned.

This latest arrest is doubly troubling, because it suggests that authoritarian rulers are having at least temporary success in manipulating international organizations, in this case INTERPOL.

The International League for Human Rights considers Mr. Kazhegeldin's arrest to be a ''particularly serious violation of article 2 of the INTERPOL Constitution'' because the founders of that organization ''were careful to provide that the INTERPOL network could not be used by authoritarian governments to harass their domestic political opponents.''

The real reason for the arrest was the latest in a series of attempts by the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to suppress his political opposition, which is led by Mr. Kazhegeldin.

The timing is probably not coincidental. Mr. Kazhegeldin had recently offered to testify before U.S. authorities about corruption at the highest levels in Kazakhstan.

This is the second time that President Nazarbayev has had Mr. Kazhegeldin detained by national authorities—there was a similar occurrence in Moscow last fall. In both cases, President Nazarbayev's government filed bogus charges through INTERPOL to have Mr. Kazhegeldin detained.

I understand that our own Department of Justice has routinely ignored such INTERPOL notices concerning Mr. Kazhegeldin.

In an even more sinister vein, the harassment against Mr. Kazhegeldin's associates has turned to physical violence—his press aide was stabbed in Moscow recently.

Mr. President, the stakes in Kazakhstan are extraordinarily high. The country is four times the size of Texas and is blessed with energy resources that even the Lone Star State would envy.

For example, it has proven oil reserves of some 15½ billion barrels; areas under the Caspian Sea may yield up to another 30 billion barrels.

Estimates of natural gas reserves range from 3 to 6 trillion cubic meters. In addition, there are rich deposits of minerals such as copper, zinc, chromium, and uranium.

The Tengiz oil field is currently being worked by U.S., Russian, Kazakh, and other companies. Construction is underway on a pipeline to the Russian port city of Novorossiisk, and Central Asian leaders have signed agreements with Turkey for a Baku-Ceyhan route.

But this energy wealth is prospective for now. The big fields have not yet begun to yield, and the country remains poor.

Kazakhstan's political landscape remains as undeveloped as its oil fields. Elections have been marked by irregularities to the point where international monitors agree that they have not met democratic standards. In fact—and this speaks volumes about the arrest in Rome—President Nazarbayev was re-elected in 1999 by banning his only real opponent, none other than Akezhan Kazhegeldin.

Human rights abuses have been reliably documented and include extrajudicial killings, harsh prison conditions, and torture of detainees.

The press in Kazakhstan has been constrained by President Nazarbayev's desire to curb those who would ''harm the country's image in the world.'' In addition, the government owns and controls significant printing and distribution facilities and subsidizes publications. Restraints on the press are severe enough that self-censorship is now practiced.

The right of free assembly is restricted by law and by the government. Organizations must apply 10 days in advance to hold a gathering, and local authorities are widely reported to deny such permits. In some instances, demonstrators have been fined or imprisoned.

There is, however, one piece of good news, in the area of weapons nonproliferation. Kazakhstan, which was one of four nuclear states formed out of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, has been a vigorous partner with the United States in the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. In 1995, President Nazarbayev announced that his country was no longer a nuclear power, after the last of its nuclear warheads had been removed to Russia.

On the negative side, however, government officials of Kazakhstan illegally sold 40 Soviet-built MiG 21 fighter jets to North Korea. The officials implicated in the sales have received only minor punishment.

The United States has worked with Kazakhstan and the other Central Asian states to promote democracy, economic reform, development of the energy sector, and other goals. In Kazakhstan alone, we provided $600 million in assistance from 1992 to 1999.

It is important to note that the Silk Road Strategy Act, passed by this Congress, specifically calls for increased aid to support conflict resolution in the region, humanitarian relief, economic and democratic reform, and institution-building.

Finally, the United States has pursued a policy of vigorous engagement with the Government of Kazakhstan, including visits to that country by Secretary of State Albright and First Lady Hillary Clinton. We have also received many of their leaders in Washington, including President Nazarbayev.

Kazakhstan, for all of its failings, is important to global security—because of its location, because of its wealth of energy resources, and because of its commitment to remain a nuclear weapons-free state.

But no matter how important Kazakhstan is, the United States must forcefully remind President Nazarbayev that acts of harassment such as the arrest of Mr. Kazhegeldin endanger the good relations between our two countries. He must be made to see the benefits of democracy and a free market economy, and the blind alley of authoritarian cronyism.

Therefore, I call upon President Nazarbayev to stop his harassment of Mr. Kazhegeldin and the rest of the legitimate political opposition in Kazakhstan. It is these attacks—not the legitimate activities of the political opposition—that are serving to tarnish the reputation of Kazakhstan. This political repression makes the developed nations—whose support and investment Kazakhstan desperately needs—wary of economic involvement there.

The United States can work in partnership to build a better life for the people of Kazakhstan, but only if President Nazarbayev understands that political democracy must go hand-in-hand with economic development.

## UNMANNED COMBAT VEHICLE INITIATIVE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, since January, I have been working on an initiative that deals with introducing new cutting-edge technology into the combat arms of our Armed Services. The initiative is to have one-third of our airborne deep strike aircraft remotely operated within 10 years, and one-third of our ground combat vehicles remotely operated within 15 years.

I asked one of our ''Captains of Industry,'' Mr. Kent Kresa, the Chief Executive Officer of Northrop Grumman, for his assessment of the technical feasibility for such an undertaking. He expressed his unqualified support for the initiative, saying that it was certainly feasible from a technical viewpoint. His thoughts have been published in the July 2000, issue of National Defense, the magazine of the National Defense Industrial Association. I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From National Defense, July, 2000.]

FOR UNMANNED SYSTEMS, THE TIME HAS COME

(By Kent Kresa)

Today's technology gives us the ability to do things in different ways. All we really need is determination. In preparing for future conflicts, the area of unmanned systems is one where institutional determination has not matched technological reach. But that may be about to change.

Sen. John Warner, R–Va, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, recently announced that he supports efforts to make one-third of the U.S. operational deep strike aircraft unmanned by 2010, and one-third of ground vehicles unmanned by 2015.

Such a significant change in how the United States conducts military operations would have a profound impact on future national security efforts. Having spent many years of my career in the defense industry working on unmanned systems, I believe Warner's goals are reasonable aspirations. In my view, such an acceleration reflects both a technological possibility and an operational necessity. Certainly, there are technological challenges to be overcome, but the greatest obstacle may be our past experiences and concepts.

A senior defense official commented last year that, by the year 2050, there will be no manned aircraft in the military inventory. A growing number of senior officers see this transition as inevitable. However, most do not see it as imminent. The 50-year period suggested in that observation approximates the chronological distance separating Kitty Hawk from Sputnik.

Although there are certainly issues to be resolved, particularly regarding command and control, we know considerably more today about building and controlling unmanned vehicles than the Wright Brothers did about rocketry.

Certainly, there are those who harbor reservations about unmanned systems. But I have been surprised at the growing acceptance of these technologies across the Defense Department. Field commanders, in particular, increasingly are confident and comfortable about conducting unmanned strikes. During Operation Desert Fox—the fourth-day campaign against Iraq in December 1998—72 percent of the strikes were conducted by unmanned cruise missiles. By comparison, during the first four days of Operation Desert Storm in 1991, only 6 percent of the strikes were conducted with cruise missiles.

Although the scales of these two operations were significantly different, this dramatic shift to unmanned strike systems reflects a fundamental operational change.

As Gen. Michael Ryan, Air Force chief of staff, has commented on several occasions, cruise missiles and other standoff munitions are merely unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) on a ''one-way trip.'' Transitioning to UAVs that are re-usable and capable of making numerous trips dropping less costly precision munitions is within our near-term technological ability.

Calculations suggest that in fewer than 10 missions, unmanned combat air vehicles (UCAVs) dropping ordnance similar to Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) become considerably more cost-effective than cruise missiles. Furthermore, these calculations do not consider additional cost savings resulting from lower manning and routine operational costs.

In the intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) mission area, UAVs already are well accepted. The recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee by Gens. Wesley Clark and Anthony Zinni, commanders-in-chief of two of our more important regional commands, reflects this trend. Both articulated the need for a larger number of UAVs for ISR missions that ''are 24-hour-a-day capable and are adverse-weather capable.''

In my view, this is a near-term possibility. Assets such as the Global Hawk system provide such a capability. When teamed with other key ISR assets, such as the joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) and the airborne warning and control system (AWACS), U.S. commanders will have a formidable capability for seeing their operational area in real-time, in all weather. Other assets—such as the Predator UAV, the Army's new tactical UAV, and the Navy's vertical take-off UAV—will offer high-fidelity battlefield surveillance to tactical commanders.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

There are numerous tactics, techniques, and procedures, as well as organizational and operational issues to be resolved on how all of these systems work together, and how they are-controlled and integrated to form a common operational picture. But the work currently under way by the Joint Forces Command's experimentation program will highlight the major issues and suggest reasonable solutions.

A study on unmanned systems conducted by the Government Electronics and Information Technology Association (GEIA) last fall concluded that in all areas—air, land and sea—both institutional and technological barriers to the expanded use of unmanned systems were dropping rapidly. The report concluded that a heavy reliance on UAVs in both the ISR and attack roles would happen sooner, rather than later. This suggest that others in industry, as well as the government, share this perspective.

Unmanned systems address two pressing problems. First, not only will they be less expensive to build, but their ownership costs will be lower. Since the aircraft fly themselves, their ''mission managers'' can be trained on simulators. The aircraft can be kept in storage until needed, thus lowering operations and maintenance costs that currently consume a high percentage of the defense budget.

Second, unmanned systems empower our troops, while lowering the risks that they assume. In an age where manpower is becoming more expensive, and sensitivity to casualties more prominent, performing ''dirty and dangerous'' missions with unmanned systems is likely to become an imperative. Moreover, by removing the real constraints associated with having humans on board, unmanned systems can provide greater range, greater mission endurance, and great agility. Such systems expand the options available to national and operational leaders.

The issue of greater use of UAVs is less ''can we do it?'' than ''do we want to do it?'' In my view, the first question is already answered: We can do it. The second question is a function of institutional commitment and funding. Warner's bold vision is certain to stimulate discussion that will inevitably lead others to the conclusion that several factors—strategic, operational, and fiscal—