

any statements relating to the bill appear in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 6743) was read the third time and passed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT—H.R. 4354

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate receives from the House H.R. 4354, a bill regarding the U.S. Capitol Police Memorial Fund, the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill appear in the RECORD.

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

Mr. GORTON. I further ask consent that if the language of H.R. 4354, as amended, as received, is different than that of the bill currently at the desk, this consent be vitiated.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent the Agriculture Committee be discharged from further consideration of the nominations of James E. Newsome, Keith C. Kelly, Charles Rawls, and Barbara Pedersen Holum, and further that the Senate proceed to their consideration and consideration en bloc the following nominations on the Executive Calendar, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 707, 708, 710, 712, 713, 714, 715, 717, 723, 724, 725, 727, 729, 736, 737, 782, 791, and 792, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; any statements relating to the nominations appear in the RECORD; and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

John D. Kelly, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Dan A. Polster, of Ohio to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Robert G. James, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Ralph E. Tyson, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

Raner Christercunean Collins, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Deborah K. Kilmer, of Idaho, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Neal F. Lane, of Oklahoma, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Clyde J. Hart, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Raymond W. Kelly, of New York, to be Commissioner of Customs.

James E. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement.

Elizabeth Bresee, of New York to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jacob Joseph Lew, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

THE JUDICIARY

Kim McLean Wardlaw, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Richard Nelson Swett, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

Arthur Louis Schechter, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

James Howard Holmes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia.

John Bruce Craig, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman.

David Michael Satterfield, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Charles F. Kartman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for the Korean Peace Talks.

William B. Milam, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bill Richardson, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of Energy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Howard Hikaru Tagomori, of Hawaii, to be United States Marshal for the District of Hawaii for the term of four years.

Paul M. Warner, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Foreign Service nominations beginning Homi Jamshed, and ending Joseph E. Zadrozny, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 1998.

Foreign Service nominations beginning Robert Bigart, Jr., and ending Carol J. Urban, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 15, 1998.

NOMINATION OF RAYMOND W. KELLY

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today this body formally approved the nomination of Raymond W. Kelly, of New York, to be Commissioner of Customs. I am deeply, deeply pleased and believe that we have a Customs Commissioner of whom we can be proud, who will do the kind of outstanding work that Ray Kelly has done over the years in law enforcement.

He is a native New Yorker. He spent quite a bit of his time as a young man in the village of Island Park, where I live and grew up. So it is a great pleasure to see him come to this highly regarded position. I know he is going to be an outstanding Commissioner, and I look forward to working with him.

NOMINATION OF JACOB JOSEPH LEW

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, as we confirm the nomination of Mr. Jack Lew to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, I want to take this opportunity to highlight a problem that OMB has the power to help correct, but to this date has chosen not to.

As many are aware, there is a real problem right now in rural America brought about the dismal farm prices. The only way that commodity prices are going to increase is to boost exports. Certainly, passage of Fast Track, funding of the IMF, continuing normal trade relations with China, and lifting sanctions are necessary parts of the strategy to grow our export markets.

However, there is also a tool, the Export Enhancement Program, that the federal government can be using to help boost exports and revive farm exports in the near term. Congress has done its part in providing appropriations for this program, but the Administration has failed to utilize the program.

The EEP program is designed to help our agricultural exports compete in the face of subsidized competition in international markets. Despite clear evidence that subsidized competition is eroding U.S. markets, particularly for wheat flour, the Administration has been dragging its feet in initiating the EEP.

The USDA has been pushing for the use of the Export Enhancement Program for wheat flour for almost two years. However, before the program can be initiated, an interagency review group, of which OMB is a member, must approve the initiative. OMB has not endorsed usage of the Export Enhancement Program to counteract European subsidies for wheat flour, and thus has effectively blocked use of the program.

It is objectionable that the Clinton Administration is not compelled to stand up for its farm community in the face of adversity in the same way that its European counterparts are. Secondly, it is objectionable that the OMB is driving agricultural trade policy, instead of the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the U.S. Trade Representative.

Exports of U.S. wheat flour have come to a virtual standstill, and it is not because U.S. farmers and millers are relatively inefficient. It is because our competitors, namely the European Union, highly subsidize flour milling. The Administration has the power to correct this by using our own export subsidy program, but OMB is preventing it.

The Administration has announced its intention to purchase wheat and donate it overseas for humanitarian purposes. This is a fine idea, but it is not a substitute for an initiative that will target commercial markets. The EEP program can be used in countries that pay cash for the wheat flour they consume and that do not qualify for humanitarian assistance. These are important markets that the U.S. wheat industry has spent years developing. Furthermore, using the EEP to leverage sales will allow USDA to facilitate a larger amount of wheat flour sales using fewer federal dollars than it would through a donation program.

The EEP is needed not only because it will help us regain our commercial presence in markets traditionally held by the U.S., but also because it will increase our leverage in future trade negotiations. The real objective here needs to be to eliminate export subsidies worldwide. However, our competitors have no reason to come to the negotiating table if the U.S. has already unilaterally eliminated export subsidies.

The Export Enhancement Program needs to be utilized now for wheat flour. I encourage Mr. Lew to make that a priority when he enters office.

NOMINATION OF BILL RICHARDSON TO BE
SECRETARY OF ENERGY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to work with the current Ambassador to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, on a number of occasions. I have met with him briefly twice this week. I find him to be a very impressive man.

I, first, wish to commend him for his work at the United Nations, and particularly that chapter of his work which occurred during the course of the crisis in the gulf with Saddam Hussein in the early part of this year. I accompanied the Secretary of Defense on his trip to the gulf region and to Russia and to meet with his counterpart in Germany, and throughout that process then-Ambassador Richardson played a key role.

I know for a fact Ambassador Richardson had a very significant participation, together with the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense, in negotiating with other nations to avoid the need for the use of force and to bring about a conclusion, while not entirely satisfactory to this Senator and to others, nevertheless, it was the best that could be achieved at that time. It was an extraordinary role that he played.

I also observed, as did others, his tireless efforts throughout the world in

fulfilling his responsibilities as Ambassador to the United Nations, and, indeed, he put a particular emphasis on Africa, where assistance is very gravely needed at this time.

I think he comes eminently qualified to the position of Secretary of Energy. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, has oversight of approximately two-thirds of the budget of the Department. The key elements of that budget relate to stewardship of our nuclear weapons stockpile. We currently do no underground nuclear testing, and, therefore, there is a very significant challenge placed on the Secretary of Energy to make certain that the nuclear stockpile is maintained in a state of readiness to ensure its safety and reliability. The nuclear stockpile is an essential part of our arsenal of deterrence, and the certification of the stockpile's safety and reliability is a responsibility under the Secretary.

That, together with the need to do cleanup at numerous Department of Energy weapons sites, places a great challenge on the Secretary. In my judgment, I believe unequivocally he has the ability to meet these challenges, and I join others in the Senate in supporting his nomination.

Again, the term Secretary of Energy is aptly named for Bill Richardson because, as I think my good friend and colleague from New Mexico would say, he is a man of unlimited energy and is, indeed, the right man for that job.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on July 22, exactly one week after receiving the nomination of Ambassador Bill Richardson to be Secretary of Energy, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held a hearing on his nomination. Two days ago, exactly one week after the hearing, the Committee ordered his nomination reported. Now, two days later, the nomination is before this body for final passage at 2:00 p.m. I describe this to make it clear that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and its Chairman, have made every effort to go beyond simple good faith and work cooperatively with the White House and Department of Energy to fill this vital cabinet position.

I believe that Ambassador Richardson is personally well-qualified to be Secretary of Energy. However, I, along with other members of the Energy Committee, have had serious reservations about this nomination. I have supported the demand of Senators CRAIG and GRAMS, and others, that this Administration show that it intends to live up to its responsibility to solve this Nation's nuclear waste problem.

The Federal government is in breach of its contractual obligation to remove nuclear waste from more than 80 sites in 40 states by last January, making the American taxpayer liable for as much as \$80 billion in damages. The Administration's failure to address this pressing environmental problem

threatens to eliminate our single largest source of emissions-free power, and is already resulting in dirtier air.

The Administration not only failed to propose a solution for this problem, they threatened to veto a Congressional solution that has overwhelming bipartisan support in both Houses. This issue was raised when the previous Secretary was nominated and confirmed, and we received assurances that he would work with us to address this problem. However, all we received from the Department of Energy was silence and a threat to veto Congress' proposed solution.

All during this time, my request, echoed by many others on both sides of the aisle, to the Administration has been simple: live up to your obligation. The problem is real, and getting worse every day. If you do not like the solution Congress has proposed, you have an obligation to propose an alternative. I have made it clear that, while I can accept and support Ambassador Richardson as Secretary of Energy, I cannot accept any Secretary of Energy that would attempt to undertake all of this responsibility with no real authority. If the President does not trust, or expect, his nominee to undertake a resolution of one of the most important problems facing the Department of Energy, then he should not nominate him. If the Secretary of Energy cannot work with Congress to resolve such problems, then there is no point in having a Secretary of Energy.

As I indicated earlier, despite these reservations, I, along with all of the members of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources have gone out of our way to engender a spirit of cooperation with the Administration with respect to this nomination. In response, I am glad to say that the President has confirmed, via letter, the Administration's commitment to resolving the nuclear waste storage issue, and has assured me that Ambassador Richardson, if confirmed, will have the portfolio, and full authority, to address this problem. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 30, 1998.

Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural
Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to encourage your support for an expeditious confirmation of Ambassador Bill Richardson as Secretary of Energy. Ambassador Richardson brings a wealth of experience to this position and I believe he will be able to move the Department of Energy forward on its many critical missions.

I want to assure you that my Administration is committed to resolving the nuclear waste storage issue. I have personal confidence in Ambassador Richardson's ability to deal with this complex matter in a competent, straight-forward professional manner.

It is extremely important that Ambassador Richardson be confirmed so he can oversee

the Department of Energy's viability assessment process for the Yucca Mountain site. As you know, the viability assessment will be completed by the end of this year. Once that assessment is made, the Ambassador will have my complete support in talking with Members of Congress on future issues related to the Yucca Mountain site. Let me assure you that Ambassador Richardson has the portfolio for addressing the nuclear waste issue and has full authority to carry out his responsibilities in this area.

I believe it is in the Nation's interest to confirm Ambassador Richardson as quickly as possible so that he can bring his full attention to the viability assessment and the future of Yucca Mountain as well as to the other important missions of the Department of Energy.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The letter does make it clear that Congress should not expect to hear anything substantive from the new Secretary of Energy on this matter until the end of the year, well after the election. This concerns me, as a signal that the Administration plans to continue to hold nuclear waste hostage for political posturing, while the physical and economic health of American citizens is held in abeyance.

However, the President also assures me of his faith in Ambassador Richardson's ability to deal with this complex matter in a competent, straight-forward professional manner. I have faith in his ability, as well, as long as he is given the authority to exercise it. As I now have a promise that he will have such authority, I will take this commitment in good faith, the spirit in which I have conducted this entire process, and will expect no less from President and Ambassador Richardson.

Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Ambassador Richardson to be Secretary of Energy.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the Senate today passed by unanimous consent the nomination of Bill Richardson to be the next Secretary of Energy. Mr. Richardson's nomination passed the Senate unanimously because he was an honorable Member of Congress, he was an honorable representative for our country at the United Nations, and he is an honorable man. Mr. Richardson has the capability to be among the best Secretaries of Energy to serve our nation.

But if we had voted today on Mr. Richardson's nomination, I would have voted no. I would have done so not out of doubt for Mr. Richardson's capabilities, but because of the horrible record of the Clinton Administration in responding to my concerns and the concerns of many other Members of Congress with regard to nuclear waste storage.

On April 8, 1998, I wrote a detailed letter to the President outlining my dissatisfaction with responses to questions I have posed to nominees for positions within the Department of Energy. In that letter I quoted those nominees and showed very clearly how

they all want to do something, how they all want to work with Congress, and how they all recognize the problems at the DOE. Regrettably, not one of them has ever been allowed to tackle the issues for which they express so much concern before Congress. This Administration has yet to allow a nominee or professional staffer from the DOE to come to Congress and speak openly about nuclear waste.

As I stated earlier, I wrote to the Administration with my concerns on April 8, and just received a response this morning. They knew I was going to be looking closely at the answers of Mr. Richardson and that I expected those answers to be detailed and substantive. Instead, they ignored my letter until the last minute and sent to me responses from Mr. Richardson that displayed the same lack of candor as all previous nominees. Let me read for the Senate a couple of examples.

I provided Mr. Richardson with a detailed description of what I learned on a recent trip to France about its nuclear industry. I explained how France uses nuclear energy to meet over 80% of its electricity needs. I explained their use of reprocessing and MOX fuel and the level to which they are able to reduce the amount of nuclear waste they retain for final disposal. I then asked Mr. Richardson if he felt we should begin to look for ways to expand our use of nuclear energy. Mr. Richardson's response was notable in its brevity. He wrote:

I agree that nuclear energy must be a viable option to meeting future electricity demand in the United States.

I find it hard to believe that Mr. Richardson, who used to represent the Congressional District in which Los Alamos National Laboratory rests, cannot be more specific in his views on the future of nuclear power in the United States. The answer provided above was written by a staffer at the DOE who sought to evade my question.

I expanded on that question by asking Mr. Richardson how we expand our use of nuclear power? He wrote:

The Department, in its FY 1999 Budget Request, recognized the need to maintain a viable nuclear option for the future. The Budget Request proposed new programs to work on the technologies required to extend the licenses nuclear plants and to undertake the research necessary to develop more efficient, more reliable, and safer nuclear plants for the future. I think these efforts are a good start at providing the Nation with the option of safe and affordable nuclear power in the future.

Again, not a very definite statement on the future of nuclear power, but at least it was longer than the one sentence answer to the previous question. Sadly, Mr. Richardson's answer doesn't address any of the real issues in relation to the continuation and expansion of nuclear power. First, he never once mentioned nuclear waste storage in his answer. Without a storage solution, not only will we not build new plants, but our existing plants will begin to shut down prematurely. In fact, Min-

nesota is set to lose our Prairie Island facility in 2007 due to a lack of storage space for nuclear fuel. Minnesota will at that point lose 20% of its electricity generating capacity and will be forced to replace clean nuclear power with polluting fossil fuels at exactly the same time the Kyoto Protocol is set to take effect—and consumer costs will soar.

That brings me to the next consideration unmentioned in Mr. Richardson's response: the role of nuclear power in our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear power is responsible for 90% of our greenhouse gas emissions reductions from the electricity industry since 1973. The countries of Europe and Japan are going to meet their requirements under the Kyoto Protocol using nuclear power. Mr. Richardson mentioned a new program to develop more reliable and safer nuclear power plants. Europe, Japan, and others are using our technology right now to build new plants—technology we continue to ignore.

Those are but two of the important issues which must be addressed when we consider expanding or maintaining our use of nuclear power in the next century. I find it unreasonable that this Administration would send to me responses which so clearly lack the information directly asked for in the question.

Mr. Richardson did, however, write some interesting things about nuclear power in his responses. Let me share with you a couple of those responses. They read:

Nuclear power is a proven means of generating electricity. When managed well, it is also a safe means of generating electricity.

It is my understanding that spent nuclear fuel has been safely transported in the United States in compliance with the regulatory requirements set forth by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Transportation.

From the experience that France, England, and Japan have reported, it appears that they have engaged in successful shipping efforts. However, my understanding is that these countries also have experienced some degree of difficulty and criticism from the public.

The widely publicized shipment last week of spent fuel from California to Idaho is proof that transportation can be done safely. The safety record of nuclear shipments would be among the issues I would focus on as Secretary of Energy.

I asked Mr. Richardson to tell me who would pay the billions of dollars in damages some say the DOE will owe utilities as a result of DOE failure to remove spent nuclear fuel by January 31, 1998. After writing about the DOE's beliefs on their level of liability he wrote: "I will give this issue priority attention once I am confirmed as Secretary of Energy."

I asked Mr. Richardson if he felt the taxpayers had been treated fairly. Again, after telling me about the history of the Department's actions to avoid their responsibilities, he wrote: "I share your interest in resolving these issues and I will continue to pursue this once I am confirmed."

Now, Mr. President, let's look at who then nominee Federico Peña responded to my question regarding the responsibility of the DOE to begin removing spent nuclear fuel from my state. He said in testimony before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee:

... we will work with the Committee to address these issues within the context of the President's statement last year. So we've got a very difficult issue. I am prepared to address it. I will do that as best as I can, understanding the complexities involved. But they are all very legitimate questions and I look forward to working with you and others to try to find a solution.

Does that sound familiar? I suspect Secretary O'Leary had something equally vague to say about nuclear waste storage as well. Secretary Peña, I believe, said it best when he stated, "I will do that as best as I can, understanding the complexities involved." Those complexities, Mr. President, are not that complex at all. Quite simply, the President of the United States, despite the will of 307 Members of the House of Representatives and 65 Senators, does not want to keep the DOE's promise and does not want to address this important issue for our nation. His absence in this debate is all the complexity we need identify.

Mr. President, I want to be very clear that I am sincere in these complaints. My concern is for the ratepayers of my state and ratepayers across the country. They have poured billions of dollars into the Nuclear Waste Fund expecting the DOE to take this waste. They have paid countless more millions paying for on-site nuclear waste storage. Effective January 31, 1998, they are paying for both of these cost simultaneously even though no waste has been moved.

Mr. President, when the DOE is forced to pay damages to utilities across the nation, the ratepayers and taxpayers will again pay for the follies authorized by the DOE. Some estimate the costs of damages to be as high as \$80 to \$100 billion or more. The ratepayers will also have to pay the price of building new gas or coal fired plants when nuclear plants must shut down. And, if the Administration gets its way, my constituents will pay again when the Kyoto Protocol takes effect in 2008—exactly the same time Minnesota will be losing 20% of its electricity from clean nuclear power and replacing it with fossil fuels.

Six years of rudderless leadership in the White House with regard to nuclear energy holds grave consequences for the citizens of my state. I cannot merely sit by now and tell my constituents I tried. I must take whatever action I can to raise this issue with this Administration and with this Congress.

The Administration has admitted nuclear waste can be transported safely. They have admitted they neglected their responsibility. They have admitted nuclear power is a proven, safe means of generating electricity. And they have admitted there is a general consensus that centralized interim

storage is scientifically and technically possible and can be done safely. If you add all of these points together and hold them up against the Administration's lack of action, you can only come to one conclusion: politics has indeed won out over policy and science.

If the Senate would have voted on the Richardson nomination I would have voted no. I like Bill Richardson and I think he will do a fine job as Secretary of Energy—but my state and my constituents need someone to take substantive action at the DOE to begin removing nuclear fuel from my state. Regrettably, as long as Bill Clinton occupies 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, I do not believe it will happen. I do not believe Bill Richardson will have the opportunity to do what is needed to resolve these problems. I know he will have to advocate the policies of President Clinton and Vice President GORE. And in my opinion, that is the problem. This Administration has made this a political issue at the expense of the electricity needs of the country. Until this Administration wants to deal with policy and not politics, I will not support its continued lack of action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF FOR THE PEOPLE OF SUDAN

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 267 submitted earlier by Senator FRIST.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President, acting through the United States Agency for International Development, should more effectively secure emergency famine relief for the people of Sudan, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of a Sense of the Senate which, with the help of Senators FEINGOLD, DEWINE, ASHCROFT, and GRAMS, I have brought before this body in an effort to more clearly define the role of the United States Agency for International Development in the ongoing multinational effort to address the needs of the people of southern Sudan. At least 1.2 million Sudanese are hovering on the brink of starvation, with an additional 1.4 million being targeted by the World Food Program in an effort to stave off the famine conditions which may soon threaten them.

This Sense of the Senate we offer both urges the President to go forward with a more aggressive approach to our

contribution to that effort, and it gives him explicit Senate backing for the efforts which the Administration is already undertaking to that end. The underlying premise of the legislation is simple: the United States' role in that relief effort and in other, proactive self-sufficiency programs has general recognized the constraints placed upon the members of Operation Lifeline Sudan—the United Nations' agreement with the government of Sudan in Khartoum, where the regime holds veto authority over the member's specific deliveries of humanitarian relief. This flawed arrangement has allowed Khartoum to use that very humanitarian relief as a weapon in their war on the South, and with devastating effect. Indeed, the current famine conditions now threatening the lives of over 2 million Sudanese is largely created by the massive disruptions to the fragile agrarian and pastoralist populations in the South these acts of war represent. While the United States should continue to provide relief through the established channels of Operation Lifeline Sudan, it must also seek to use other distribution channels to reach populations to which Khartoum has routinely and with devastating calculation denied relief agencies access. Additionally, the United States must also begin to plan how we can help in preventing future threats of famine.

To realize these goals and directives, the Sense of the Senate recommends that the President take three specific actions. First, through the Agency for International Development, he should begin to more aggressively utilize relief agencies which distribute famine relief outside the umbrella of Operation Lifeline Sudan, thus unimpeded by the restrictions of Khartoum. Second, the Agency for International Development should begin to incorporate areas of southern Sudan which are outside of Khartoum's control into its overall strategy for sub-Saharan Africa in an effort to prevent future famine conditions and assist in helping the region realize a greater level of self-sufficiency—both in food production and in rule of law. Finally, the President is urged to use the current tentative cease-fire in Sudan, and international attention the famine has created, to push for the United Nations and the State Department to revamp the terms under which Operation Lifeline Sudan operates. It is especially important to guarantee that food cannot be used as a weapon and thus end Khartoum's veto authority over shipments of humanitarian relief in southern Sudan.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the support this critical piece of legislation has received on both sides of the aisle, and I am especially thankful for the effort and support of the Senators who have cosponsored this Sense of the Senate. It is important that the Administration and the Congress work together to ensure that the United States relief effort is the most effective it can possibly be.