The underground plant is comprised of 10 areas—two concentration grounds measuring 3,000 square meters each, a drying room of 400 square meters, four 400 square-meter-wide dissolution rooms for uranium extraction and refining, a room for packing uranium into containers, storage for the finished products, and a room where the workers change into anti-radiation suit or take breaks.

The report said there is a waste disposal facility in the plant in addition to the areas mentioned above. The packed uranium products are carried out of the facility through a passage at the end of the tunnel and transported to an underground storage area in Anju by helicopter. The report added that although forests in the Kumchangri area, 30 km southeast of Chonma, were polluted by water discharged from the Chonma facility, the United States could not detect the Chonma plant despite the technical team's inspections in Kumchangri.

According to Yi's career record attached to the report, Yi graduated from P'yongyang University of Technology, and studied at Frunze (now Bishkek) military university of the former USSR from 1958 to 1962. A South Korean source said that Yi attempted to defect to a third country after fleeing to China, but it is highly likely that he was sent back to North Korea by Chinese authorities.

Mr. BROWNBACK. The U.S. has real, legitimate political and economic security interests with India. We need to engage India on all levels as soon as possible. In fact, seizing the opportunity we have to build greater ties should be one of our main foreign policy goals. That is one that is not taking place. We are, after all, the two most populous democratic nations in the world. Our relationship should be based on shared values and institutions, economic collaboration including enhanced trade and investment, and the goal of regional stability across Asia.

I ask the President and other Members to take into consideration how we treat India versus China as well. In China, we are on a very aggressive relationship economically. We will be considering later in this body normalizing permanent trade relations with China. We are saying we need to be engaged with them on a number of different issues. With India we then say no, we are going to put economic sanctions against you, whereas with China we are trying to open up. And China is the one that has missiles pointed this way, that threatens Taiwan, that has weapons proliferation. Religious persecution itself takes place on that continent. I myself have visited with Buddhists who have fled out of Tibet into Katmandu, a number of them walking over the Himalayas in the wintertime to get to freedom. Yet look at how we treat China. We are going to do everything favorable for China, but for India we are going to put on economic sanctions. The contrast is stark.

Again, as a major foreign policy objective, we should be looking to India over the next several years to build up this strategic relationship in some respects as an offset to China and what China is doing in South Asia and what China is aspiring to around the world.

I do not think anybody is sanguine about where China is heading today. We are going to need partners, and India is a key one for us to look at. It is tough for us to convince them of that if we are going to leave economic sanctions on them. One of the ways to reduce our dependency on China economically is to lift economic sanctions on India and try to build up that relationship even more.

These are the key reasons that I put forward this amendment. The differences are so stark as to how we treat China and North Korea versus India. Ask yourself why. I fail to see the reasons for this policy of seeking to reward China, a country that has openly and continually challenged United States interests and values, while at the same time ignoring and punishing India.

As the example of North Korea which I mentioned earlier, the inequity of this situation is striking. Why reward a country that is aggressively working against everything for which we stand and, at the same time, punish and blackmail a country with which we share basic values and interests?

We should be engaging India as the strategic partner it can become. To do so, we should not be maintaining economic sanctions which serve only to impede the development of this relationship. Maintaining economic sanctions on India which affect the poorest parts of the country is not the way to go about this.

The Prime Minister of India, I understand, will be in Washington this fall. I believe it is incumbent upon us to lift these sanctions, and if the administration will not do it, which they have shown to date they will not, then we should.

AMENDMENT NO. 3493 WITHDRAWN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I understand there is a rule XVI problem with the amendment I have put forward. While I would dearly want to have a vote on the amendment on this bill, I understand it will be a problem.

Therefore, reluctantly and regrettably, because I do think this body should take up this issue, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks, to which I listened carefully. He made a number of very important points.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATOR ENZI'S 100TH PRESIDING HOUR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today I have the pleasure to announce that Senator MIKE ENZI, of Wyoming, has earned his second Golden Gavel award.

Since the 1960's, the Senate has recognized those dedicated Members who preside over the Senate for 100 hours with the Golden Gavel. This award continues to represent our appreciation for the time these dedicated Senators contribute to presiding over the U.S. Senate—a privileged and important duty.

Senator ENZI is not only the first in his class to earn the Golden Gavel award, but has time and time again offered his services to preside during late night sessions, on short notice, or when a great understanding of parliamentary procedure is needed.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our sincere appreciation to Senator ENZI for his efforts and commitment to presiding during the 106th Congress.

COMMENDING DAVID REDLINGER AND THE NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, when I was in high school, there was a great deal of discussion in the Senate and across the country about our country's role in preserving and promoting world peace. With the end of the cold war, the focus of that debate has changed dramatically. The arms race with the Soviet Union and the threat of communism spreading in Europe are, thankfully, a part of our history. The challenge of promoting peace, however, is as relevant today as it was at the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

From Northern Ireland to the Middle East; from Africa to Asia, too many innocent lives are destroyed by war and violence. We must be creative in developing and adapting strategies for peace. Thankfully, there are young people from across the country who have given thoughtful consideration to how to create and sustain peace in the world. The National Peace Essay Contest recognizes high school students who have articulated a commitment to peace, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to recognize one of those young people.

Tomorrow, I will meet with David Redlinger of Watertown, South Dakota who is this year's South Dakota winner of the National Peace Essay Contest. David's essay on Tajikistan and Sudan is eloquent, and demonstrates his commitment to the fight for peace in the world. I would like to congratulate David, and I ask that his essay be inserted into the RECORD.

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

COMMITMENT TO PEACE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

(By David J. Redlinger)

In 1991, statues crumbled along with the tyrannical governments that erected these symbols of the Cold War. As chaos manifested the potential for instability became a

reality. The United States then felt obligated to help to mold new democracies and promote regional security for these new nations. As globalization and the interdependency of nation takes priority, cooperation must be used as the guiding principle for the foreign policy of nations, in the benefit of both security and democracy. Unfortunately, self-interest is the dominating determinate in the formulation of foreign policy which leads to hypocritical and paradoxical policies toward other nations. In 1991, the United States was faced with injustices in Tajikistan and Sudan stemming from the polarization of the work and the lack of cooperation amongst nations. The changing nature of conflicts toward regionalism, coupled with the United States' domestic pressures to create foreign policy for the sole benefit of America, led to perpetuated inaction that has threatened both regional security and the promotion of democracy, supposedly the cornerstone to United States' foreign policy. More than just symbols of communism's bygone era crumbled in 1991; the foundation of foreign policy for the leader of the free world was also denigrated.

Regional instability pervades attempts to form legitimate governments. Tajikistan is juxtaposed with the extremely unstable areas of Afghanistan, Pakistan, China, and the other former Soviet Republics. Daniel Pipes wrote, ''Peace and stability in the region depend in large part on Afghanistan, and its future will be determined by developments in Tajikistan.'' The fragile balance of power that has existed in the region could easily be upset. With new nuclear powers, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, and China, it is necessary that the United States form policies that would help mitigate proliferation and support regional security.

Barnett R. Rubin, Director of the Center for the Study Central Asia at Columbia University, in testimony stated that, ''. . . structural conditions virtually guaranteed that inevitable disputes over the future of the country would escalate into chaotic and bloody warfare, and that neighboring states would act, sometimes brutally, to protect their own security.'' The inability to solve these quandaries between the national themselves can lead to the destabilization of the region. The United States never took an appropriate stance for the promotion of regional security. Mr. Rubin calls for the integration of Tajikistan into a coalition of Central Asian countries to render stabilization of the region. The United States' policy must direct attention towards this region if peace and stability are to be established. Intervention, not inaction,will best reduce the animosity amongst the countries.

Democratic ideas are also critical to peace. Unfortunately, United States' policy did not help the struggling new democracy of Tajikistan. Davlat Khudonazarov, a Presidential candidate in Tajikistan of 1991 recalls in testimony to congress, ''At political meetings I would talk about America and about American values, about the values of American democracy. It was my hope that these ideas would become a symbol of truth for my people, truth and justice for my people. Unfortunately, we received no help from the outside.'' The leader of the free world did not fulfill its duty in promoting democracy to a country that was asking for it. United States' policy remained selfish and domestically oriented in 1994 and never answered Tajikistan's cries for help.

This inaction led to Tajikistan's thrust into political turmoil, an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 internally displaced people, and left more than 1 million innocent civilians dead. The United States never seized the opportunity for the advancement of democratic ideals in Tajikistan. Furthermore, regional security was compromised because of the absence of meaningful U.S. policies.

Said Akhmedow, Senior Lecturer of Philosophy at Tajik State University and Chairman of the Committee for Religion of the Council of Ministers of Tajikistan, relates the conflict most significantly to both religious and political struggles after the fall of communism. Mr. Akhmedov credits the political differences of the Party of Islamic Renaissance of Tajikistan (PIRT) and the Democratic Party of Tajikistan (DPT) to the social differences between these two groups. Democratic modernists were pitted against the Islamic traditionalists in the fight for control of the country, while inversely the democratic forces did not. The United States neglected to form policies to promote the democratic ideals. Thus, Tajikistan was left to fight for itself without the tools a free society could utilize. America, because of domestic pressures, was unable to promote the democratic ideals Davlat Kludonazarov and other Tajiks has asked for. Therefore, Tajikistan lost its autonomy to the repression of democracy and the destabilization of the region.

Sudan has also been plagued by struggle. The conflict has resulted in a total of 6 million people displaced, over 1 million injured, and the worst famine in the world this century. The war continues because, as according to Francis Deng, a former ambassador from Sudan, it is a ''zero-su?n conflict.'' Lengthy wars cannot reach resolution without significant intervention. The United States has not implemented effective policies that have resulted in the necessary change for the Sudanese people. The universal goals of regional security and the promotion of democracy have been discarded for a conflict which, ''. . . Even by the tortured yardstick of Africa, a continent riven by armed conflict, the scarcely visible war ravaging southern Sudan has surpassed most measures . . . The conflict rates as the continent's most deadly . . .'' The Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) of the southern part of the country who are generally moderate Muslims have been in conflict with the Northern Islamic Front (NIF), Islamic fundamentalists and seek to have the SPLA assimilate culturally.

In the region, Kenya, Egypt, and Uganda have all felt the effects of the conflict. Kenya has felt the economic impact of refugees, while Egypt has felt a security threat from the Islamic fundamentalists. Uganda on the other hand was politically drawn into the conflict because of President Museveni's support of the SPLA. The security of the region can easily become weakened when all these factors collide. The extension of the civil war outside the borders of Sudan means that a full scale war could easily ignite in the hot desert sand. The United States never intervened with peacekeepers or policies that would marginalize the African conflict. Instead, domestic issues and pressures took precedence, while NGO's were expected to provide humanitarian aid. Conflicts as lengthy as Sudan's war require third party intervention into the root of the conflict, and not simply surface level corrections with humanitarian aid. Clearly, Uganda cannot make effective and fair foreign policy to support Sudan, but the United States, because of its nonpartial status, can provide for the protection of the Sudanese, help to establish fair peace accords, and can objectively examine the situation and formulate policies to best support the goal of regional security.

Most recently the United States formed the wrong agenda which jeopardized its relations with Sudan. As Donald Patterson, the last United States Ambassador to Sudan, wrote, ''The Clinton administration's continuing criticism of Sudan, its call for a cease-fire, and the lead it had taken in the United Nations to bring about the adoption of resolutions condemning Sudan put additional strains on U.S.-Sudanese relations.'' The damage to relations could have easily been avoided if cooperation would have been used. Instead, the policies were formed in the sole interests of the United States.

This is not the most advantageous way to support democratic reforms of emerging nations. Sudan has many Islamic fundamentalists who resist the modernization and liberalization of their country. This is the root cause of the hostility. The country in the mid-1980's was going through a ''transitional'' period where a new constitution was established along with a new government. Political fragmentation between the NIF, SPLA, and others led to a lack of cohesiveness that is necessary for a new government. This allowed for the strengthening of Islamic fundamentalist ideas and the subsequent loss of budding democratic ideals. If the United States had cultivated its relationship with the Sudanese, then the prospects for a true democracy would have had more time to flourish. Both regional security and democratic ideals were compromised because of the United States' lack of legitimate and meaningful foreign policy directed towards Sudan.

In the future, conflicts will continue to be defined by root causes of religious and social differences, but to reduce the animosity amongst these nations, it is imperative that the United States establish policy with the cooperation as the guiding principle. With globalization, only through cooperation can effective policies be created. The post-Soviet world, specifically for Tajikistan and Sudan, has meant difficulty for the formulation of United States' foreign policy. The principle of cooperation was often placed second behind the self-interests of the United States. Future conflicts, similar to Tajikistan and Sudan, deserve the United States' help and cooperation in the rendering of both regional security and the promotion of democracy. Only through these goals will the society of the 21st Century attain true and lasting peace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akhmedov Said. ''Tajikistan II: The Regional Conflict in Confessional and International Context.'' Conflicting Loyalties and the State in the Post-Soviet Russia and Eurasia. Ed. Michael Waller, Alexi Malashenko, and Bruno Coppieters. London: Frank Cass Publications, 1998.

Ali, Nada Mustafa M. ''The Invisible Economy, Survival, and Empowerment: Five Cases from Atbara, Sudan.'' Middle Eastern Women and the Invisible Economy. Ed. Richard A. Lobban, Jr. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Anderson, G. Norman. Sudan In Crisis: The Failure of Democracy. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999.

Atkin, Muriel. ''Thwarted Democratization in Tajikistan.'' Conflict, Cleavage, and Change in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Ed. Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrot. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Burr, J. Millard and Robert O. Collins. Requiem for the Sudan: War, Drought and Disaster Relief on the Nile. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.

Gretsky, Sergei, ''Russia and Tajikistan.'' Regional Power Rivalries in the New Eurasia, Russia, Turkey, and Iran. Ed. Alvin Z. Rubinstein, Oles M. Smolansky and M.E. Sharp. New York: Armonk, 1995.

Howd, Aimee. ''The Other Genocidal War.'' Insight 10 May 1999; 45–47.

Keith, Linda Camp. ''The United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Does it Make a Difference in

Human Rights Behavior.'' Journal of Peace Research, 36.1 (1999): 95–113.

Lesch, Ann Mosely. The Sudan—Contested National Identities. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

—''Sudan: The Torn Country.'' Current History. May 1999; 218–222.

Parmelee, Jennifer. ''Sudan's Hidden Disaster.'' Washington Post 28 Jan. 1994. Lexis-Nexis. Online 7 Jan. 2000.

Patterson, Donald. Inside Sudan: Political Islam, Conflict, and Catastrophe. Boulder Westview Press, 1999.

Pipes, Daniel. ''The Event of Our Era: Former Soviet Muslim Republics Change the Middle East.'' Central Asia and the World: Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan. Ed. Michael Mandelbaum. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1994.

Shalita, Nicholas. The Sudan Conflict (1983–).'' The True Cost of Conflict; Seven Recent Wars and Their Effects on Society. Ed. Michael Cranna. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Sidahmed, Abdel Salam. Politics and Islam in Contemporary Sudan. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

United States. Cong. House, Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee of Foreign Affairs. Developments in Tajikistan. 103rd Cong. 2nd sess. Washington: GPO, 1994.

REMEMBERING KOREAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this weekend we will commemorate an important day in American history. June 25th, the 50th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, will provide all Americans the opportunity to pause and remember the men and women who fought and died in the Korean War.

Some historians refer to the Korean War as the ''forgotten war.'' Perhaps the reason the Korean War has receded in our memories is because it was unlike either the war that preceded it or the war that followed it. Rationing brought World War II into every American home. And television brought the Vietnam War into every home with unforgettable images and daily updates.

But Korea was different. Except for those who actually fought there, Korea was a distant land and eventually, a distant memory. Today, as we remember those who served in Korea, it is fitting that we remember what happened in Korea, and why we fought there.

The wall of the Korean War Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC, bears an inscription that reads, ''Freedom is not free.'' And in the case of South Korea, the price of repelling communist aggression and preserving freedom was very high indeed. Nearly one-and-a-half million Americans fought to prevent the spread of communism into South Korea. It was the bloodiest armed conflict in which our nation has ever engaged. In three years, 54,246 Americans died in Korea—nearly as many as were killed during the 15 years of the Vietnam War.

The nobility of their sacrifice is now recorded for all of history in the Korean War Veterans Memorial. As you walk through the memorial and look into the faces of the 19 soldier-statues, you can feel the danger surrounding them. But you can also feel the courage with which our troops confronted that danger. It is a fitting tribute, indeed, to the sacrifices of those who fought and died in Korea.

But there is also another tribute half a world away. And that is democracy in the Republic of South Korea. Over the last five decades, the special relationship between our two nations that was forged in war has grown into a genuine partnership. Our two nations are more prosperous, and the world is safer, because of it.

The historic summit in North Korea earlier this month offers new hope for a reduction in tensions and enhanced stability in the region. We can dream of a day when Korea is unified under a democratic government and freedom is allowed to thrive.

As we continue to move forward, however, we pause today to remember how the free world won an important battle in the struggle against communism in South Korea. Let us not forget that it is the responsibility of all those who value freedom to remember that struggle and to honor those who fought it. The enormous sacrifices they made for our country should never be forgotten.

SUBMITTING CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect amounts provided for continuing disability reviews (CDRs) and adoption assistance.

I hereby submit revisions to the 2001 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

[Dollars in millions]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	$541,095	$547,279
Highways		26,920
Mass transit		4,639
Mandatory	327,787	310,215
Total	868,882	889,053
Adjustments		
General purpose discretionary	+470	+408
Highways		
Mass transit		
Mandatory		
Total	+470	+408
Revised Allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	541,565	547,687
Highways		26,920
Mass transit		4,639
Mandatory	327,787	310,215
Total	869,352	889,461

[Dollars in millions]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Surplus
Current Allocation: Budget Resolution	$1,467,200	$1,446,000	$57,200
Adjustments: CDRs and adoption assistance	+470	+408	−408
Revised Allocation: Budget Resolution	1,467,670	1,446,408	56,792

IN SUPPORT OF UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, today on the East Front of the Capitol ground is being broken for the new Capitol Visitor Center, a project that will take at least five years and hundreds of millions of dollars to complete. Nearly a century ago, in March 1901, the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia embarked on another project. The Committee was directed by Senate Resolution 139 to ''report to the Senate plans for the development and improvement of the entire park system of the District of Columbia * * *. (F)or the purpose of preparing such plans the committee * * * may secure the services of such experts as may be necessary for a proper consideration of the subject.''

And secure ''such experts'' the committee did. The Committee formed what came to be known as the McMillan Commission, named for committee chairman, Senator James McMillan of Michigan. The Commission's membership was a ''who's who'' of late 19th and early 20th-century architecture, landscape design, and art: Daniel Burnham, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., Charles F. McKim, and Augustus St. Gaudens. The commission traveled that summer to Rome, Venice, Vienna, Budapest, Paris, and London, studying the landscapes, architecture, and public spaces of the grandest cities in the world. The McMillan Commission returned and, building on the plan of French Engineer Pierre Charles L'Enfant, fashioned the city of Washington as we now know it.

We are particularly indebted today for the commission's preservation of the Mall. When the members left for Europe, the Congress had just given the Pennsylvania Railroad a 400-foot wide swath of the Mall for a new station and trackage. It is hard to imagine our city without the uninterrupted stretch of greenery from the Capitol to the Washington Monument, but such would have been the result. Fortunately, when in London, Daniel Burnham was able to convince Pennsylvania Railroad president Cassatt that a site on Massachusetts Avenue would provide a much grander entrance to the city. President Cassatt assented and Daniel Burnham gave us Union Station.

But the focus of the Commission's work was the District's park system. The Commission noted in its report:

Aside from the pleasure and the positive benefits to health that the people derive from public parks, in a capital city like Washington there is a distinct use of public spaces as the indispensable means of giving