we visited believed their ergonomics programs yielded benefits, including reductions in workers' compensation costs.''

The truth is that the Labor Department's ergonomics rule is based on sound science. In addition to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, medical and scientific groups have expressed widespread support for moving forward with an ergonomics rule.

The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, representing over 7,000 physicians, has stated that ''there is * * * no reason for OSHA to delay the rule-making process while the NAS panel conducts its review.'' The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, representing 16,000 surgeons, the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses, representing 13,000 nurses, and the American Public Health Association, representing 50,000 members, all agree that an ergonomics rule is necessary and based on sound science.

Many members of the business community support ergonomics protections, because good ergononics is good business. Currently, businesses pay out $15 to 20 billion each year in workers' compensation costs related to these disorders. Ergonomic injuries account for one dollar in every three dollars spent for workers' compensation. If businesses reduce these injuries, they will reap the benefits of lower costs, greater productivity, and decreased absenteeism.

That's certainly true for Tom Albin of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, who said, ''Our experience has shown that incorporating good ergonomics into our manufacturing and administrative processes can be effective in reducing the number and severity of work-related musculoskeletal disorders, which not only benefits our employees, but also makes good business sense.''

Similarly, Peter Meyer of Sequins International Quality Braid has said, ''We have reduced our compensation claims for carpal tunnel syndrome through an effective ergonomics program. Our productivity has increased dramatically, and our absenteeism has decreased drastically.''

This ergonomics rule is necessary, because only one-third of employers currently have effective ergonomics programs.

Further delay is unacceptable, because it leaves workers unprotected and open to career-ending injuries. Since OSHA began working on this standard in 1990, more than 6.1 million workers have suffered serious injuries from workplace ergonomic hazards.

It is time to stop these injuries—and stop all the misinformation too. This year's attack on OSHA's ergonomics standard is just the latest in a long series of attacks against this important worker protection measure.

American employees deserve greater protection, not further delay. It's time to stop breaking the promise made to workers, and start supporting this long overdue ergonomics standard now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3598

(Purpose: To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under the medicare program)

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, this past April when the Senate was debating its annual budget resolution, I offered an amendment which stated that if Congress was going to consider massive tax cuts this year, it must first pass legislation that modernizes Medicare through the creation of a prescription drug benefit. Fifty-one Senators voted in favor of this amendment, in favor of putting our Nation's seniors before massive tax cuts, including six of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle—Senators CHAFEE, SPECTER, ABRAHAM, DEWINE, BURNS, and the distinguished occupant of the chair.

I rise today to follow up on the vote that we took in April and to urge a majority of our colleagues to, once again, come together across party lines for our Nation's seniors. Putting seniors before tax cuts was the first step.

Now the Senate needs to take up and pass a comprehensive affordable prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries. Unfortunately, it is now mid-June and neither the Senate Finance Committee nor the Senate itself has considered a Medicare prescription drug benefit. With so few legislative days left in the year and so much work to be done, it is crucial that we take this issue up now.

The amendment I am offering today will commit this bill back to the Appropriations Committee with instructions that they report out a new bill that provides a universal, comprehensive, dependable prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries.

The Medicare Outpatient Drug Act, a bill that I introduced this week with Senators GRAHAM, BRYAN, CONRAD, CHAFEE, BAUCUS, ROCKEFELLER, and LINCOLN, is a moderate bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation. It combines the best elements of prescription drug proposals offered by Members on both sides of the aisle.

More important, the Medicare Outpatient Drug Act will help every senior better afford the prescription drugs which they so badly need, and the need is real.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENZI. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator sending a motion to the desk?

Mr. ROBB. A motion to commit with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the motion to the desk?

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] moves to commit H.R. 4577, the Labor-HHS appropriations, to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report forthwith with the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. REID. I object.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2522, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

HELMS amendment No. 3498, to require the United States to withhold assistance to Russia by an amount equal to the amount which Russia provides Serbia.

NICKLES amendment No. 3569, to provide that not less than $100,000,000 shall be made available by the Department of State to the Department of Justice for counternarcotic activity initiatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, is recognized to call up an amendment relative to Mozambique.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 3520

(Purpose: To increase amounts appropriated for international disaster assistance for Mozambique and Southern Africa and to offset such increase)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] proposes an amendment numbered 3520.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, lines 1 and 2, strike ''$220,000,000, to remain available until expended'' and insert ''$245,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $25,000,000 shall be available only for Mozambique and Southern Africa: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts that are appropriated under this Act (other than under this heading) and that are available without an earmark, $25,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3520, AS MODIFIED

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my

amendment, and I send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 3520), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the text, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MOZAMBIQUE AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) In February and March of 2000, cyclones Gloria, Eline, and Hudah caused extensive flooding in southern Africa, severely affecting the Republic of Mozambique.

(2) The floods claimed at least 640 lives and left nearly 500,000 people displaced or trapped in flood-isolated areas.

(3) The floods contaminated water supplies, destroyed hundreds of miles of roads, and washed away homes, schools, and health clinics.

(4) This heavy flooding and the displacement it caused created conditions in which infectious disease has flourished.

(5) The southern African floods of 2000 washed previously identified and marked landmines to new, unmarked locations.

(6) Prior to the flooding, Mozambique has been making progress toward climbing out of poverty, enjoying economic growth rates of 10% per year.

(7) The World Bank estimates that the costs of reconstruction in Mozambique alone will be $430 million, with an additional $215 million in economic costs.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that an additional $168,000,000 should be made available for disaster assistance in Mozambique and Southern Africa.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for working with me to reach agreement on this modification. I thank them for cosponsoring it. I thank Senator FRIST for joining me in offering it.

This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the administration's request for flood recovery in southern Africa, and particularly in the Republic of Mozambique, should be fully funded.

Right now the foreign operations bill falls far short of fulfilling the administration's request for flood relief in southern Africa. The floods that took so many lives there, and destroyed so many farms, businesses, schools, and hospitals there, have faded from our television screens. But Mr. President, the terrible destruction of these floods has not receded in Mozambique. On the contrary, the longer Mozambique waits for additional flood relief, the more severe the long-term damage of this disaster will become. In February and March Mozambique was in the news because it was devastated by flooding. But before that Mozambique made headlines with the highest economic growth rate in the world. The people of Mozambique have proven that they are fighters, who worked their way back from a terrible civil war to achieve impressive economic and social progress. But today the people of Mozambique are in a fight that they can't win without the help of their African neighbors, and the help of the United States.

It was not long ago that Americans saw dramatic images of daring rescues and remarkable perseverance in Mozambique. Massive rainstorms and furious cyclones inundated the low lands of Mozambique and flooded the rivers that meander through southeastern Africa. The region was ravage by not one, not two, but three cyclones. As we stand here, thousands of miles away on the floor of the Senate, it's hard to comprehend the human cost of this disaster. But these floods claimed the lives of 640 people, and displaced or trapped 491,000 others. Schools, business, and clinics were destroyed, and, in a devastating blow to rescue efforts and to prospects for economic recovery, hundreds of miles of the transportation system were destroyed.

The floods washed away roads, contaminated water supplies, and forced whole families onto rooftops—even into trees—for days on end. The people of Mozambique have seen their crops flooded, their homes destroyed, and their loved ones drowned by the worst flooding southern Africa has seen in the last 100 years. Yet, alongside these tragedies, we saw vivid images of hope as fellow African nations rose up to help their neighbors—most notably South Africa with its courageous helicopter pilots, but also Malawi and even tiny Lesotho, which helped to get supplies to those in need as quickly as possible. I was proud of the U.S. involvement in these efforts, and I know that many of my constituents shared that pride. It is my intent, with this amendment, to ensure that the people of southern Africa are not forgotten in this bill. The administration asked for $193 million to assist the flood-ravaged countries of southern Africa. This bill provides for only $25 million. That, Mr. President, is simply not good enough.

I urge my colleagues to remember that these floods are particularly tragic because the country most seriously affected by them, Mozambique, has made significant strides toward recovery from its long and brutal civil war. Though the country is still affected by extreme poverty, in recent years Mozambique has enjoyed exceptional rates of economic growth, and while more needs to be done, the country has improved its record with regard to basic human rights. It has been making great strides ever since the end of a civil war that ended in the early 1990's. Up until the flood, Mozambique was registering economic growth at a rate of 10 percent a year. That's an incredible achievement for any nation, Mr. President, and it deserves special recognition as a nation of sub-Saharan Africa, where some of its neighbors have struggled to achieve growth rates a fraction of that size.

The people of Mozambique have been working hard for a better future—too hard to see that future swept away by the floodwaters that have already destroyed so much. They need our help. Recovery assistance is critically needed to help the people of Mozambique to hold on to the opportunities that lay before them before the waters rose. The World Bank estimates that the cost of reconstruction in Mozambique alone will be $430 million. The floodwaters washed landmines into new, unmarked locations, and infectious diseases spread quickly in the wake of the disaster. In Mozambique, forecasts suggest that the floods have led to grain production shortfalls of more than 15 percent. And the outlook for the future could be even worse if we don't act. Without repaired roads, farmers and small businesses will be unable to function. Without working railroad lines, lost revenues will total an estimated $35 million per year. And without working hospitals and sanitation facilities, Mozambique will suffer further outbreaks of disease. If we don't reach out to help Mozambique now, it won't be long until were read about this nation again in headlines, as the people of Mozambique suffer the consequences of these floods alone without help, Mozambique may never be able to regain its footing on the road to stability and prosperity.

I am pleased that both Senators LEAHY and MCCONNELL intend to work to address this issue in conference. I thank them for their cosponsorship, their attention to this, and their assistance with this amendment.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the managers intend to accept this amendment. With that understanding, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is to be recognized to call up two amendments, Nos. 3541 and 3542, on which there shall be a total of 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. LEAHY. If the Senator will yield, what was the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin? Was that accepted?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I think people had assumed there would have to be a vote. It is my understanding that the managers have no objection, and I suggest it be accepted at this point.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment (No. 3520), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3551, AS MODIFIED; 3553, AS MODIFIED; 3555, AS MODIFIED; AND 3569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a group of modified amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 3551, as modified; 3553, as modified; 3555, as modified; and 3569, as modified.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3551, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the United States should authorize and fully fund a bilateral and multilateral program of debt relief for the world's poorest countries)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE ON DEBT RELIEF FOR WORLD'S POOREST COUNTRIES.

(1) the relevant committees of the Senate should report to the full Senate legislation authorizing comprehensive debt relief aimed at assisting citizens of the poor countries under the enhanced heavily indebted poor countries initiative;

(2) these authorizations of bilateral and multilateral debt relief should be designed to strengthen and expand the private sector, encourage increased trade and investment, support the development of free markets, and promote broad-scale economic growth in beneficiary countries;

(3) these authorizations should also support the adoption of policies to alleviate poverty and to ensure that benefits are shared widely among the population, such as through initiatives to advance education, improve health, combat AIDS, and promote clean water and environmental protection;

(4) these authorizations should promote debt relief agreements that are designed and implemented in a transparent manner so as to ensure productive allocation of future resources and prevention of waste;

(5) these authorizations should promote debt relief agreements that have the broad participation of the citizenry of the debtor country and should ensure that country's circumstances are adequately taken into account;

(6) these authorizations should ensure that no country should receive the benefits of debt relief if that country does not cooperate with the United States on terrorism or narcotics enforcement, is a gross violator of the human rights of its citizens, or is engaged in military or civil conflict that undermines poverty alleviation efforts or spends excessively on its military; and

(7) if the conditions set forth in paragraphs (1) through (6) are met in the authorization legislation approved by Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 3553 AS MODIFIED

On page 33, line 6 strike ''funds made available under this heading shall be available subject to authorization by the appropriate committees'' and insert in lieu thereof, ''funds made available to carry out the provisions of part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or as a contribution to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) or the HIPC Trust Fund shall be subject to authorization and approval by Congress''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3555 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide funds for the President to direct the executive directors to international financial institution to prohibit funds to the Russian Federation if the Russian Federation delivers SN22 Missiles to the People's Republic of China)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

''SEC. . RUSSIAN MISSILE SALES TO CHINA

''It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Treasury should direct the executive directors to all international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans, credits, or guarantees to Russian Federation, except for basic human needs, if the Russian Federation delivers any additional SS–N–22 missiles or components to the People's Republic of China.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3569 AS MODIFIED

On page 157, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

METHAMPHETAMINE PRODUCTION AND TRAFFICKING

For initiatives to combat methamphetamine production and trafficking, $40 million to be made available until expended: *Provided*, That entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount provided shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be part of the effort here today—led by Senator CHAFEE—to put the Senate on record in support of United States' participation in an international program to lift the burden of debt from the poorest countries of the world. That is the HIPC program, named for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries for which it is intended.

With this amendment the Senate is now on record in support of a simple, but powerful, idea.

Right now, in the poorest countries of the world, desperately needed resources—including both money and some of the best-educated public officials—are used to pay money to the richest industrial economies. That's right—they are sending money to us.

That is happening because, over the years, we and our allies have loaned substantial amounts to those countries, often to pursue our own goals of fighting communism during the Cold War or for other foreign policy purposes. That often meant that we turned a blind eye to the problems in those countries, including how their governments might spend the money, or if they had any hope of repayment.

The perverse result is that, while we seek to promote economic growth and opportunity in the least developed countries of the world, at the same time we continue to collect payments on those debts. At a time when foreign assistance of all kinds is shrinking, we continue to expect these countries to send money to us, most commonly to pay the interest to simply service their debts.

And this is no small problem for these poor countries. Many of them will spend more on just servicing the interest on their debts than they do on childhood immunizations, or education.

That is not just unconscionable, Mr. President, it is bad policy. It defeats many of our best efforts to help those countries turn the corner to more sustainable economic growth and development.

There is so little chance that these countries will ever be able to pay off the principal on these loans that we carry them on our own books at just a few cents on the dollar. That means that it will cost us very little to give a great deal of benefit to these countries.

Those benefits come not just from the lifting of the debt itself. The HIPC program requires that each country that is to receive debt relief must draw up and stick to a plan for social and economic development, reducing poverty and creating sustainable growth.

Banks here in the United States and all around the world know that when there is no chance that a loan will be repaid, you take it off the books.

But the HIPC program is more than just a bookkeeping matter—it is a way of leveraging money that we are unlikely to ever see into essential resources for the neediest countries.

Earlier this year, I made full authorization of the HIPC program my top priority when the Foreign Relations Committee passed its first foreign assistance authorization bill in fifteen years. With the cooperation of Senator HELMS, we reached agreement on all of the pieces needed for full U.S. participation in the HIPC program, participation which we have already pledged, along with our partners among the advanced industrial nations.

That legislation authorized full funding, at the levels requested by the Administration earlier this year, as well as the authorization needed from us to permit the International Monetary Fund to dedicate to the debt relief effort the proceeds from a revaluation of their gold holdings.

As it stands, the Foreign Operations Bill before us today cuts the Administration's request of $262 million for debt relief by $187 million—that's a cut of more than 70 percent. That affects both the HIPC program and another priority of mine, the Tropical Forest Protection Act, a debt-for-nature program that was established with strong bi-partisan support.

While this amendment will not change that situation, it does put the Senate on record in favor of changing it, when this process is once again engaged later on in this session.

Whatever disagreements we have about the IMF, the World Bank, or other aspects of foreign assistance, we should all be able to support this program. The HIPC program comes with its own strong program that the poor countries must comply with to be eligible for debt relief.

It stands on its own merits and should not be tangled up in other debates. Given the heavy burdens on these poor countries, relief delayed is relief denied. Every day that debt relief is put off, those obligations continue to sap their limited resources.

This is a program that has the support of a strong, ecumenical, interfaith effort by the world's major religions. The Pope, the Reverend Billy Graham, and other religious leaders have dedicated their time and effort to making debt relief a reality.

Considering the small and shrinking support we give to the poorest nations, and the importance to us of their economic health and stability, this is an issue where conscience and economic common sense agree.

Again, I want to thank Senator CHAFEE, Senator SARBANES, Senator HAGEL, and all of our cosponsors, for keeping this issue before us. I am confident that at the end of the day, we will do what is right, and fully fund this worthy program.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment sponsored by Senator CHAFEE from Rhode Island. This amendment expresses the sense that the United States should support bilateral and multilateral debt relief for the world's poorest countries with unsustainable debts, and provide the funding for bilateral and multilateral debt relief the Clinton administration has requested.

Last year, United States and other industrialized countries agreed to provide $27 billion in debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries that adopt sound economic policies and use the savings for health, education, and poverty reduction efforts, and the Clinton administration pledged to pay four percent of the total. The $435 million the administration requested for Fiscal Year 2001 is a down-payment on our $920 million pledge.

The countries that will benefit are classified by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund as Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs), which means they have unsustainable debts and are extremely poor.

In these countries:

One in ten children dies before his or her first birthday;

One in three children is malnourished;

More than half of all citizens live on less than $1 per day; and

HIV infection rates are as high as 20 percent.

More than two out of three of these countries spend more on debt service than health care.

Every dollar in debt payments these countries make to the United States and other creditors is one fewer dollar to spend on education, health care, and other basic needs.

Many of these countries, including Zambia, Uganda, Togo, Cote d'Ivoire, Mozambique, and Tanzania, to name but a few, are in the midst of a HIV/AIDS pandemic. Every dollar in debt payments these countries make is one fewer dollar to spend on HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs.

This debt relief proposal will not solve every problem in these countries, but it will help. Bolivia, our democratic ally, began receiving debt relief in 1997. In 1999, Bolivia saved $77 million in debt service as a result of debt relief provided by multilateral institutions. Most of the savings went to increased spending on health care and education.

Uganda has also received multilateral debt relief. Uganda saved $45 million in debt service payments in 1999, and it increased spending on poverty reduction programs, primary education, and primary health care by $55 million. Since 1997, the primary school enrollment rate has increased by 50 percent.

Uganda is not the only country in desperate need of debt relief in Africa. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund list 33 countries in Africa as HIPCs, meaning they are extremely poor and have unsustainable debts.

As Dr. Jeffrey Sachs, the director of the Center for International Development at Harvard University, wrote in The Washington Post, on May 23, 2000, in regard to malaria, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis,

> Debt cancellation for Africa has come down to a matter of life and death. African leaders know very well that for their own countries to muster the internal resources to fight these dread diseases, they will have to be permitted by the creditor nations to shift the funds now spent on debt servicing into public health.

We must provide debt relief to accountable governments, not to dictatorial regimes that waste funds on the military and violate human rights.

This amendment urges the Senate to fund multilateral debt relief efforts carried out by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund for countries that use the funds transparently, allow participation by civil society, do not grossly violate human rights, and do not spend excessively on the military.

Debt relief will allow Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, which use up to 60 percent of their budgets for debt service on loans made by the United States and other industrialized countries to dictators during the Cold War, to use these precious resources to meet basic needs.

The debt burden condemns these countries to poverty. Relieving the burden from these debts will give these countries a chance to develop. Relieving debts that can never be repaid is the humane thing to do.

The Clinton administration has requested $435 million for this initiative to help the world's poorest people. The United States has committed to this multinational debt relief plan, and we should live up to our commitment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support funding for debt relief for the world's poorest people. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments, as modified, are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 3551, 3553, 3555, and 3569), as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, that leaves amendments by Senator BOXER and Senator BYRD as the only amendments left to dispose of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3531, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide support for the Defense Classified Activities)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 3531, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in Title VI of the bill insert the following:

SEC. .In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $8,500,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading, ''Military Construction, Defense Wide'' for classified activities related to, and for the conduct of a utility and feasibility study referenced under the heading of ''Management of MASINT'' in Senate Report 105–279 to accompany S. 2507, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount provided shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $8,500,000 that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment I am proposing would provide $8.5 million to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Military Construction, Defense-wide'' for classified activities, to remain available until expended. The entire amount would be designated as an emergency requirement and would be available only to the extent that an official budget request for $8.5 million is transmitted by the President to the Congress. These funds would be used for the conduct of a utility and feasibility study referenced under the heading of ''Management of MASINT'' in Senate Report 106–279. I am constrained from speaking further about this matter due to the nature of the classification of the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. I urge adoption of the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The amendment (No. 3531), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3541, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I send a modification to my amendment No. 3541 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 3541), as modified, is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . INTERNATIONAL HEALTH EMERGENCIES.

In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated in this Act, $40 million shall be available for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of Chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for global health and related activities: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this section, not less than $30 million shall be made available for programs to combat HIV/AIDS: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this section, not less than $10 million shall be made available for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this section are hereby designated by the Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be made available only after submission to the Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.

On page 155, line 25, strike ''$25,000,000'' and insert ''$35,000,000''.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this legislation on both sides for agreeing to this. It isn't everything I had asked for regarding tuberculosis and the HIV/AIDS fight, but it is helpful. It will also take into consideration Senator FEINGOLD's request on the flooding in Mozambique. It will give an additional $30 million for the worldwide fight against HIV/AIDS, an additional $10 million for the worldwide fight against tuberculosis, and $10 million for the flooding in Mozambique. I am proud that Senators FEINGOLD, LEAHY, DURBIN, DODD, and KERRY are sponsors of this amendment.

I want to take a moment of the Senate's time, because we won't need to have a rollcall on this, to simply say that if we are looking at a true emergency, we have one here. The U.N. Security Council met on the issue of HIV, and it was the first time the Security Council ever met on an international health issue.

Last month, our own National Security Council declared that the global spread of AIDS is a direct threat to U.S. national security because of the destabilizing impact of this deadly disease.

One of the reasons they so found was that the CIA did something they call the National Intelligence Estimate. They titled it ''The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States.'' I am simply going to read a tiny bit from this report.

New and reemerging infectious diseases will pose a rising global health threat and compromise U.S. and global security over the next 20 years. These diseases will endanger United States citizens at home and abroad, threaten U.S. Armed Forces deployed overseas, and exacerbate social and political instability and keep countries and regions in which the United States has significant interest.

I know that my colleagues are very aware of the horrific problem of AIDS in Africa, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. Mr. President, 84 percent of all the people in the world who have died of AIDS have been from that region. It is now predominantly a women's disease. Many children are left as orphans.

Lastly, as far as tuberculosis is concerned, this is a disease we thought we had eliminated in the 1950s. However, the disease is making a comeback. The World Health Organization estimates that nearly 2 million people die of tuberculosis-related conditions annually. One-third of the entire world's population is infected with tuberculosis—an extraordinary number when you think about it.

I am pleased we have this amendment and it is in agreement. I trust and hope and pray for the sake of people all across this world and in our own Nation that these numbers will hold up in the conference. Believe me, it means so much. We know how to treat tuberculosis. We know how to stop HIV transmission from mother to child. It would be a real sin, it seems to me, if we didn't push as hard as we could to fight these diseases.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I took the floor to thank the Senator from California and to ask consent I be included as an original cosponsor. It is a very important amendment and directly connected to people's lives. I thank the Senator for her fine work.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy for a voice vote, if the manager is ready to do that.

Mr. MCCONNELL. There is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3541, as modified.

The amendment (No. 3541), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to reconsider the vote.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3542, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. BOXER. How much time remains to explain this next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 35 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I assure my friends I do not intend to take anything near that time.

Mr. President, I send my modified amendment to the desk on behalf of Mr. LEAHY and Mr. FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, could we see what is being modified?

Mrs. BOXER. This is, at the suggestion of my friend, for a sense of the Senate. It shows support of rules for engagement in Colombia for the Department of Defense.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Is there objection to the Senator being able to modify her amendment?

Without objection, the amendment is modified.

The amendment (No. 3542), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . POLICY REGARDING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES IN COLOMBIA.

(a) AFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—The United States Senate affirms and supports the Department of Defense policy that United States Armed Forces personnel in Colombia should make every effort to minimize the possibility of confrontation, whether armed or otherwise, with civilians in Colombia, and that funds appropriated by this Act and other resources of the Department of Defense will not be used—

(1) to support the training of any Colombian security force unit that engages in counter-insurgency operations;

(2) to participate in any law enforcement activity in Colombia, including search, seizure and arrest;

(3) to permit any Department of Defense employee to accompany any United States drug enforcement agency personnel, or any law enforcement or military personnel of Colombia with counter-narcotics authority, on any counter-narcotics field operation; and

(4) to permit any Department of Defense employee to participate in any activity in which counter-narcotics related hostilities are imminent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chair clarifies at this time the amount of time now evenly divided under previous agreement. The intention was to divide 20 minutes equally. The Senator from California has 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, after I make just an opening remark, I will yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

I am offering an amendment which is completely consistent with the Department of Defense guidelines on the activities of their own personnel in Colombia. It actually says that we support these guidelines, we think it is good to put limits on our involvement, and we should express ourselves on that point.

The first part of the amendment supports the prohibition of the DOD using its personnel, equipment, or other resources to get involved in the counter-insurgency; in other words, to get involved in what some call the civil war between the left and the right in that country.

Again, written by the Secretary of Defense in March 2000:

I am directing that no DOD personnel, funds, equipment, or resources may be used to support any training program that engages solely in counterinsurgency operations.

That supports that DOD guideline.

The same thing occurs on the second part of my amendment; that we support the fact they shouldn't be involved, our own personnel, in law enforcement activities in Colombia. Again, that mirrors the position of our Secretary of Defense.

The third part of the amendment says we agree with the Secretaries that our personnel shouldn't conduct any counterdrug field operation in which counterdrug-related hostilities are imminent. That is to protect our people from harm.

Finally, we say we agree with the Secretary of Defense that U.S. military personnel should make every effort to minimize the possibility of confrontations with civilians.

Clearly, what we should do here is support our own Secretary of Defense and our own administration. I don't think it should be controversial.

I am hopeful it can be accepted because I believe we ought to go on record in support of these limits. I think it is sensible. I think the DOD is correct on this.

Yesterday, we voted millions and millions of dollars to send advisers. I think it would be wonderful if we stood with our own DOD and said there ought to be limits on the participation of our own personnel.

I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is another modification on the Boxer amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct. Senator MCCONNELL has offered a modification.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California if it is her understanding that the most recent modification does not undercut or diminish in any way the so-called Leahy law that is in effect in Colombia and in U.S. operations in Colombia?

Mrs. BOXER. That is certainly my understanding.

I ask Senator MCCONNELL if he would comment on that further.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, that is also the understanding of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hope we can just adopt this as it is and do so by voice vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Has the further modification been sent to the desk?

AMENDMENT NO. 3542 AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I send the further modification we have just been discussing to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Without objection, the amendment is further modified.

The amendment (No. 3542), as further modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . POLICY REGARDING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESOURCES AND ACTIVITIES IN COLOMBIA.

(a) AFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—The United States Senate afirms and supports the Department of Defense policy that United States Armed Forces personnel in Colombia should make every effort to minimize the possibility of confrontation, whether armed or otherwise, with civilians in Colombia, and that funds appropriated by this Act and other resources of the Department of Denfense should not be used—

(1) to support the training of any Colombian security force unit that directly engages in counter-insurgency operations;

(2) to directly participate in any law enforcement activity in Colombia, including search, seizure and arrest;

(3) to permit any Department of Defense employee to accompany any United States drug enforcement agency personnel, or any law enforcement or military personnel of Colombia with counter-narcotics authority, on any counter-narcotics field operation; and

(4) to permit any Department of Defense employee to directly participate in any activity in which counter-narcotics related hostilities are imminent.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what we were hoping to achieve was to voice vote this. A number of Senators are missing important conferences.

The Senator from Florida is interested in seeing the modification.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to see the final language of this amendment before we vote on it. Would it be appropriate to suggest the absence of a quorum until we have that opportunity?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the pending amendment that it violates rule XVI as legislation on an appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order must await the finalization of all time ordered. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. STEVENS. I apologize.

Mrs. BOXER. I do not yield my time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has not yielded time back.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there time left on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 9½ minutes remaining to the opponents and 5 minutes remaining to the sponsor.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Alaska whatever time he may desire of our time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment covers resources in the Department of Defense and it deals with matters with which we are dealing in the supplemental right now. I do not want to mislead the Senate. We are trying to settle this matter in a conference on the military construction bill with the supplemental portions associated with it. I am perfectly happy to see the Senate express its point of view on the Colombia money, but in terms of the item as a place in the Department of Defense portion of the Colombia money, it really has been objected to by the Department of Defense, and as chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, I strenuously object to it.

We should be in the position of determining how defense money is spent, how Armed Forces personnel are governed when they are abroad, and we should not take the occasion now to put limitations on the use of defense assets in connection with the war on drugs.

I just returned from Key West, Tampa, and Alameda in California. I know some of the defense assets we are using to supplement the activities in the war on drugs. I am very reluctant to see the Senate act on a bill at this time like this to set down rules that apply to the use of defense personnel, defense assets, and defense money in connection with the war on drugs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am deeply distressed that the Senator from Alaska raised a point of order. I want to explain why.

Yesterday we voted for almost $1 billion to get involved in a very serious problem in Colombia. Our people will be exposed to a lot of danger there. All we are simply trying to do with this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is to protect them. Further, all we are trying to do is say to Secretary Cohen: You are right on your guidelines that you have issued. And those guidelines simply say our people should not be involved in counterinsurgency, that our people should not be in the line of hostile fire. It is very straightforward, and it is very simple.

Frankly, the way the Senate has responded to this shows me I did the right thing when I never voted for this in the first place. If we cannot stand up in the Senate and support the Secretary of Defense in his very straightforward directive, then I am very concerned about what we are getting ourselves into. I hope I am wrong.

I am distressed the Senator from Alaska did this. When Senator SESSIONS from Alabama, from his side of the aisle, offered legislation on an appropriations bill yesterday, no one said the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, which dealt with this very same subject, was legislation on an appropriations bill. I do not think it is fair to have a double standard. If we are going to use that rule, we ought to use it.

I did not like Senator Sessions' amendment yesterday. Frankly, I viewed it as a way to get us far more

involved in the counterinsurgency, but I did not make a point of order. The fact the Senator did this is distressing.

I am not going to ask for a vote on a procedural motion because that would not even be close to the kind of vote I think I could get on this sense-of-the-Senate amendment. That is what I fear is happening. People do not seem to want to vote on the sense-of-the-Senate amendment. It is not fair.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator does make a good point about the point of order. We should either be consistent on these points of order or not have them, one or the other.

The Senator is correct that when a similar motion was made from the Republican side of the aisle yesterday, Senators on this side of the aisle who wanted to make a point of order refrained because there have been a number of amendments accepted on this bill by both Republicans and Democrats that were subject to the point of order of which the Senator from California speaks. We all refrained from making them.

The Senator from California raises a legitimate point that now, at the end of the bill, on her amendment, which is no more subject to a point of order than those other amendments where a point of order was waived, suddenly she faces the only point of order in this whole bill. I can understand her concern, and I share her concern.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend. I believe it is not fair play, and if there is one thing I expect in the Senate—and I think we all stand for it—it is fair play. We voted huge amounts of money into this region of the world. We have horrible problems there. We have a few disagreements here, but I had hoped we could agree that the Secretary of Defense is correct when he puts limits on the use of DOD personnel.

I am very saddened by this. I do not want to keep repeating it, but it is sad. The people in this country are going to be upset about it. The people in this country, when we get involved in a foreign place, want to know that we in the Senate put restrictions on the use of our personnel.

We have had a lot of experience in this. We have had a lot of tears over this. Yet yesterday we had an amendment from Senator SESSIONS that was clearly legislation on an appropriations bill, which I believe gets us deeper involved because it says we should support the military and the political policies of the Government of Colombia, and no one raised a point of order. But a simple amendment supporting the Secretary of Defense, and where are we? We get a point of order.

I am not going to play that game. I am not going to get caught in a procedural vote. I will just let it go, but I want to make it clear that we have a lot of options later when this bill comes back. If there are going to be things in this bill that violate our parliamentary procedures, some of us are going to get tough on it. It is not right.

This is a sad day, frankly, for this Senate. It is also a sad day for our men and women in uniform that we cannot vote on a simple sense of the Senate supporting our own Secretary of Defense on his views as to how we can, in fact, make sure our people over there are as safe as they can be.

I thank the Chair. I have no need to retain any further time. We will await the decision of the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired. Who yields time? Who seeks recognition?

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

I make the point of order that the pending amendment No. 3542, as further modified, violates rule XVI as legislation on an appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order. The amendment falls.

Mr. LEAHY. Regular order, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 3498, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Helms amendment No. 3498 be withdrawn.

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

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, by now it should come as no secret that I believe that the bill as it stands right now is inadequately funded. The foreign operations appropriation bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation we pass each year. Yet for the past several years Congress has not been devoting the necessary funds to this portion of the budget.

Due in large part to the crucial need for the Colombia supplemental I am going to vote yes on final passage. The Pastrana government urgently and desperately needs these funds to continue its fight against drug lords who are not only undermining the stability and viability of Colombia as a nation, but who are literally killing the people of two nations: Colombians through violence, and Americans through drugs. The government of Colombia deserves our help as they put their lives on the line to stop the production of illegal drugs. I think the outcome of the votes rejecting the Wellstone and Gorton amendments, which would have significantly decreased the amounts available in the supplemental, showed that the majority of my colleagues agree about the severity of the problem in that country and the necessity of U.S. aid.

During the course of this debate, we have been faced with having to make several other untenable decisions. I and my colleagues have had to come to the floor and in essence attempt to get blood from a rock. I believe that we need more money for non-proliferation, anti-terrorism, and de-mining. My colleague Senator FEINGOLD rightly believes that the amount designated for the Mozambique supplemental appropriation needs to be increased.

Senator BOXER has attempted to channel more funds towards combating HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.

In every instance, each of us has been stymied by the fact that there is not enough money in this bill. It simply isn't there. So we are left with the option of either not attempting to raise the level of appropriations for programs that we think are important, or of using different political maneuvers, none of which is particularly effective, to get the money that we feel these programs need. We should not have to face a choice between helping victims of flooding in Mozambique, and preventing the spread of AIDS. The United States should be able to help with these activities as well as drug eradication and non-proliferation.

I spoke briefly this morning about the shortfall in the NADR accounts, and at length yesterday about Plan Colombia. These are not the only accounts about which I am concerned. Development assistance is short-changed, funds for voluntary peacekeeping activities fall below requested amounts, and as the Senator from Wisconsin points out, the President's request for resources to aid victims of the flooding in Mozambique is virtually ignored. I will continue to go on record as being adamantly and staunchly opposed to any attempts to undertake diplomacy on the cheap. That is what the Senate is attempting to do here. By neglecting to grant the administration's request for development assistance and economic support, we are robbing ourselves.

According to a report published in April by a nonpartisan research organization called the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, spending on development aid—defined as all international development and humanitarian assistance, as well as economic support fund monies—measured either as a share of the federal budget or as a share of the U.S. economy, will be lower than at any time in the fifty years before 1998. The report further states that out of the countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United States ranked ''the lowest of all . . . OECD countries examined in the share of national resources devoted to development of poor countries.'' Some would argue that this is because the administration has not asked for enough money. I would answer that constitutionally, Congress controls the purse strings, thus we have only ourselves to blame. I suggest that we make a commitment to take

corrective action, because our foreign assistance programs are vital to our national interests.

Foreign assistance helps us further international peace and security. U.S. citizens and citizens of the world benefit from programs that U.S. assistance pays for. I spoke before about programs aimed at keeping Russian scientists from being employed by states intent on developing nuclear and biological weapons of mass destruction. I am sure that we can all agree that keeping these scientists out of countries such as Iraq makes for a safer world.

When the United States provides assistance to Colombia for crop substitution programs, it is the citizens of the United States who benefit. Less drug production means less drugs on the streets of our neighborhoods. When the United States funds vaccines for infectious diseases such as tuberculosis, we are helping to protect our own citizens from being infected by these illnesses.

Every time United States economic support funds help bolster a new democracy, we widen America's sphere of influence in the hopes of increasing security for the United States. And the preceding represent only a few of the ways in which our foreign assistance aids in promoting our national security. I could go on at length about the positive effects of aid to the Middle East, Russia, and Eastern Europe. Programs in these regions have prevented conflict, helped build economic and financial infrastructure, and combated transnational crime and corruption.

Let me conclude by saying this: our foreign assistance is a preventative tool. The idea behind it is to aid in building a community of like-minded states, states free of internal conflict, states that get along with their neighbors. If we are able to do that, if we are successful with our preventative tools in increasing security, then we will never have to use our corrective tool—that of military action—to achieve security. Think about that. If prevention works, correction is not necessary. Given the sentiments of some Members of this chamber about the commitment of our soldiers overseas, doesn't it make sense to make every effort to prevent our troops from having to deploy?

Some of my colleagues urge frugality in our foreign assistance spending. I agree with the notion that Congress should spend wisely. However I would caution against an approach that is penny-wise and pound foolish. Mr. President, I cannot emphasize this point enough, and it brings back to what I said at the beginning of my remarks: We cannot obtain security on the cheap. By stinting on our foreign assistance programs we are short-changing our national security.

As the administration indicated in their statement regarding this bill, if the sum appropriated for our foreign operations is not increased, the President will have no choice but to veto this legislation. I sincerely hope that as the fiscal year comes to a close, the allocation for the foreign operations appropriation is significantly increased, and conferees distribute any additional amounts wisely.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Baucus-Roberts amendment to engage China on the important issue of rapid industrialization and the environment. The amendment would permit appropriated funds for the US-Asia Environmental Partnership (USAEP)—an initiative of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—to be used for environmental projects in the People's Republic of China (PRC). In other words, the U.S. government would finally be able to, for example, help U.S. businesses connect with provincial and municipal governments in China to initiate badly needed environmental engineering projects. This work is necessary to attempt to prevent a possible long-term environmental catastrophe resulting from intense industrialization and development in the PRC and Asia in general.

Why should one care whether Chinese or Asian people breath clean air or drink clean water? Besides the obvious humanitarian concern, a ruined environment throughout Asia will—at some point—effect us here in the United States and our interests. This is common sense.

The Baucus-Roberts amendment also sends a strong pro-engagement message to the PRC since the U.S. excluded de jure or de facto the PRC from U.S. foreign aid programs with passage and signing of the FY 90-FY 91 State Department Authorization, specifically section 902 of H.R. 3792.

Our government purports to be concerned about global environmental issues, Mr. President, about avoiding contamination of the world's water, air, and soil. Yet, we prohibit ourselves from consulting and cooperating on a government to government basis with the one nation with the greatest potential to impact the world's environment over the next 50 to 100 years. That makes no sense.

What is the United States-Asia Environmental Partnership? It is a public-private initiative implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Its aim is to encourage environmentally sustainable development in Asia as that region industrializes at a phenomenal rate. By ''environmentally sustainable development,'' we mean industrial and urban development that does not irreparably damage the air, water, and soil necessary for life. It's really that simple. US-AEP currently works with governments and industries in Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. In creating US-AEP, the U.S. government recognized the long-term environmental hazards of Asia's rapid industrialization and the need for the U.S. government to engage on the issue.

The program provides grants to U.S. companies for the purpose of facilitating the transfer of environmentally sound and energy-efficient technologies to the Asia/Pacific region. Again, the objective is to address the pollution and health challenges of rapid industrialization while stimulating demand for U.S. technologies. In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce, US-AEP has placed Environmental Technology Representatives in 11 Asian countries to identify trade opportunities for U.S. companies and coordinate meetings between potential Asian and U.S. business partners.

Mr. President, on the basic issue of the global environmental impact of Asian industrialization, specifically Chinese modernization, the Senate has the responsibility to authorize at least some cooperation between Beijing and Washington. I ask for my colleague's support for this common sense amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to speak about one of the most important parts of the proposed aid package for Colombia, the human rights conditions.

Narcotics traffickers, rebel forces, and paramilitary groups present a clear threat to democracy and economic development in Colombia. The bill before us provides $934 million to help the Colombian Government meet this threat. About 75 percent of this aid is for military equipment, training, and logistical support. The Colombian Government says it needs this military assistance—especially the helicopters—to enable its armed forces to retake the southern part of the country from the narcotraffickers and the rebel forces who protect and profit from their activities.

Like my colleagues, I am interested in ensuring that this aid does not contribute to human rights abuses. While allegations of human rights violations by military personnel have decreased in the past several years, the State Department's 1999 Country Report on Human Rights Practices concluded that the Colombian Government's human rights record ''remained poor'' and that ''armed forces and the police committed numerous, serious violations of human rights throughout the year.'' The Colombian Armed Forces are consistently and credibly linked to illegal paramilitary groups, which are now responsible for the majority of serious human rights abuses in Colombia, including an estimated 153 massacres in 1999 which claimed 889 lives. These paramilitary groups have stepped up their own illegal narcotics operations, which, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration, include drug trafficking abroad.

When I met with President Pastrana last December, he emphasized his commitment to improving the human rights performance of the Colombian Armed Forces, which have a long history of human rights violations. The

bill before us makes this commitment the basis for new military assistance to Colombia. The bill requires the Secretary of State to certify that the Colombian Government has met or is meeting four conditions before new military aid can be provided.

The first condition requires the Secretary of State to certify that the President of Colombia has directed in writing that Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights will be brought to justice in Colombia's civilian courts, in accordance with the 1997 ruling of Colombia's Constitutional Court.

Currently, the military justice system does not aggressively or consistently pursue cases against high-ranking military personnel accused of human rights abuses. The 1999 State Department Human Rights Report states that ''authorities rarely brought officers of the security forces and the police charged with human rights offenses to justice, and impunity remains a problem.'' It concludes that the ''workings of the military judiciary lack transparency and accountability, contributing to a generalized lack of confidence in the system's ability to bring human rights abusers to justice.''

To rectify this problem, in August 1997, Colombia's Constitutional Court ruled that ''crimes against humanity'' could never be considered acts of military service and that military personnel alleged to have committed such crimes must be prosecuted in civilian courts. However, the military has consistently challenged civilian court jurisdiction. The military has retained jurisdiction by threatening government investigators and by arguing that alleged violations of human rights, such as collusion with paramilitary groups, are simply acts of omission. Acts of omission are considered acts of military service, as if they were simple dereliction of duty. Most importantly, the military continues to retain jurisdiction in human rights by relying on the support of a pro-military block within the Superior Judicial Council, the body responsible for determining the jurisdiction of individual cases.

The U.S. Government has said that these practices undercut the intent of the Constitutional Court ruling. According to the 1999 State Department Human Rights Report, the Superior Judicial Council ''regularly employed an extremely broad definition of acts of service, thus ensuring that uniformed defendants of any rank, particularly the most senior, were tried in military tribunals.'' In the 8 years the Superior Judicial Council has existed, it has never sent a case of a general accused of a human rights violation to a civilian court.

As a result of these practices, the military has retained jurisdiction even in cases of the most egregious atrocities. For example, dozens of civilians were killed, and thousands were forced to flee for their lives, in the town of Mapiripan in July 1997. The Superior Judicial Council ruled that the case involved an act of omission by General Jaime Uscategui. Therefore, as an act of military service, it belonged before a military court. The General was eventually forced to resign, but he has yet to be prosecuted for his crimes.

The Colombian Armed Forces have claimed that they are abiding by the Constitutional Court ruling and accepting civilian court jurisdiction in human rights cases. However, a careful analysis of the military's own statistics demonstrates the opposite. In a recent publication on human rights, Colombia's Defense Ministry asserts that, pursuant to the 1997 Constitutional Court ruling, the Colombian Armed Forces had turned over 576 cases of possible human rights violations to civilian courts for investigation and possible prosecution. For 3 months my office has tried to obtain a breakdown of this number in order to determine the nature of the crimes committed, the number of these cases that were actually prosecuted, and the rank of the personnel involved. To date, the Colombian Defense Ministry has only documented 103 of the 576 cases. Of these 103 cases, only 39 actually involved human rights violations by members of the Armed Forces. The highest ranking officials were two lieutenant colonels. The remaining 64 cases involved abuses by members of the Colombian National Police or common crimes. In other words, the Colombian Defense Ministry grossly misrepresented its record. In fact, the Colombian Armed Forces have transferred only 39 cases of human rights violations, committed by low level officials, to civilian courts in the past 2 years—not the 576 cases that the Colombian Defense Ministry claimed.

Colombian lawyers have analyzed this matter. The highly respected Colombian Commission of Jurists concluded that the requirement in the amendment that the President issue a written directive requiring the military to accept civilian jurisdiction in human rights cases is consistent with President Pastrana's role as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces. In fact, the Commission recently filed a petition with President Pastrana requesting that, as Commander-in-Chief, he order the military to cease disputing jurisdiction in cases involving credible allegations of human rights abuse. This requirement does not compromise the integrity of Colombia's separation of powers or the independence of the executive and judiciary. To the contrary, it would uphold the judiciary's power by obligating the military to abide by civilian rule and the law.

The second condition contained in this bill requires the Secretary of State to certify that the Commander General of the Armed Forces is promptly suspending from duty any Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights or to have aided or abetted paramilitary groups.

Currently, there is no automatic process for suspending a member of the Colombian Armed Forces alleged to have violated human rights. The case of Colombian Senator Manuel Cepeda is illustrative. Senator Cepeda was murdered in 1994. The investigation carried out by the Attorney General's Office revealed that the murder had been carried out by the military in collusion with paramilitary groups. Nevertheless, the accused officers remained on active duty for five years, from 1994 until 1999, when they were finally suspended as a result of vigorous protests by the human rights community.

In contrast, General Serrano, who just recently resigned as head of the National Police, had the authority to suspend police suspected of corruption, human rights abuses, or other misconduct. To his credit, General Serrano discharged over 11,000 officers since taking command in 1994.

This condition supports the recent actions of the Colombian Congress. On March 15, the Colombian Congress passed a law to restructure the Armed Forces, including granting the Armed Forces Commander the authority to suspend Armed Forces personnel suspected of misconduct. President Pastrana was given 6 months, until September, to issue the necessary implementing decrees. If he does not, the law becomes null and void.

The third condition contained in the bill requires the Secretary of State to certify that the Colombian Armed Forces and its Commander General are fully complying with the provisions regarding prosecution and suspension of Armed Forces personnel credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights. The Colombian Armed Forces must also cooperate fully with civilian authorities in investigating, prosecuting, and punishing in the civilian courts Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed such crimes.

As I discussed earlier, the Colombian Armed Forces have consistently resisted the 1997 Constitutional Court's ruling that transfers jurisdiction for human rights cases from military to civilian courts. They have failed to ensure that Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed human rights abuses are investigated, prosecuted, and punished in the civilian courts. They have resisted suspending military personnel who are alleged to be involved in human rights violations or to have collaborated with paramilitary groups. And they have grossly misrepresented their record, claiming that 576 human rights cases involving Armed Forces personnel were transferred to civilian courts when, in fact, only 39 cases of human rights violations were transferred—and those cases involved low level officials.

The fourth condition contained in the bill requires the Secretary of State to certify that the Government of Colombia is vigorously prosecuting in the

civilian courts the leaders and members of paramilitary groups and Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are aiding or abetting these groups.

According to the 1999 State Department Human Rights Report, paramilitary groups accounted for about 78 percent of human rights abuses in 1999. In a rare televised interview, notorious paramilitary leader Carlos Castaño recently admitted that cocaine and heroin fund an entire unit of 3,200 paramilitary fighters. Overall, he said that 70 percent of his war chest is culled from drug trafficking.

Despite President Pastrana's commitment to eliminate ties between the Colombian Armed Forces and paramilitary groups, the State Department, the United Nations, and human rights groups have documented continuing links. The 1999 State Department Human Rights Report stated that the Armed Forces and National Police sometimes ''tacitly tolerated'' or ''aided and abetted'' the activities of paramilitary groups. According to the report, ''in some instances, individual members of the security forces actively collaborated with members of paramilitary groups by passing them through roadblocks, sharing intelligence, and providing them with ammunition. Paramilitary forces find a ready support base within the military and police.'' The report also concluded that ''security forces regularly failed to confront paramilitary groups.'' The fact that Carlos Castano appeared on Colombian television in March, but remains invisible to Colombian law enforcement agencies, demonstrates the impunity with which he is able to operate in Colombia.

Human Rights Watch has documented links between military and paramilitary groups. These links are not only in isolated, rural areas but in Colombia's principal cities. According to evidence collected by Human Rights Watch, half of Colombia's 18 brigade-level units are linked to paramilitary activity.

The Colombian military has resisted investigating these links. Instead of investigating a credible allegation of military collaboration with paramilitary groups in a civilian massacre that occurred in the town of San Jose de Apartado on February 19, 2000, the Commander of the 17th Brigade filed suit against the non-governmental organization that made these allegations, charging that it had ''impugned'' the honor of the military. If the Colombian Government is serious about severing the links between military and paramilitary groups, it must demonstrate, at all levels of government and the military, that these allegations will be investigated promptly and punished seriously. These links must be severed if the Colombian Government, with United States assistance, is to mount a successful counternarcotics campaign and stop the violence committed by illegal paramilitary groups. If these links are not severed, our Government will be complicit in the abuses.

I recently met with Colombian Senator Piedad Cordoba, the chairman of the Colombian Senate's Human Rights Committee. She personally witnessed this military-paramilitary cooperation during her May 1999 kidnapping by paramilitary leader Carlos Castano. Senator Cordoba told me that the kidnappers' car passed through eight military roadblocks without being stopped or searched. She said that the helicopter that took her to the jungle camp where she was held landed at an airstrip just a few miles from a military base. She told me that Castano boasted when he showed her transcripts of her private telephone conversations, transcripts that he could have only obtained from military intelligence sources.

The strong human rights conditions contained in this bill will ensure that the Colombian Government takes concrete steps to prosecute and punish military personnel alleged to have committed human rights abuses or to have collaborated with paramilitary groups. I commend Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY for including this language in the bill. The conditions will also encourage the Colombian Government to arrest and prosecute at least some paramilitary leaders and members.

During the conference on this bill, I urge the Senate conferees to insist on retaining these strong and well-considered conditions. The conditions contained in the House version of the bill, while certainly well-intentioned, are both weak and inconsistent with Colombia's Constitution. For example, the requirement to create a Judge Advocate General Corps within the Armed Forces to investigate human rights abuses is contrary to the 1997 ruling of Colombia's Constitutional Court that requires the investigation and prosecution of these abuses in the civilian justice system. The House provision regarding a Presidential waiver of the human rights conditions in case of ''extraordinary circumstances'' seriously degrades the importance of human rights as a fundamental principle of U.S. foreign policy—a principle shared on a bipartisan basis over many years. The protection of human rights should not be a ''waivable'' foreign policy objective. It should be enforced with the same vigor as our anti-drug goals. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a May 11 letter from Human Rights Watch on the House provisions be included in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. This letter reflects the strong opposition of the human rights community to these House provisions.

Two years ago, the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial presented its annual Human Rights Award to four Colombians who are leaders of grassroots efforts to defend human rights in Colombia. These Human Rights Laureates—Jaime Prieto Méndez, Mario Humberto Calixto, Gloria Inés Flórez Schneider, and Berenice Celeyta Alayón—represented groups that fight for human rights, the rights of displaced persons, and the rights of political prisoners. These courageous individuals, and thousands of others like them throughout Colombia, risk their lives every day. They need and deserve our support. The conditions included in this bill are for them. The conditions are also for us. They will guard against America's complicity in human rights violations in Colombia.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I have followed the issue of narcotrafficking and other international crimes for years, particularly during my tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, Narcotics and Terrorism. Although I have many concerns about this piece of legislation, I believe we have a chance here to provide support to a Colombian administration trying to address its largest problem—drug trafficking.

The line between counternarcotics and counterinsurgency is not at all clear in Colombia, but we cannot let this stop our extension of aid. Withholding aid is not an option. In doing so, we would send the message to Colombia, our important ally in the war on drugs, that when the going gets tough, they must go it alone. We must be very clear: the terrible human rights conditions in Colombia are inextricably tied to the narcoterrorists. That won't change overnight with our support of this assistance package, but it won't change at all without our help. And just as important as our support for this package will be our continuing oversight of its implementation. If human rights abuses continue, or if we begin to get embroiled in the counterinsurgency efforts, the Senate must remain vigilant, ending the program if necessary. But we cannot simply turn our backs and walk away.

Civil conflict in Colombia has worn on for half a century as the government has fought narcoterrorists for control of the country. Opposition groups such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia [FARC] and the National Liberation Army has made a business of guerrilla warfare and continue to terrorize the civilian population. Paramilitary groups, formed in the 1980's as anti-guerrilla forces, have resorted to many of the same terror tactics. Opposition and paramilitary groups control much of the country and the vast majority of the drug producing areas. It is clear that drug money fuels the fighting. In the last decade, this conflict has claimed over 35,000 lives and has created a population of over a million and a half internally displaced persons.

Colombian President Andres Pastrana, in sharp contrast to his recent predecessor, is trying to improve human rights conditions and promote democracy, under extremely difficult conditions. Under Pastrana, the Colombian Government has begun the first peace talks ever with the FARC. Though the talks have been slow moving and have encountered setbacks,

Pastrana has clearly made the peace process a top priority.

Plan Colombia was developed by President Pastrana as a comprehensive approach to strengthening the Colombian economy and promoting democracy, with heavy emphasis on fighting drug trafficking. In my view, any successful approach to Colombia's myriad of problems will require a strong counterdrug effort. The United States contribution to Plan Colombia, as proposed by the administration, does this.

Let us be clear, however, that the drug trade in Colombia is not simply a Colombian problem. The United States is the largest and most reliable market for the Colombian cocaine and heroin that is at the center of this conflict. We have approximately 5.8 million cocaine users and 1.4. million heroin users. Based on the most recent National Household Survey on Drug Abuse estimates, fourteen million Americans are current drug users. Clearly we are making a large contribution to the problem and should therefore contribute to finding a solution.

The United States must seize the opportunity presented by President Pastrana's current efforts to fight drug trafficking and bring stability to Colombia. This legislation offers us a chance to play a constructive role in Colombia while simultaneously promoting American interests.

The Plan addresses the major components of the problem. ''Push into Southern Colombia'' is designated to affect the major growing and production areas in the South. It provides for the training of special dedicated narcotics battalions, and the purchase of helicopters for troop transport and interdiction. To complement this effort, interdiction tools will also be upgraded, including aircraft, airfields, early warning radar and intelligence gathering. The Plan also provides increased funding for eradication of coca and poppy, and the promotion of alternative crop development and employment. Perhaps most importantly, the Plan calls for and provides resources for increasing protection of human rights, expanding the rule of law, and promoting the peace process.

As I outlined earlier, Colombia's situation is bleak, and this may be its last chance to begin to dig its way out. If we fail to support aid to Colombia, we can only sit back and watch it deteriorate even further. This Plan presents a unique opportunity to support the Colombian Government's effort to address its problems while at the same time promoting U.S. interests. The Colombian Government, despite immense obstacles, has begun to address significant human rights concerns and is working to instill the rule of law and democratic institutions. Though the United States is not in the business of fighting insurgents, we are in the business of fighting drugs, and this is clearly an opportunity to work with a willing partner in doing so.

While I support a United States contribution to helping Colombia, I believe that if we are going to commit, we must do so in the context of an ongoing process under constant review to respond to changing needs.

My first concern is the fine line that exists between counternarcotics and counterinsurgency operations, particularly since they are so intertwined in Colombia. It is impossible to attack drug trafficking in Colombia without seriously undercutting the insurgents' operations. We must acknowledge that the more involved in Colombia's counternarcotics efforts we become the more we will become involved in its counterinsurgency, regardless of our intentions to steer clear of it. But, because the drug trade is the most destabilizing factor in Colombia, our cooperation with the government will over the long run, advance the development and expansion of democracy, and will limit the insurgents' ability to terrorize the civilian population. But our military involvement in Colombia should go no further than this. Efforts to limit number of personnel are designed to address this.

I appreciate the concerns expressed by my colleagues that the United States contribution to Plan Colombia is skewed in favor of the military, but we must keep in mind that our contribution is only a percentage of the total Plan. The total Plan Colombia price tag is approximately $7.5 billion. The Colombian Government has already committed $4 billion to the Plan, and has secured donations and loans from the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the Andean Development Corporation, and the Latin American Reserve Fund. As part of our contribution, and to balance military aid, the United States must continue to support Colombian requests for additional funding from international financial institutions and other EU donors. We must also continue to implement stringent human rights vetting and end-use monitoring agreements, and make sure that our Colombia policy does not end with the extension of aid.

Second, I am concerned that even if the Plan is successful at destroying coca production and reducing the northward flow of drugs, large numbers of coca farmers will be displaced, worsening the current crisis of internally displaced people in Colombia. Colombia has the largest population of internally displaced persons in the world, estimated at over one and half million in November 1999. Seventy percent of those displaced are children, and the vast majority of them no longer attend school. There is every indication that as Plan Colombia is implemented, this population may grow. This problem underscores the importance of supporting the Colombians in their efforts to secure economic aid for alternative development. Unless we strongly support loans and additional donations, the danger remains that desperate farmers will simply move across the borders into Peru and Bolivia, and undo all the eradication progress that has been made in those areas.

My third major concern with respect to this aid package is that it does not adequately address Colombia's human rights problem. The Colombian Government has made a real effort to address human rights and to promote the rule of law. Pastrana has worked to root out members of the military who have committed gross violations of human rights, and has suspended a number of high-level officers. He has also attacked corruption in the legislature, and has come under heavy fire for doing so. Despite this progress, there is no question that recent events in Colombia have raised some cause for concern. The Colombian Government's unfortunate decision to send back to the legislature a bill to criminalize genocide and forced disappearance was a significant setback for the promotion of human rights and the rule of law. I would like to commend my colleagues on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for bolstering the human rights component of this legislation. In addition to requiring additional reporting from the Secretary of State on the human rights practices of the Colombian security forces, Senator LEAHY's provisions for human rights programs in the Colombian police and judiciary, a witness protection program and additional human rights monitors in our embassy and Bogota, and Senator HARKIN's provision to provide $5 million to Colombian NGOs to protect child soldiers, demonstrate our commitment to improving the human rights situation.

Despite my reservations, the potential benefits of this plan are too large to ignore. In light of the changes made by the committee, I believe the plan can help advance United States interests by reducing drug trafficking and thereby promoting stability and democracy in Colombia. We must now work to ensure that our concerns do not become realities. Recognizing that we are not the sole contributors to this Plan, we must support Colombia's requests for additional aid from our allies, and work closely with them to ensure that additional aid complements our efforts in the areas of human rights and strengthening the rule of law. The committee report recognizes the importance of reducing the drug trade first to build confidence among the Colombian people that progress can be made in other important areas such as economic development and democracy.

Plan Colombia's counterdrug focus will also benefit the United States by reducing the flow of drugs to the United States. The United States is faced with a serious drug problem which must be attacked at both ends—supply and demand. Our consideration of counterdrug aid to Colombia should force us to look inward, reexamine our domestic counterdrug plan, and find ways strengthen it.

The United States has long been the cocaine traffickers' largest and most reliable market, fueling continued and expanded cultivation and production. Without addressing the problem here at home, we present no reason to expect that the growers and traffickers will not continue to shift their operations to maintain access to their best market.

Increasing funding and expanding drug treatment and prevention programs are absolutely imperative if we are to coordinate an effective counterdrug campaign, particularly if we are to expect any real improvement in the situation in Colombia. Levels of drug abuse in the United States have remained unacceptably high, despite stepped-up interdiction efforts and increased penalties for drug offenders.

Our criminal justice system is flooded with drug offenders. Three-quarters of all prisoners can be characterized as alcohol or drug involved offenders. An estimated 16 percent of convicted jail inmates committed their offense to get money for drugs, and approximately 70 percent of prisoners were actively involved with drugs prior to their incarceration.

America's drug problem is not limited to our hardened criminals. The 1997 National Household Survey revealed that 77 million, or 36 percent of Americans aged 12 and older reported some use of an illicit drug at least once in their lifetime. The statistics in U.S. high schools are even more disturbing. According to a 1998 study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, 54 percent of high school seniors reported that they had used an illicit drug at least once and 41.4 percent reported use of an illicit drug within the past year.

As we support Colombia's efforts to attack the sources of illegal drugs, we need to make sure we are addressing our own problems. According to recent estimates, approximately five million drug users needed immediate treatment in 1998 while only 2.1 million received it. It was also found that some populations—adolescents, women with small children, and racial and ethnic minorities—are badly underserved by treatment programs. Only 37 percent of substance-abusing mothers of minors received treatment in 1997. Drug offenders, when released from jail, are often not ready or equipped to deal with a return to social pressures and many return to their old habits if they are not provided with effective treatment while incarcerated and the social safety net they so desperately need upon release.

It is clear that drug treatment works, and there is no excuse for the high numbers of addicts who have been unable to receive treatment. As we increase funding for supply reduction programs in Colombia, we must increase funding for treatment to balance and complement it. Drug research has made significant strides in recent years, and there are a variety of treatment options now available to help even the most hardcore addicts. These treatments have been successful in the lab studies. Now we must allow these methods to be successful in helping the population for whom they were developed. Access to drug abuse treatment in the United States is abysmal when compared to the resources we have to provide it.

The administration's Office of National Drug Control Policy argues that a balanced approach that addresses both demand reduction and cutting off supply at the source is necessary to significantly reduce drug abuse in America. While Plan Colombia works to cut off the drug supply, we must balance that with increased funding for drug abuse prevention and better treatment programs that reach more of the population that so desperately needs it.

Plan Colombia is an opportunity to help an important ally attack the sources of illegal drug production reduce the flow of cocaine and heroin to the United States. The United States must stay engaged with the Pastrana government and support its critical efforts to combat drug trafficking. Instead of being limited by our reservations, we must use them to carefully craft a policy that addresses economic development, political stability, human rights and the rule of law. Drug trafficking is the major obstacle to the advancement of these goals, and it must be curbed if any progress is to be made in our drug war at home.

AMENDMENT NO. 3546

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the capital city of India, a woman is burned to death every 12 hours. Earlier this week, NPR reported the story of a courageous survivor of a phenomenon that is commonly referred to as ''dowry deaths.'' Joti Dowan was held prisoner by her husband and mother-in-law for two years because she refused to ask her mother for a $1,000 dowry.

Locked in a tiny room, isolated from friends and family, and rationed only two pieces of bread a day, Joti weighed only 55 pounds when authorities found her. Frequent beatings and malnutrition left her too weak to stand without help. A long scar covers her arm because, at one point during her torture, her husband and his family tried to kill her by dousing her with kerosene. It was only because they feared her screams would alert the neighbors that they extinguished the fire.

Shelanie Agerwall was shot and killed by her husband when he became dissatisfied with the new car that originally came with her dowry. He traded in the vehicle for a more expensive one and demanded his wife's family compensate him for the extra cost. When Shelanie Agerwall's family did not pay him quickly enough, he murdered her.

Death resulting from dowry disputes are on the rise. In 1998, 12,600 women in India were victims of dowry deaths—a 15 percent increase from the previous year. Burning a woman to death is the most common form of dowry death. Commonly referred to as ''bride burning,'' women are doused with kerosene and lit on fire. In many cases, their murder is planned to look like a cooking accident.

The law provides little or no support for the victims of dowry disputes. Corruption is rampant throughout the system—police are bribed by the husbands' families to destroy evidence, doctors are persuaded to change their testimony, and the legal system rarely convicts husbands and families guilty of dowry deaths.

Dowry has evolved from a custom to a form of extortion. The demand for quick money to buy consumer goods has increased the demands for so-called ''dowries'' throughout India. As a result, the use of dowries has spread to communities which never before had a dowry custom. The growing middle class has been met by eager manufacturers. Conspicuous consumption demands greater dowry payments.

In April, a 29-year-old Pakistani woman was shot dead in the law office of a leading human rights activist. Her parents had ordered the killing because she had shamed the family by seeking a divorce.

Perveen Aktar, a 37-year-old woman living in Pakistan, was severely burned in September when her husband, a fruit peddler, threw acid on her. According to Aktar, whose face, back, and chest are badly scarred, her husband wanted to return to his first wife, and she refused. She went to the police, but her husband paid them a series of bribes, and they did not investigate.

These women's struggles are a part of a larger epidemic of ''honor killings''—or culturally sanctioned killing of women in the name of preserving a family's honor. ''Honor crimes'' remain a serious problem in many countries, including: Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt.

Few statistics are available on honor crimes, but the independent Human Rights Commission of Pakistan reported that in 1998 and 1999, more than 850 women were killed by their husbands, brothers, fathers or other relatives in Punjab, Pakistan's most populous province.

In many of those cases, the woman was suspected of what was considered ''immoral behavior.'' According to lawyers and women's rights advocates, many such cases are never brought to trial. Police are easily bribed or persuaded by the men's families to dismiss the complaints as ''domestic accidents.''

Some say that the problems of ''dowry deaths'' and ''honor killings'' are cultural. These problems are criminal, not cultural, and we have an obligation to do something about it.

The amendment I offered would encourage the Secretary of State to meet with representatives from countries that have a high incidence of ''dowry deaths'' and ''honor killings'' to assess ways to work together to increase awareness about these problems and to

develop strategies to end these practices.

The United States, as a world leader, needs to realize its influence in the world. I do not believe it is our place to go into other countries and dictate their traditions. But at the same time, we need to send a message to those countries that condone the brutal killings of innocent women.

INTERNATIONAL RULE OF LAW PROGRAM IN CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, will my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I am pleased to yield to my friend the Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I note in the committee's report that $2 million is being designated for the creation of an International Rule of Law Program in China. The report states that the U.S. Agency for International Development is requested to give serious consideration to the proposal of Temple University Law School in cooperation with New York University Law School to establish a Business Law Center in China.

Mr. SPECTER. That is correct. It is the intention of the committee to support these two prestigious institutions in building upon the very important Temple University Masters of Law Program in Beijing, which is the first and only foreign law degree-granting program in China. After reviewing the case of Yongyi Song, a librarian at Dickinson College in Pennsylvania who was released in January after being held under dubious charges in China, I believe the U.S. Congress should support programs that advance the rule of law in China. At a time when the People's Republic of China is seeking permanent most-favored-nation status and seeking entry into the World Trade Organization, it is my hope that the government of the PRC will respect basic norms for due process such as an open public trial and the right to confer with counsel. International Rule of Programs such as the Temple University/NYU Program are important means to build understanding and respect for these basic norms in the Chinese legal community.

Mr. SCHUMER. I agree that this is an important program which the Congress should support, and it is my hope that this funding will be maintained as the bill goes to conference with the House. I have one further question. Is it the committee's intention that the U.S. Agency for International Development provide the full amount of this funding to an individual rule of law program in the People's Republic of China, such as the program by Temple University, in cooperation with New York University, for the creation of their Business Law Center in China?

Mr. SPECTER. That is correct. I certainly encourage AID to release the full funding as designated in the committee's report.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my good friend for his helpful clarification.

AMENDMENT NO. 3547

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the years, I have come to the Senate floor on many occasions to talk about female genital mutilation (FGM). Still, it is very difficult for me to stand here and talk about something as repulsive, as cruel and as unusual as the practice of FGM. But ignoring this issue because of the discomfort it causes us does nothing but perpetuate the silent acquiescence of its practice.

For those who are unfamiliar with this ritual, FGM is the cutting away of the female genitals and then sewing up the opening, leaving only a small hole for urine and menstrual flow. In many cases, the girl's legs are bound together for weeks while a permanent scar forms. It is performed on girls between the ages of 4 and 12.

This is a practice that has been around for thousands of years and is not going to go away overnight. We need to continue to talk about it and insist upon aggressive education of the African communities that practice it, as well as the implementation of laws prohibiting it.

Several years ago, I passed legislation that requires the Health and Human Services Secretary to identify and compile data on immigrant communities in the United States who are practicing FGM. I worked to pass legislation, that is now law, to make criminal the practice of FGM in the United States.

I have offered two amendments that would keep the United States focused on its work to eliminate FGM abroad. One amendment would allow US AID (US Agency for International Development) to spend up to $1.5 million on its activities to eradicate FGM. My second amendment requires the Secretary of State to further study FGM and to submit her findings along with a set of recommendations on how the United States can best work to eliminate the practice of FGM to Congress by June 1, 2001.

US AID has a long history of supporting the eradication of FGM, however, it still has a long way to go. In 1995, Congress mandated that US AID dedicate one million dollars to efforts to end FGM. Since 1995, funding for this program has fluctuated from a low level of $500,000 per year to a high level of $800,000 per year. My amendment will restore funding to this important program.

It is estimated that 130 million girls are genitally mutilated. Every year, two million girls face FGM—that's 6,000 girls every day.

Last year, I met with Waris Dirie, an activist and supermodel, who serves as a special ambassador for the Elimination of FGM for the United Nations Population Fund. A native of Somalia and born to a nomadic family, Ms. Dirie survived the traditional form of FGM that kills hundreds of women every year—her younger sister and two cousins died from the procedure. At age 13, just before she was to be married off to an elderly man, Ms. Dirie ran away from home. She has left the glamour of the fashion world to speak out and work to eradicate this heinous procedure.

As Ms. Dirie will tell you, the initial operation leads to many health complications that will plague the girl throughout her life—if she does not bleed to death during the procedure. But the immediate health risks are not over after a couple of months or even a couple of years after the operation. When a girl is married, her husband either has to force himself upon her, or re-cut her in order to have sexual intercourse.

During child birth, additional cutting and stitching takes place with each birth. All of this re-cutting and stitching creates tough scar tissue. The procedure is usually performed by female laypeople and is most often performed with a razor, knife, or even a piece of glass.

Often, we refer to FGM as a women's issue, but this needs to be seen as a child abuse issue as well. A four year-old girl does not have the ability to consent or to understand the significance and the consequence this ritual will have on her life, on her health, or on her dignity. Young girls are tied and held down, they scream in pain and are not only physically scarred, they are emotionally scarred for life.

We know a lot about the psychological effects of child abuse from studying children of domestic abuse in the United States. Imagine the psychological effect this must have on children from the initial operation throughout adulthood. The health complications are a constant reminder of the mutilation they endured.

I understand that this custom is deeply embedded in African culture. However, that does not mean we should pretend it is not happening. According to a report by Amnesty International, FGM is practiced in African countries where it has already been criminalized. In some of these countries, over 90% of the women undergo FGM, in spite of laws prohibiting it.

This is a cruel and tortuous procedure performed on young girls against their will. The United States must make all efforts to condemn and to curb this practice.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the fiscal year 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, which has been moved to third reading.

Most immediately, the supplemental emergency funding for Assistance to Plan Colombia—requested by the President at the beginning of the year, and passed by the House months ago—can finally be included in the Military Construction Appropriations bill already in Conference.

In Colombia, we have a real opportunity to work with a democratically-elected government which is committed to combatting drug production

and trafficking in a country which supplies most of the heroin and about 80 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States.

Mr. President, I recently visited Colombia to assess what our aid could accomplish. I went to see the scope of drug crop cultivation and processing, to look into the political context, the human rights situation, the goals of the Pastrana Government, and to assess the capabilities of the military and the police.

I went with an open mind, though I was concerned about the horrendous abuses of human rights and with the effects of Colombian cocaine and heroin on the streets of New Jersey and other states.

I left Colombia convinced that we can help Colombia and help America by cooperating in the fight against drug production, trafficking, and use. Let me briefly share a few of my observations and conclusions:

Aid for Plan Colombia is strongly in the U.S. interest. While there can be legitimate differences of opinion about the exact content of the aid package, we must use the opportunity to cooperate with a fellow democracy to fight the scourge of drugs which harms both our people.

This is a genuine emergency and should be funded as such. Drug crop eradication, training, and counter-narcotics military and police operations have been curtailed for lack of funds. Other elements of the package—like helicopters and alternative development aid—have longer lead times, but the process cannot start until the funds are passed.

Every week we delay, 1,000 more acres of coca are planted, so the problem grows ever larger and narcotics-trafficking groups grow stronger.

Colombia's political will is strong. While the political situation in Colombia is uncertain, President Pastrana and the Colombian Congress have backed away from forcing early elections and appear to be working out their differences. But the Colombian people and their elected representatives want an end to the violence.

They support peace negotiations with the FARC and ELN guerrillas. And they know the violence will not end as long as it is fueled by drug trafficking and its dirty proceeds.

The U.S. and Colombia have a symbiosis of interest in combating drug production and trafficking.

While the Colombians mainly want to end financial support for various armed groups, they are highly motivated to cooperate with our main goal—eliminating a major source of narcotics destined for the United States.

Colombia's military and police need reform and assistance. I was appalled to learn that any conscript with a high school education is exempt from combat duty, so only the poorest, least-educated people serve in front-line units.

Moreover, the standards of training for most military personnel are quite low, and the NCO corps is particularly weak. Colombia needs to accelerate military reforms, some of which require legislation.

But the U.S. can also help a great deal by providing sound training to the Counter-Narcotics Battalions which will be most directly involved in operations supporting the Colombian National Police as they eradicate crops, destroy laboratories and processing facilities, and arrest traffickers.

We need to improve protection for human rights in Colombia. The Colombian people face very real risks of murder, kidnapping, extortion, and other heinous crimes, so they always live in fear. Hundreds of thousands of people have fled the violence. The Colombian Government—including the military and the police—take human rights issues very seriously.

We need to hold them to their commitments to make further progress, as the Senate bill language Senators KENNEDY and LEAHY and I authored would do. I was particularly impressed that the independent Prosecutor General's Office—known as the Fiscalia —is firmly committed to prosecuting criminals, particularly human rights violators.

But in meeting with Colombian human rights groups, I learned that the overwhelming majority of human rights abuses are committed by the paramilitary groups, followed by the guerrillas. Colombia must sever any remaining ties between its military and the paramilitary groups and treat them like the drug-running outlaws they are.

On the whole, winning the war on drugs in Colombia should do more to improve security and safeguard human rights than anything else we or the Colombian government can do.

Mr. President, I reluctantly opposed the Amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE.

I share his conviction that we as a country must do more to reduce the demand for illegal drugs in our society.

In 1998, the most recent year for which I have these statistics, more than 5 million Americans were chronic, hard-core users of illegal drugs.

Just over 2 million—less than half of them—received treatment. I firmly believe that we should provide drug treatment for every drug addict willing to make the tremendous effort to overcome his or her addiction. In my view, we should ensure that no one leaves our prisons—whether federal, state, or local—addicted to narcotics.

We absolutely must do more to reduce demand and thus reduce the use of dangerous drugs and reduce the terrible toll drug use and related crime takes on our society.

Where I differ with the Senator from Minnesota is that I do not believe we should undermine our Assistance for Plan Colombia to pay for increased domestic drug treatment and prevention programs.

Even if we were to fully fund the President's request for Assistance to Plan Colombia, our international programs would account for only about one-tenth of our counter-narcotics budget.

In Colombia, we have a real opportunity to work with a democratically-elected government which is committed to combating drug production and trafficking in a country which supplies most of the heroin and about 80 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States.

In short, Mr. President, I opposed the Wellstone Amendment because I believe we need to keep working to reduce demand for drugs here in America, but not at the expense of cutting efforts to eliminate a major source of drugs to our country.

I also opposed the Amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, Senator Gorton. I voted against a similar Amendment in the Appropriations Committee, and my subsequent visit to Colombia leaves me more convinced than ever that I was right to do so.

Our vote on the Gorton Amendment was, quite simply, a vote on the proposed Assistance to Plan Colombia. We all know that President Pastrana's Plan Colombia—which includes an aggressive counternarcotics effort—could not go forward with only one hundred or two hundred million dollars in U.S. aid.

Even if the Gorton amendment had merely delayed funding, as its sponsor has argued, it would have prevented President Clinton from seizing the opportunity to act now. In my view, we have waited too long already to address a major source of the narcotics which bring so much harm on the American people.

We have a tremendous opportunity—if we are willing to devote a reasonable level of funding—to drastically curtail the production cocaine and heroin in Colombia while supporting democracy and the rule of law in that country.

I am concerned that other emergency needs have not been met.

The President requested emergency supplemental funds for Kosovo and the Southeast Europe Initiative to help bring peace and stability to that troubled region, but those funds have not been provided.

Funding for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, or HIPC, multilateral debt relief trust fund also was not provided, so we cannot fulfill our goals to help relieve the world's poorest countries from the crushing burdens of debt. I hope we will be able to address these deficiencies in Conference with the House on emergency supplemental appropriations.

Let me turn now to the underlying Foreign Operations Appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

As I noted when we considered this bill in Committee, I believe Subcommittee Chairman MCCONNELL and Ranking Member LEAHY, working with other Senators and aided by their capable staff, have done a good job of allocating the resources available to them.

I particularly appreciate their help to include revised language to ensure our aid in Bosnia and elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia is used to help bring war criminals to justice. I also support the creation of an account for Global Health, with increased funding for tuberculosis, AIDS, and other health challenges. And the bill fully funds support for our ally Israel and peace in the Middle East.

That said, Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that the funds provided for the Foreign Operations Subcommittee simply are not sufficient to sustain America's global leadership as we begin a new century.

President Clinton requested increased funding for international programs in fiscal year 2001, though still far less in real terms than we spent in the mid-1980s.

But the bill before us today falls about $1.7 billion short of the President's request.

Let me cite just a few examples of the cuts:

Funding for the Global Environment Facility is more than $125 million below the President's request, so our arrears will continue to mount and environmentally-sustainable development projects in poor countries will not be funded. Even the International Development Association, or IDA—the main institution known as the World Bank—is funded below last year's level and more than $85 million below the Administration's request.

While I appreciate Chairman MCCONNELL's strong funding for Central and Eastern Europe, it's not nearly enough to make up for the Kosovo supplemental which was apparently not funded.

Meanwhile, assistance to the Independent States of the former Soviet Union—many of them still at a critical stage in their economic and political transition—is $55 million below the level requested by the Administration.

The International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement and Non-Proliferation, Anti-Terrorism and Demining accounts are each cut by nearly $100 million from the President's request.

I don't want to waste the Senate's time citing all the examples, but I hope I've made my point.

President Clinton sought a more responsible level of international affairs spending within his balanced budget, but this bill is more than 11 percent below the Administration's request.

Mr. President, I believe we need to strengthen Foreign Operations funding as this bill goes to Conference with the House. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the subcommittee to make that happen, so we can avoid having this bill vetoed.

We need to work together to achieve a responsible Foreign Operations funding level which will advance America's interest and reflect America's values around the world.

I thank the chair and yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the foreign operations appropriations bill that the Senate completed debate on today contains $934 million to launch a major counter-narcotics initiative in Colombia. Other financing attached to the Military Construction and Defense Appropriations bills boosts that total to well over a billion dollars.

This funding will enable the United States to embark on a massive ramping up of its counter-narcotics offensive in Colombia. But curiously enough, the bulk of this program is being implemented through a series of supplemental funding measures. A major anti-narcotics program in Central America, anchored on the provision of U.S. military equipment and U.S. military and State Department advisers, seems to me to be a policy issue that begs for in depth Congressional discussion and consideration. And yet, we are effectively creating it through supplemental appropriations. This may be an expedient way to deal with a difficult problem, but I question its efficacy. I wholeheartedly support aggressive counter-narcotics efforts. Illegal drugs and drug abuse are scourges on our society, and we cannot pretend that the problem will go away if we simply ignore it. But I am concerned about the large number of unanswered questions surrounding the President's plan.

I understand where the money is to be spent, and what it is to be spent on, but I am unclear as to what the results are expected to be. What precise impact is the U.S. assistance expected to have on the production of cocaine and heroin into the United States? What impact will massive U.S. assistance to Colombia have on drug production in other Andean Ridge nations? What impact will intensified U.S. assistance to the government of Colombia's have on Colombia's internal politics and simmering civil war? And, most importantly, what impact will this initiative have on reducing drug abuse and the toll of the illegal drug trade within the United States.

Providing answers to those, and other questions, is the primary intent of a provision that I added in Committee to the foreign operations appropriations bill. My provision requires the Administration to seek and receive congressional authorization before spending any money on U.S. support for the counter-narcotics program in Colombia, called Plan Colombia, beyond the funding contained in this and other relevant spending bills. If this funding is sufficient, all well and good. But if more money is needed to prolong or expand the anti-drug effort, then Congress has a responsibility to reevaluate the entire program. The purpose of my provision is to prevent the U.S. government from slowly but steadily increasing its participation in the anti-narcotics effort in Colombia until it finds itself embroiled in, at best, a costly and open-ended anti-drug campaign throughout the Andean Ridge, or, at worst, a bloody civil war in Colombia.

A secondary goal of my provision is to limit the number of U.S. personnel engaged in the counter-narcotics offensive in Colombia to specific levels unless Congress approves higher levels of U.S. personnel. The provision, which I modified to address concerns raised by the Defense Department, imposes a ceiling of 500 U.S. military personnel and 300 U.S. civilian contractors working on Plan Colombia in Colombia unless Congress authorizes higher levels.

In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Defense Department indicated that it would not be opposed to troop caps. This is a prudent measure that Congress should endorse to ensure that U.S. involvement does not unwittingly spiral out of control in Colombia.

In an effort to ensure that my provision does not impede ongoing counter-narcotics operations in Colombia, I amended it to address concerns raised by the Administration regarding the availability of funds provided in the FY 2001 Defense Appropriations Bill, and the availability of relevant unobligated balances in other spending bills. My amendment protects ongoing programs without giving the Administration the green light to begin empire building in Colombia.

There are those, I am sure, who will say that my provision is too cumbersome, that we should simply handle this huge counter-narcotics offensive in the normal course of business. That, I believe, would be a dangerous course of action, one that would invite mission creep and deep entanglement in the internal affairs of Colombia.

U.S. assistance to Plan Colombia is not, and should not be, business as usual. If the Administration is sincere in its commitment to launch a major, coordinated, inter-agency offensive against the burgeoning drug industry in Colombia, then the Administration should welcome the spotlight that my provision will shine on its efforts. The Administration should welcome the extra safeguards that this language provides against unintended consequences.

Mr. President, winning the war against illegal drugs is vitally important to the future of our nation and to the future of our neighbors, but it is the responsibility of Congress to ensure that we are allocating U.S. taxpayers dollars in the most effective manner possible. Congress cannot make that determination without fully exploring the goals and potential ramifications of this effort to provide assistance to Colombia. My provision provides the minimum necessary safeguards to ensure congressional oversight of Plan Colombia. I commend the Senate for maintaining the integrity and the intent of this provision.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with several of my colleagues, including Senator CHAFEE, Senator MACK, Senator BIDEN, and Senator LEAHY in sponsoring this Sense of

the Senate amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. I am also very pleased that agreement has been reached for the amendment to be accepted. The amendment calls on the Senate to support full authorization and funding for international debt relief. I worked with Senator MACK last year in introducing the ''Debt Relief for Poor Countries Act of 1999,'' and am glad to work with him again on this important issue.

The purpose of this amendment is to highlight one of the major shortcomings in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill, as reported out of Committee, which only included $75 million for the purposes of debt relief. That allocation falls far short of what the Administration has requested and what is needed to meet our obligations to the HIPC (Heavily Indebted Poor Countries) trust fund and bilateral debt relief commitments. The Administration has requested $210 million for FY 2000 for HIPC and $225 million for FY 2001 ($150 million to HIPC and $75 million for bilateral debt relief). This money is necessary for us to meet our commitments to the HIPC trust fund, estimated at $600 million over the next three years, and our commitments to bilateral debt reductions, estimated at $375 million over the same period.

The Administration has also requested an authorization from Congress to support use for HIPC debt relief of the full earnings on profits from IMF off-market gold sales.

Why is debt relief so important? Many poor countries are saddled with large debt payments. All too often, payments on the foreign debt—which account for as much as 70 percent of government expenditures in some countries—mean there is little left to meet basic human needs of the population, such as health, education, nutrition, sanitation, and basic social services.

As a group, HIPCs post some of the world's lowest human development indicators: one in ten children dies before their first birthday; one in three children is malnourished; the average person attends only three years of school; half of all citizens live on less than $1 dollar a day; HIV infection rates are as a high as 20 percent.

In effect, debt service payments are making it even harder for the recipient governments to enact the kinds of economic and political reforms that the loans were designed to encourage, and that are necessary to ensure broad-based growth and future prosperity.

Last year, President Clinton pledged to cancel all $5.7 billion of debt owed to the U.S. government by 36 of the poorest countries. Canceling the debt will not cost the full $5.7 billion because many of the loans would never have been repaid and are no longer worth their full face-value. It does not make economic sense to keep these loans on the books.

Additionally, I believe U.S. leadership is at stake. As the richest country in the world and as one that has long been interested in the development of poor countries, we risk losing our moral authority in the international arena if we cannot, especially during our country's time of prosperity, alleviate the crushing debt burden of many poor countries.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like once again to address the issue of unrequested and unnecessary earmarks in the annual foreign operations appropriations bill.

It is a constant struggle, Mr. President, to maintain a reasonable—if not always adequate—amount of funding for foreign operations when the public overwhelmingly opposes foreign aid programs. It is therefore incumbent upon those of us who believe that foreign aid programs are an important component of U.S. national security policy to spend that budget wisely. As usual, the foreign operations appropriations bill before us squanders vital financial resources for unnecessary, low-priority and unrequested programs. Once again, pressuring the Agency for International Development to fund research into the future welfare of the Waboom tree; providing millions of dollars for organizations like the Orangutan Foundation, the Peregrine Fund's Neotropical Raptor Center, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Dian Fossey Gorrilla Fund, and the World Council of Hellenes—none of which was requested by the Agency for International Development or the Department of State—was deemed preferential to higher priority activities that unquestionably contribute to regional stability in less developed countries.

Mr. President, the notion that funding from the foreign aid budget not requested by the Administration should only go to organizations and programs following an objective, rigorous and competitive process eludes the Appropriations Committee. I am not reflexively opposed to all of the programs for which funding was added in this bill. I do take strong exception to the process by which funding is earmarked for parochial reasons. The bill before us today is replete with such examples. A long list of earmarks for university programs, the vast majority of which coincide with membership on the Appropriations Committee, is more evidence than even the O.J. Simpson jury would need that reasonable doubt exists as to whether such objective criteria are employed.

United States military forces are being deployed at record levels; conflicts in Africa and elsewhere are raging out of control, bringing with them untold misery, and we continue to pass spending bills of such dubious merit. I will support passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill, but only because it is imperative that funding for Israel, Egypt, refugee and migration assistance, and other vital programs receive the timely assistance they require. But to be forced to swallow such questionable earmarks as the $1 million for the Fort Valley State University agribusiness program in Georgia—and I should point out that the Republic of Georgia has no greater friend in the Senate than me—without the benefit of a competitive analytical process is more than a little painful. I suppose it is only appropriate that, once again, we are adding funding, this year to the tune of $4 million, for the International Fertilizer Development Center. There is something strangely appropriate that we spend tens of millions of dollars to fund the fertilizer center given the process by which this bill is put together every year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in the RECORD, accompanied by the list of earmarks and directive language that I have assembled.

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

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 (S. 2522)

DIRECTIVE LANGUAGE AND EARMARKS

Report language provisions

Iodine Deficiency/Kiwanis: Recommends that AID provide at least $5 million to Kiwanis International via UNICEF

Streetwise Program: Encourages AID to provide $50,000 for the program

Morehouse School of Medicine: Expects AID to provide $5.5 million for the Morehouse School of Medicine's International Center for Health and Development

Iowa State University: Recommends that $1 million provided to support Iowa State University's International Women in Science and Engineering program

International Executive Service Corporation: Strongly supports the efforts of the IESC, believes that AID has underutilized the corporation, and urges AID to grant funds to IESC to expand its programs

International Rice Research Institute: Recommends $5 million for the institute

Donald Danforth Plant Science Center: Recommends up to $500,000 to train Thai researchers at the center, and recommends up to $500,000 for research into bacterial and virus problems related to rice

Tropical Plant and Animal Research Initiative: Urges AID to fund a joint Israel-State of Hawaii research and development project to enhance the competitiveness of the tropical fish and global plant market

Protea Germplasm: Urges AID to fund meritorious aspects of a joint South Africa-U.S. protea industry proposal to create a repository to safeguard protea germplasm

Missouri Botanical Garden: Directs AID to increase funding for biodiversity conservation above current level and to work with the Missouri Botanical Garden to protect biodiversity

Orangutan Foundation: Provides $1.5 million to support organizations such as the Orangutan Foundation

Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International and the Karisoke Research Center: Provides $1.5 million to support the fund and the center

Peregrine Fund: Recommends $500,000 for the Peregrine Fund's Neotropical Raptor Center

Pacific International Center for High Technology Research: Encourages AID to provide up to $500,000 for the center

Soils Management Collaborative Research Support Program/Montana State University:

Recommends that AID provide $3 million for the SM–CRSP, and encourages AID to provide $500,000 through the SM–CRSP to Montana State University-Bozeman

U.S./Israel Cooperative Development Program and Cooperative Development Research Program: Urges an increase in funding for CDP/CDR

Patrick J. Leahy War Victims Fund: Recommends that $11 million be made available to support the fund's work

American Schools and Hospitals Abroad: The Appropriations Committee regularly allocates funds for specific institutions, usually the same institutions every year, under the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad program. The following are specified as deserving of further support:

The Lebanese American University, International College

The Johns Hopkins University's Centers in Nanjing and Bologna

The Hadassah Medical Organization

The Feinberg Graduate School of the Weizmann Institute of Science

American University in Beirut: encourages consideration of a plan to establish a Palestinian scholarship and education initiative

City University-Bellevue, Washington: encourages AID to provide adequate resources to build a new administrative center and expand the program to educate Eastern European students in democratic practices and principles

University Development Assistance Programs: The Committee annually earmarks or ''recommends'' funding for specific universities around the United States without benefit of competitive analytical processes to determine the value of the activity and whether it can best be done in an alternate manner. The following universities are expected to continue to receive such funds:

University of Vermont, $500,000, to establish and advanced telecommunications link between three hospitals in Vietnam and the University of Vermont College of Medicine

Champlain College, for the U.S.-Ukraine Community Partnerships Project

American University in Bulgaria, to sustain the university's program

Utah State University, $1.1 million, for the university's proposed World Irrigation Applied Research and Training Center, and $1 million for the university to assist the Arab-American University of Jenin to establish a College of Agriculture of Jenin

University of Missouri, $2 million, for establishment of the Center for Livestock Infectious Disease

University of Mississippi, $2 million, for the National Center for Computational Hydroscience and Engineering, for the purpose of transferring technology to the Polish Academy of Sciences

Mississippi State University, $2 million, for the Office of International Programs

Boise State University, $2 million, to continue and expand the university's involvement with the National Economics University's Business School in Vietnam

University of Miami, $3.5 million, for the Cuban transition project

University of Northern Iowa, for the Orava Project in Slovakia

Washington State University, Purdue University, South Carolina University, and the University of Jordan, $1 million, for water research in the Middle East

Washington State University, $2.46 million, for research, education, and training in international food security in collaboration with the State of Washington, the International Center for Maize and Wheat Improvement, and institutions in Central Asia and the Caucasus

University of South Carolina, $1 million, for the International Urban Growth Network; $1 million, for the Earth Sciences and Resources Institute; $2.5 million, for joint Chernobyl-effect research with Texas Tech University

George Mason University, $2 million, for health care in developing countries

Loyola University, $1 million, for the Family Law Institute for Latin American Judges

Louisiana State University, $1 million, for the International Emergency Management Training Center

Historically Black Colleges, $1 million, for the Renewable Energy for African Development Program

St. Thomas University, $5 million, for the Institute for Democracy in Africa

University of Notre Dame, $1.2 million, to support human rights & democracy in Colombia in collaboration with Inter-American Dialogue and the Colombian Commission of Jurists

Western Kentucky University, $2 million, for an independent media initiative

University of Louisville, $1.5 million, to work with impoverished South African communities in partnership with Rand Afrikaans University

China Rule of Law/Temple Law School: Recommends $2 million for an International Rule of Law program and urges AID to consider a proposal for Temple Law School, in collaboration with New York University School of Law, to operate a Business Law Center in China

Tibet/Bridge Fund: Recommends $1.5 million to support development projects administered by the Bridge Fund

Sharada Dhanvantari Charitable Hospital: Recommends $250,000 for the Sharada Dhanvantari Charitable Hospital to administer health care in Karnataka, India

University of Chicago/Chicago House: Urges AID to continue to support the Chicago House in Luxor, Egypt

Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust: Urges the International Fund for Ireland to support the work of this organization

Academic Consortium for Global Education: Expects AID to continue funding the consortium at the current level

Florida State University: Recommends AID support a distance learning project being developed by the university

University of South Carolina: Directs AID to provide $750,000 for the University of South Carolina College of Criminal Justice's Moscow Police Command College

Magee Womancare International: Encourages AID to work with Magee Womancare International to distribute vitamins and educate at-risk Russian women on the importance of nutrition in pregnancy and infancy

World Council of Hellenes: Urges the Department of State to provide $1.5 million for the council's Primary Health Care Initiative

Rotary International/Anchorage Interfaith Council/Municipality of Anchorage: Supports $5 million for providing medical and other assistance to improve the lives of Russian orphans, and expects AID to work with Rotary International, the Anchorage Interfaith Council, and the Municipality of Anchorage to do so

International Republican Institute/National Democratic Institute: Directs AID to assure continuity in support for IRI & NDI efforts to contribute to political reforms in Ukraine

University of Louisville: Earmarks $1 million for training in water and wastewater management in the Republic of Georgia

Fort Valley State University: Earmarks $1 million for training in agribusiness in the Republic of Georgia

City University of New York: Earmarks $1 million for training in transportation in the Republic of Georgia

Colombia Child Soldiers: Instructs the Secretary of State to transfer $5 million to the Department of Labor for rehabilitation and demobilization of child soldiers, and urges the Department of Labor to work with the Colombia Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Justapaz, Asoda, Ceda Vida, and Defense for Children International to develop and fund programs to counsel, educate, and reintegrate former child soldiers

Bill Language

Substitutes 30 Blackhawk helicopters requested by the Administration and the Colombian Government for a total of 60 Huey II helicopters

University of Missouri: Earmarks $1 million for International Laboratory for Tropical Agriculture Biotechnology

University of California-Davis: Earmarks $1 million for research and training foreign scientists

Tuskegee University: Earmarks $1 million to support a Center to Promote Biotechnology in International Agriculture

International Fertilizer Development Center: Earmarks $4 million for the center

United States Telecommunication Institute: Earmarks $500,000 for the institute

American Schools and Hospitals Abroad: Earmarks $17 million for ASHA programs

International Media Training Center: Earmarks $2 million for the center

Carelift International: Provides up to $7 million for Carelift International

American Educational Institutions in Lebanon: Provides $15 million for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon

American University in Cairo: Provides up to $35 million for the relocation of the American University in Cairo

Egypt Endowment/Theban Mapping Project: Provides up to $15 million for the establishment of an endowment to promote the preservation and restoration of Egyptian antiquity, of which $3 million may be made available for the Theban Mapping Project

American Center for Oriental Research: Earmarks $2 million for the center

Cochran Fellowship Program in Russia: Earmarks $400,000 for the program

Moscow School of Political Science: Earmarks $250,000 for the school

University of Southern Alabama: Earmarks $1 million to study environmental causes of birth defects

Ukranian Land and Resource Management Center: Earmarks $5 million for the center.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, the Senate today will pass the foreign operations appropriations bill and I rise to speak in support of the additional funding for the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) that is contained in this legislation. The bill makes additional FY2000 funds available for the DEA to step up efforts against the burgeoning epidemic of methamphetamine—commonly called ''meth''. This funding is needed for the DEA to combat the explosive meth problem which is emerging as one of the fastest growing threats in our country, especially in Missouri.

With its roots on the west coast, the meth epidemic has now exploded in middle America. Meth is today what cocaine was to the 1980s and heroin was to the 1970s—the hot, ''in'' drug with a catastrophic potential to destroy all those it comes in contact with—financially, spiritually, and physically. It is currently the largest drug threat we face in Missouri. Unfortunately, it is most likely coming soon to a city or town near you.

If one wanted to design a drug to have the worst possible effect on the community, one would make methamphetamine. It is highly addictive, highly destructive, cheap, and easy to manufacture.

To give my colleagues an idea on the scope of the problem in Missouri alone, let me share with you these frightening statistics: during the whole year of 1992, law enforcement seized two clandestine Meth labs in Missouri and in 1994, the number of Meth labs seized increased to 14. By 1998, the number of seized labs mushroomed to 679. Based on reports of the figures collected in 1999, that number jumped again last year to over 900 labs in Missouri alone. According to the latest national statistics from the DEA, reported meth lab seizures in 1999 for the entire United States totaled 6,438, up from 5,786 in 1998 and 3,327 in 1997. This is nearly a 100% increase in only two years.

The rapid increase and spread of meth across the country has brought with it the problems that we too often see with illegal drug use. As the ''popularity'' of meth has increased, we have seen the proportional increases in domestic abuse, child abuse, burglaries and drug related murders. In addition, from 1992 to 1998 meth-related emergency room incidents increased by 63 percent.

What is most unacceptable to me is that meth is ensnaring our children. In 1998, the percentage of 12th graders who used meth had doubled from the 1992 level. In recent conversations I have had with local law enforcement officers in Missouri, they estimated that as many as 10% of high school students know the recipe for meth. In fact, one need only log-on the Internet to find numerous web sites giving detailed instructions for setting up a meth lab. This is troublesome.

We in Congress have taken these indicators seriously. Despite yearly appropriations to combat meth abuse and trafficking, the meth problem continues to grow. I believe it is time to dedicate more resources to stopping this scourge once and for all. To that end, earlier this year I joined a number of my colleagues in the Senate in sending letters to President Clinton and Attorney General Reno requesting that at least $10,000,000 in additional funds be made available for the DEA to assist state and local law enforcement in the proper removal and disposal of hazardous materials recovered from clandestine methamphetamine laboratories. This funding would provide the necessary resources for the DEA and state and local law enforcement officials to combat this growing meth problem.

Meth presents us with a formidable challenge. We have faced other challenges in the past and we can face this one as well. In fact, the history of America is one of meeting challenges and surpassing people's highest expectations. Meth is no exception. All it takes is that we marshal our will and channel the great indomitable American spirit.

In order to successfully combat this growing meth problem, we must provide law enforcement officials with adequate resources to stifle this growing epidemic. To this end, I support the increased level of funding in this foreign operation bill, and I encourage the conferees to maintain adequate funding in the Supplemental appropriations measure for fighting the scourge of methamphetamine. Through legislative efforts like this to assist law enforcement efforts to combat meth, we will meet this new meth challenge and defeat it.

Mr. L. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the managers of this bill, Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY, for accepting a revised version of the amendment I submitted yesterday. This amendment addresses international debt relief.

Today we are at the dawn of the new millennium—2000 is the Year of Jubilee. It is in this year that people throughout the world have been inspired by the Book of Leviticus in the Hebrew Scriptures. This book describes a Year of Jubilee, in which slaves are freed, land is returned to original owners, and debts are canceled.

The Bible's teachings of the Year of Jubilee has led to a worldwide movement to have the world's wealthiest nations forgive the debt of the world's poorest nations. Great Britain, Canada, the Philippines, Australia, Ireland, Austria, Germany, Sweden, South Africa, and the United States have national campaigns in this regard. The most prominent churches and relief groups worldwide also endorse this goal.

This spiritual movement in turn is helping motivate the United States and our G–7 allies to put forth the heavily indebted poor countries (''HIPC'') initiative. This groundbreaking effort will provide substantial debt relief to poor nations conditioned on making real progress towards economic growth and poverty reduction. It will also emphasize greater budget discipline within recipient countries so that scarce resources, rather than being wasted, are directed where they are needed most.

Although the President requested $435 million this year for the U.S. contribution to the HIPC initiative, the appropriations bill before the Senate today provides just $75 million. The amendment I have authored expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should authorize and appropriate full funding. This amendment is cosponsored by seventeen of my colleagues, including those who have been leaders on this issue during the past several years. Cosponsors of my amendment are Senators MACK, SARBANES, BIDEN, HAGEL, WELLSTONE, LIEBERMAN, LANDRIEU, DODD, JEFFORDS, LAUTENBERG, GORDON SMITH, DEWINE, LUGAR, FEINSTEIN, GRAMS, INOUYE, and BRYAN.

I believe it is important to draw attention to this critical issue, and would again like to thank the bill's managers for accepting my amendment. I am hopeful that in the coming weeks, we will make further progress towards full U.S. participation in the HIPC initiative. Thank you.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as Americans, we have two vital tasks in our relations with Colombia. We are obligated to help a neighbor that is struggling to build democracy and civil society, and it is in our best interest to assist them in halting the flow of lethal narcotics from the Andean mountains of Colombia to American communities. These are the two underlying grounds for the Clinton Administration's ''Plan Colombia,'' a request for $1.07 billion in emergency supplemental funds over the next two years to aid Colombia.

After a painful decade of violence, the Colombian people have boldly elected an unassailable ally of democracy and reconciliation, President Andres Pastrana, and they are demanding an end to human rights abuses and impunity by both the paramilitaries and the FARC guerillas. At the same time, the lawlessness and violence of southern Colombia have permitted the narcotics dealers to widen their cultivation and consolidate their delivery routes into the U.S. With the remarkable success of U.S. Government anti-narcotics programs in Peru and Bolivia, eighty percent of the heroin consumed in the U.S. is now cultivated in Colombia. We have no choice now but to focus our anti-drug efforts in Colombia.

While I realize that we must bring pressure to bear on the drug cartels, my experience with Central America in the 1980s leads me to be very skeptical about the utility of the military response to social and political problems. I therefore have been wary of the Administration's Plan Colombia. My chief concerns with it have been the Colombian military campaign against narcotics cultivation, and the abysmal human rights record of paramilitary groups that have frequently been linked to the military forces. I am also concerned that we not get dragged into a major, long-term counter-insurgency effort which is not our fight.

In the end, though, I decided to go along with the Administration's proposal as significantly improved by the Senate Foreign Operations Subcommittee. The Subcommittee downsized the scale of the Colombian military effort, and shifted the funding from Blackhawk to Huey helicopters. Smaller and more agile, the Hueys are more suited to fighting narcotics cultivation, while the Blackhawks are more suited to counter-insurgency combat. The Subcommittee also increased the bill's sizable human rights component, including new programs to bolster the rule of law and fight corruption. The Subcommittee also shares my concern for U.S. Government responsibility for this expensive anti-narcotics effort by increased funding for

end-use monitoring. Given the well-documented human rights problems in Colombia, heightened monitoring is an extremely important component of this program. Although we will be funding a military effort, I note that U.S. military personnel are barred from any military operation, and that the Leahy Amendment puts strict safeguards on the activities of any U.S. funded partner, so that the human rights behavior of the Colombian military will now be under a microscope.

An integral component of the final legislation is sizable funding to encourage judicial reform, strengthen the rule of law, and improve the quality of life for all Colombians. Without greater social and income equality and greater respect for human rights, all our efforts will fail. The military aid can only provide an opening for those who are trying to build the foundation for civil society. By electing President Pastrana, the Colombian people have indicated their desire for a future free of drugs and violence. We must ensure that U.S. assistance is instrumental in helping them achieve that goal.

Let's make no mistake. If this bill becomes law, the U.S. will have made a major commitment to helping Colombia eradicate the narco-business that plagues both it and us. We are pledging to stand beside President Pastrana, an enlightened and popular leader with a broad mandate to pursue this campaign, while he also resolutely holds negotiations with entrenched but highly unpopular insurgents. I think that, for his sake and ours, we must give him the tools and the confidence to see this through.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I voted for S. 2522, the Senate version of the Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. I voted for the bill despite serious reservations about parts of it because it also funds some very important priorities.

First, the bill provides economic and military assistance to some of America's most important allies, at the level requested by the President.

The bill includes $450 million for international family planning programs, less than requested by the President but more than last year.

S. 2522 also provides funding for many very important international programs, including the Peace Corps, U.N. peacekeeping operations, refugee assistance, and antiterrorism efforts.

I am especially pleased that, with the passage of my amendment to add $40 million, the final bill includes $51 million for international tuberculosis control and treatment and $255 million to fight HIV/AIDS in developing countries.

Unfortunately, attached to the foreign operations bill this year was almost $1 billion in emergency spending for counter-narcotics efforts in Colombia. I am disappointed that the Senate rejected an amendment offered by Senator WELLSTONE, which I cosponsored, which would have transferred the military aid portion—$225 million—to domestic drug treatment programs.

We would have done more to fight the so-called drug war by putting those dollars into proven drug treatment programs here to reduce demand. A Rand Corporation study found that for every dollar spent on demand reduction you have to spend 23 dollars on supply reduction in order to get the same decrease in drug consumption.

And because I fear that the military assistance may lead to further U.S. involvement in the 40-year-old civil war in Colombia, I tried to offer an amendment to simply affirm current Defense Department policy regarding activities of DoD personnel in Colombia. This policy states that DoD funds may not be used to support training for Colombian counter-insurgency operations, participate in law enforcement activities or counternarcotics field missions, or join in any activity in which counter-narcotics related hostilities are imminent.

I was not allowed a roll call vote on my amendment because the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made a point of order that it was legislation on an appropriations bill. However, less than 24 hours earlier, the Senator from Alabama, Senator SESSIONS, had an amendment accepted which also dealt with U.S. policy toward Colombia, and which was also subject to the very same point of order. But no senator objected to the Sessions amendment.

This selective enforcement of Senate rules is a double standard and is unfair. I am particularly bothered because I had strong concerns about the Sessions amendment. This is another breakdown in comity and civility in the Senate, and I am very troubled by it.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, to increase funding for the U.S. Peace Corps.

This amendment will increase funding for the Peace Corps by $24 million, restoring funding to the enacted FY2000 level of $244 million. Even with passage of this amendment, $244 million is well below the amount authorized under the four-year Peace Corps Authorization Act which I sponsored with Senator DODD and that passed Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support last year. The Act authorizes an FY2001 level of $298 million to expand the Peace Corps to 10,000 volunteers, just as President Reagan originally intended fifteen years ago. This amendment will allow the Peace Corps to keep pace in reaching this important goal of 10,000 Volunteers within the next five years.

I remind my colleagues that the Peace Corps represents just 1 percent of the international affairs account. Over the past several years the Peace Corps has worked to increase the number of Volunteers through modest increases in its budget and more efficient management that reduced costs and staff.

As former Director of the Peace Corps, I have learned first-hand of the tremendous impact that the relatively small amount we spend on the Peace Corps has throughout the world. Not only does the Peace Corps continue to be a cost effective tool for providing assistance and developing stronger ties with the international community, it has also trained over 150,000 Americans in the cultures and languages of countries around the world. Returned volunteers often use these skills and experiences to contribute to myriad sectors of our society—government, business, education, health, and social services, just to name a few.

This amendment will help put the Peace Corps on the firm footing it needs and deserves as we enter the 21st century. I firmly believe that a rejuvenated Peace Corps will help ensure that America continues to be an engaged world leader, and that we continue to share with other countries our own legacy of freedom, independence, and prosperity. This is an investment in our country and our world that we need to make.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move we go to third reading.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, all Senators have worked very closely on this. We tried to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle. I hope we will go to third reading. I am waiting for the chairman of the subcommittee to come back to the floor. I see him on the floor now. We can go to third reading. I hope we will support this bill.

This is not a perfect bill, by any means. It does not do anywhere near enough on debt forgiveness, which is something we are going to have to address, I hope, in conference, and I hope we will have a larger allocation for that. It does not do enough on infectious diseases for the poorest of the poor countries, especially in Africa. It does not do enough for Mozambique and other areas. But it is a considerably well-balanced bill within the resources we had. I do compliment the senior Senator from Kentucky in working as hard as he has to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I extend my appreciation to my good friend from Vermont. I have enjoyed working with him on this bill. And I express my particular gratitude to Robin Cleveland, Billy Piper, Jennifer Chartrand, Jon Meek, Chris Williams, Cara Thanassi, and all of my staff involved in developing this measure.

Are we now ready for third reading?

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Shall the bill be engrossed and advanced to third reading?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Edwards	Lott
Akaka	Enzi	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bayh	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Gramm	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Reed
Breaux	Hagel	Reid
Brownback	Harkin	Robb
Bryan	Hatch	Roberts
Bunning	Helms	Rockefeller
Burns	Hollings	Roth
Byrd	Hutchinson	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Inhofe	Schumer
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerry	Specter
Craig	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden
Durbin	Lincoln	

NAYS—4

Feingold	Thomas
Smith (NH)	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Johnson

The bill was ordered to be read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The clerk will read the bill for the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now returned to the calendar.

Mr. LOTT. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this very important legislation, the foreign operations appropriations bill. It has a lot of important provisions in it, funds that are critical to our foreign policy. We did have two very significant votes with regard to the Colombian aid. I think probably some Members were surprised by the show of support, with 89 votes against cutting the funds in one instance and maybe 79 in the other instance.

This has been good work. It did take patience by the managers and some cooperation on both sides of the aisle. We were able to get it done in a very short period of time. I thank all concerned for their good work. I hope we can continue that and make real progress on the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill this week. After the work we have already done, I think we can show we are doing the people's business.

I commend Senator MCCONNELL and I commend Senator LEAHY for being willing to stay here last night and suggest we were going to have more votes last night. That helped get this done. I thank the Senators.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to also thank the distinguished majority leader for his work in bringing this up. This can sometimes be a contentious bill, as he knows. His efforts in working also with the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, paid off. And the distinguished majority leader had the patience to allow Senator MCCONNELL and me to work through an awful lot of amendments on both sides of the aisle.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID. We heard periodically the crunch in the Cloakroom as he broke a few arms, but we moved it through and got an overwhelming vote.

Senator MCCONNELL showed close cooperation with me and with Senators on both sides of the aisle throughout the process. I enjoy working with him. I know he agrees we need more resources for some of these issues, and we will work together to get them.

We have many interests around the world. We know U.S. leadership costs money. I think Senator MCCONNELL and I have tried to show a bipartisan cohesion on that.

I thank the staff. They spent many long days and late nights, many long weekends in getting this far. I appreciate that. Robin Cleveland, Senator MCCONNELL's chief of staff on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, as always, has been a pleasure to work with. She shows enormous competence and knowledge. I appreciate that. Her assistant, Jennifer Chartrand, was indispensable to this. Jay Kimmitt on the committee staff and Billy Piper on Senator MCCONNELL's personal staff have all been of great help.

On the Democratic side, I mention several. First, I want to mention Cara Thanassi of my staff who was there from start to finish. Ms. Thanassi, on the floor now with me, is a Vermonter. She will be heading back to graduate school, only after she spends a month in East Timor. I am proud of her and what she has done for the Senate. She has shown the best attributes of a true Vermonter.

J.P. Dowd, my legislative director, helped on the Senate floor during the many busy times of the last few days. Of course, Tim Rieser, the Democratic clerk on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, has worked on these issues in the Senate for nearly 15 years. He probably has as great an institutional memory on the foreign policy issues as anybody in the Senate staff or Senate and was truly indispensable.

Again, I thank the leader for his help in getting the Senate this far.

I yield the floor.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—Continued

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3598

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3600 TO INSTRUCTIONS OF THE MOTION TO COMMIT

(Purpose: To limit the use of funds for standards relating to ergonomic protection)

Mr. LOTT. I send an amendment to the desk to the pending motion to commit with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 3600 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask consent that reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the amendment insert:

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate, issue, implement, administer any proposed, temporary, or final standard on ergonomic protection.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3601 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3600

(Purpose: To limit the use of funds for standards relating to ergonomic protection.)

Mr. LOTT. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 3601 to amendment No. 3600.

Strike all after the first word, and insert the following: