EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: No. 574 and No. 589.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

Nanette K. Laughrey, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri.

Dean D. Pregerson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

NOMINATION OF DEAN D. PREGERSON

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to thank the majority and minority leaders as well as the Judiciary Committee chairman, ORRIN HATCH, and ranking member, Senator BIDEN, for moving an outstanding judicial nominee, Dean Douglas Pregerson, to the floor for confirmation to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

The Central District of California includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura.

Dean Pregerson has been a practicing attorney in California and in the Territory of Guam for the past 18 years. He has tremendous experience in a broad range of legal issues and a record of exceptional performance in many different aspects of the practice of law. He has been a public defender, a legal aid lawyer, and a litigator of a wide variety of civil and criminal matters in both State and Federal courts. He is currently a partner in the Los Angeles law firm of Pregerson, Richman and Luna, where he has personally litigated many issues, including contract and commercial actions, intellectual property matters, and personal injury disputes.

Mr. Pregerson has a long record of service to his community. For the past 5 years, he has been a board member of Bet Tzedek Legal Services, which provides free legal help to about 12,000 Los Angelenos a year. He is on the advisory board of the GSA/Salvation Army homeless shelter of Bell, CA, which provides food, housing, and other services to more than 200 men and women each day. He began his service for the Recreation and Parks Commission of Los Angeles in 1989, and served a term as its president. He has been a member of the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission.

Dean Pregerson has garnered high praise from many colleagues and associates. Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan, in a letter to Judiciary Committee Chairman HATCH in February of this year, said he, ''strongly supports Dean's nomination'' and believes that he will be a judge ''who combines legal talents with a firm commitment to uphold the traditional and proper role of the judiciary.'' Los Angeles Sheriff Sherman Block writes that Dean Pregerson will be ''tough, fair-minded, and committed to enforcing the law'' as a Federal judge and he conveys his strong support for his confirmation.

Again, I commend our leaders for bringing this nomination to the floor and confirming an individual who will be a great asset to the Federal bench and to the State of California.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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. 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.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this year the foreign operations bill provides $12.246 billion to administer our foreign assistance programs. This slightly exceeds the bill signed into law last year but is more than $700 million below the administration's request. Although this is a substantial reduction, I believe we have crafted a bill which addresses congressional concerns about balancing the budget while continuing to serve vital U.S. national security priorities.

Let me briefly review both the funding levels and policy provisions which advance our common international interests.

In title I, we have provided $632 million for export promotion programs. The Trade Development Agency and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation are fully funded, and the Export-Import Bank is near the request level.

Virtually all of us have learned of the direct benefit these programs have had in securing new markets and opportunities for American business. While some people have expressed concern about our subsidizing American corporations, this support we offer in this bill is a reflection of how competitive the international market has become. I believe our export promotion programs are essential to our long-term economic security.

If you have any doubt about the significance of this funding, there is one statistic which makes clear how important our competition thinks these programs are. Last year the Export-Import Bank extended $2.9 billion in loans. Its Japanese counterpart provided $19.3 billion in support.

While I am a strong supporter of the Bank, I have been deeply concerned about recent management problems. Both the Office of Personnel Management and the General Accounting Office investigated the Bank's misuse of certain salary-related authorities. In a 1995 audit, OPM concluded that retention allowances have been granted to approximately 200 of the Bank's 450 employees ''contrary to law and regulation.'' Instead of meeting the legal requirement of establishing an employee's unique qualifications and intent to leave Government service, the current management at the Bank treated retention allowances as performance bonuses.

While the problem was drawn to White House attention, the acting Chairman's nomination pending before the Banking Committee was resubmitted as a recess appointment. This has prompted the committee to limit funding for the Chairman's salary until this matter can be fully reviewed in the context of a nomination hearing.

Let me now turn to title II. We have provided $1.7 billion in funding for development assistance, including child survival programs, and the Development Fund for Africa, the Inter-American Foundation and the African Development Foundation. This level is close to the administration's request and was a high priority of Senator LEAHY and a majority of the members of the committee.

Within the bilateral aid account there are a handful of earmarks including funds for Camp David Partners, Burma and Cyprus.

Given our strong interest in securing the transition of free market democracies, we have fully funded the administration's request for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. In addition to earmarking levels of support for Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia, the bill provides funding for safety programs at nuclear reactors, small business development, strengthening agricultural productivity, and treatment for children who are victims of the Chernobyl disaster.

While not in statute, I want to take note of important report language regarding Russia.

President Yeltsin has made a lot of extravagant financial pledges on the campaign trail which must be reconsidered if the nation is to stay within IMF fiscal guidelines and sustain economic reforms. The committee points out that the outcome of the elections reflects U.S. assistance is less important

than the political and economic choices Russia's citizens and leaders will make in the coming months.

The report states that this is an important transition year for Russia. With over $10 billion in IMF loan commitments and $4.2 billion in United States bilateral support, it is the committee's expectation that most aid will be phased out and that Russia will graduate from our foreign operations programs in fiscal 1997.

Let me now address the independent agencies which are also funded in title II. Given the strong bipartisan support for the Peace Corps, we were able to come close to the administration's request and provide a total in resources of $217 million.

The International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Program has been increased substantially over last year's level from $115 million to $160 million. I continue to be deeply concerned that the administration made the decision to shift resources away from transit countries to source countries. Long-term, this approach may make sense, but the reductions in the transit country effort seem to have been made well before the source country strategy and programs had been put in place. Hopefully, the strong funding level will assure we can maintain an aggressive effort in both transit and source countries.

Mr. President, in consultation with the House, we have established a consolidated account which includes proliferation, demining and some of the related international organization programs. Within this account, we have provided funding to complete our commitment to Israel's counterterrorism effort.

This account also provides funding at last year's level for the Korea Peninsula Energy Development Organization also known as KEDO. As the report reflects, the committee supported the administration's request to leave the actual funding number out of last year's bill in order not to impede global fundraising efforts.

I thought we had a clear understanding as to precisely what level had been justified and was permissible. Unfortunately, the administration took advantage of our effort to help them and substantially exceeded justified levels of spending.

In documents submitted last year the administration suggested we planned to contribute 20 percent or $10 million toward the annual costs of 500,000 tons of heavy fuel oil. Subsequently, without submitting required reprogramming notifications, the White House announced it intended to provide $22 million to cover fuel oil. I think it is important that there is no further confusion on the burden the United States is willing to assume, so we have included a specific level of funding.

We have also included a requirement that oil may only be made available subject to confirmation that the North Koreans are not diverting it for military or other illegal uses. This is consistent with the Secretary of State's pledge to the subcommittee to assure compliance on oil use.

Turning now to our military assistance programs in title III, we have earmarked resources for the Camp David partners and provided sufficient funds to cover the transfer of F–16's to Jordan. In other areas, we have funded IMET at $40 million and provided $65 million for voluntary peacekeeping activities.

For several years, the subcommittee has been supportive of programs under the Partnership for Peace and Warsaw Initiative. This year we moved forward and consistent with the NATO Participation Act and subsequent similar legislation, the bill designates Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic eligible for NATO admission. The committee has made $20 million in loans and $30 million in grants available to these three nations to improve their military capabilities. This is an initiative crafted in conjunction with the former majority leader and in which there had been strong bipartisan interest.

Finally, with regard to title IV which funds the international financial institutions, we have done the best we could given the enormous size of the administration's request. In response to interest expressed by a majority of the committee, we have provided $295 million to cover our international organizations and programs. This will allow the administration to fully fund our pledge to UNICEF.

Our treatment of the International Development Association bears some explanation. For the first time in history, this administration agreed to vote for an arrangement which segregated $3.3 billion in contributions in a new interim trust fund to be managed by IDA. The ITF will allow only corporations and suppliers from those nations contributing to the fund to compete for contracts. Like many of my colleagues, I oppose the administration's decision to vote to exclude U.S. suppliers from competition for contracts. Thus, we have provided $626 million as a U.S. contribution to the interim trust fund. This assures American companies will continue to have access to resources we invest in the banks.

There is one further item worth drawing attention to. In the general provisions section of the bill we have included sanctions legislation regarding Burma. I recognize this is unusual in an appropriations bill and expect some debate here on the floor on that issue. However, it is my view, a view shared by the elected leader of Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi, that the time has come for the United States to exercise leadership on this issue.

That basically completes my summary of the bill.

I would like to hear from my friend and colleague Senator LEAHY. We will have a couple of amendments to lay down tonight, one of which we expect to be able to get a vote on at 9:30 in the morning.

With that overview, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am prepared to go to third reading right now, if the distinguished chairman would want it, and save having to come in at 9:30 in the morning, but I suspect there are some who may disagree.

Mr. President, this is a balanced bill. It is a balanced bill only within an allocation which, frankly, does not meet our needs. Foreign aid would never win a popularity contest. In fact, we were able to pass foreign aid bills in the past because the funds in the bills were distributed among diverse constituencies. This year is no exception. It is fast becoming more difficult because there is less money to go around.

The bill is more than $700 million below the President's request. To put that in perspective, President Clinton has requested for foreign aid about 40 percent less than President Reagan used to request. It is not that somehow there is a Democrat foreign aid giveaway. This administration is requesting about 40 percent less than either the Reagan or Bush administrations did, but it is also $1.5 billion below the level for foreign operations in fiscal year 1995.

Each year, what we do is we take a larger and larger share of the overall pie and we earmark it for the Middle East. Unquestionably that is a major priority of the United States. But, of course, it does leave less and less for the United States to carry out any policies in other parts of the world.

We should ask what that means. For example, last week the Agency for International Development laid off 200 employees. Some of these were among the finest in or out of government, people who had a decade, sometimes even two decades, of exemplary experience, exemplary and loyal service to the United States. Some programs, including ones that everyone here strongly supports—in agriculture, in the environment, in education—they lost half their staff. A number of these programs directly or indirectly created jobs here in the United States through our export programs. They are gone—to say nothing of what it does to our security.

There is actually a crisis in our foreign aid programs that few people even know about. Senators on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, need to understand this. Both Senator MCCONNELL and I had some very difficult choices to make. This bill represents a delicate compromise. Any attempt to alter that balance by shifting significant amounts of money from one account to another, I believe, would seriously threaten its prospects for passage.

We have worked with Republicans and Democrats across the political spectrum, in this body, to try to use what small allocations we had to make them work. In doing that, we have had

to basically rob from almost every single allocation except for one area. And now if we try to change those, a lot of the support this bill has disappears.

Senator MCCONNELL has made clear what his priorities are and what the priorities of the Republican side are. Let me give one example. Despite a lower allocation than last year and cuts in many programs, funding for counternarcotics activities in this bill is increased. It is increased by $45 million. That is a 39-percent increase for the 1996 level.

I believe the evidence is indisputable that despite huge amounts of money over the past 6 years, over $1 billion, the program really has not reduced the flow of illegal drugs into this country. I know this is a priority of my friend from Kentucky and that we do need to support this effort, although other programs will have to be cut short to fund the increase. I would not want to see them cut further.

There are many, some on the other side, who would like to cut further our support for international development programs. Now we shift to a priority on this side of the aisle. In fact, it is not only a priority of mine, but a priority of Senators on both sides. Some of these programs were cut by as much as half this year.

So there is a balance. I want to preserve that balance. I know Senator MCCONNELL would want to.

Basically, what we have been told to do by the Senate is to take an allocation which is way below what is necessary, but within the realities it is the only allocation we could have, take a foreign aid program which is about 40 percent less than what we had in the past two Republican administrations, and make it work. We have done the best we can. I hope Senators on both sides of the aisle will refrain from taking apart that balance.

The statement of administration policy in this bill is relative to what I have just said. The White House said they can live with most of the budgetary levels in the bill as Senator MCCONNELL and I presented it. If a couple of problems are solved, the President's advisers will recommend he signs the bill even though it is funded far below his request levels. They know the allocation left us no alternative.

But understand the reality: The bill does not meet our international needs and responsibilities. That is not the fault of the managers of this bill. We did the best we could with too little money. We face enormous challenges and opportunities in a dangerous and competitive world.

Our foreign policy has suffered from a lack of strategic thinking since the cold war. We seem to lurch from crisis to crisis without a clear sense of where we are going or how to get there. It is a concern of mine and should be a concern of every Member of the Senate of either party.

We are now the most powerful democracy history has ever known. Much of the rest of the world looks to us for direction and guidance, but we seem to determine our direction and our guidance based on what is on the evening news. We must have a clear policy. We must have a clear policy of our foreign policy, our foreign aid, our foreign involvement as we go into the next century.

Certainly, every other country does. Japan does. Japan spends more money in this area than we do but creates more jobs as a result of it. They know where they are going. A lot of other countries do. We have the world's largest economy, but our future hinges on building foreign markets in supporting democracy. If we want to create jobs for Americans, export jobs in other countries, we have to help create those jobs. They are not going to happen all by themselves. That is why Japan and the Netherlands and all these other countries go out and create the jobs. We cut back the money so we don't do it.

If we don't want to find ourselves caught up in wars around the world, we should be supporting democracies. That is what less powerful nations do. Yet, we cut back. We spend less than 1 percent of our budget on foreign aid, and we continue to cut it. Other countries see an opening. Japan and others spend a lot more.

In fact, a dozen or more countries spend more, a higher percentage of their budget than we do on foreign aid. Several spend more money in actual dollars. Why? Because they figure if the United States does not want to go after those jobs, if the United States does not want to go after the influence in other parts of the world, they will. So they spend the money, their products get sold, jobs in their countries are created, we lose the jobs, they create the expertise in foreign policy, we fire and get rid of the people having the expertise in this country, and they get the influence.

There are several things in this bill that concern me. None of us are going to get everything we want. Some things will be revisited in conference. I do want to mention one item. The bill caps the United States contribution to the Korea Economic Development Corporation at $12 million below the President's request.

The administration said this could undermine our nuclear agreement with North Korea. I would not want to see that agreement unravel. It is in our national security interest, it is in our regional interest in that part of the world that that agreement go through. I hope that we will resolve this, but I also compliment Senator MCCONNELL and his staff for the way they have worked with us on this bill, and I hope perhaps before the end of this week, we can have this bill finished.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding Senator MCCAIN and Senator COVERDELL both have amendments to lay down. The McCain amendment is the one we will be able to schedule a vote on at 9:30 in the morning. It is my understanding the distinguished Senator from Arizona would like to proceed first.

Mr. MCCAIN. If that is agreeable with the distinguished managers of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 5017

(Purpose: To require information on cooperation with United States anti-terrorism efforts in the annual country reports on terrorism)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOTT, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 5017.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to see, however, a copy of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Does the Senator from Vermont still reserve the right to object?

Mr. LEAHY. I have no objection. I understand a copy is on its way.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 198, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

INFORMATION ON COOPERATION WITH UNITED STATES ANTI-TERRORISM EFFORTS IN ANNUAL COUNTRY REPORTS ON TERRORISM

SEC. 580. Section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 2656f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) with respect to each foreign country from which the United States Government has sought cooperation during the previous five years in the investigation or prosecution of an act of international terrorism against United States citizens or interests, the certification of the Secretary—

''(A) whether or not the government of the foreign country is cooperating fully with the United States Government in apprehending, convicting, and punishing the individual or individuals responsible for the act; and

''(B) whether or not the government of the foreign country is cooperating fully with the United States Government in preventing further acts of terrorism against United States citizens in the foreign country; and

''(4) with respect to each foreign country from which the United States Government has sought cooperation during the previous five years in the prevention of an act of international terrorism against such citizens or interests, the certification of the Secretary described in paragraph (3)(B).''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''The report'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the report'';

(B) by indenting the margin of paragraph (1), as so designated, 2 ems; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) If the Secretary determines that the transmittal of a certification with respect to a foreign country under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a) in classified form would make more likely the cooperation of the government of the foreign country as specified in such paragraph, the Secretary may transmit the certification under such paragraph in classified form.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding, if it is agreeable with the distinguished managers of the bill, that we will debate this in the morning at about 9 or 9:15, whatever is agreeable to the managers of the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Arizona, the leader was hoping to schedule a vote at 9:30. You graciously agreed to let it be on this amendment. As to when the debate occurs, we can accommodate the Senator from Arizona on that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont, if it is agreeable, I don't need more than 10 minutes. We could start, say, at 9:10 with the amendment, if the leader insists on a vote at 9:30, if that is agreeable.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me suggest we have the vote at 9:45 and start at 9:30.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to see the amendment. I hate to agree to a time, and I am sorry to upset the clerk by saying that, but it is a little bit difficult to get the exact time when we might vote. I am not sure exactly what the amendment is. I hate to cut off other people.

Why don't we agree on an hour evenly divided? The amendment I now have in my hand ends ''this transmits certification such paragraph in.''

Mr. MCCAIN. I have a better copy for the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Arizona has given me another copy. He may want to send that one to the desk. I believe the one at the desk may have had a typo. I certainly have no objection to having him substitute.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a revised version of the amendment to the desk.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if this is agreeable with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, why don't we have the vote, say, at 9:45, either a vote on it or a vote on tabling. I expect it will be a vote up or down. I just don't want to give up that right. I am sure the Senator from Arizona can understand that. And maybe have, prior to the vote, 20 minutes on each side. Will that be agreeable?

Mr. MCCAIN. That is certainly agreeable. I only need 10 minutes on this side.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona and the distinguished Senator from Vermont are going to discuss the amendment that is currently at the desk. What we would like to do at this point is to have an opening statement from Senator COVERDELL on the amendment that he is going to be offering, which will be laid aside and will be taken up subsequent to the vote on the McCain amendment.

So, Mr. President, the order will be, we will hopefully vote on the McCain amendment sometime as early as possible in the morning and then go to the Coverdell amendment which Senator COVERDELL is now prepared to discuss. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky would yield for a moment. Would it be appropriate to go ahead and lay the amendment down, and then I would make an opening statement? At the time they resolve that, you can set mine aside and proceed with the other amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest to my friend from Georgia, go on and make the statement. By the time you finish, it will probably be ready to be laid down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, at the appropriate time, I will be sending to the desk an amendment that deals with international narcotics and law enforcement.

As you know, Mr. President, the President of the United States and this Senator have been in extended disagreement about drug policy in the United States. I have been exceedingly critical of the reduction of an investment in drug interdiction. I have been critical of the reduction of our resources available for international narcotics law enforcement. I have been critical of the fact that the drug czar's office was virtually closed. I have been critical of the fact that the message coming from the White House has been less than clear to the young people of our country on how dangerous drugs are to them.

I find myself tonight in the unusual circumstance of defending President Clinton's policy for his 1997 budget request for international narcotics and law enforcement.

Mr. President, President Clinton requested that $213 million be appropriated for international narcotics and law enforcement. That figure is only half what the investment in this arena was in 1992, which is just another example of the downsizing of the drug role. But unfortunately, the House bill only appropriates $150 million in international narcotics and law enforcement, and the Senate, as we have it before the floor, is $160 million.

The purpose of my amendment will be to restore the President's request, to honor the President's request. He has requested $213 million. I think it should be more, but it certainly, in my judgment, should not be less.

My amendment restores $53 million to this effort. Where does it come from? Mr. President, the Senate's position that is before us assigns $356 million to international operations and programs, a significant program. That is $31 million higher than the President's request, $31 million more than the President requested for international operations and programs.

So my proposal would take $28 million from this proposal and shift it to international narcotics and law enforcement. In other words, we are taking money from an account for which the President requested less, but we would put in more and shift it over to where he requested more but got less. Second, we take $25 million from development assistance, that is AID, which is requiring only a 2 percent reduction in the Senate-proposed appropriations, which is $1.929 billion. Having accomplished these two shifts, $28 million from international operations programs, $25 million from AID or development assistance, we would have the effect at the end of the day of having restored—restored—this very important function, international narcotics and law enforcement.

Mr. President, in the last 3 years, as an underpinning for my amendment and for the President's request, which I am trying to fulfill, we have created in the United States a full-fledged drug epidemic. Until I had seen the figures I could not believe it. From 1980 to 1992, drug use among our teenagers was cut in half. In the last 36 months it has doubled. Every statistic—marijuana use, heroin use—we are seeing a war flash across our country. In fact, Mr. President, if the casualties we are taking were from people in uniform, we would have declared war in our hemisphere by what is happening across the board.

What am I talking about, Mr. President? What I am talking about is that 2 million—2 million—more teenagers are into drugs tonight than there were 3 years ago—2 million. That is as large as the city of Atlanta, the host of the 1996 Olympics. Two million sisters, brothers, fathers, mothers, 2 million friends, associates, folks who live next door, somebody in the workplace, whose lives are stunted, tragically altered, and the line is going straight up.

The drug war was shut off. It needs to be turned back on. We need to be concerned about what is happening to children in our own country. Mr. President, this is the first war that has been waged against children. In the 1960's and 1970's, the target audience was 17 to 21 years old. Today the drug war is waged against kids who are 8 to 13 years of age. It is a tragedy occurring right before our eyes.

The President has appointed a new drug czar. He has called for new international narcotics money. While we may disagree on the policies that got us here, I agree with his effort to get the war back on.

Mr. President, I yield for a moment. Apparently the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Vermont have worked out their differences. I will yield and return and submit my amendment officially after they have concluded their work.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 5017

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I understand the managers have agreed to a unanimous consent that we have a vote at 10 tomorrow with one-half hour equally divided.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the agreement was—I understand that the Republican leader has a scheduling concern—that we would go to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona at 9:30 in the morning, that we would have one-half hour equally divided in the usual form, but obviously we could yield that back. I mean, technically we could be on the vote at 9:31.

I say that only because I do not want the two leaders, my distinguished friends from Mississippi and South Dakota, to suddenly have to hear from Members, why are we having a vote at 9:30, not 10? But my understanding is that the distinguished chairman will soon ask unanimous consent on behalf of the distinguished majority leader that we would be on the McCain amendment at 9:30, one-half hour equally divided, though we can yield back.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in fairness to the Members, I think it is better to have a time certain for the first vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that vote occur on or in relation to the McCain amendment no later than 10 a.m., Thursday, and that the time between 9:30 and 10 a.m., be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand that would be a McCain amendment, and that there would be no second-degrees in order.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I also ask, if I could have unanimous consent, that a modification would be in order tomorrow morning, as we are still in negotiations with the Senator from Vermont concerning, perhaps, modifications for the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to modify the amendment tomorrow morning in agreement with the Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the McCain amendment be set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5018

(Purpose: To increase the amount of funds available for international narcotics control programs, offset by reductions in other appropriations)

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk that amends the bill in more than one place, and I ask unanimous consent that it be immediately considered, and no second-degree amendments be in order.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be laid aside after he finishes his discussion.

We will vote first in the morning on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, and no time agreement will be entered into tonight for a time certain on a vote on the Coverdell amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 5018.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 104, line 19, strike ''$1,290,000,000'' and insert ''$1,262,000,000''.

On page 124, line 20, strike ''$160,000,000'' and insert ''$213,000,000''.

On page 138, line 5, strike ''$295,000,000'' and insert ''$270,000,000''.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have basically concluded my opening statement on the proposal, and explained that we are restoring funding to the President's request in the arena of international narcotics.

I did misspeak when I said we were taking $28 million, the figure is $25 million for international narcotics; and I said $25 million from development and assistance, and it is $28 million. I got them reversed.

Just to reiterate, we are in the midst of a drug epidemic. This is not a time to undercut the Presidential request for direct funding to the war on narcotics and the war on 8- to 13-year-olds in America—8 to 13 years of age. They are the target. The havoc that we would pay for this is immeasurable and indescribable.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his amendment. I support it.

As far as I know, there is no further business to be conducted this evening, and 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. 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

FOREIGN OIL CONSUMED BY THE UNITED STATES? HERE'S WEEKLY BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending July 19, the United States imported 7,800,000 barrels of oil each day, 1,100,000 barrels more than the 6,700,000 barrels imported during the same week a year ago.

Americans relied on foreign oil for 54.9 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that this upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf war, the United States obtained about 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970's, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 7,800,000 barrels a day.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, too many Americans have not the foggiest notion about the enormity of the Federal