

independence, Sudan has only seen about 11 years of peace. This seemingly endless conflict has taken the lives of more than 1.5 million people and resulted in well over 2 million displaced persons or refugees. Perhaps the saddest consequence of the war is that there are thousands of teenagers who do not remember a peaceful period, and who know better the barrel of a gun than the inside of a classroom.

The international community has done the best that it can with this situation; there are approximately 40 national and international humanitarian organizations providing millions of dollars annually in food aid and development assistance. For its part, the United States government has provided more than \$600 million in food assistance and non-food disaster assistance since the mid-1980's.

The United Nations' Operation Life-line Sudan [OLS], which maintains a unique agreement with parties to the conflict, has been instrumental in allowing humanitarian access to displaced persons in the southern Sudan. I commend the humanitarian organizations operating in the region who daily face not only enormous technical and logistical challenges in serving the Sudanese population, but also the all-too-frequent threat of another offensive nearby.

Fourth, the Sudanese government has a deplorable record in the area of human rights. According to the most recent State Department human rights report, the Khartoum government maintains not only regular police and army units, but also internal and external security organs, a militia unit, and a parallel police called the Popular Police, whose mission includes enforcing proper social behavior. In 1996, according to the report, government forces were responsible for extrajudicial killings, disappearance, forced labor, slavery, and forced conscription of children. Basic freedoms—of assembly, of association, of privacy—are routinely restricted by the government. Worse, imposition of Islamic law on non-Muslims is far too common. An April 1997 U.N. Human Rights Commission resolution identified pages of similar abuses.

Mr. President, this is not a regime that should be included in the community of nations.

In response to Sudan's actions in these areas, particularly with respect to terrorism, the U.S. government has imposed a series of sanctions on the current Sudanese regime over the past several years, including suspending its assistance program and denying senior Sudanese government officials entry into the United States.

In part at my urging, the Administration officially designated Sudan as a state sponsor of terrorism by placing it on the so-called "terrorism list" in 1993. Inclusion on the terrorism list, according to Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act (P.L.96-72), automatically puts statutory restrictions

on the bilateral relationship including prohibitions on foreign, agricultural, military and export-import assistance, as well as licensing restrictions for dual use items and mandated U.S. opposition to loans from international financial institutions.

In addition, the United States has supported several resolutions by the United Nations Security Council, including three demands that Sudan extradite three suspects wanted in connection with the failed 1995 assassination attempt against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. After Sudan failed to comply with these resolutions, the Council later adopted measures calling on member states to adopt travel restrictions and to ban flights by Sudanese-government controlled aircraft.

But, as important as these measures have been, Sudan has apparently refused to get the message that its actions are simply unacceptable.

Sudan has the potential to be one of the most important countries in Africa. It is the largest country on the continent and has a population of 29 million people. With cultural and geographic ties to both Arab North Africa and black sub-Saharan Africa, the Sudan has the potential to play a significant role in East Africa and the Gulf region.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, Sudan continues to squander that potential by engaging in or supporting outrageous acts of violence and terrorism.

So, Mr. President, I welcome the President's decision to take a tougher line with respect to Sudan.●

FEHBP + 65 DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 224, to allow Medicare-eligible military retirees to join the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 1334, introduced by Senator BOND. S. 1334 will create a demonstration project to evaluate the concept of increasing access to health care for military retirees by allowing them to enroll in the Federal employees plan.

After hearing from military retirees in Montana, I am convinced that FEHBP + 65, as it's called, is a necessary step to help ensure that military retirees have access to quality health care. When military retirees turn 65, they no longer have guaranteed access to health care. The lucky ones can get services from military treatment facilities [MTFs] on a space-available basis, but the rest do not have access to MTF's. They must rely on Medicare, which has less generous benefits and significant out-of-pocket costs, despite the commitment they received for lifetime health benefits by virtue of their service to this country. They are the only group of Federal employees to have their health benefits cut off at age 65. That just not right.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan is a popular program which

provides good benefits at a reasonable cost. It will serve military retirees well and uphold the Government's commitment to provide quality health benefits. Our military retirees deserve no less.●

FUNDING OF THE MEDICINE CREEK TRIBAL COLLEGE

●Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, would the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee yield for a question?

Mr. GORTON. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senator GORTON and I have been working with the Puyallup Tribe of Washington to establish base funding in the BIA budget for the Medicine Creek Tribal Community College in Tacoma, WA. The Tribe has been working diligently and patiently with the BIA to secure the necessary accreditation to facilitate such base funding. I am happy to report that the tribe has just recently received such accreditation.

However, the BIA has recently denied the Puyallup request for funding on the grounds that they had not established their accreditation, even though that was not a requirement of the BIA rules when the initial request for funding was made. On April 8, 1997, I wrote the BIA to express my concern regarding an apparent accreditation "catch-22". It seemed that in order to be accredited, the school needed to demonstrate a secure funding base. However, to secure a funding base the college needed to be accredited. I expressed to the BIA my sincere desire to see this apparent conundrum resolved. Over the past several months, it appeared that the BIA was, in fact, moving to address this issue. In a recent meeting the tribe had with Michael Anderson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, they were assured they would receive funding for fiscal year 1998. But we now understand that the BIA has changed its mind and indicated that Medicine Creek Tribal College will not receive funding for fiscal year 1998. This is not acceptable.

In the conference report on H.R. 2107, the conferees agreed to increase funding for tribally controlled community colleges by \$2,500,000 over the fiscal year 1997 level. Is it the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the Medicine Creek Tribal College be eligible for some of this funding?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, like Senator MURRAY, I am disturbed that BIA has now taken the position that the Medicine Creek Tribal College will not receive any funding. My office has worked with the tribe and understood that their funding needs would be met in fiscal year 1998. We urge the BIA make funds available from the increase in tribal community college funding to assist the Medicine Creek Tribal College move forward with its recent accreditation.