thirty-seven million, four hundred twenty-three thousand, seven hundred seventy-one dollars and seventy-nine cents).

One year ago, July 17, 1997, the federal debt stood at $5,363,009,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred sixty-three billion, nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 17, 1973, the federal debt stood at $455,472,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-five billion, four hundred seventy-two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,077,165,423,771.79 (Five trillion, seventy-seven billion, one hundred sixty-five million, four hundred twenty-three thousand, seven hundred seventy-one dollars and seventy-nine cents) during the past 25 years.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to express my profound concern for the International Criminal Court that was overwhelmingly approved in Rome late on Friday. I was pleased that the United States voted against final passage of this global criminal court. The Administration should be commended for rejecting this international folly, which would have been dead on arrival in the Senate.

Unfortunately, however, the danger from this Court has not passed. The Administration is already coming under pressure from proponents of the court to reconsider its opposition. Even more disturbing is the possibility that the Court would assert jurisdiction over American soldiers, despite the American refusal to join the court. The Administration should ''just say no'' to any efforts to get the United States to reconsider or to signal any informal compliance with the Court.

As both a Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism and Property Rights, I find the International Criminal Court profoundly troubling. If there is one critical component of sovereignty it is the authority to define crimes and punishments. This Court strikes at the heart of sovereignty by taking this fundamental power away from individual countries and giving it to international bureaucrats.

There are other aspects of this Court that are equally troubling. As examples, the authorization of international independent prosecutors, the expense of such a permanent court, and the lack of any clear limits on the Court's jurisdiction are all alarming. But no aspect of this Court is more troubling than the fact that it has been framed without any apparent respect for—indeed, in direct contravention of—the United States Constitution.

As Chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee, I have a number of particular concerns about the Court. First and foremost, I remain concerned by the possibility that Americans could be dragged before this Court and denied the protections of the Bill of Rights.

Even more fundamentally, I am concerned that the Administration participated in these negotiations without making any effort to insist that the proposed International Criminal Court incorporate and honor the Bill of Rights. Even if one concedes that we need an International Criminal Court—which I emphatically do not—we should certainly insist on respect for the Bill of Rights as the price of American admission.

America's ideals and values are ascendant in the post-Cold War world. America's position as world leader is, in no small part, a product of a Constitution that is the envy of the world. The Administration should be justly proud of that Constitution and should have insisted that those principles form the cornerstone for any International Criminal Court. That unfortunately was not the official position of this Administration.

In the United States, there is a right to a jury of your peers. In the United States, there is a privilege against self-incrimination. In the United States, we have eliminated the prospect of criminal liability for ill-defined common law crimes. In the United States, the Constitution limits the authority of prosecutors. None of these protections will be guaranteed for defendants brought before this international star chamber.

The proposed Court negotiated in Rome neither reflects nor guarantees the protections of the Bill of Rights. The Administration was right to reject the Court and must remain steadfast in its refusal to join a court that stands as a rejection of American constitutional values. We must never trade away American sovereignty and the Bill of Rights so that international bureaucrats can sit in judgment of the United States military and our criminal justice system.

In today's New York Times, there is an opinion piece in which Anthony Lewis chastises the United States for missing a historic opportunity by failing to vote in favor of the International Criminal Court. The author states that the vote to form the International Criminal Court ''will be seen as a turn in the road of history.'' That is perhaps the only point in the piece with which I agree. The approval of this Court was indeed ''a turn in the road of history.'' By ceding the authority to define and punish crimes, many nations took an irrevocable step to the loss of national sovereignty and the reality of global government. I, for one, am heartened to see that the United States took the right turn on the road of history, and I will work hard to ensure that there is no backtracking.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4112, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4112) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3220

(Purpose: To amend House legislative branch appropriation bill to include Senate items.)

Mr. STEVENS. 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 legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. BENNETT, for himself and Mr. DORGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 3220.

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

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. This is, in effect, putting down our version of the bill, and it becomes original text.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3221, 3222, AND 3223, EN BLOC, TO AMENDMENT NO. 3220

Mr. STEVENS. I send to the desk a series of second-degree managers' amendments and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. BENNETT, for himself and Mr. DORGAN, proposes amendments numbered 3221, 3222, and 3223, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3221

(Purpose: To increase the appropriation for Capitol Police expenses)

On page 14, line 24, strike ''$6,077,000'' and insert ''$6,297,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3222

On page 2, line 9, strike ''$79,183,000'' and insert ''$87,233,000''.

On page 2, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries of the Committee on Appropriations, $6,050,000.

On page 3, line 25, strike ''$19,332,000'' and insert ''$21,332,000''.

On page 4, line 22, strike $75,600,000'' and insert ''$66,800,000''.

On page 5, line 10, strike ''$7,905,000'' and insert ''$8,655,000''.

On page 12, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 10. (a) The Committee on Appropriations is authorized in its discretion—

(1) to hold hearings, report such hearings, and make investigations as authorized by paragraph 1 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate;

(2) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;