We have the Senator from Alabama on the floor ready to offer an amendment and to talk about that some tonight. I believe the occupant of the Chair is also interested in discussing an amendment of his own tonight.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, before we go to the Senator from Alabama, as I understand it, anything we may do tonight would be simply in the form of discussing amendments and then laid aside.

I see the distinguished Senator from Alabama on the floor.

I don't want to delay that any further.

I yield the floor.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3492

(Purpose: To provide an additional condition on assistance for Colombia)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) proposes an amendment numbered 3492.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 144, strike line 22 and insert the following: aiding and abetting these groups; and

(D) the United States Government publicly supports the military and political efforts of the Government of Colombia, consistent with human rights, that are necessary to resolve effectively the conflicts with the armed insurgents that threaten the territorial integrity, economic prosperity, and rule of law in Colombia.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to talk a little about this amendment tonight, in general terms, and talk a little more precisely about it in the morning. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be time tomorrow for me to have approximately 30 minutes sometime during the day to speak on the amendment, unless some others would want more time on the other side.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, will the 30 minutes for the Senator from Alabama come after the consideration of the Wellstone amendment, which we have already locked in?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. That would be satisfactory to me, and such other accommodations we can make to make it better for the managers.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Alabama amend that to request that this side have an equal amount of time on his amendment tomorrow, which we may or may not use?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am troubled by our efforts, which I support, to help the nation of Colombia.

I serve on the Narcotics Committee. I serve on the Armed Services Committee. Over quite a number of months, we have had testimony and hearings involving this issue. I have become quite concerned about the stability of the nation of Colombia. I believe it is a democracy, and it is one of the oldest in the Western Hemisphere. It is worthy of our support.

I believe Colombia is in a critical point in its history with over 50 percent of its territory—or at least over 40 or perhaps 50 percent of its territory—under the hands of insurgent forces. This great nation is in trouble.

I hope we can devise a way to effectively assist them in their efforts to preserve democracy and freedom, economic growth and prosperity, and safety and freedom for their people.

That is the intent of my amendment. It goes to an issue that I think is important.

This is the problem we are dealing with. The President, his State Department, and his representatives have testified and said repeatedly that our goal here is to reduce drugs in America and to save lives in America.

Our goal is to fight drug dealers in Colombia. Our goal is to help defoliate and destroy coca production in Colombia. The administration has steadfastly avoided and refused to say that this Nation, the United States of America, stands with the democratically-elected Government of Panama against two major Marxist organizations that seek to overthrow the Government of Colombia, and have actually occupied large portions of that nation.

It is baffling to me why this is so. I do not understand what it is. Maybe it is an effort to appease the hard left in this country. Maybe it is an effort to appease certain liberal Members of this Senate who just can't see giving money to fight a left-wing guerrilla group anywhere in the world. Indeed, I can't recall an instance in which this administration has ever given any money to support democratically-elected governments, or other kinds of governments, for that matter, against left-wing Marxist guerrillas.

These guerrilla groups have been involved in Colombia for many years. They have destabilized the country. They have undermined economic progress. They have provided cover and protection for drug dealers. They have in fact damaged Colombia substantially.

I believe it is time for us to encourage Colombia to stand up to these organizations, to retake this country, and to preserve democracy in the country. It is a serious matter, in my view.

Colombia has been an ally. We have encouraged them to enter into peace negotiations, and President Pastrana has tried his best to negotiate with these guerrilla groups. In fact, Colombia has given a piece of their territory, I am informed, the size of Senator LEAHY's State of Vermont to the guerrillas as a cease-fire zone, a safe zone in which they can operate without fear, and that the duly constituted Government of Colombia would not enter there and do something about it while they attempt to establish peace. But this concession, this appeasement to the guerrilla groups, has not appeased them. It has not caused them to be less violent or aggressive. But in fact it appears it has encouraged them in some ways.

I believe Colombia is at the point where they can achieve stability. I believe they can drive home, through a combination of diplomacy and military efforts to these insurgent forces, that war is not going to pay off, that war is a dead-end street for everyone, that they are willing to accept divergent views in their democracy, that they are willing to hear from the underlying concerns of the guerrilla groups. In fact, President Pastrana has said that over and over again. But fundamentally they have to send a message that they are willing to pay the price, that they are going to produce an army capable of putting these guerrillas on the defensive, and that they will take back their territory and unify their country.

There are also right-wing para-military groups in the country, a right-wing militia, that is involved in terrorist-type acts and violations of human rights. They also need to be defeated and disbanded before Colombia can be unified. There can be no higher goal than that, from my perspective, for our country at this critical point in time.

What are our goals? Why won't the President discuss them plainly? Our goal in Colombia is to produce regional stability. The collapse of Colombia can undermine nearby nations, whether Bolivia or Peru or other countries that border it. It can have a tremendous adverse effect on their stability.

Instability in Columbia, should it occur, would knock down and damage one of our strongest trading partners. Colombia has 40 million people. Those people trade with the United States to a heavy degree. It would be a tragedy if they were to sink into chaos and could not maintain a viable economy. We have a self-interest in that, but we have a real human interest in trying to make sure we utilize our abilities, our resources, to help that nation to right itself and take back its territory.

As I had occasion to say to President Pastrana recently: I want to see that we help. I want to help you strengthen your country. But I would like you to think about a great American. I would like you to think about Abraham Lincoln, who was faced with division of his country. Nearly 50 percent of his country had fallen under the hands of the Southern States. He had to make a big, tough decision. That decision was whether he was going to accede to that, was he going to allow the United

States to be divided. He decided no, and he rallied the American people.

In the course of it, as I told Senator BIDEN, at one point when we discussed it, he had the occasion to have my grandfather killed at Antietam, who fought for the South at that time. But that was a tough war. It was a tough decision. But in the long run, this country is better because we are unified today.

I do not believe we can achieve any lasting ability to reduce drugs being imported into this country from Colombia if Colombia cannot control its territory. How is it possible we can expect we will make any progress at all if Colombia cannot control nearly 50 percent of its territory? It boggles the mind.

I have been a Federal prosecutor for 15 years. Prosecuting drug cases was a big part of my work starting in the mid-1970s, through the 1980s and through the early 1990s. At one point, I chaired the committee in the Department of Justice on narcotics. I had briefings from everybody. During the time I was working on this issue, we believed and worked extraordinarily hard to achieve the end of drugs in America by stopping drug production in South America. Colombia, for well over 20 years, has been the primary source of cocaine for this country. They remain so. In fact, cocaine production in Colombia has exploded. It has more than doubled in the last 3 years. It is a dramatic increase. That is a concern of ours.

I believe we can, I believe Colombia can, make some progress in reducing that supply. My best judgment tells me that after years of experience and observation, this Nation is not going to solve its drug problem by getting other countries in South America to reduce their production. In fact, an ounce of cocaine sells in the United States for maybe $150. The cost of the coca leaf utilized to make that $150 product is about 30 cents. Farmers in South America are making a lot of money producing coca at 30 cents for those leaves. They could pay them $2, $3, $4, 10 times what they are paying now for coca leaf, and these farmers would yield to the temptation and produce coca.

I do not believe this market of illegal cocaine is going to be eliminated from our country by efforts to shut off production in South America. The reason countries need to shut off the production of cocaine—and Bolivia and Peru have made progress in that regard—is to preserve the integrity of their own country. They do not want to allow illegal Mafia-type drug cartels to gain wealth and power to destabilize their countries in democracy and turn it into chaos and violence as has so often occurred. They have a sincere interest in achieving that goal, but that interest has to be understood to be primarily their own interest.

This administration refuses to talk about the real situation in Colombia. It refuses to be honest with the American people. Their foreign policy request was $1.6 billion. That has been approved in the House. This bill wisely reduces that, I believe, to a little less than $1 billion. They are requesting this much money to make a government that our Nation, the President, and the Secretary of State will not assert to be a country we support in their efforts against these guerrilla groups. I believe that is wrong. I think we need to be more clear eyed, more honest about our foreign policy. I believe that would be the healthy approach. It will help the American people to understand exactly what their money is being spent for. It will help them to understand what our goals are in the region. It will help them to understand whether or not we are achieving those goals.

If we do so correctly, we could utilize this money to inspire President Pastrana and the people of Colombia to rise up, take back their country, to preserve their democracy, take back their territory from those who don't believe in democratic elections, who kidnap, kill, protect drug dealers, who rob and steal. That is what is going on.

We can do something about it. We have an opportunity to utilize the wealth of this country to encourage that kind of end result. If we do so, it would be a magnificent thing for the country. To say we will spend $1 or $2 billion in Colombia, give it to a country we don't even support in their efforts to take back their territory, is typical of the kind of disingenuousness that has characterized this administration's foreign policy. It is not healthy. It should not be done.

Therefore, I have offered a simple amendment that will say one thing: Mr. President, you can spend this money, but you have to publicly state and assert and certify to this Congress that you support the duly elected Government of Colombia in their efforts against the Marxist, drug dealing insurgents who are bent on destroying the nation.

This is more important than many know. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for allowing me to have this time, and more than that, for his leadership on a foreign operations bill that protects the interests of the United States. It is frugal, as frugal can be in this day and age. He has done his best to contain excessive spending and has improved and reduced this spending bill. I appreciate his leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Alabama. We look forward to dealing with his amendment tomorrow.

In that regard, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, has an amendment related to cooperation with Cuba on drug interdiction that he would like to have considered after the Sessions amendment is disposed of tomorrow. That has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Specter amendment be taken up after the disposition of the Sessions amendment on tomorrow.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the pending Sessions amendment be set aside so I can offer an amendment for consideration at this time.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3493

(Purpose: To make available funds for India)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 3493.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ___. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR INDIA.

Funds appropriated by this Act (other than funds appropriated under the heading ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'') may be made available for assistance for India notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of this section, the term ''assistance'' includes any direct loan, credit, insurance, or guarantee of the Export-Import Bank of the United States or its agents: *Provided further*, That, during fiscal year 2001, section 102(b)(2)(E) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1(b)(2)(E)) may not apply to India.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wanted to spend some time discussing what this amendment is about. I think at the outset, the best way to capture it is to compare it to what is taking place in the news today. This is an amendment about lifting economic sanctions on India. The administration has the authority—we provided it last year and the year before—for them to lift the economic sanctions this country has against India. Those sanctions were automatically put in place after India tested nuclear weapons. We have been providing them the authority and flexibility to be able to deal with India broadly. The administration was provided that waiver authority last year and it has chosen not to use it. So currently this country, the United States of America, has economic sanctions against India, another democracy in the world.

In today's newspaper, the administration is stating they will lift economic sanctions against North Korea. This is the country that has the most

weapons proliferation taking place anywhere in the world, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is a country on the terrorist list. It is on the big 7 terrorist list of state sponsors of terrorism. This is the country that has a number of different violations, a country where we have been at war.

There have been some different things taking place in North Korea. I am not saying I am opposed to the administration doing this. I am just saying it is quite odd, and very striking, that at the time the administration is proposing to lift economic sanctions, they continue to insist on economic sanctions against India, the second most populous nation in the world, soon to be the most populous nation in the world; a nation we trade with, a nation that is a democracy, a nation that has a free press, a nation that I think, in the future, stands to be a very strong strategic critical ally of the United States. That is India. They will be a partner of ours, working to hold stability in south Asia. Not that they don't have problems, not that we don't have issues associated with that, but this is a democracy with a free press, with capital markets, that has a number of similar aspirations to those of the United States. At the same time we are lifting economic sanctions against North Korea, this administration is going to leave them on India.

My amendment is simple. It would suspend economic sanctions against India—suspend them. While we provided the administration with the waiver authority so they could do it, they have chosen not to. By this amendment, we, the Congress, would be lifting these economic sanctions against India.

I want to say as well what this amendment does not do. My amendment does not suspend any military or dual-use technology assistance to India. The President has national security waiver authority for military-related sanctions, but we are not dealing with military-related sanctions. He has authority to waive the prohibition on sales of defense articles, but we are not doing that here. We are not dealing with defense services, foreign military financing, or dual-use technologies.

If the administration really wants to get to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with India and say we want to force you to sign the CTBT, wouldn't it be better to use the military set of sanctions rather than economic sanctions that the administration is currently using? Plus, if you think about this for a moment, is it likely we are going to force India, by economic sanctions, to sign CTBT? They are a democracy. How will their people react if their leaders are seen as capitulating to U.S. economic pressure to sign something their leaders are saying they needed to do? Is that a way we are actually going to be able to force India to do this? I think not.

Plus, this is a much bigger country with much broader issues than simply the U.S. issue of CTBT. We have a broad array of issues with India. We need to grow this relationship rapidly. To hold the entire relationship hostage to one issue is bad foreign policy on our part. It is hurting us. I think it will hurt India and hurt our ability to shape things in that part of the world.

I was hopeful that during the President's recent trip to India, he would use that chance to remove the economic sanctions on India. He was there for a number of days and had the opportunity to do that. It would help set up the atmosphere for a more aggressive, broad-based relationship with India. This was a way to leapfrog this relationship forward. This trip did improve relations with India, but he could have done so much more that he failed to do. A number of us were terribly disappointed that he did not make more use of the broad waiver authority he now has. He used it very sparingly. This was waiver authority that I fought last year to give him.

There should be no more economic sanctions on India, period. The United States should not do that. Yet the Clinton-Gore administration continues to hold up international financial institution loans which are destined for infrastructure projects which would help sustain the economic activities in rural areas where the bulk of India's poor population lives. More than a third of India's population lives in poverty today. U.S. opposition to development loans to India impedes the growth of vital infrastructure, employment, and living standards in the poorest parts of India. That is not the way to improve U.S.-India relations. These loans are being held up by the administration until India signs the CTBT.

The President of the United States has more appropriate carrots, as I mentioned at the outset, particularly in the noneconomic area, and particularly those associated with military functions, which could be used rather than these sanctions which hit the poorest people in India. Nuclear proliferation is a vitally important issue, but it should not be the only issue on which we deal with a country such as India, the largest democracy in the world.

This is all the more outrageous in view of the news I mentioned about lifting the economic sanctions on North Korea, a country which is run by one of the world's most notorious dictators, a country on the state sponsorship of terrorism list, as I mentioned, a country developing nuclear weapons and which is a direct threat to the United States and our east Asian allies.

Think about this for a moment. We are considering right now putting up a missile defense system, putting it in Alaska, and part of the reason is because of what we are fearing from North Korea. Yet we are going to lift economic sanctions there, but we are not going to do it against India? The contrast here is outrageous.

There are even recent newspapers reports out that I want to submit for the RECORD about the development of nuclear material. This was in a newspaper in Japan, about North Korea's secret underground facility producing uranium for use in its weapons programs. These are weapons programs. They are the largest proliferator around the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have this document printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Tokyo Sankei Shimbun, June 9, 2000]

SANKEI SHIMBUN: DPRK SECRET UNDERGROUND FACILITY PRODUCING URANIUM

(By Katsuhior Kuroda)

SEOUL, 8 June.—North Korea has reportedly utilized natural uranium produced in the country as raw material for its nuclear weapons development program. Meanwhile, Sankei Shimbun has obtained a detailed report on North Korea's secret underground plant for refining natural uranium and its material production procedures. The secret underground plant is widely called ''Mt. Chonma Power Plant,'' located at Mt. Chonma in North Phyongan Province. North Korea has operated the plant in secret since the end of 1989 for uranium production for the nuclear weapons program, the report said.

EX-MILITARY OFFICIAL WHO FLED TO CHINA UNVEILS EXISTENCE OF PLANT

The report was drawn up based on statements made by North Korean military official Yi Chun-song [name as transliterated], 66, during interrogation by Chinese authorities. Yi is former vice director of the operation bureau of North Korean Ministry of People's Armed Forces who served as commander in chief at a missile station. He fled from North Korea to China last year and was held in Chinese authorities' custody.

The report said that the ''Mt. Chonma facility'' has a uranium refining capacity of 1.3 grams a day. By simple calculation, the production during the past 10 years of operation would amount to approximately 5 kg. Concerning North Korea's uranium production plants, there are some unconfirmed information including plants in Pakchon and Pyonsan, but this is the first time that an accurate location and details of the inside of the facility were unveiled.

According to the report, the ''Mt. Chonma facility'' is built in a large tunnel under the 1,116-meter mountain. Soldiers of the 2d Division of the Engineering Bureau of the Ministry of People's Armed Forces started constructing the facility in 1984 and completed the work in 1986. The uranium-producing operations started in 1989.

Approximately 400 people, including 35 engineers and 100 managers, are working at the plant. The rest are physical laborers who were all political prisoners sentenced to life in prison. The uranium minerals are brought into the facility from mines in Songchon, South Phyongan Province, and Sohung, North Hwanghae Province, by the transportation unit of the Ministry of People's Armed Forces.

The report said that the arched entrance of the tunnel is 7 meters wide and 6 meters high. A pathway of about 2.5 km is connected to the entrance, and there is a corner at the end of the pathway. Making a 90-degree right turn and going along the path about 1 km, you will find a 6-km-long main tunnel with a width of 15 meters and height of 6 meters. The inside surface of the tunnels is covered by aluminum plates, and there are 3-meter-wide drains and ventilation openings there.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3493 WITHDRAWN

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

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

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SENATOR ENZI'S 100TH PRESIDING HOUR

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

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

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

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

COMMENDING DAVID REDLINGER AND THE NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

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

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

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

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

COMMITMENT TO PEACE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

(By David J. Redlinger)

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